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Ranganathan, Shiyali Ramamrita, rao sahib 1892-1972

In Dr. S. R. Ranganathan, current advocates of the primacy of the service function of libraries could find no greater source of a guiding philosophy. Though well known for *The Five Laws of Library Science, Colon Classification*, and his *Prolegomena to Library Classification*, few librarians have stimulated as much thought in as many areas of librarianship as has the “Father of the Library Movement in India.”

Writing about the award of the Margaret Mann Citation in Cataloging and Classification to Dr. Ranganathan in 1970, Pauline Atherton noted that, “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.” ([LRTS](http://example.com), v.14, p.584.)

*LRTS* sadly reports the death of Dr. S. R. Ranganathan on September 27 at the age of 81 in Bangalore, India.

His presence among us will be missed but his words will continue to guide us through the uncertainties of modern librarianship:

1. Books are for use.
2. Every reader his book.
4. Save the time of the reader.
5. The library is a growing organism.
Reorganization of ALA/RTSD

Robert Wedgeworth

The Fall 1971 issue of LRTS (v. 15, no. 4) carried in it a tear-out questionnaire which members of the Resources and Technical Services Division were asked to indicate their preferences with regard to the reorganization of ALA as well as to a possible reorganization of RTSD. The results of this survey, which were reported at the 1972 Annual Conference, were quite inconclusive. Of the 10,503 eligible respondents, only 177 (1.68 percent) responded. Even when allowances are made for the 1,547 members and subscribers who reside outside of the U.S. this is an extremely poor showing.

Of those responding, 68 percent preferred the present separate division of RTSD to a merger with other divisions or to dispersal among several type-of-library divisions. As to the reorganization of ALA, the responses were about evenly divided between the present organization of ALA (38 percent) and a federation of divisions forming ALA (33 percent).

Many of the responses carried notes indicating that LRTS was a “primary” or “essential” benefit of membership in RTSD. While this is quite gratifying to the LRTS Editorial Board, it does raise the question of what the division offers to those members who for various reasons cannot attend the Midwinter and Annual Conferences. The importance of this question was underscored by respondents calling for “alternate general and regional meetings,” or “local area or regional chapters.” The fact that regional groups for technical services already exist suggests that less time should be spent worrying about the structure of ALA and RTSD while more time should be spent developing programs to meet membership interests and needs.

It seems very clear that ALA, in general, and RTSD, in particular, must develop means other than journals to carry its programs to its membership at large. The success of the regional MARC seminars can as easily be attributed to making an ALA program more accessible to the membership as to interest in the subject matter. Can it be that ISBD, government documents acquisition and organization, as well as cataloging nonbook materials are of as much current interest?

RTSD to the people!
Cataloging-In-Publication: Problems and Prospects

HENRY W. WINGATE
Graduate School of Business Administration
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia

The Cataloging-in-Publication program has been accompanied by a good deal of optimism. The program faces, however, a number of difficult problems which must be solved if Cataloging-in-Publication is to succeed. The difficulties that resulted in the failure of the 1958-59 Cataloging-in-Source program still exist, and the actual value of such a project to libraries has yet to be proved. For a number of reasons, the optimism with which CIP has been approached does not appear to be warranted.

WHEN THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS issued its very negative report in 1960 on the Cataloging-in-Source program it was generally felt that the century-old idea of a system which would provide for the printing of cataloging information in each individual book as published was at last dead. The idea had been first suggested in 1876 and experimented with during the late 1870s. By 1880, however, the experiments had ceased due to a general lack of interest.1 During the twentieth century the concept has been frequently revived, and projects similar to Cataloging-in-Source have been undertaken in Australia, New Zealand, the Soviet Union, and the United States. By far, the most important experiment was the 1958-59 Cataloging-in-Source program carried out by the Library of Congress. In an eight-month period from July 1958, to February 1959, the Library of Congress cataloged 1,203 books before publication, using page proofs sent to the Library by publishers. The cataloging entries were returned with the proofs to the publishers, and the entries appeared printed in each copy of 1,082 of the 1,203 titles cataloged. The entry generally appeared on the verso of the title-page in the form of a more or less accurate facsimile of a Library of Congress card. In 1960 the Library issued its conclusions concerning the program in a 199-page report.2 Based on the eight-month experiment, it was decided that:

the over-all conclusion seems inescapable that a permanent, full-scale Cata-
The logging-in-Source program could not be justified from the viewpoint of financing, technical considerations, or utility. In the light of the experience gained through the experiment, it is concluded that neither a full nor a partial Cataloging-in-Source program is desirable. There should be no further experiments with Cataloging-in-Source.3

The failure of the project was so conclusive that it appeared the idea had been dealt a deathblow. In truth, it had only been stunned. The concept remained dormant for nine years, and then in 1969 it was revived in what appears to have been an almost spontaneous plea on the part of librarians for a new program. The revival rapidly gained momentum and in two years has led to the current Cataloging-in-Publication program. The optimism accompanying this new program might seem curious in light of the failures of such projects in the past. There has been some feeling among librarians, however, that the 1958-59 CIS effort was not given every chance for survival by the Library of Congress. It has been argued that inadequate funding and the limited number of books cataloged invalidate the conclusions reached by the Library. Be that as it may, there is now a new program which poses many problems and has far-reaching implications for all libraries.

Cataloging-in-Publication from the Publishers' Viewpoint

The single largest problem which any Cataloging-in-Publication program faces is that of gaining the cooperation of individual publishers. Unlike the Library of Congress which may accept the greater part of the burden of a Cataloging-in-Publication program in its role as the national library or the individual libraries which will make use of the cataloging information supplied through CIP, the individual publishing firm has very little to motivate it to cooperate in a program. Nearly a century ago, within a year of the first suggestion for prepublication cataloging, R. R. Bowker saw the problem quite clearly. In 1877, speaking at the annual meeting of the American Library Association, he pointed out:

The difficulty in regard to obtaining the cooperation of the book trade would be that publishing books is a business and not philanthropy. It is desirable to approach publishers chiefly from the commercial side. They desire to see that there is money in it.4

This is essentially the same problem which faces Cataloging-in-Publication today.

Because book sales to libraries do represent a sizable portion of the revenues of most publishers, the publishing industry has no desire to alienate librarians by vigorously opposing an idea which has so long been cherished by librarians and the American Library Association. At the same time, CIP does not appear to offer any incentive to publishers which might insure their participation in the program. In 1968, libraries accounted for approximately 19 percent of the total book
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sales in the United States ($486 million of the $2.6 billion total). More important than the fact that the publishing industry does not depend overwhelmingly on the library market is the realization on the part of the individual publisher that libraries are obligated to buy books without regard to the presence or absence of CIP entries in those books.

The 1960 report on Cataloging-in-Source pointed out some of the difficulties involved in eliciting the cooperation of publishers. In 1958, the Library of Congress approached over 300 publishers to ascertain whether they would be willing to participate in the CIS experiment. Of these, 244 agreed to send in page proofs for one or more of their forthcoming books. However, when the project was terminated in 1959, only 157 publishers or something less than 52 percent of the more than 300 originally approached had submitted proofs for at least one book. Perhaps more telling is the fact that in the post-experiment survey which the Library of Congress took of publishers in 1959 only 50 publishers expressed a willingness to continue in the program. That is, something less than 16 percent of the more than 300 publishers approached had cooperated in Cataloging-in-Source and were willing to continue to do so. Furthermore, "co-operation" on the part of a publisher generally meant submitting a small percentage of his total output. Of the 141 trade publishers who actually submitted proofs—the remaining 16 publishers were U.S. government agencies—only 12 submitted more than 14 books during the entire period. On the other hand, 106 publishers (or about 75 percent) submitted fewer than 7 books each.

The types of books which publishers chose to send to the Library of Congress for Cataloging-in-Source also indicate something about the attitude of the industry toward the program. Individual publishers, realizing that some delay in their production schedules would be inevitable, tended to submit proofs for books which had not been assigned a high priority, rush schedule. This tendency was evident in the very small percent of CIS books which became bestsellers. Of the 136 titles which appeared on the lists of bestsellers in Publishers' Weekly during 1958-59, only 5 contained CIS entries. Unfortunately, the books which publishers refused to submit for Cataloging-in-Source were the very books libraries were most interested in getting to their readers in the shortest possible time. If Cataloging-in-Publication is to achieve its objective of reducing the processing time for prime adult fiction and nonfiction, publishers must be persuaded to submit their more important titles for prepublication cataloging.

The record of publisher cooperation in the 1958-59 Cataloging-in-Source project was a very poor one, and there is reason to suspect that their performance in the current Cataloging-in-Publication may be no better. One of the problems encountered by publishers in the 1958-59 program was the delay involved in sending the proofs to the Library of Congress. In the words of the 1960 report: "The interruption of production schedules was reported by a great majority of publishers.
as being a very real problem. Only a few firms experienced no difficulties of this sort.\textsuperscript{10} If present plans are carried out, there will be considerably more delay involved in the new program than in 1958-59. In Cataloging-in-Source the Library of Congress set a 24-hour time limit for cataloging a book. This emphasis on speed led, however, to some difficulties for the cataloging staff.

The work was taxing because of the over-all time limit, the presence of the "rush" slip, the necessity for recording the exact amount of time spent, and the special difficulties involved in working with proofs and data sheets. These factors combined to produce a feeling of tension and considerably greater fatigue than in regular cataloging.\textsuperscript{11}

To relieve pressure on the cataloging staff the new program will operate under a ten-day time limit rather than the previous 24-hour limit. This will no doubt relieve some of the tension for the catalogers, but a week-long delay may prove to be unacceptable to a majority of publishers.

It has been suggested that the only way to assure satisfactory publisher participation in a Cataloging-in-Publication program is to require their cooperation by force of law. K. A. Lodewycks offered this solution in 1953.\textsuperscript{12} However, the record of Cataloging-in-Publication in the Soviet Union has demonstrated that even legal requirements will not necessarily insure success. In 1959, the Russian Ministry of Culture ordered publishers to include cataloging information in all books in certain classes. At the same time, the burden of cataloging was shifted to publishers by requiring that books be cataloged at the individual publishing houses by members of their own staffs.\textsuperscript{13} Even under these circumstances Cataloging-in-Publication has experienced difficulty. It was reported in 1970 that "after a decade of effort, the Soviet Union still has not achieved the comprehensive CIP program that is envisaged by American proponents of the plan."\textsuperscript{14}

Supporters of Cataloging-in-Publication have for years—the first instance was in 1877—argued that publishers would be willing to participate in a program because it would result in increased book sales. The reasoning is that such a program would permit reductions in the cataloging staffs of most libraries and so would permit funds previously spent on cataloging now to be spent for book purchases, thus resulting in increased revenues for the publishing industry. This argument is faulty in at least two respects. In the first place, it has never been demonstrated that Cataloging-in-Publication would actually reduce cataloging costs for individual libraries. There was no study conducted after the 1958-59 project to measure the effect of the program on the processing routines of libraries. The second fault in the argument results from its failure to look at Cataloging-in-Publication from the viewpoint of individual publishers. If indeed the program did result in increased book sales for the publishing industry, it would not offer incentives to individual publishers to include CIP en-
tries in their books. Publishers will recognize the fact that libraries cannot base their book selection on the criterion of whether or not a book contains cataloging copy. Libraries will have to continue to purchase books for their collections without regard for Cataloging-in-Publication entries. To the individual publisher, this means that participation in the program will not necessarily result in increased book sales to libraries.

While there are other problems that Cataloging-in-Publication presents from the viewpoint of the publishing industry—such as cost, aesthetic considerations involving the appearance of a facsimile of a library card on the printed page, objections to the printing of authors’ real names in pseudonymous works, and interruptions of production schedules—the main difficulty is that Cataloging-in-Publication means to each publisher additional expense and additional problems while it offers him nothing in return.

Cataloging-in-Publication from the Viewpoint of the Library of Congress

The 1958-59 Cataloging-in-Source experiment was not a happy experience for the Library of Congress. After eight months of the program, there were still some publishers who were willing to continue to submit proofs for selected books, but the cataloging staff at the Library of Congress was nearly exhausted. The problems encountered in 1958-59 have, however, been valuable in planning for the current Cataloging-in-Publication program. A number of changes have been made in the new project in an effort to avoid some of the difficulties experienced in the earlier project.

Probably the most difficult aspect of Cataloging-in-Source for the Library of Congress was the pressure on the cataloging staff caused by the 24-hour “nonstop-rush” schedule. The 1960 report concluded that the catalogers “were unanimous in regarding this type of cataloging as unrewarding and taxing.”16 To eliminate this pressure CIP will operate on a ten-day schedule. While this undoubtedly will reduce the pressure on the cataloging staff, it is questionable if the publishers who complained of the delay involved in the 24-hour schedule will be able to tolerate the new schedule.

Changes have also been made in the new program to reduce the percentage of discrepancies between the catalog entries and books which had been so high in 1958-59. Of the 1,082 titles published with CIS copy, 615 or 57 percent of the entries contained one or more errors.17 Many of the 615 entries included more than one error, resulting in a total of 1,062 errors. Very close to one half of the errors (505 to be exact) occurred in the collation. Errors in the imprint accounted for another 184 discrepancies. Because the greatest occurrence of errors was in the imprint and collation, it has been decided that in CIP these statements will be omitted altogether. Judging from the 1958-59 project this should reduce the rate of discrepancy from the 57 percent of
the CIS experiment to approximately 20 percent. There has been some discussion of further reducing this discrepancy rate by omitting all subtitles.\textsuperscript{18} Additional omissions would of course serve to further decrease the error rate, but at the same time they would reduce the usefulness of the program. Carried to its logical conclusion, this process would result in no errors, but also in no entries. In any event, there will always be a fairly high rate of discrepancy in cataloging done from proofs. Alex Ladenson, writing in 1960, described the problem:

The basic difficulty is that a book cannot be cataloged adequately until it has been endowed with all of the physical properties of a book. To attempt to catalog a book from galley or even page proofs is to ignore some of the fundamental bases of cataloging.\textsuperscript{19}

To the Library of Congress, this means that it must, to all intents and purposes, catalog every book in the CIP program twice. The Library will first catalog a book from the proofs to prepare the CIP copy. After the book is published the Library will be faced with the task of preparing another, completely accurate, catalog entry for its own catalogs and for the production of Library of Congress cards to be sold through the Card Division. The discrepancy rate of the CIP entry will always be too high to permit a cataloger to accept any part of the entry without checking it carefully against the published book, and the omissions which are part of the current program will necessitate adding the collation and imprint in the second cataloging process.

The problems which Cataloging-in-Publication present for the Library of Congress are not as formidable on the whole as those which concern the publishing industry. It is the Library of Congress, however, which must, almost alone, bear the total cost of Cataloging-in-Publication. It must be willing to increase its cataloging staff considerably in order to handle the double cataloging which CIP entails.

\textit{Cataloging-in-Publication from the Viewpoint of Librarians}

The main purpose of any Cataloging-in-Publication program is, of course, to provide individual libraries with cataloging information for a particular book within that book. The simplest way to accomplish this is to have a facsimile of a Library of Congress card printed on the verso of the title page of each copy of a title selected for CIP. Ideally, this would enable each library acquiring the book to produce a set of cards, using the cataloging information in the book as the master copy. In this way, the process of ordering and waiting for catalog cards could be eliminated, and the book could be processed immediately. There are, however, a number of obstacles which must be overcome if anything near this objective can be achieved.

The single factor which might have made Cataloging-in-Publication the panacea that some of its stronger advocates have claimed it to be is
the elusive "cataloger's camera." This is the device which would photo-
copy the facsimile of the Library of Congress card appearing in a book
and then produce a complete set of catalog cards from that photocopy.
Until the present CIP project the idea of such a camera has been in-
separably linked with the idea of prepublication cataloging. The final
report on the Cataloging-in-Source experiment saw the cataloger's cam-
era as an integral part of the program:

The underlying concept was that all books could be cataloged once and for
all at some central point by standardized methods, and that libraries would
transfer the catalog entries by means of a "cataloger's camera" from the books
themselves to cards. . .20

The idea of such a camera has been abandoned, at least for the fore-
seeable future, for a number of reasons. In addition, the 1958-59 ex-
periment demonstrated that even if a satisfactory cataloger's camera
could be developed, its use would be severely limited because of the
high number of discrepancies between CIP entry and printed book. The
current program has had to completely abandon this concept,
due to the omissions of collation and imprint from the entries. It
would be necessary to add these items to the facsimile before a set of
cards could be produced.

Lacking a method by which card sets could be produced directly
from the CIP entries, the important questions become how and to what
extent libraries will use Cataloging-in-Publication. Unfortunately, there
was no study of the actual use made by libraries of the 1,082 entries
which were printed in books during the 1958-59 experiment, and there-
fore there is no accurate measurement of the impact a CIP program
might have on libraries. There have been a number of surveys taken
with the intention of measuring the attitudes of librarians toward such
programs, and as one would suspect these have shown that they are
endorsed by a large majority of librarians. These surveys could hardly
have come up with a different conclusion, since libraries will bear none
of the expenses of a CIP program but stand to reap all of its benefits.
While the surveys have shown very little negative reaction on the part
of librarians, there is some indication of a feeling of apathy toward the
idea.

The often cited "Consumer Reaction Survey," which was taken in
1959 after the cessation of the Cataloging-in-Source project, reached
the conclusion that "the vote for CIS was overwhelming approval, pos-
sibly as high as 98 or 99 percent."21 A closer look at the survey shows
that these figures may be misleading. In the first place, the method of
selecting the libraries to be surveyed raises some questions. Rather
than sending the questionnaires to randomly selected libraries, the sur-
vey committee followed a different procedure:

When the interview form settled down into its final shape, letters were sent
to approximately 200 libraries to ask if they would cooperate with the Cata-
log-in-Source project to the extent of granting interviews. ... It was only after they consented that they saw the questionnaire.22

In effect, only librarians who expressed an interest in the program were surveyed. It is curious that a 100 percent expression of approval was not achieved using this method. More telling perhaps is the fact that 56 percent of the librarians stated that they would continue to purchase Library of Congress or Wilson cards for those books containing CIS entries.23 It appears that while “98 or 99 percent” expressed approval of the program, only 44 percent intended to use it for its primary purpose: the preparation of card sets from CIS entries.

A more recent survey of librarians was taken in 1970 to measure their attitudes toward the new CIP project. Like the earlier survey, it concluded that “97 percent in all welcomed it.”24 Again, this indication of overwhelming enthusiasm may be misleading. The survey was conducted by mailing questionnaires to 391 libraries of all types. However, only 230 questionnaires were completed and returned.25 This represents a 59 percent response. Of those responding, indeed, 97 percent did express approval. The more important factor here, however, is the percentage of returns. By not taking the time to complete a questionnaire which consisted of 7 multiple-choice questions, a librarian was at least expressing a degree of indifference, if not disapproval. If only 59 percent of all librarians in the U.S. are interested enough in Cataloging-in-Publication to take the time to return a questionnaire, the need for such a program may be doubtful.

More important than the attitudes of librarians toward the CIP program is the question of how CIP entries will be utilized. With the elimination of the concept of the “cataloger’s camera” to produce card sets directly from CIP entries, librarians are faced with a rather limited range of options. Each CIP entry will have to be retyped onto card stock to prepare a master card from which a card set can be produced. It has been suggested that this is not a cataloging task, but rather a clerical operation.26 However, the rate of discrepancy between the entries and the books will necessitate careful examination of every CIP entry. This, together with the tasks of retyping the partial CIP entry and examining the book itself to obtain the missing imprint and collation would appear to require a cataloger rather than a clerk. Because the missing information must be supplied as the master card is typed, it will probably be necessary for a cataloger to prepare the entire card. Perhaps the most economical method of producing card sets under these circumstances would require the use of an IBM Magnetic Tape Selectric Typewriter (MT/ST). An MT/ST would permit a cataloger to type a number of master cards onto a tape which could later be run off by a clerk to produce the card sets. Because of the increased typing time on the part of catalogers, utilization of CIP entries by a library may require an increase in its cataloging staff while permitting a reduction in its clerical staff.
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Conclusions

Any Cataloging-in-Publication program is made difficult by the fact that publishers, the Library of Congress, and the libraries which will use the entries must all cooperate and must find such a program consistent with their individual objectives. Publishers must be willing to include in their production schedules a step which will permit galley or page proofs to be sent to the Library of Congress, and they must be willing to print in each copy of every title cataloged in the program the catalog card facsimile prepared by the Library of Congress. The Library of Congress must be willing to accept practically the entire expense of the program and must set up a department to rush catalog the titles submitted by publishers. The libraries which will use the CIP entries will have to demonstrate that the program is indeed as useful as has been claimed. If the publishers, or the Library of Congress, or libraries find the program inconsistent with their objectives, the program is destined to failure.

Cataloging-in-Publication programs, in spite of a long record of failures, seem always to be approached by librarians with surprising optimism. The optimism surrounding the current program is very much in evidence in recent journal articles which have appeared on the subject. A more critical attitude might in the long run mean the difference between the program's success or failure. The fact that any Cataloging-in-Publication program is fraught with problems should not be glossed over by the optimism of well-meaning librarians. The program would be better served by a more objective examination of the problems facing it.
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Title Entry as Unit Entry

JAY E. DAILY
Graduate School of Library and Information Sciences
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Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Author entry as main entry is derived from traditions that are no longer valid when the identical entry can appear under many different headings or is used in a computerized system. Title entry as unit entry eliminates the unnecessary choice of a main entry and prevents problems of identification in a computerized system. The resulting simplification of processing sharply reduces the need for descriptive cataloging by professionals without sacrificing quality as all entries are of equal value.

Main Entry

ANYONE WHO LIKES an interesting though exasperating exercise, should try to run the concept of main entry to ground. Others have not found any clear statement of the concept after Maunsell's 1595 catalog until Cutter's Rules were finally incorporated in the Anglo-American Code (Catalog Rules) beginning in 1908. All the theorists of the nineteenth century, including Panizzi, repeated what was an accepted conclusion. Scholars have always cited authors, hence the "natural" rule that entry should be made under author. Panizzi's rules did not provide for corporate authorship so that a great portion of the British Museum catalog was main entry by title under the heading "Anonymous." Strictly interpreted, main entry is a convenience of book catalogs. If full entry is to be found in only one place, then a system of rules is necessary to establish authorship so that, in Panizzi's theory, anyone aware of bibliographic practice could find the full entry without recourse to cross referencing by added entries for title, secondary authors, and subject.

The use of printed cards did not change the concept, because libraries could order a single printed card and make brief entries as needed for the shelflist and the subject catalogs. Title cards were traditionally very brief and cards for other added entries just as brief. The Library of Congress encouraged the purchase of a whole set of cards by selling the additional cards after the first at very low cost and eventually standardizing the number ordered for all books cataloged.
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Even the development of locally produced unit cards did nothing to bring the tradition into question.\(^2\)

The tradition was exported along with other accomplishments of American librarianship, so that quite reluctantly the postwar Japanese library movement deserted its traditional title main entry approach and adopted the Japanese equivalent of the Anglo-American code. Although cataloging in the Arabic world, especially in Egypt, followed title main entry as the rule, this concept is specifically rejected here. It seems quite clear that when full bibliographic detail can be included in only one spot in a catalog, a scholar is most likely to look under the author he knows rather than under the title. The purpose and value of a main entry system is to condense information for practical reasons of space in a book catalog.

**Unit Entry**

The identifying characteristic of unit entry is that all significant bibliographic detail is found under each entry whether title, author, or subject. This repetition of bibliographic detail is now less costly than individually prepared cards because modern cheap printing methods can reproduce cards, or entries for a book catalog, very rapidly and at minimum expense. Even in a computerized system, the unit entry can be reproduced far more rapidly and for less cost than the specially condensed entries of previous times. Any of the examples produced can be altered to provide for an approach other than that selected for the unit entry. Strictly defined, the Library of Congress uses an Author Unit Entry System. That is, the difference is not in the style of principal entry but in other entries. If significant details are omitted from all entries save one and reference is made to it from all other entries, we can define the method as main entry and the particular type of main entry as author, following Panizzi’s rules, or “Author or Equivalent” in Cutter’s method, now substantially preferred in the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR) of 1967.

International agreements have now produced the Standard Bibliographic Description (SBD), constituting only a slight change in the sequence of elements but not including rules of condensation for main entry procedures. The SBD does not establish whether main entry or unit entry is to be utilized but has provided a standard of description that will completely identify all the examples of any given edition. These may be compared with the following list:

1. Title
2. Subtitle or alternate title
3. Author statement
4. Edition statement
5. Edition identification (illustrator, translator, editor, etc.)
6. Place, Publisher
7. Date
8. Pagination
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9. Illustration
10. Series statement
11. Price, Standard Book Number, Binding, etc.
   (Given before Series in SBD)

These elements constitute the *endogenous* items of description that identify copies down to edition. We might, if we wanted to be quite pretentious, call them the *endogens* of description, borrowing our terminology from the Greek, through French and biological science of the 1830s. In biology, the distinction is made between pathological conditions that arise within the organism (endogenous) and those that invade it (exogenous). For a book, the endogenous elements should be found in the copy at hand, and it is an accident or peculiarity of the edition if any must be ascertained from reference sources. Other elements such as descriptive notes and contents notes are usually endogenous as well, but the former may identify a single copy and the latter is very much a matter of choice in format as well as precise statement. An annotation is as much a contents note as is a list of the individual parts of a book. The important thing to note here is that we are dealing with details needed to create a unit entry on the reasonable basis that no two copies of different editions will have all these details in common. In other words, we assert the logical probability that the sum of the elements of description (our *endogens* of description) is such that it constitutes unique identification, like the spots around a lion's whiskers or the patterns in the retina of the eye or the combination of epidermal ridges on the finger tips of human beings.

Except for some contents notes, all else is exogenous and must be derived by reference from another source than the book in hand, whether subject heading list, classification schedule, or book of rules for selection of main entry. We can now add more elements of description, it being understood that these are derived not solely from direct quotation of printed matter in the copy at hand, thereby further limiting the definition of a bibliographic *endogen*.

12. Descriptive notes
13. Contents notes (or annotations)
14. Tracing

The tracing contains all the exogenous elements of bibliographic description that fit the book into the retrieval system of a library. This includes entries by author, entries by subject, and, if given separately, entry by classification in a chain indexing system. The location number (call number) of the book is also given in the tracing. The tracing contains as well a uniform title if desirable.

*Unit Entry in Automated Systems*

To store bibliographic information in a computer and minimize programming difficulties, these fourteen elements may be divided into independently searchable, dependently searchable, and non-searchable.
fields. A long series of experiments on the author's part, but especially an experiment conducted by a skilled programmer showed that title entry was an independently searchable field and the principal field of identity. That is, only the title can be programmed to take full advantage of the redundancy of natural language so that inquiry can be based on approximation rather than precise statement. Obviously a proper name must be correctly spelled to be found, there being no redundancy at all until unnecessary portions are added. Smith, John and Smita, Joan are two different identifications however you want to chop them. "Laws of Iran" if spelled "Lhws of Irhn" would still be searchable because of the redundancy in position of terms and the ubiquitous particle "of." The particularity of "Iran" as the name of a country aids in identification, but that must be disregarded here. The crucial test is in the natural language and its consequences. "Laws" may be varied throughout the alphabet for the second letter, but only "lows" is an English word. The choice is limited to "Laws of Iran," "Laws of Iraq," "Lows of Iran," "Lows of Iraq," etc. As the only element to be given in the response to every inquiry, the title alone serves as a primary identifying feature. More identification is conveyed by the title than any other endogenous element of bibliographic description.

This can be simply tested by referring to the title section of Books in Print and The Subject Guide to Books in Print and counting the number of books with the same title and different authors. Either "economics" or "education" makes a good test, especially if the term is truncated to "Econom" and "educat" and all the book titles with these words are listed. The result of the test will show that no proper name can be truncated without producing irreconcilable ambiguity and that a greater amount of identifying detail is needed for proper names to resolve the ambiguity than is required for titles. Even if the title is, for instance, "Economics" the ambiguity is within controllable limits.

Obviously syntactical words such as "the, a, an, of, and . . ." do not constitute a fair or reasonable test. It is just these words in the title that may be programmed so that inquiry is not dependent upon precise statement. The initial article is suppressed in any case.

All inquiries yield the title as well as the element sought, including all that is stored if necessary. Independently searchable fields may be sought as logical products of fields, but the title is necessary as an element of the logical sum of dependently searchable fields. No inquiry can be based on a nonsearchable element.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Field</th>
<th>Independently Searchable</th>
<th>Dependently Searchable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Subtitle or Alternate title</td>
<td>4. Edition Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Author Statement</td>
<td>5. Edition Identification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Searchable</td>
<td>6. Publisher</td>
<td>7. Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Illustration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Series Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The distinction between searchable and nonsearchable fields is easy to discern. Even descriptive notes are of little value in the average search, and it can be assumed that few if any users would want to find a book based on the number of pages or number of volumes. Information that will be needed as the basis of search may be put in other fields. The contents of the nonsearchable fields would be printed out, but no search strategies may be based on any of these fields. Independently searchable fields may be searched on the basis of complete information such as the whole subtitle or alternate title, author, series statement, and tracing—the usual areas where entries are made at present in a manual system. A programming feature to prevent inordinate listing on the basis of a search is easily developed so that the number of items within a search field can be offered the user before the listing begins, which is particularly useful in the case of publisher.

Independently searchable fields can be used for the making of lists on a batch-process basis, as well as the on-line searching for which the program was developed. The Standard Book Number is a most useful item for identification of a title in the collection when all other means fail, but any list made for a certain number would be limited to one item if the complete number was used as the limit of the titles to be listed. Other programs can be developed so that analysis of contents is possible. Independently searchable fields may be combined into limited strategies using the title field or other independent fields where partial information can be used to obtain a complete record for identification. These possibilities can be investigated as the library develops its program.

Dependently searchable fields, however, can be used only in conjunction with the title. There is often need to determine how many different editions of a title the library has, especially in processing gift books, so that identification of edition by means other than numbering is listed as a separate dependently searchable field. Date and illustration are each of value in the search for different editions of a title, although it is very doubtful that either field alone is of much value as means of search. An inquiry for all the third editions of all books in the library would be foolhardy and ought to be prevented in the programming, hence the use of dependently searchable fields.

Various ways can be found for utilizing the title field for searching, including the first word and first letters of the next three words as in the Ohio College Library Center system. A possibility of inquiry based on partial information is perhaps the most useful feature of a com-
puterized method of inquiry, although obviously the system must be limited to what technology affords. It is very likely that the whole catalog of a large research library can never be put into a searchable online file. There seems to be no good reason why it should be if the same results can be achieved by a variety of up-dated bibliographies based on the independently searchable fields.

Only the briefest tinkering with the MARC tapes is necessary to establish that they comprise a valuable reference source but are not suitable for use in systems automation. The amount of "garbage" in the tapes is of less consequence than the fact that no system other than that developed for a particular library can provide a means of accumulating data, storing, and manipulating it as the materials processing system demands. It must be the most apparent fact in the world that every library has a unique collection calling for a particular selection and processing operation.

One of the old problems, if not bugbears, of technical services operations has been how to pass along information gathered in the acquisitions process so that catalogers need not retread steps already covered. An automated system that cannot resolve the dilemma is insufficient, and title unit entry is the only way found to achieve what systems automation aims for.

Early in the development of various projects meant to codify thinking about systems automation, a curious paradox was revealed. Arranging temporary files by main entry, as prescribed by cataloging rules, meant that a book would, in effect, have to be cataloged from other than the best source. Bibliographers have always demanded a copy in hand before they begin their work; yet, on-order files were supposed to be arranged by main entry before the book was obtained, sometimes before it was published. The question led to a conclusion about unique entry files: Main entry assumes secondary entries. Unique entry means that for one item there must be only one entry. On-order files especially require this rule if unwanted duplicate copies are not to snarl the processing and deplete the budget for materials.

For reasons that reconfirm title entries as the least troublesome in single entry systems, title entries are virtually essential in unique entry systems. Field experiments comparing matching operations under AACR main entry as unique entry, as against title entry as unique entry, brought incontroversible evidence that clerical personnel could utilize title unique entry files with greater speed, greater success, and greater accuracy than was ever possible with established main entry in unique entry files. Repeated trials brought the same result, hence reluctantly we must differ in this detail from Welch in her article "Acquisitions" in the Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science.4, 5

If an orderly progression of steps is to lead ultimately to the announcement that certain material is available for use by the patrons of a library, then all temporary files and especially the unit entry of an automated system must utilize title as the principal independently
searchable element of bibliographic identification. It is inescapable (and only further evidence so far as the author is concerned) that the computer is teaching us a great deal about librarianship that we failed to notice before.

Data can be accumulated as it is found and incorrect data revised so that the establishment of the record parallels the procedures of obtaining, cataloging, classifying, and announcing that materials are available for use. In other words, the sequence of elements is fixed so that endogenous elements of bibliographic description can be handled by clerical personnel from the point of selection to the point of establishing the choice and form of entries and the classification for a particular library. The record can be identified as

a. Desiderata
b. On Order
c. Received
d. In Cataloging
e. Cataloged
f. Listed (in Accessions
   List or otherwise)

Any data collected in this process may be stored in the appropriate field of the appropriate record and revised as necessary. Indeed, the fallibility of human beings in citing bibliographic detail accurately need not hinder access to the record sought even if it must be selected from those that are obtained in response to an inquiry.

Unit Entry in Existing System

Too many years as practicing librarian make any large revision for whatever theoretical reason undesirable to the author. All the foregoing would never have been offered for discussion outside the sheltered environment of his laboratory, if the author had discovered that a change of existing records is essential to establish a title unit entry procedure in automated systems or in the popular semimechanized systems that abound in all types of libraries. In fact, often enough, title is main entry, so that for the dictionary catalog there is little change except where an error of filing has survived despite all reason and logic.

Filing should go from added entry authors directly to the title. The main entry author must be disregarded if the cross referencing function of added entry is not to be lost. In fact, there is as much reason to file by subject then by title as by subject then by author, although the latter appears to be preferable. Subject headings are a natural language approach to an artificial system of classification even when there is little correspondence between the two. They are never separable because the classification is simply an artificial approach to a natural language classification obtained by the title of the book. The tendency of catalogers is to make subject headings of titles, because in a highly
diffuse way titles tend to indicate the contents of a work as much as to identify it. This is meant not as a demonstration of the obvious, but rather as a means of showing that "how-to books" is a very good subject heading as well as book title, derived as it is from the commonality of titles with these two words as descriptions of content and approach. It is just as obvious that authors cannot be dictated to and that Storm over Tokyo or The Hinge of Fate have nothing to do with meteorology or the occult. These are digressions and utilizing them would produce invalid or at least irrelevant arguments.

In fact, there is no need to be simon-pure about the rules. All additional entries are found on the top line of the unit card. What follows next can be a cataloger's decision that further frees the catalog from the rigidities of a system. If subject entries in a dictionary catalog are filed by author under the subject heading, then the tracing or the rules for preparing the unit cards can take this into account. The first item of the tracing can be the author entry that is repeated after each subject heading so that the unit card has two lines of information before the title unit entry.

In a dictionary catalog the rule that a title card is not made when subject heading and title are identical, or nearly so, is obviously no longer operative. It is simply easier to make subject cards as needed and elaborate the heading with author information if desired. In fact the rule is questionable unless aligned with filing processes. Further, dividing a dictionary catalog when the title is used as unit entry presents less problem than is found if an author-title section is filed separately from the subject entries. Of more consequence is the fact that form headings (e.g. "Laws, statutes, etc.") become both subject headings and close enough to uniform titles to be so designated. In our previous example, a divided catalog for a book in Parsee on the laws of Iran would require both a uniform title entry for the author-title catalog and a subject heading that would well be identical, for example,

Iran. Laws, statutes, etc.

for both, as well as the required transcription of the title page for the title unit entry.

As mentioned above, all temporary unique entry files—"On order," "Desiderata," "Proof slips," "Continuations"—must be arranged by title unless matching problems are enjoyed and needed by the library's technical service personnel. Title as unique entry seems so well established as a functional method of arrangement for all temporary files, even books awaiting processing, that further argument seems unnecessary.

Title Unit Entry and Cataloging-in-Source

A close study of the possibility that uniform cataloging information can be a part of a book convinces one that the reason for previous failure was more mechanical than actual. Errors in the collation as
much as anything tended to discredit the experiment of the late 1950s. This is highly regrettable because collation is the very element that is most easily ascertained by a trained clerk or technical assistant.6

This separation of endogenous elements from those added by reference to outside sources suggests that the Library of Congress needs only include the tracing on the verso of the title page. There seems to be no good reason to reprint its card and thus tie the publication of a book to the government's printing schedules. Only the entries, with the Library of Congress selection of main entry first, the subject headings, the Dewey Decimal and Library of Congress classification and the LC card number are needed. All these can be determined from a copy of the final edited manuscript or, if need be, from the galley proof. Those libraries using the Cutter-Sanborn tables or the Library of Congress tables will have to select one entry to provide the cipher that completes the call number. For about ninety-five percent of the books obtained by medium-sized public or college library, this will be forthright enough so that a clerk can take the following formula and produce an order of entries that will at least be certain of shelving works by personal authors together: (a) List as entries all the names of actual persons, up to date, in the order of their importance as shown on the title page. (b) If no personal authorship can be ascertained, list corporate bodies as authors. (c) If both personal names and corporate bodies are found, list the names of persons first and the names of corporate bodies next, following the established form of the library whenever possible.

As classifiers know, a vague rule makes uniform choice impossible. The only way to provide for uniform choice of entry is to accept the decision of an authority. Only if the Library of Congress agrees to put its decisions into the book itself can the cataloger be certain that his choice of call number will be that of the Library of Congress without having to delay processing until the printed cards are on hand and matched with the book. The book can be made available to users on the basis of classification and entry information form in the book even if the library will use Library of Congress printed cards as permanent cards in its catalog. It requires but little planning to make a shelflist card and such circulation records as are necessary from information on the verso of a title page so that end-processing of the book precedes the final filing of cards in the public catalog. This is very often the case, in any event, unless the library withholds a book from its patrons until the last card is filed.

But libraries planning systems automation that will preserve the existing records are dependent on cataloging-in-publication if the speed of the computer is not to be nullified by the lengthy operations that get an order for cards off to the Library of Congress and a set of them back again. It seems foolish to rely on the U.S. postal service and the printing schedules of the U.S. government to work in microsecond tolerances, even supposing that the Library of Congress fills card or-
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ders with the speed of a computer. For new books, the very ones most desired by patrons, it is frankly impossible at present.

If, into the bargain, publishers would accept Standard Bibliographic Description and give all the elements in their proper sequence in at least one entry in their lists of publications, then an automated system would be able to mesh human and computer work to the point that a book could be in the hands of a patron fully and correctly cataloged within twenty-four hours of receipt. The Library of Congress might have to sacrifice or re-arrange its work schedules so that the printed book contains all the exogenous elements that can reasonably be expected by a library, certainly all those now found on its printed cards. This suggestion is not utopian; no technological invention is necessary and no reorganization of society required.

The squandering of professional cataloging resources on uncomplicated work would cease so that catalogers could turn their attention to the really difficult problems of works not under bibliographic control and the provision of sufficient analytics. At present in many libraries, ease of access is dependent on ease of cataloging not on necessity. In other words, catalogers will not become obsolete, they will only have to start earning professional pay by professional work. Transcribing endogenous bibliographic detail scarcely deserves that designation.

Rules for Title Unit Entry

(1) Title:

Transcribe the title exactly as found on the title page or its substitute but observing the rules of capitalization and punctuation. Do not re-arrange elements found unless clearly indicated by the nature of the book and other bibliographic detail. Capitalize only proper names and proper adjectives, as in formal English, and the first word of the title. Do not omit articles or shorten the title.

(2) Subtitle or alternate title:

Include the complete subtitle or the alternate title, distinguishing between the two by punctuation. Subtitles are preceded by a comma following the title. Alternate titles are preceded by a semicolon, the word “or” if found on the title page, and a comma. The first word of a subtitle is not capitalized. The first word of an alternate title is capitalized. Subtitles do not begin with the word “or.” Do not supply the word “or” in brackets if not found on the title page.
The author or authors of the work are always cited and always identified by the word "by." This may be supplied in brackets if not found on the title page. If found on the title page, it is preceded by a comma and the name (or names) of the authors given exactly as found on the title page. If more than three authors are given, all after the first are omitted and this is followed by the words "and others" in brackets if the work is in the English language. If the work is in another language, the abbreviation "et al." is supplied in brackets, but not underlined or italicized. Authors may be actual persons, imaginary persons, or corporate bodies. Do not use the name of the publisher as author. If publisher's name precedes the title on the title page, it should be so transcribed. If not, it will ordinarily be shown in the imprint. Compilers or editors of the first edition may be considered authors.

At times a book is published in a special edition with editor given, such as "11 ed. by Christopher Morley." This can be transcribed precisely. At other times a new edition may be published without identifying it except by the editor's name. Sometimes the only clue to the edition is the name of a translator or an illustrator. At times, the illustrator or editor may be a compiler as well and really be equivalent to an author so that his name must be shown in the author statement. Transcribe the information found on the title page or the verso of the title page regarding identification of edition, but do not attempt to locate such information elsewhere.

Obviously, details of spacing on catalog entries will have to be determined in local applications of this system. The examples of problem cases use block spacing and include all matter found on the title page and elsewhere to demonstrate some of the peculiarities of the system.
The rules and many examples will be found in Cataloging of Separately Published Monographs, A Text and Workbook for Library Technical Assistants, co-authored by Jay Daily and Mildred Myers. It is sufficient here to state that there are no significant variations from the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules of 1967 so far as description is concerned. The difference is in establishing that the unit entry will be equivalent to Standard Bibliographic Description as the international basis of agreement. The choice of type and form of entry depends on the library and the material being cataloged.
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The establishment of personal name, whether it is to be used as the main entry or an added entry, is always important in the organization of library materials for use. If the personal name happens to be that of an author of belles-lettres, the establishment of that name, with proper dates added, will determine the classification. In organizing the majority of Western language materials, the cataloger has found the National Union Catalog an adequate authority for establishing personal names. However, that is not the case with many Chinese materials. Since the Library of Congress printed cards for Chinese literature have had a history of only slightly over a decade, they have not grown into a vast resource. For the establishment of Chinese personal names, the cataloger must consult a good number of reference books, in Chinese as well as in other languages, in addition to the National Union Catalog.

The following is a list of such reference books that have been found helpful for establishing Chinese personal names at the Ohio State University libraries since the inception of the East Asian collection over eight years ago. Their inclusion in this list is based on two criteria: (1) availability in the current market, and (2) ease in handling by the cataloger. It will be of little practical value to produce an impressive list of scholarly works, many of which are out of print and currently unavailable. At the same time, the writer has also taken into consideration the nature of the cataloger's work. A cataloger is chiefly responsible for creating authentic records of the materials he organizes.
for use. He is not engaged in time-consuming research. A cataloger, therefore, always attempts to “cut through to the heart of the problem” as quickly as possible, and prefers those books that are sensibly arranged, or well-indexed, or better still, both. All of the books listed below meet with such requirements. They are divided into three categories: (1) works covering several periods, (2) works limited to a specific period, and (3) works dealing with a specific profession. Under each category, the books are further arranged in descending order according to their importance or usefulness.

(1) Works covering several periods


This is the most informative chronology of Chinese personalities from B.C. 551 down to 1919, with their alternative names, native places, and biographical sources given. The cataloger will find this work clear and easy to use. The first edition was published in 1937 by Shang wu yin shu kuan, Shanghai, under title: **Li tai ming jen nien li pei chuan tsung piao** ("A chronology of famous Chinese through the dynasties, with their native places, from inscriptive biographies.")

**Li tai ming jen sheng tsu nien piao.** ("A chronology of famous men in Chinese history.") Compiled by Liang T'ing-ts'ian. Shanghai: Shang wu yin shu kuan, 1933; Reprinted by Chung Mei tu shu kung ssu, 1969. p. 279.

This work lists the names of approximately five thousand Chinese of historical importance, dating from the time of Confucius (B.C. 551–479) down to the year 1911. Names are arranged chronologically according to the year of birth, and under each name are given: (1) alternative name or names, (2) native places, (3) birth and death dates, and (4) length of life. At the beginning, there are two indexes to names, one by the number of strokes, and the other by the four-corner system. At the end, there are tables of emperors, famous women, and famous Buddhist monks; preceded also by indexes similar to those for the main part of the work. The clarity of arrangement and good indexes make this work convenient to use.


This work comprises over 70,200 given names, pen names, and fancy names of Chinese personalities, and many of the foreigners that once served in China. These names are arranged according to the compiler’s own system, which is explained in his preface. Under each alternative
name, the compiler gives the person's real name in full, and the period in which he lived. The sources used are not indicated, but there is a bibliography at the beginning. For the reader who does not want to learn the compiler's own system of arrangement, there is an index by the number of strokes.


The Taipei reprint is published under the title: Li t'ai tso chia shih ming pieh hao so yin ("An index to writers' fancy names for their residences through the dynasties"). This work was originally published in the thirties as two separate books under the titles Shih ming so yin ("An index to fancy names for residences"), and Pieh hao so yin ("An index to alternative names"). Now combined in one volume, it contains over 17,000 fancy names the Chinese writers have given to their libraries, gardens, pavilions, and so forth. These fancy names have been used as parts of their alternative names, or of the titles of their writings. Some of these fancy names are given by others, and some adopted by the writers themselves. The fancy names are arranged by the number of strokes, and under each fancy name are given the period, native place, and the real name of the person using it. There is an index to the fancy names by the number of strokes.

Chung-kuo jên ming ta tz'ŭ tien. ("Dictionary of Chinese names.")
Edited by Tsang Li-ho and others. Shanghai: Shang wu yin shu kuan, 1938; Reprinted by T'ai-wan Shang wu yin shu kuan, Taipei, 1968. p. [19], 1808, [159].

This biographical dictionary contains brief sketches of over forty thousand persons in all phases of Chinese history, including foreign tribemen that once resided in the Chinese territory. The information is drawn from the biographical sections of the dynastic histories, and other types of source materials, such as gazetteers, inscriptions, and Chinese classics. The periods it covers range from the ancient times down to the Ch'ing dynasty (1644-1912), but the biographical information about the Ch'ing dynasty is inadequate. This dictionary should be used only by the cataloger as the last resort, as the birth and death dates are inexact, and the sources used are seldom given. The names are arranged by the number of strokes, and there are appendixes for the pseudonyms and a chronology of emperors through the dynasties. There is a romanized index, compiled by Jean Gates, and published separately in Washington, D.C., in 1942.

(2) Works limited to a specific period
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This biographical dictionary is indispensable to the cataloger in handling materials that deal with the personalities of the Ch'ing dynasty. It contains sketches of over eight hundred men and women in dynastic, racial, military, territorial, political, intellectual, literary, and religious phases of Chinese history of the last three hundred years. Its chief source materials are the major Chinese biographical literature, with its defects corrected, and non-Chinese historical documents. In addition to biographical sketches, this work offers much biographical information invaluable in both descriptive and subject cataloging. There are separate indexes to names, books, and subjects, and a listing of names arranged in chronological order.

**Ch'ing tai hsüeh chê chu shu piao.** ("A table of Ch'ing scholars and their works.") Vol. V of Ch'ing tai t'ung shih. ("A general history of the Ch'ing dynasty.") By Hsiao I-shan. 5 vols. Shanghai: Shang wu yin shu kuan, 1932-35; Reprinted by T'ai-wan Shang wu yin shu kuan, Taipei, 1963.

Of the seven tables contained in the fifth volume of this authoritative history of the Ch'ing dynasty, the sixth table on the leading scholars and their works is very useful to the cataloger for establishing Chinese personal names. This table is divided into four columns: (1) Name and alternative names, (2) native place, (3) birth and death dates, and (4) published and unpublished works. It is arranged in chronological order but the cataloger, with some practice, should not find it difficult to use.


Intended as a supplement to Eminent Chinese of the Ch'ing Period (1644–1912), this work contains over 600 biographies in four volumes. The cataloger will find it an excellent authority for establishing names of the Chinese, both the living and the dead, for the period 1911–1949. The criterion for inclusion in this work is prominence in some aspects of Chinese life, political, military, economic, literary, artistic, or academic. In addition to the subject's name, alternative name or names, native place, birth and death dates, the biography describes the subject's family background, education, career, political affiliation, and writings. The fourth and final volume contains a comprehensive bibliography. It lists the published writings, if any, of the subject of each biography and the sources, both personal and written, used in preparing the biography.

**Hsien tai Chung-huo tso chia pi ming lu.** ("A list of pseudonyms of modern Chinese authors.") Compiled by Yüan Yung-chin. Peiping: Chung-hua t'u shu kuan hsieh hui, 1936; Photocopy by Dai An Kabushiki-kaisha, Tokyo, 1968. p. 144.
Compiled by a former cataloger at Kuo li Pei-p'ing t'u shu kuan (National Library of Peiping), this list contains names, courtesy names, and pseudonyms of over five hundred modern Chinese authors. The names are arranged by the number of strokes, with real names appearing in the first column on each page, followed by the corresponding alternative names in the second column. There is a detailed index to all the names, and alternative names, and an alphabetical index to those who write their names in romanized forms, or roman letters.


This work contains over 3,000 biographical sketches, and is very useful for cataloging materials dealing with Communist China. It includes top party, government, and military leaders but also a wide variety of other types of men and women such as economic planners, legal and society personnel, professors, artists and writers, diplomats, leaders of youth, women and labor organizations, and minority and religious leaders. Each sketch gives name, alternative name or names, native place, birth date whenever ascertainable, education, career, and writings. Some writers are listed under their real names, and some their pseudonyms, and there are cross references between them. At the end of each volume, there is an index by the number of strokes.

*Chung kung jén ming lu.* ("Personal names of Communist China.")


Intended for the researcher in the politics of Communist China, this biographical dictionary is equally helpful to the cataloger for establishing personal names. It covers all types of men and women that play important roles in party and government, and military, cultural, and artistic fields. Each biographical sketch gives the subject's real name, his alias or aliases, his birth date, and, of course, his career. There is an index by the number of strokes, and an appendix which groups all personalities by profession.


This work contains biographical sketches of over two thousand leading personalities in various fields of modern China from the establishment of the Republic to 1954. Each sketch gives the name, alternative name or names, native place, birth and death dates, career, and writings. Although outdated for most reference purposes, it is still useful to the cataloger as it contains many names not to be found in other sources.

*A Guide to Doctoral Dissertations by Chinese Students in America, Volume 16, Number 4, Fall 1972* • 449 •

This guide was intended as a complete record of the doctoral dissertations submitted to American universities by Chinese students during the years 1905-1960. The dissertations are arranged by two broad classes: (1) humanities, social, and behavioral sciences, and (2) physical, biological, and engineering sciences. Under each class, the entries are arranged alphabetically by the author's names, which total 2,789. This guide also contains a listing of dissertations submitted to Canadian universities, and of the recipients of honorary degrees, 1876-1961. The cataloger will find this guide useful for establishing the names of Chinese trained in America and Canada.


This is the continuation of A Guide to Doctoral Dissertations by Chinese Students in America, 1905-1960, compiled by Yuan T'ung-li. It covers the years 1961-1964, with the exception of 10 dissertations accepted prior to 1961 but left out in Yuan's work. A total of 843 dissertations are grouped under specific disciplines such as aeronautical engineering, electrical engineering, and so forth, and under each discipline, the entries are further grouped by the authors' names. The cataloger will find this list useful for establishing the names of Chinese trained in the United States during the years 1961-1964.


Reprinted from the Chinese Culture Quarterly, vol. 4, no. 4, March 1963, this work is a companion volume to the author's A Guide to Doctoral Dissertations by Chinese Students in America, 1905-1960. The dissertations are arranged similarly by two broad classes: (1) humanities, social, and behavioral sciences, and (2) physical, biological, and engineering sciences. Under each class, the entries are arranged alphabetically by the authors' names, which total 344. The cataloger will find this guide useful for establishing the names of Chinese trained in Great Britain and Northern Ireland during the years 1916-1961.


Reprinted from the Chinese Culture Quarterly, vol. 5, no. 3, 4, and vol. 6, no. 1, this guide is a sequel to the author's two previously published guides to doctoral dissertations. A total of 1,574 dissertations are grouped by countries such as France, Belgium, Switzerland, Germany, Austria, Netherlands, Italy, and Spain. They are further re-
grouped alphabetically by authors under various disciplines. The cataloger will find this guide very useful for establishing the names of Chinese trained in continental Europe.


This work was prepared by a Japanese author, and published in Peking under Japanese occupation during the Sino-Japanese Conflict, 1937-1945. It lists somewhere between 4,500 and 4,600 contemporary Chinese prominent in cultural and educational fields, and is particularly strong in persons trained at the Japanese universities. For each person, it gives his name, alternative name or names, birth date, native place, education, career, and writings or other achievements. The brief biographical sketches are arranged according to the number of strokes.

(3) Works dealing with a specific profession


This work contains the biographical sketches of more than 6,800 Chinese men of letters. Each sketch gives the name, alternative name or names, birth and death dates, native place, chief activities, personality, and the most significant writings. The arrangement is chronological, beginning with Lao-tzu (b. ca. b.c. 571) and concluding with a writer who died in 1931. The index to the names is arranged by the number of strokes.


This biographical dictionary of Chinese painters through the dynasties also includes writers who have made achievements in the artistic fields. Each biographical sketch gives the artist's name, alternative name or names, native place, chief activities, and a description of his works and style. No exact birth or death date is given; only the dynasty in which he flourished is indicated. However, bibliographical source or sources are often cited, and the cataloger can sometimes determine the exact birth and death dates from these sources. There is an index to the names according to the number of strokes.

Chung-kuo li tai shu hua chuan k'o chia tz'u hao so yin. ("An index to the alternative names of Chinese calligraphers and painters through the dynasties.") Compiled by Shang Ch'eng-tsu and Huang Hua.
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Peking: Jên min mei shu ch'u pan shê, 1960; Reprinted by Chung-kuo shu hua yen chiu hui, 1968. 2 vols.

This work contains approximately sixteen thousand alternative names for Chinese calligraphers and painters from the Ch'in dynasty (B.C. 255-209) through Ch'ing dynasty (1644-1912). Its chief source material is Chung-kuo hua chia jên ming ta tz'u tien ("A biographical dictionary of Chinese artists"), edited by Sun Ta, but the exact birth and death dates are given. The first volume gives the artist's alternative name or names, his real name, his native place, and his specialty, in that order. The second volume is an index from the artist's real name to his alternative name or names, with pagination in the first volume indicated. This work, compiled with painstaking care, serves as a reliable source for establishing the names of Chinese calligraphers and painters.

Sung Yüan Ming Ch'ing shu hua chia nien piao. "A chronology of calligraphers and painters of Sung, Yüan, Ming, and Ch'ing dynasties (960-1912)." Edited by Kuo Wei-ch'iü. Peking: Jên min mei shu ch'u pan shê, 1962. p. 12, 76, 555, 69.

This work includes more than four thousand calligraphers and painters, and important collectors, as well as writers related to calligraphy and painting. It lists their names and alternative names, birth and death dates, length of life, chief activities, and representative works, with bibliographical sources indicated. The arrangement is chronological, but there is an index to the names by the number of strokes. Among the appendices which the cataloger will also find useful are: (1) a list of additional calligraphers and painters about whom only scanty information has been found, and (2) a chronology of important calligraphers and painters of the Chin, Sui, and T'ang dynasties, and the Five Dynasties, covering 265-960 A.D.
According to the Library of Congress Subject Headings list and the Sears List of Subject Headings, there are at least six different forms in which period subdivisions under main subject headings are constructed, some with verbal designations, others with numerical dates. The diversity in form creates tremendous problems in the filing, especially by machine, and use of the catalog cards bearing such headings. A modification of the various forms into one uniformed type has been proposed in the Hines-Harris computer filing code. This paper attempts to examine this revised format with reference to the basic nature and function of the period subdivision in subject headings and with regard to its use from the catalog user's point of view.

In recent years, largely due to the problems encountered in filing by machine, there has been frequent discussion in library literature regarding the formation of period subdivisions under subject headings. The basic problem involves the interfiling, in chronological order, of period subdivisions formed by words or phrases and those formed by numerical dates. Of the various solutions recommended, the most feasible seems to be the consistent formation of period subdivisions by dates, as proposed in the Hines-Harris computer filing code. However, there seems to be a certain hesitation in accepting this revision outside of the computer field, as pointed out by Kelley L. Cartwright, "If LC were to change the heading 'U.S.—History—Civil War' to 'U.S.—History—1861-1865 (Civil War),' then that majority of libraries that have, and for some time to come will continue to have, card catalogs, would legitimately object to the necessity of interfiling headings so different in form."

This paper attempts to determine whether there are logical or inherent reasons for resisting the proposed revision of period subdivision in subject headings. The discussion will be based on an examination of the most widely used subject headings lists in this country—Subject Headings Used in the Dictionary Catalogs of the Library of Congress, and the Sears List of Subject Headings.
The various subdivisions under subject headings do not represent a logical development of the dictionary catalog. As Paul S. Dunkin has pointed out, "Subdivision is the mark of the alphabetically-classed catalog" and was adopted by Cutter on the basis of "arrangement rather than on theory of entry." The proliferation of library material must have necessitated the subdivisions as a convenient means of arranging the cards.

Since certain subject areas, such as history, the politics and government of individual countries, music, and national literatures, lend themselves to historical or chronological treatment, the period subdivisions were introduced. Each of these subjects requires a different division of historical or chronological periods. As stated by David Judson Haykin, "The period subdivisions used should either correspond to generally recognized epochs in the history of the place or should represent spans of time frequently treated in books, whether they possess historic unity or not." It is impossible to apply a uniform division of periods to all countries or to all subjects. The history of a country is subdivided by the ruling houses and important events or significant dates, and national literatures are usually subdivided by literary movements or trends.

However, there is also diversity in the formation of period subdivisions for which there is little apparent logical reason. According to both the LC and the Sears lists, there are at least six ways of constructing a subject heading with period subdivisions. The Sears list differs from the LC list only in the degree of subdivision in period subdivisions, not in form. The examples used throughout this paper are taken from the 7th edition of the LC list.

(1) An inverted "noun, adjective" heading, for example:

- Sculpture, Ancient
- Baroque
- Gothic
- Medieval
- Renaissance
- Rococo
- Romanesque

Modifiers such as "Ancient," "Renaissance," "Rococo," and "Modern" denote both period and subject characteristics. Such headings are not true period subdivisions, and therefore are interfiled alphabetically with other subheadings that have no period connotation.

However, in certain cases, some of the same adjectives are used as period subdivisions, instead of as modifiers, for instance:

- Music—History and criticism—Ancient
- Music—History and criticism—Medieval.

The ALA Rules for Filing Catalog Cards are quite explicit on this point:

The divisions ANCEINT, PRIMITIVE, MEDIEVAL, RENAISSANCE, BA-
ROQUE, MODERN, etc. are arranged alphabetically, not chronologically, even when followed by a date (e.g., HISTORY, MODERN—20th CENTURY), except when used as further divisions of the subdivisions HISTORY or HISTORY AND CRITICISM (e.g. MUSIC—HISTORY AND CRITICISM—ANCIENT).⁶

Note that in the latter case, the headings are filed chronologically.

This type of subdivision is usually not followed by dates. The filer and the user are assumed to know the proper sequence of these divisions, e.g. “Medieval” comes between “Ancient” and “Renaissance” or “Modern.” Although this creates problems in filing by machine, to the manual filer, and the catalog user, at least, it poses relatively few problems, since most of these terms, such as “Ancient” and “Modern,” are indicative enough.

(2) A main subject heading with a subdivision in the form of a noun or phrase (without any dates) clearly denoting a chronological period or historical event, such as,

- English drama—Early modern and Elizabethan
- English drama—Restoration
- American literature—Colonial period
- American literature—Revolutionary period
- U.S.—History—Colonial period
- U.S.—History—Revolution
- U.S.—History—Civil War

In filing, according to both the ALA Rules and the order in which they appear in the LC Subject Headings list, these subdivisions are arranged chronologically (instead of alphabetically with the other forms of subdivisions); that is, “U.S.—History—Revolution” is filed as if written “U.S.—History—1775–1783,” and “U.S.—History—Civil War” as if written “U.S.—History—1861–1865.”

This peculiarity creates a number of problems. The difficulty in instructing a machine to file these headings in the proper chronological order is obvious and has often been commented on in print. The manual filer must mentally translate the period subdivision into dates, for these headings are arranged chronologically without chronological (i.e., numerical) designation. If the filing rules in this particular regard create numerous problems for the librarians, for the average reader they must be close to a mystery. Moreover, even if the reader’s awareness of the filing rules is taken for granted, it must also be assumed that he has a familiarity with the chronological order of the events under that particular subject in order to find the headings in the proper places. This means the reader also must insert the dates mentally in the headings. Haykin, recognizing this problem, made the remark: “The date . . . makes the sequence of periods in the catalog clear, while the name, if used alone, would make it difficult, sometimes perhaps impossible, for the reader to find.” He offered an explanation for the use of such subdivisions in the LC Subject Headings.
Because terminal dates are not always easy to establish, or because there is disagreement about them, or because certain periods and events are familiar to readers, they are sometimes omitted. This practice should, however, be avoided as far as possible.  

Most of the headings with period subdivisions of this type occur under American history and American literature. This fact clearly shows a national bias in the early principles of forming subject headings, as stated in the preface to the ALA List of Subject Headings for Use in Dictionary Catalogs, a forerunner of the LC Subject Headings list:

The general principle of decision is that the heading should be that under which it is supposed that the majority of educated Americans will look. It is probably true that “the majority of educated Americans” know when the Civil War or the American Revolution took place and can mentally supply the dates to the headings when they use the catalog. However, in the case of many others, especially foreign readers, one cannot assume a similar degree of familiarity. One cannot expect them to be able to always recall the dates of these events and to place them in the proper chronological sequence. With the increasing international scope in the use of Library of Congress catalogs and cards, this national bias should not be retained.

(3) A main heading with a subdivision containing the name of a historical period or event followed by dates.

- English literature—Middle English (1100-1500)
- English literature—Early modern (to 1700)
- Great Britain—History—Wars of the Roses, 1455-1485
- Great Britain—History—House of York, 1461-1485
- Great Britain—History—Modern period, 1485-

This form is a modification of type 2. The period subdivisions of this type, when used with headings for history of foreign countries, almost always contain dates after the name of the period, probably with the assumption that the average American reader is less familiar with historical facts of foreign countries. The user, when dealing with this type of heading, need not supply the missing dates, but still must transpose the name of the period and the dates in order to place the headings in the proper sequence. In other words, the heading “Great Britain—History—Wars of the Roses, 1455-1485” is located in the catalog as if written “Great Britain—History—1455-1485, Wars of the Roses.”

(4) A main heading with the name of the century as a subdivision.

- English fiction—19th century
- English fiction—20th century

These subdivisions are arranged as if written “1800-1899” (for nineteenth century), “1900-1999” (for twentieth century), etc. This type of
subdivision usually occurs when there is a lack of a distinctive name for the period or event and in cases where a longer period of time than a single event or movement has to be covered.

(5) A main heading with a period subdivision constructed with the preposition "to" followed by a date.

Great Britain—History—To 1485
Great Britain—History—To 1066
Great Britain—History—To 449

Although this type of heading may cause difficulty in filing by machine, it presents little problem for the manual filer and the user. These headings usually precede all the other period subdivisions, i.e., as the beginning period subdivision under a subject.

(6) A main heading (often with aspect subdivision) with dates alone as period subdivision.

English language—Grammar—1500–1800
English language—Grammar—1800–1870
English language—Grammar—1870–
Great Britain—History—1714–1837
Great Britain—History—1760–1789
Great Britain—History—1789–1820

Among the different forms listed above, this is the most logical and straightforward.

From the examples cited above, it is obvious that there is no consistency or uniformity in the formation of the period subdivisions. The various forms often appear simultaneously under the same main heading. U.S. and British history will serve as examples:

U.S.—History
—French and Indian War, 1755–1763
—Revolution
—1783–1865
—Confederation, 1783–1789
—Constitutional period, 1789–1809

* * * *
—War of 1898
—20th century
—1919–1933

Great Britain—History
—To 55 B.C.
—Roman period, 55 B.C.–449 A.D
—Anglo-Saxon period, 449–1066
—1066–1687

* * * *
—Commonwealth and Protectorate, 1649–1660
—1660–1714
There are no apparent logical or inherent reasons why the period subdivisions should be formed in six different ways, for they all serve to give the subject a chronological or historical treatment. The diversity in form creates numerous problems while serving no useful purpose. On the other hand, the revised form proposed for use in the computer filing code appears to be a logical and the most practical one. If all the period subdivisions were formulated in one format:

Main heading—(subject subdivision, if any)—dates (name of period or event, if desired)

the problems discussed above with regard to both filing and using these headings could be largely eliminated. The period subdivisions adopted by the Canadian Library of Parliament for use with Canadian history in the French catalogue follow precisely this format:

e.g. Canada—Histoire
   —1534–1763, Régime français
   —1534–1701
   —1701–1763

   * * *

   —1812, Guerre de
   —1837–1838, Rébellion
   —1841–1867
   —1866–1870, Invasions fénianes

One can see little reason for objecting to this revision, except a tenacious adherence to tradition or habits; for, in fact, subject headings with period subdivisions are being filed as if they were constructed according to the above format, e.g., “U.S.—History—Civil War” filed as if written “U.S.—History—1861–1865 (Civil War).” The revision will affect the outward forms of the headings only, and will not disturb the order of the cards already filed in the catalog. On the other hand, it will facilitate both the filing and the using of the cards, as the filers and the users are no longer required to supply the dates mentally, or to transpose them to the proper place.
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A sample of new entries for a conventional subject authority list was analyzed. Main headings were divided by form, and subject subdivisions by type, as characterized by Haykin, and the occurrence of headings requiring references in each of these forms and types examined. Only 26 percent of the cards were for main headings, yet this group produced 82 percent of the cards requiring references. Some questions on the value of the conventional subject authority file are considered.

La Trobe University maintains a conventional subject authority list on cards. It very closely fits the description by Tauber in Technical Services in Libraries.

"Ideally, the subject authority file will include a record of all terms used as subjects in the library's catalog, with the exception of names of persons and of organizations—since these will be recorded in the name authority file, if one is maintained. It will record also the subdivisions used under each heading. Definitions and distinctions will be given, all cross-references traced, and all local variations in practice from the standard subject heading list will be noted and described so that each cataloger will know the pattern being followed."

A further description of practice at La Trobe is relevant. The latest edition of the Subject Headings Used in the Dictionary Catalogs of the Library of Congress is used as the authority for subject headings. Variations from the LC list are made as required. Only see references are used in the public subject catalogue, and thus only these are traced on the subject authority cards. References are taken from the LC list, supplemented by the principles of Haykin, special needs and common sense. Copies of the see reference cards are filed in the authority catalogue. Scope notes are not included on the authority cards, but local variations are noted and described. No subsidiary files, such as a record of subdividing forms, are as yet maintained.

The reasons for maintaining a subject authority list, and the particular advantages of keeping it on cards, are adequately described in the literature on subject work. Some questions remain, however.

La Trobe University library establishes about 5,000 new subject
authority cards each year. Of what kind, and in what form, are these headings? What type of headings produce references?

In order to attempt to answer these and other related questions, all subject authority cards produced over a period of three months were examined in detail. In all, 1,844 cards were examined.

General Summary

Initially, the cards were divided into main heading cards and subject subdivision cards. Within each group those requiring references were separated from those not requiring references, and the number of see references required counted from the tracings of references. This information is shown in Table 1. Twenty-six percent of the cards were for main headings, and of these approximately 55 percent required references. Of the 74 percent of cards for subdivisions, only 4 percent required references. From the number of references produced it can be seen that the 26 percent of main headings produced 82 percent of the references required. For both main headings and subdivisions, approximately two see references each were needed for each heading requiring references.

Main Headings

In Table 2, the main heading cards are divided by form of heading as categorized by Haykin. Headings with qualifications in parentheses are included with the type to which the unqualified heading belongs.

This list gives information on the relative frequency of forms. The most common forms of heading are Direct adjectival (35 percent of total), Noun (34 percent), Phrase (15 percent), and Inverted adjectival (11 percent). Compound (1.9 percent), Composite (1.9 percent), and Inverted phrase forms (1.6 percent) occur fairly infrequently.

References were required for 100 percent of the inverted forms, both Adjectival and Phrase, 89 percent of Compound forms, 78 percent of Composite, 56 percent of Adjectival, 48 percent of Phrase, and 38 percent of Nouns. This information is slightly misleading as it stands because of the relative proportion of each form. It can be explained another way by saying that 35 percent of cards requiring references were Adjectival, 24 percent were Noun, 20 percent were Inverted adjectival, 13 percent were Phrase, 8 percent each were Inverted phrase and Compound, and less than 3 percent were Composite.

Subject Subdivisions

Table 3 on first sight appears to be quite complex because it was thought to be useful to separate subject subdivisions of geographical headings from subject subdivisions of other types of headings. The “other” will be principally normal subjects, with a small proportion of personal names and corporate bodies which are subdivided by History, Bibliography, and so on. Of the 1,361 cards for subdivisions, 31 percent were subdivisions of geographical headings. Only 1.9 percent of
TABLE 1

GENERAL SUMMARY OF SUBJECT AUTHORITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References Required</th>
<th>References Not Required</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main headings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of refs.</td>
<td>267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of refs.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TABLE 2

MAIN HEADINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References Required</th>
<th>References Not Required</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Direct) adjectival</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverted adjectival</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrase</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverted phrase</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compound</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TABLE 3

SUBJECT SUBDIVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References Required</th>
<th>References Not Required</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
these cards required references, compared with 5.5 percent of "other" cards.

The subdivisions are broken down into type, once again in Haykin's categories. One point may require explanation. Geographical subdivision of geographical names may appear impossible until it is realized that it is only the last stage of subdivision, the one actually being established, that is being considered. Thus, this category is of the type Australia—Foreign relations—China or United States—Commerce—Cuba, and so on.

The analysis of the type of subdivisions is very revealing. Only 34 percent of the subdivisions were by topic, but this group produced 88 percent of all subdivision cards requiring references. Thirty-two percent of the subdivisions were Form (or standard) subdivisions. This group, which is in fact 24 percent of the whole sample of authority cards, produced no references. Twenty-seven percent of the subdivisions were Geographical, and produced only one reference (a reverse reference). Finally, 7 percent of the subdivisions were by Period. Most of the latter (79 percent) were subdivisions of geographical headings and in all produced 10 percent of the cards requiring references.

Looking at this from another point of view, as before, 11.5 percent of Topic subdivision required references, 7 percent of Period, 0.3 percent of Geographical, and none of Form.

One final observation can be made. For geographical names, 54 percent of subdivisions were Topic subdivisions, 17 percent were Period, 15 percent were Form, and 14 percent Geographical. For "other" types of headings, 39 percent were Form subdivisions, 34 percent were Geographical, 25 percent were Topic, and 2 percent were Period.

Distribution of Form Subdivisions

One further analysis was made. As was noted above, 32 percent of subdivisions were form subdivisions, which represented 24 percent of the whole sample. The occurrence of form subdivisions is recorded in Table 4. Three of these form subdivisions account for 70 percent of the total. These are Bibliography, 27 percent; History (or History & criticism), 24 percent; and Addresses, essays, lectures, 18 percent. These three subdivisions, in fact, represent 16 percent of the whole sample.

Conclusions

The conclusions that can be drawn from this information are of two kinds, with different kinds of significance.

In the first place, the relative frequency of various forms of main subject headings and the types of subject subdivisions can be seen. Whether the proportions are different for an established library rather than an establishing library such as La Trobe, which was founded in 1965, cannot be determined. As an obvious example, the relatively high frequency of occurrence of the subdivision Bibliography (6 percent of the whole sample) may well reflect a new library developing a strong bibliographical base collection.
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### TABLE 4
**Distribution of Form Subdivisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>COUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addresses, essays, lectures</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio-bibliography</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collected works</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congresses</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionaries</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directories</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handbooks, manuals, etc.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(History and Criticism)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societies, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study and teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second place, it has been stated that among the reasons for the maintenance of a subject authority file, is the need to know what headings have been used and in which catalogues, and what references have been made and in which catalogues. Clearly the second half of this aim could be achieved by making authority cards only when references are required, which amounts to only 18 percent of all cards in the sample. This study has shown for what forms and types of headings these references occur. The reason for knowing what headings have been used in which catalogues is either so that references can be added or subtracted and appropriately traced to the relevant catalogues (and I doubt if anyone tries to keep up with the Library of Congress on this) or to be able to alter headings.

Alteration of headings is a complex question. For main headings (26 percent of the sample), it is simple, because the part that may have to be altered is the part that is controlled (that is, the whole thing). For subject subdivisions (74 percent of the sample), there are problems. I will consider each type in turn. It is only with Period subdivisions (5 percent of the sample) that the main heading completely controls the subdivision, that is, that the subdivision is unique to the heading. There are some exceptions, such as the period subdivisions of Economic conditions, but they are few. With Form (24 percent of the sample) and Geographical (20 percent of the sample) subdivisions, the reverse is true. The subdivisions will change without reference to the heading under which they are used. What needs to be known is under what headings Form and Geographical subdivisions have been used. For Topic subdivision of the "other" (nongeographical heading)
type (13 percent of the sample), the main heading again controls the subdivision, except for a small group of near "standard" subdivisions, such as *Mathematical models*. For Topic subdivisions of geographical headings (12 percent of the sample), however, the situation is reversed, and the majority of subdivisions are of the "standard" type, such as *Politics and government, Description and travel*, and so on.

When these figures are combined, it will be seen that for 56 percent of authority cards (all of them subject subdivisions) the heading does not control the element that may have to be altered. It is impossible to systematically make alterations if the subdivision is changed. What is needed is a file of the subdivisions showing under which headings they have been used.

To return to the quotation which I gave at the beginning of this article, Tauber, after describing the conventional subject authority file, continues:

"Further refinements might include a record of subdividing forms, together with a list of the headings under which each has been used, and a similar record of geographic subdivisions."³

From the conclusion above, the "refinements" of Tauber would appear to be the only useful control of 56 percent of all authorities. Perhaps libraries which do not maintain subsidiary files assume that subdividing forms and geographical subdivisions (that is, geographical names), do not change. At best, surely, a forlorn hope. If subsidiary files are not maintained, subdivision of headings will become increasingly inconsistent and related material will be scattered in the library's public catalogue. This should be a matter of great concern to library administrators. To put it simply, the subject authority control file does not control.

**REFERENCES**

By introducing ample cross references and explanatory notes into the subject elements of the catalog, currency can be achieved without sacrificing previous subject approaches or requiring extensive re-doing of subject cards.

IF A SUBJECT CATALOG is to reflect—as it must—changes in the state of knowledge and in the user’s approach to it, subject headings cannot remain static. Their speed of change, however, is relative to the observer—appearing glacial to the user, who may find that headings lag behind current descriptors. The cataloger, conscious of the need for consistency within the catalog over a period of many years, and wanting to minimize the task of changing the headings, would like to be sure that today's jargon will settle down into something like semipermanence before he abandons old headings for new.

The purpose of this paper is to advocate greater flexibility in subject catalogs. Given the conservatism of catalogers, no one need fear massive introduction of new and transient headings. The object is to keep the descriptors (another word for subject headings) current with the usage of scholars or other knowledgeable people in the various subject fields. By introducing ample cross references and explanatory notes into the catalog, currency can be achieved without sacrificing previous subject approaches or requiring extensive redoing of cards.

Catalogers tend to view a change of subject headings as a disaster whose proportions vary with the number of cards that must be changed. I propose that no cards be changed at all.

Instead, a notecard is placed at the beginning of the subject heading now being discontinued, reading to this effect:

Note: the use of this subject-heading was discontinued June 1971. For later material see

A similar notecard under the new heading will read:

Note: use of this subject-heading was begun June 1971. For earlier material see

Headings like “Natural philosophy,” once used for what came to be
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called “Physics,” are more accurate for the books they index than the newer heading, and more useful than “Physics—To 1800.” Books pertaining to a subject which has parameters in time ought to have headings consistent with the climate of knowledge of that time.

These reference-notes on headings will serve the user better by grouping his material for him in chronological segments. The most recent books will be under the latest heading that has won acceptance by the specialists in that subject. The notecards will refer to previously used but discontinued headings that are synonymous or virtually so, giving the time-span of each.

If old books are received subsequent to a change in subject heading, the old heading is still available and is more appropriate. The anachronisms that sometimes occur when new language is used for old material can be avoided.

In a time like the present when there is a widespread reconsideration of social values and when numerous groups are protesting with much justice the discrimination and obloquy to which they have been subjected, even the catalog departments—the backwater of the library profession—are feeling great pressure to revise headings which, now that the scales have fallen from our eyes, are seen to be discriminatory, pejorative, judgmental, and offensive. The task forces of the Social Responsibilities Round Table have called attention to many of them, showing how they reflected the outlook of the dominant elements of our society.

It is good for catalogers to be reminded that the catalog is supposed to aim for neutrality and to avoid the use of headings that reflect mere opinion, however strong and pervasive. Yet this is a counsel of perfection. Headings must fit the material being cataloged. Our predecessors who many years ago devised the headings now under attack undoubtedly used their best judgment. They were not conscious of bias. What many now see as bias was to them a description of society as they perceived it. They never doubted the existence of perversions, deviations, immoral literature and pictures, and many other things on which the social outlook has now considerably altered. Nor can we today ignore the fact that many books and articles were produced dealing with such subjects, and from the point of view which the headings accurately reflect.

Instead, therefore, of extensive replacement of such old, now outdated headings by ones believed more nearly neutral, they might well be allowed to remain in the catalog, their use discontinued, a notecard calling attention to that fact and referring to the newer headings where similar material will be found. Let the old headings remain as evidence of the social climate of a former day.

A misconception about the neutrality of subject headings needs to be corrected. It will be very difficult to purge a catalog of all headings that might be offensive to some group. Headings do not and should not reflect the opinions of catalogers. They reflect, as they must, the
material cataloged. Thus headings that appear judgmental and opinionated do so because that is the nature of the stuff that comes under such headings. Articles and books on “immoral literature and pictures” were written by people who believed that certain materials really were immoral. Even the strongest advocates of freedom to read invariably drew the line at so-called hardcore pornography, assuming that there were some things that every decent and respectable person would agree were beyond the pale. The heading might be doctored to read “Immoral literature and pictures, Alleged,” but why can’t it simply be understood that items listed under the old heading were written from that point of view?

Headings under the words “Negro” or “Women” are now under criticism. Yet they too reflected the outlook of their day and the material cataloged under them. If the decision is reached that they are no longer suitable, it should be based on the fact that they do not correctly describe the literature now being produced.

In cataloging material expressive of a certain viewpoint it is very difficult to avoid the use of headings that summarize the viewpoint in question. The attempt to be neutral may result in failure to provide an accurate heading.

Materials dealing with criminals, the insane, the defective, etc., deal to a large extent with segments of society widely believed to be criminal, insane, or defective. There are differences of opinion as to the meaning of such terms. Individuals who find themselves branded with them may very well object. But the task of the cataloger is to provide access to the literature dealing with these subjects as viewed by the writers. If new and more suitable headings are needed for today’s material, the older ones should be merely discontinued, with reference made to the new. To force yesterday’s literature to fit today’s headings is likely to do a disservice to the user of the older material. The bed of Procrustes, altered in dimensions as the social climate changes, should not be the required resting place of retrospective bibliography.

Headings like “Women as scientists,” “Women in business,” etc., are objected to on the grounds that nobody ever thought it necessary to identify “Men as scientists,” or “Men in business.” For the latter “Scientists” and “Businessmen” were sufficient. (But not “Businesswomen”; instead see “Women in business.”) “Negro artists,” “Negro librarians,” and similar headings, are likewise objected to (apart from the use of “Negro” instead of “Black”). The fact remains that books and articles dealing with those subjects have been published.

There are many terms to which society has imparted different meanings with the passage of time. As Dan Bergen suggests, we must be aware of the milieu in which a document is prepared as well as that in which it will be used. There is “a cultural unconscious, or complex of unexamined assumptions, which imparts a particular texture to the intellectual life of a period.”

A catalog serves its users best when its makers are mindful of this
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Headings must be altered from time to time to reflect these changes. By the same token the older headings, however erroneous they now seem, ought to be left as they are, with reference cards relating the old and the new.

The Library of Congress could helpfully incorporate this feature into its published list of subject headings. Instead of merely referring from a discontinued heading to its replacement, LC could note, "Discontinued Jan. 1972. See ..." The old but discontinued headings would still be in evidence for libraries cataloging old material. (Incidentally the history of the development of subject headings would be made visible.) The time during which a heading was in accepted use might be given, at least approximately, by decades or centuries if not by years—for subject usage is seldom begun or ended with precision.

We have here a rather simple catalog device that should find favor with both camps—the users, by serving them better, and the catalogers by enabling them to achieve currency of headings without extensive and costly reheading of cards.

REFERENCE

The Library of Congress classification schedules relating to Eastern Europe were drawn up in 1916 when all of this huge area was politically divided between the Austro-Hungarian, German, and Russian empires. While in the Austrian schedules the existence of many nationalities was taken into account, it was completely disregarded in the Russian schedules. For the last half century not much has been done by the Library of Congress to rectify this deficiency and, consequently, these schedules are inadequate and obsolete in many areas. In some instances the LC classification schedules themselves and new instructions as to their use indicate that there is a certain apprehension on the part of LC to introduce new classification schedules and subject headings for that part of Europe.

This paper endeavors to present some examples of inconsistencies which contradict the overall LC policy and defy the sound principle of classification based on deductive and inductive methods applied by the Library of Congress in other areas. The paper also supplies some examples as to how the LC classification schedules could be improved and, in the long run, could save time and money, both for library administration and library users.

ONE OF THE OUTSTANDING FEATURES of the Library of Congress classification lies in the detailed construction of the schedules based upon both deductive and inductive methods. It is not surprising that this classification and its subject headings have found wide acceptance. But, as often happens, it has some serious deficiencies. It is a well known fact that the Library of Congress classification was originally designed and developed about 1900 as a utilitarian system for the use of that particular library. At that time “the classification of our collection was assumed to be of concern solely to ourselves, that is to the efficient administration of this Library within itself” stated the Report of the Librarian of Congress in June 1916.¹ Since then the
Library of Congress has grown to be a world leader among book collections on the one hand and a leader in systematic library cataloging and classification on the other. At present, what is being done in the Library of Congress is of concern to all libraries and organizations which rely on its information.

Scholars and librarians engaged in Slavic studies find with dismay that the least developed Library of Congress subject headings and classification schedules are those in the Slavic field. This problem has been raised many times in the past and has been brought directly to Library of Congress' attention. However, no adequate action has as yet been initiated on the part of the Library of Congress to rectify them. Since the Library of Congress is keeping pace with many modern trends of the world, it makes the inadequate Slavic section even more striking than ever.

This problem has already been discussed at the Conference of the Slavic Subsection of the Association of College and Research Libraries as well as at the Conference of the Canadian Association of Slavists, which is an interdepartmental organization of University and College teachers in Canada. The Slavic Subsection of the ACRL and CAS have authorized a committee to bring this problem once more to the attention of the Library of Congress authorities.

The subject headings in history, economics, and political science lack necessary periodization, and are not as yet adequately elaborated, especially for those Slavic nations which are now within the Soviet Union or within its political orbit. The existing subject headings do not provide a direct approach to the material of each individual Slavic country with the single exception of Russia, which has substantial coverage. But it is not entirely satisfactory either.²

It is in the interest of the Library of Congress as well as in the interest of all the colleges and universities which rely on and use Library of Congress subject headings and classification schedules to have the deficiencies in the Slavic field corrected as has been done in many other branches of knowledge. In view of the rapid accumulation of Slavic materials through the Shared Cataloguing Program, it would be cheaper and much easier to bring about the necessary changes now than at a later date. Let me cite some of the most striking shortcomings which are most characteristic of the present day Library of Congress policy in classification and cataloging.

Class A—General Works and Polygraphy

In this class the non-existent Austro-Hungarian empire, as well as the Russian empire, in spite of their multinational composition, is still treated as a unity in the same way as Italy, France, Germany, or Greece, which are essentially homogeneous in ethnic composition. For example, subclass AS—Academies and learned societies, Austrian no. AS 142 or Russian AS 262. In the former are classed all Austrian, Hungarian, Czechoslovak, and even Slovenian (Yugoslavia) academies and learned
societies and in the latter (i.e. AS 262) all Russian, Polish, Finnish, all Baltic, Ukrainian, and all other non-Russian institutions of the Union Republics. Such treatment is not only confusing for the cataloger but it defies the general LC classification principle which is well applied to Scandinavia and the Balkan states. In Scandinavia there is a set of numbers for Scandinavia as a whole (AS 271–279). Scandinavian learned periodicals are classed in AS 280, and academies and learned societies are classed by country: AS: 281—Denmark, AS 282—Iceland, AS 283—Norway, and AS 284—Sweden. A similar principle is applied to Turkey and the Balkan states. Cannot the same principle be applied to the former Austria-Hungary and to Russia? In both cases there are nine numbers left for expansion. At the same time, the headings for the numbers in question are obsolete. Austria-Hungary ceased to exist in reality in November 1918 and Russia has been transformed into the Soviet Union with fifteen constituent republics, and at least two of them are members of the U.N., but they have not as yet been recognized by the Library of Congress. As far as the heading Russia is concerned, "Soviet Union" and "Eastern Europe" would be more appropriate, exactly the same way as was done with Turkey and the Balkan states.

Class B-BJ—Philosophy

It must be stated with due credit to the Library of Congress that some very useful additions and changes were introduced in the classification schedules of the philosophy subclasses. They are quite an improvement over the original ones and save time for catalogers.

Class C—Auxiliary Sciences of History

Subclass CJ—Numismatics, numbers CJ-2570-2599 are assigned to Austria with application of Table of Subdivision . . . (p. 57). The following thirty-five numbers (CJ2601-2635) are additional numbers for the former Austrian provinces and Crownlands among which Bukowina, Bohemia, Carmiol, Coastland, Dalmatia, Galicia, Moravia, Bosnia, and Herzegovina are Slavic and like Transylvania in Rumania, no longer are a part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. CJ 3000-3029 numbers are assigned to Russia with application of Table 1 of subdivision. Following Russia are listed two other countries formerly wholly or partly belonging to the Russian Empire, i.e. Poland and Finland with twenty numbers each. The existence of seven Union Republics of the Soviet Union in Europe and three Union Republics in the Caucasus has not been taken into account at all, not even to the extent of the Austrian provinces like Styria, Lower Austria, or Vorarlberg, which are German in language and culture and are inhabited by the same people as the rest of Austria.

Is there any logical or practical explanation why Vorarlberg or Styria in Austria should get separate and fuller treatment by the Library of Congress than the Baltic countries together and individually,
White Russia, Ukraine, and the Moldavian SSR or Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia in the Caucasus? In fact, the numismatics of the Moldavian SSR should be incorporated into the Rumanian class numbers. The other countries which have a completely different ethnic population and different languages, history, and culture should not be classed in the same way as Russian Provinces of Kaluga, Voronezh, or Ryazan. Would it not be logical to assign at least one or two numbers for each of these countries, now Soviet Union republics, and to have the classification streamlined along the pattern established for Western Europe? The library materials that are being handled nowadays fully warrant separate schedules for each of them by their amount and contents.

Class D—History: General and Old World

Now let us have a glance at the next class, D—History. The main criticism of this class is that different subclasses were elaborated by different people and they, in their turn, did not apply deductive and inductive methods in the same way in all subclasses. The subclasses of particular interest to us are DB, elaborated by A. F. W. Schmidt and DK and DR—elaborated by Alexis V. Babine prior to 1916 when the Austro-Hungarian and Russian empires were in existence. Since that time these schedules have not been revised and consequently, in the Library of Congress schedules, these two empires stand as strong as before the first World War.

The fact that radical changes took place in that region has not as yet been taken into consideration, and it must be stated in all fairness that Babine’s approach to the task entrusted to him, unlike A. F. W. Schmidt’s, was not scholarly but rather politically oriented. While Schmidt recognized the existence of national minorities within the Austro-Hungarian empire, for Babine there was only one Slavic nation—Russia—worthy of consideration in the scheme of classification in history and literature. However, what might have been politically justified in the first decade of the twentieth century, is totally unacceptable in the 1970s.

These schedules require a complete revision in order to adapt them to the present situation in Eastern Europe. Keeping in line with the Library of Congress schedule for Western Europe, the Eastern European and Central European countries should be accorded the same treatment so that one general principle may be observed throughout. There is no need to develop new tables for subdivisions, thus bringing even more confusion into the classification schedules. Instead, either new schedules should be provided for the new material to be classed from now on, or at least a table for local history and description for former Austrian provinces should be used.

This should also be applied, with the addition of a number for local subdivision, to all Union Republics of the U.S.S.R. This change, if introduced, would lead to a unified inductive system which would be easy
to apply and at the same time it would prevent the present confusion. It may be mentioned at this point that Poland's classification schedules are already closed for all practical purposes, since the last number now in use is DK 443, and DK 445 is already assigned to Finland.

Inadequacies in Babine's schedules were well recognized in their application to Russian literature a long time ago when Miss Voegelin was entrusted with the development of new comprehensive schedules in 1948. Babine's schedules are even more inadequate for other Slavic literatures and require a substantial revision. The same could be said about his schedules for history in the DK and DR subclasses. This revision is warranted by both political changes in Europe and by the great amount of Slavic material as well as non-Slavic material on the Slavs which is published nowadays and which is being acquired by North American libraries.

Speaking of the DK subclass of History, we believe that for clarity and consistency and even more so for the Library of Congress automation processing a revision of classification numbers should be inaugurated as soon as possible to meet the actual need. Subdivisions accepted for Western European countries should be introduced in the Eastern European section, which the Library of Congress calls "Russia." Some of the numbers originally assigned to Russia (DK 501 and DK 503) remain unused or almost unused and others are severely overcrowded (DK 507 and DK 508). This means that the original planning or assignment of classification numbers missed the goal and therefore must be revised as, for instance: DK 501 for Northern Russia, DK 503 for Eastern Russia, DK 507 for Western Russia and DK 508 for Little Russia.

The last two numbers have already been reassigned to White Russia and Ukraine respectively and have become so crowded that they were subdivided by decimals. Would it not be more appropriate to assign to White Russia and to Ukraine a separate group of numbers (the same applies to the Baltic and Caucasian countries) where it would be possible to subdivide according to the growing need and not to squeeze their material with difficult long Cutter numbers. We would like to point out that DK 501 is practically unused and DK 503 was already cancelled in 1969 because these areas were always integral parts of Russia and their history is not much different from the rest of Russia.

It is a completely different story when we come to the non-Russian border lands (Baltic countries, White Russia, Ukraine, Bessarabia, and the Caucasus countries). Another superfluous Library of Congress classification number is DK 509 for "Southern Russia, including Novorussia, Black Sea, Caucasus, Armenia, etc., in various combinations." This number makes no sense at all and is unnecessary, because the regions specified do not form a unit of any kind. The former tsarist name "Novorussia" has been abolished because it was a government name for what always has been Southern Ukraine. Armenia has its own
special set of numbers (see DS 161-199) where all Armenian material should be classed, and the other two Caucasian nations (Azerbaijan and Georgia) surely deserve their own blocks of numbers in the classification schedules. Moreover since there is not a single book as yet published dealing with all these regions as a unit, DK 509 is an anachronism without any justification to be preserved.

The material on the two countries or Union Republics, which happen to be the founding members of the United Nations, Ukraine, and White Russia, has always created a problem for librarians and scholars. Although each of them was assigned one LC number (DK 508 and DK 507 respectively) and later a decimal subdivision was introduced to give at least a primitive classification of their material, there was no class number provided for their local histories. As a result, local histories of each of these and other Union Republics is classed in the number for Russian local history (DK 511 or DK 651) thus contributing even more to confusion of the Russian and non-Russian material. Historical material on each individual Union Republic is intermixed with Russian material which is detrimental to both Russian and non-Russian collections.

Recently another strange and illogical instruction governing DK 508 was issued by the Library of Congress, "For the events of the revolutionary period, 1917-1921, including the period of independence—see DK 265.8 U4," which is a Russian local number for the revolutionary period.\(^9\) This instruction is paradoxical because, first of all it applies only to Ukraine and second, not all of Ukraine was within the boundaries of the Russian empire in 1917-1921. Furthermore, the character of the revolution in Ukraine was not identical with the revolutions in, let us say, Leningrad, Tula, or Kaluga provinces which are classed in DK 265.8. Suffice it to say that while in Russia it was a social and economic revolution, in Ukraine, as well as in other non-Russian countries, like Baltic and Caucasian, it was also a national revolution and a struggle for independence. To class this period into the local revolutionary history of Russia is a total defiance of logic and the actual state of affairs. How can one logically class historical books on the period of the Ukrainian revolution in Galicia and Bukowina (which were at the time Crownlands of the Austrian Empire) into Russian local history?

Due to lack of proper subject headings and their periodization, as well as to a lack of a well-developed classification schedule for North Eastern European countries, a confusion results which often leads to misclassification as, for instance: a book on the Polish-Ukrainian War of 1918-1919. Written from the Polish point of view, it has a subject heading: Poland—History—Wars of 1918-1921, but the same topic written from the Ukrainian point of view does not have a specific subject heading or classification number for the period and is classed in Polish history (Fig. 1) while it should have been classed with Ukrainian history.
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This might suggest either a bias or insufficient knowledge of the area on part of the LC specialists. For example: a short historical outline by Natalia Polons’ka-Vasyleenko entitled: Ukraine—Ruś and Western Europe in the 10th-13th centuries is classed with Russian history in spite of that explicit title with subject headings: 1. Russia—History—To 1533, and 2. Russia—Relations (general) with Europe (see Fig. 2). Consequently it was classed in Russian history with a complete disregard of Ukrainian history. Similar examples of mishandling could be quoted from all other nationalities of the U.S.S.R.

Polons’ka-Vasyleenko, Nataliia Dmytrivna.
Ukraine—Ruś and Western Europe in 10th-13th centuries
47 p. plates (incl. ports.) 22 cm.
Bibliographical footnotes.

1. Russia—Hist.—To 1533. 2. Russia—Relations (general) with Europe.

DK62.P6 65-50205

Figure 2
The correct subject heading for that particular book should have been: *Ukraine—History—Kievan period* and classed in Ukrainian historical number. For clarity’s sake such a subdivision (i.e. *Kievan period*) is imperative for Russian, Ukrainian, and White Russian history to cover the period before the Tatar invasion in 1240. Unfortunately the Library of Congress authorities are hard to convince as to the advantage of introducing such changes.

To cover miscellaneous works dealing with various aspects of attempts by subjugated people to restore their independences, the Library of Congress has invented very practical subject headings: *Polish questions, Macedonian questions,* and many other national or regional questions. For some reason, however, no such subject headings have been introduced for non-Russian nations within the present-day Soviet boundaries and no numbers assigned in their respective national classification schedules. These few representative examples show that the non-Russian nations, the present-day Union Republics of the U.S.S.R., receive unsatisfactory treatment by the Library of Congress cataloging and classification policy. In the end this confuses the cataloger and because of the lack of clear-cut policies as with Western European countries, much more time is needed to catalog Slavic material.

Local History: *DK 511—Provinces, Republics, etc.*

Under this Russian local number (DK 511) are listed regions and provinces of which some have never been Russian, even by conquest. Starting from the Baltic Sea in the northwest and from the Polish Carpathian mountains in the southwest down to Caucasus and to the Ural Mountains, everything is listed under DK 511 which is contrary to the accepted Library of Congress practice in all other regions of the world.

Why, for example, should not the material on the Soviet Union Republics be treated in at least the same way as that on the former Austro-Hungarian Crownlands which have been assigned twenty numbers each in DB subclass? The Union Republics of the U.S.S.R. do not as yet have separate schedules and their historical material is intermixed with Russian local history. (It is even more surprising that the former possessions of the British and French empires, which disintegrated only a few years ago, have already been assigned their own classification schedules and subject headings thus reflecting the actual state of affairs, while the former Austrian and Russian empires are still kept intact by the Library of Congress.) Such a treatment of Eastern European material does not provide a ready access to printed material neither for Russia nor for all other Eastern European countries and baffles scholars who are using the stacks and even more the librarian who must classify such material.

As an example let me quote one such curiosity under the Russian local number DK 511. DK 511.B25-B3 are the numbers assigned for Baltic provinces (Baltic States). It would be only logical to expect that the individual Baltic Union republics should be found under Baltic
states, just the same way as the Scandinavian individual countries are found under Scandinavia. And yet this principle has been disregarded here just as in many other regional units of the U.S.S.R. Estonia has a group of Cutter numbers under DK 511:E4-E8, Latvia L15-L18, and Lithuania L2-L28. Material on the Baltic countries is dispersed although geographically, politically, and economically they form one group. Moreover even the history of some Baltic countries is also separated as, for instance: DK 511:C6 has been assigned for Curland, and L3-4 for Livonia, although these are historical names for Latvian provinces and as such, especially Curland, should be classed under a Latvian number.

While subdividing the Cutter numbers for Estonia and Latvia, one number was assigned for their local histories (DK 511:E7 for Estonia and DK 511:L19 for Latvia) in consistency with the general LC principle. However, later some other authority cancelled these numbers and local histories of all Baltic countries are classed in Russian local numbers (DK 511 and DK 651) as Russian local histories.

The best solution in the case of the Baltic countries would be to assign a separate set of classification numbers (not necessarily within the DK subclass) and to arrange them in accordance with a general LC policy, taking Scandinavia as an example.

Comparing the Cutter numbers assigned to Lithuania (DK 511: L2-L28) with subject headings in history of this country one can detect the lack of cooperation or at least disagreement between different authorities at the Library of Congress. The authority assigning the Cutter numbers for Lithuania thought it proper to subdivide its history by periods, while the authority assigning subject headings thought differently and as a result periods are not specified in subject headings, with one exception of the German occupation 1941-1944.

Under the Russian local number DK there is also listed Bessarabia with a Cutter number B4. Again the former province of Bessarabia, inhabited mostly by Rumanians, now forms the Moldavian SSR. In short, the Moldavian SSR is not Moldavia, an ancient Rumanian province and principedom, but Bessarabia. And yet a great deal of its historical material is being classed by the Library of Congress not under DK 511:B4, but under the other Cutter number for Moldavia, DK 511:M55 or in the local Rumanian number DR 281.M6 which is for the Moldavian province of Rumania. Serious confusion has been created by the Library of Congress because it has accepted two different names for the same province instead of bringing them together by a "See reference."

**DB 879 and DK 651—Cities and Towns**

A similar case exists under the Austrian and Russian numbers for cities and towns (DB 879 and DK 651 respectively). Under the Russian number DK 651 are listed all the cities and towns of the European part of the Soviet Union regardless of the Republic, and also the Polish cities including the capital city of Warsaw, which prior to the first
World War belonged to the Russian Empire. But many other cities which before 1918 belonged to the German Empire are classed in the German number for cities and towns, DD 901.

Under the Austrian local number DB 879 are classed Hungarian, Croat, Slovenian, some of the North Italian, Czech, and Slovak cities and towns, including the Czech capital city of Prague, and even the ancient Polish city of Krakow. By some reason, however, some of the cities like Lemberg (now Lvov) and Uzhgorod, formerly within the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which are now within the Ukrainian S.S.R., have been transferred to the Russian number DK 651. This is perhaps a classic example of the lack of a clear-cut policy by the Library of Congress for Slavic and East European material.

Hungary has its own classification schedules even with a special number for local history and description (DB 975 is assigned for countries, regions, etc.) "Cities and towns, etc." are referred to DB 861-879 which are the Austrian numbers, although there is no reason not to assign another number for local history within the Hungarian schedule. It seems that confusion is made rather deliberately. For example, Ljubljana, the capital city of Slovenia, the western-most republic of the Yugoslav Federation neighboring with Austria, is classed in the Yugoslav number for local history, DR 396.L55, as are its provincial cities of Celje (DR 396.C4) and Maribor (DR 396.M3). However, Zagreb, the capital city of Croatia, another federated republic of Yugoslavia, situated further to the east and separated from Austria by Slovenia, is classed in the Austrian number for cities and towns, DB 879.Z3, as is the ancient Croatian city of Dubrovnik, which is cuttered after its Italian form of name Ragusa (?) (DB 879.R2). This could be explained if all Croatian local histories were classed in the Austrian number. But there is no consistency because Karlovac, a provincial city of Croatia, is classed in the Yugoslav number DR 396.K37. Cannot these cities, if not classed with a history of their own republics, be classed at least in one or another local number consistently? Cannot they be transferred to the Yugoslav number DR 396, and the Italian cities of Trento and Bolzano to the Italian number DG 975, and so on? In all cases where too many titles have already been classed under the Austrian, German, or Russian numbers, and reclassification is not feasible, they could be left there and a simple "see also" note in the shelflist could be installed for internal library information in order to avoid confusion. For instance:

DR
396
D8 Dubrovnik
For titles about this city classed before 1972
see also
DB
879
R2 Ragusa. Dubrovnik. (Cutter number discontinued)
A dummy book on the stack shelf could provide the same information for stack users.

In conclusion, we believe that such cities as Prague DB 879.P7, Warsaw DK 651.W2, and Kiev DK 651.K37, which have very rich histories and many books written about them, fully warrant separate schedules with at least one number with decimal subdivisions. (Moscow and Leningrad have twenty and forty numbers respectively—DK 591-609 and DK 541-579.)

Class G—Geography, Anthropology, Folklore, etc.

Now let us move to the next class G—Geography, Anthropology, Folklore, Manners and Customs, Recreation. The tables of geographical subdivisions, on p. 329-31, do not list any of the countries of Eastern Europe, and are probably relegated to the "Other Divisions of Europe, A-Z." However, in practice the anthropology of all East European countries is classed in the Russian local number GN 824, interchangeably with Russian provinces, instead of in a general number for "Other countries, A-Z"—GN 845. The same policy is applied to all other subclasses in schedules G—Geography, Anthropology, Folklore, etc. Such treatment does not provide clarity either for the Russian material or for the non-Russian nations within the U.S.S.R. None of these countries is listed in the Index, except for the atlases and maps, in spite of the fact that their folklore, manners, and customs in every day life differ in many ways from that of the Russian people.

Strange as it may be, the former British crown colony of Malta and the little Principality of Monaco are treated separately and have their own separate LC classification numbers (GR 178 and 179 respectively); all the tribes of Africa have been assigned their own cutter numbers under GR 360, for "other countries and tribes, A-Z." This means that the Slavic countries are not treated even in the same manner as African tribes. This is an anomaly which should be corrected by changing the heading of Russia to Eastern Europe (like Netherlands or Scandinavia) under the number GR 190 (and elsewhere) and assigning it to works covering the whole of Eastern Europe, and numbers GR192-194 should be introduced for Russia aligning it with Poland and Finland, with GR 192 for serials, GR 193 for monographs and GR 194 for local Russian material (see Italian numbers GR 175-177). GR 203 should be used for other divisions of Eastern Europe, A-Z.

Class H—Social Sciences

Perhaps most deficient are the subdivisions in Class H—Social Sciences. Subclasses HC and HD do not provide anything for Eastern Europe, except Russia, which results in complete chaos. Let us take as an example numbers HC 331-340. HC 337 is the number for a Russian local subdivision and here we find not only Russian regions, provinces, etc. but also all European Soviet Republics, including independent Finland, and a Soviet satellite—Poland. However, the strangest thing is that the Russian and non-Russian provinces, and Polish voivodeships
are intermixed and the sound principle of subdivision from a larger to a smaller political or geographical unit is completely disregarded in this case.

It is time to straighten this chaos out by the introduction of special numbers for each of these countries the way it has been done for the German provinces. True, there are not many numbers available for expansion; however, for the sake of clarity and consistency, a uniform policy should be introduced and followed in practice for all countries and for all former or present colonial possessions regardless of whether they used to belong to Great Britain, France, or Russia. The accumulation of all kinds of non-Russian material under the Russian numbers does not benefit scholars or the Library. It only confuses the subject matter as much for the Russian material as for Finland, Poland, Ukraine, or any other country.

Recommendation

This could be easily corrected by the introduction of decimal subdivisions and the application of Table 1 on p. 23; e.g.:

HC 337  Russia, by province or region, A-Z
HC 337.2-24  Finland
  .3-34  Estonia
  .4-44  Latvia
  .5-54  Lithuania
  .6-64  Poland
  .7-74  Ukraine
  .8-84  White Russia

A similar expansion could be introduced in the Tables of Geographical Division (p.529) where, in addition to Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland, all the European Union Republics should be introduced. The same could be and should be done with the Austrian Table, where the Czechoslovak Republic, and Hungary still form an integral part of the Austro-Hungarian empire, now non-existent for more than half a century. Bosnia, Dalmatia, Croatia, and Slavonia should be transferred to the Balkan States where they belong politically and geographically (Yugoslavia) and Transylvania to the Rumanian number and Galicia should be under the local number of Ukraine.

Following the same principle as suggested for the Russian HC 337 we would like to suggest that the Austrian number HC 267 should be used for the German speaking Austrian provinces, A-Z and Czechoslovakia and Hungary should be assigned decimal expansions, e.g. HC 267.2-24 Hungary and .3-34 Czechoslovakia. We also note that in the Tables of Geographical subdivision in the Balkan countries Albania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Montenegro, as well as Serbia, have been assigned decimal subdivisions under the Turkish numbers. The same could be done for those countries under the Turkish number in.
the HC subclass, namely HC 407. Instead of mixing their materials on economic history and conditions, these countries should be assigned their own decimals in the following way:

HC 407 .2-24 Albania
   .3-34 Bulgaria
   .4-44 Rumania
   .5-54 Yugoslavia
   .6-64 Serbia
   .7-74 Croatia
   .8-84 Slovenia
   .9-94 Macedonia

This would not disturb the present system of the Library of Congress but it would provide an easier approach to the classification numbers for catalogers and bring all the material on these countries and peoples together. It is also illogical that in the "Tables of Geographical Divisions," where Montenegro and Serbia have their own numbers, Croatia, Slovenia, and Macedonia have been omitted. There is no indication where to class White Russian, Ukrainian, Armenian, Azerbaijani, and Georgian material while such insignificant economic areas as Andorra, Gibraltar, Malta, Monaco, and San Marino have been entered already under "Other European countries." (See Revision and expansion of "Tables of Geographical Divisions," Class H, p. 530.)

Similar examples could be repeated for all the other H subclasses, yet we are not trying to enumerate all the discrepancies but just to cite some of them as examples to support our case for the imperative need for a revision of the Library of Congress schedules in regard to Slavic material.

Class J—Political Science

The material in the H class is hard to accommodate because there are not many numbers left for expansion, except through the introduction of decimals as already suggested. However, in J class—Political science, there are numbers for expansion but for some reason they are not used. Let us cite just one case. In JN subclass there is a great deal of confusion. Numbers JN 6500-6599 are assigned to Russia and former Russian provinces. But starting from JN 6615 some of the former Russian provinces have already been assigned their own numbers: Estonia—JN 6615; Finland—JN 6700-6719; Latvia—JN 6730-6739; Lithuania JN 6745. Poland JN 6750-6769 and even the Far Eastern Republic which existed only in 1920-1922 was assigned its own number JN 6625.

White Russia, Ukraine, and the Caucasian countries (or Union Republics) which have already existed for over fifty years are still treated as mere provinces of Russia on the same basis as Leningrad, Tula, or Voronezh province. And yet there is enough space for expansion; all that is needed is a little interest in the problem. Numbers JN 6790-7000 are waiting for expansion while catalogers are wasting their time.
trying to class the material of these Union Republics and finally must use a Russian local number. Why cannot the Caucasian countries, Ukraine and White Russia be assigned their own political numbers for clarity and simplicity and consistency with the Library of Congress policy in other areas? This shortcoming could be easily straightened out by assigning for each individual Republic a certain group of numbers, for instance:

- JN 6630 Transcaucasia
- JN 6635 Armenia
- JN 6645 Azerbaijan
- JN 6655 Georgia
- JN 6685 White Russia
- JN 6780 Ukraine

With the application of the respective tables for constitutional history on p. 231-235 of the J class schedules it would be a logical arrangement, consistent with the Library of Congress policy in other areas.

** * * *

Similar shortcomings could be cited from L—Education class (Subclass LB) where none of the Eastern European countries, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, White Russia, and Ukraine are even mentioned. By some miracle, however, Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia have been assigned numbers in LF—subclass for Individual institutions.

**Class M—Music**

A very strange thing has happened in the M—Music schedules and in N—Art schedules. As far as the history and criticism of music is concerned, under Vocal music there is a number for the Baltic provinces M 1758-1759, and ML 302 but individual Baltic countries (or are they “provinces”?) are removed from this logical position of subdivision down to “Other” in number M 1766-1767 and ML 309. Would it not be logical to keep all the Baltic musical material under the Baltic numbers regardless of whether they are treated as a unit or subdivided by individual countries? This, however, requires some additional change, such as the addition of a decimal, etc., which would make it simple and logical. We think that if the Baltic numbers were subdivided, let us say ML 302 A1 for individual countries (ML 302 A1E3 for Estonia; A1L3 for Latvia, etc.) it would be possible to keep all the material on the Baltic countries together.

However, number ML 308 is assigned for Little Russia which in many other places of the Library of Congress classification schedules is correctly referred to as Ukraine. It would be a very simple matter to replace “Little Russia” by “Ukraine,” and class all material in the same number since Little Russia is merely an obsolete Russian Imperial name for Ukraine. In fact, this has been done in M 1764-1765, but not in the ML subclass; it seems that ML 308 has been abandoned and a Cutter number ML309.U4 has been assigned for Ukraine, and also for other
Union Republics of the U.S.S.R. Why assign a Cutter number when there were two numbers assigned for it a long time ago?

Class N—Art

The N—Art class in relation to Eastern Europe has been left intact the way it was before the First World War and as a result Finnish, Baltic, Polish, Ukrainian, and White Russian artists are all classed as Russian artists in the Russian numbers for individual artists (NA 1199, NB 699, etc.). The same pattern was applied to the nationalities within the former Austro-Hungarian empire. However in the new and revised edition (1970) of the classification schedules for Fine art (Class N) the Austro-Hungarian empire has been already “dissolved.” Table IV of subdivisions (p. 230-243) lists classification numbers for collective and individual biographies for artists of Austria, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. By some unexplained Library of Congress logic, the U.S.S.R. is being treated as a homogeneous nation. A respective section in Table IV (p. 235-236) reads as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLES OF SUBDIVISIONS—TABLE IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slavic art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476 General works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481-488 Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divided like 341-348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special divisions of European Russia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland. Polish art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>491 General works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland. Finnish art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493 General works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495 Others, A-Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496 Leningrad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497 Others, A-Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498 Collective biography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>499 Special artists, A-Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above Table shows that numbers 490, 492, and 494 are as yet unused, while numbers 491 and 498 are assigned to Poland and Finland respectively for general works on their art. The unused numbers 492 and 494 could be assigned to Ukraine and White Russia respectively and each of them (491-494) could be subdivided by decimal as follows:

| 491 Poland. Polish art          |
| .3 Special divisions, A-Z      |
| .4 Warsaw                      |
| .5 Other cities, A-Z           |
| .8 Collective biography        |
| .9 Special artists, A-Z        |

• 484 Library Resources & Technical Services
Numbers 492, 493, and 494 could be subdivided like 491, with exception of .4 which could represent under each number the capital of the country, 492.4—Kiev, 493.4—Helsinki, and 494.4—Minsk. The Baltic republics should be referred to number 755 in Table IV for “Other countries” of Europe, e.g. Estonia—E7-73. If Soviet Central Asiatic republics can be treated separately as individual entities, why should not the Baltic countries, White Russia, and Ukraine with their specific and rich art and art history be treated in at least the same way?

PG—Slavic Philology, Languages and Literatures

We believe that the shortcomings of the Classification schedule for Slavic literature, as well as languages are too obvious to be discussed here at a great length. For example, the deficiency of the Oriental languages and literatures has been recognized by the respective Division of the Library of Congress and their classification schedules have been completely revised so now there is no problem in dealing with that material.

With Slavic literatures there is a completely different story. Slavic and all other Eastern European national literatures are classed together with their philology and languages, and, with exception of the Russian literature, have been assigned for all individual authors and for all periods prior to 1960—one, two, or at the most three classification numbers. In contrast, 150 classification numbers have been assigned for Russian individual authors, 200 numbers for Norwegian, and 225 classification numbers each for Danish and Swedish authors for the same period. (In other Western European literary classifications some individual authors have been assigned up to 50 numbers each.) And what is even more important, most of the non-Russian Slavic and other Eastern European literary classification schedules have no room for future expansion, which is at present a serious deficiency of these schedules.

Why cannot Slavic literary schedules be removed from the language subclass as is the case with English, German, French, and other literatures which have been assigned a completely new subclass, PR, PT, etc. with satisfactory and logical numbers? For instance, Polish literature up to 1960 has two numbers (PG 7157 and 7158); Czech and Slovak literatures have three numbers each (PG 5086-5088 and PG 5436-5438 respectively); but, Ukrainian and White Russian and South Slavic literatures—Bulgarian, Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian—as well as those of the Baltic countries have only one number each.

As a result, the Cutter numbers for these national literatures grow incredibly long. True, this sad state of affairs was somewhat corrected by the introduction of new numbers for individual authors after 1960. The same could be said also with regard to the tables of subdivision for literary history which lack class numbers for periods. Could not these
literary numbers be subdivided by decimals to provide enough space for periodization?

Conclusion

We may cite other inconsistencies in the treatment of Slavic as well as other Eastern European materials where they are treated as a part of the non-existing Austrian, German and even Turkish Empires and of the U.S.S.R. While the Library of Congress has a well elaborated system of subdivision from larger to smaller areas, as far as Eastern European book material is concerned this sound policy is not applied to all. Such practice does not benefit the Austrian, German and Russian collection or the former provinces of the above-mentioned empires. Czech, Polish, Baltic, Finnish, and Ukrainian material is interfiled, thus creating confusion for the librarian who must catalog and classify it and who is never sure where to place the material. On the other hand, it also confuses the scholars or students interested in those areas when they are using the stacks. Finally it is contrary to accepted Library of Congress policy in other areas, thus lacking consistency.

Insufficient Library of Congress schedules for Eastern Europe, which are long overdue for revision, is only one side of the story. Another problem which contributes to the confusion and which could easily be solved is the insufficient periodization in the social sciences of Slavic material. This includes both subject headings and quite often even the schedules. In some cases, there is a provision for periodization in the schedules but there is none in the subject headings. For instance, Lithuania has numbers for different periods of its history: DK 511.L23—Early to 1569; .L24—1570-1795/1814; .L25—1795/1814-1914; .L26—1914-1919; .L27—1919-on. But this periodization is not reflected in subject headings where only the general one: Lithuania—History is used. So if a student wants material on one of these specific periods he has to search in the subject catalog through all of the general history of Lithuania.

As has been already pointed out, of all Eastern Europe only Russia has been accorded better classification schedules but here again Russia is not treated the same way as Austria or Germany, and since its material is mixed up with all the material for Eastern Europe one can hardly distinguish by the classification number or even by subject headings where Russia begins and where it ends.

Since the term Russia is used in at least six different meanings (Russia—for Eastern Europe; Russia—for Kievan Rus of the Middle Ages; Russia—for Russian Empire; Russia—for the proper modern Russia; Russia—for R.S.F.S.R. and Russia—for the U.S.S.R.) the confusion works detrimentally both for Russian and for non-Russian materials. If some positive changes could be introduced, they would streamline the Library of Congress classification schedules and in the long run they would be more efficient not only for the Library’s technical services but also for the users of the catalog.
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Expansion of the Public Card Catalog in a Large Library

EDMUND G. HAMANN
Catalog Maintenance Department
Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York

Expanding a large card catalog is a complex process requiring careful planning of procedure, judicious allocation of labor, and simplified techniques. The operation at Cornell involved a timesaving method of determining the catalog's size by random sampling and a careful determination of labor skills required for each phase of expansion. The report updates those of earlier expansion operations in other libraries. It gives an analysis of labor costs incurred and attempts to relate them to cost figures from a similar operation carried out by a library in 1952. The conclusion is reached that a major catalog expansion can be undertaken economically and without disruption of regular technical and public service activities.

PERIODICALLY EVERY LIBRARY MUST EXPAND its card catalog, a task performed easily in small libraries but one which escalates into a long, complex operation in large libraries, requiring careful planning and the application of special techniques. There are useful sources of instruction in the library literature on how to expand a catalog. Acknowledged are articles by Terry, Merritt and Frarey, Cavender, and Friedgood, describing the methodology of expansion at Columbia, Duke, Iowa State, and U.C.L.A. respectively. However, they are now out of date in one respect or another, and none describes a project of the size undertaken by the large research library of today. While many of the methods illustrated in these earlier reports are still applicable, further refinements, such as determining the size of the catalog by a sampling technique instead of measuring every drawer, and planning a judicious allocation of labor, must be employed in a very large context in order to hold down costs and avoid disruption of both public and technical services.

The Olin Library, Cornell University's central research library, opened its doors in 1961 with a brand new card catalog containing approximately 1,900,000 cards in 4,920 drawers, roughly four inches of...
cards per drawer. Ten years later, following a decade of tremendous growth in acquisitions and cataloging (including the reclassification and recataloging of approximately 1,000,000 volumes received prior to 1948) the average number of inches per drawer had swollen to eleven, or a total of nearly 5,500,000 cards. Although each drawer has an absolute capacity of 17 inches, allowing an average of six inches for further expansion, the distribution of additional cards among drawers over this period of time had become so uneven that the time-consuming task of local shifting was occurring with depressing frequency by 1970. It was plain in 1971 that the library, notwithstanding a curtailed operating budget, had to come to grips with a major overall expansion of the catalog.

The project involved the rearrangement of catalog cards contained in the 4,979 drawers currently occupied into 6,084 available drawers, leaving all top drawers empty for later local readjustments. A period of lesser use of the catalog, June through August 1971, was selected for the operation with the August academic intermission the target date for the physical relocation of cards. The plan of operation was divided into six phases: (1) determine the number of cards presently in 4,979 drawers and divide the number of drawers available for expansion into it in order to arrive at an average number of cards to be arranged in each drawer; (2) mark the new divisions within the present arrangement with distinctively colored, consecutively numbered guide cards; (3) draw up a handwritten list of labels to be made; (4) type temporary labels and duplicate them by Xerography so as to provide a legible list for the production of new permanent labels; (5) shift the cards within the catalog, inserting temporary labels and editing the duplicate list as the task progresses; (6) prepare and insert permanent drawer labels. To each phase, the kind and approximate amount of labor was assigned in advance.

To avoid the time-consuming drudgery of measuring all of the cards in the catalog, an estimated number was calculated by a technique of sampling a given number of drawers selected at random. From a table of mathematically random numbers, twenty drawers (an arbitrary choice) were identified out of the 4,979 occupied and the cards in each carefully measured to the nearest 1/8 inch. The measurements obtained are recorded in column "x" of Table 1, Observations 1-20. However, it is necessary to know the accuracy of the sample: What is the appropriate sample size for a catalog as large as Cornell's? To determine a sample size which will yield a figure that is 95 percent accurate* a formula is applied which will reveal the number of drawers which need to be sampled to achieve the degree of confidence stipulated.

*To go any higher would require an exponentially larger sample without significantly altering the average per drawer measurement needed for expansion.
The formula illustrated in Chart 1 is applied to the figures derived from the first twenty observations in Table 1. The calculation of the figure 71, from which the first twenty observations is subtracted, indicates that 51 more observations must be made in order to achieve a confidence level of 95 percent. These are recorded subsequent to the first twenty observations in Table 1. In order to check the validity of measuring 71 drawers, the formula was reapplied using the new total figures as shown in Chart 1. The figure calculated, which is the same as the number of drawers sampled, confirms that a sufficient number of drawers were measured.

### TABLE 1

**Sampling Work Sheet**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obs. No.</th>
<th>Drawer No.</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>10.625</td>
<td>112.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>7.875</td>
<td>62.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>13.375</td>
<td>178.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1343</td>
<td>13.625</td>
<td>185.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>9.500</td>
<td>89.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>9.875</td>
<td>87.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>11.750</td>
<td>138.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1857</td>
<td>8.375</td>
<td>70.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>8.875</td>
<td>78.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2211</td>
<td>7.750</td>
<td>60.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2303</td>
<td>10.375</td>
<td>107.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2315</td>
<td>11.750</td>
<td>138.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2617</td>
<td>11.375</td>
<td>129.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3508</td>
<td>12.500</td>
<td>156.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3897</td>
<td>14.250</td>
<td>203.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4043</td>
<td>15.625</td>
<td>244.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4287</td>
<td>10.500</td>
<td>110.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4310</td>
<td>12.500</td>
<td>156.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4410</td>
<td>10.750</td>
<td>115.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal (Drawers 1-20)</td>
<td>225.750</td>
<td>2649.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.625</td>
<td>135.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8.750</td>
<td>76.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>13.125</td>
<td>172.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>9.250</td>
<td>85.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>8.500</td>
<td>72.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>10.250</td>
<td>105.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>9.500</td>
<td>90.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>11.875</td>
<td>141.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>9.750</td>
<td>95.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>12.875</td>
<td>165.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>15.375</td>
<td>236.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>8.625</td>
<td>74.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>11.125</td>
<td>123.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE I (cont'd)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obs. No.</th>
<th>Drawer No.</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>8.500</td>
<td>72.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1288</td>
<td>10.875</td>
<td>118.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1569</td>
<td>6.750</td>
<td>45.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1736</td>
<td>8.625</td>
<td>74.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>10.625</td>
<td>112.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2335</td>
<td>12.750</td>
<td>162.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2523</td>
<td>7.125</td>
<td>50.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>9.125</td>
<td>83.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2607</td>
<td>10.750</td>
<td>115.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2627</td>
<td>16.250</td>
<td>264.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2680</td>
<td>7.125</td>
<td>50.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2693</td>
<td>7.125</td>
<td>50.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2748</td>
<td>15.500</td>
<td>240.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2837</td>
<td>11.750</td>
<td>138.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>3135</td>
<td>9.875</td>
<td>97.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3157</td>
<td>10.375</td>
<td>107.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>3258</td>
<td>14.250</td>
<td>203.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>3279</td>
<td>13.500</td>
<td>182.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>3337</td>
<td>10.625</td>
<td>112.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>3384</td>
<td>9.500</td>
<td>90.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>3393</td>
<td>13.375</td>
<td>178.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>3676</td>
<td>9.875</td>
<td>97.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>3775</td>
<td>11.000</td>
<td>121.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>3880</td>
<td>9.000</td>
<td>81.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>4036</td>
<td>10.125</td>
<td>102.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>4154</td>
<td>8.750</td>
<td>76.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>4187</td>
<td>10.500</td>
<td>110.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>4195</td>
<td>10.875</td>
<td>118.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>4298</td>
<td>9.500</td>
<td>90.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>4331</td>
<td>7.375</td>
<td>54.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>4336</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>4467</td>
<td>13.625</td>
<td>185.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>4491</td>
<td>9.250</td>
<td>85.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>4647</td>
<td>8.750</td>
<td>76.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>4755</td>
<td>10.375</td>
<td>107.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>4862</td>
<td>8.250</td>
<td>68.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>4889</td>
<td>9.250</td>
<td>85.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>4935</td>
<td>12.750</td>
<td>162.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal (Drawers 21–71)</strong></td>
<td><strong>534.250</strong></td>
<td><strong>5848.65</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>760.000</strong></td>
<td><strong>8498.36</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Units samples: Inches of cards/drawer.
Date sampled: January 18–29, 1971.
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The answer is \( N' = 71 \)

The formula, given the \( N' \) the number of observations actually taken.

\[ N' = \frac{1600 \left[ N\Sigma X^2 - (\Sigma X)^2 \right]}{(\Sigma X)^2} \]

\( N' \) is The number of observations (drawers) needed to achieve 95 percent confidence and ± 5 percent variation.

\( N \) = The number of observations actually taken.

\( \Sigma X \) = The sum of the values (inches of cards per drawer) of all the observations.

\( (\Sigma X)^2 \) = The square of the sum of the values of all the observations.

\( \Sigma X^2 \) = The sum of the squares of the values of all the observations.

1600 is the square of the constant used at this confidence level.

Therefore:

\[ N' = \frac{1600 \left[ 20 \times 2,649.71 - (225.75)^2 \right]}{(225.75)^2} \]

The answer is \( N' = 71 \)

The formula, given the figures from the larger sampling:

\[ N' = \frac{1600 \left[ 71 \times 8498.36 - (760)^2 \right]}{(760)^2} \]

The answer is \( N' = 71 \)

It is a simple matter to arrive at the average number of inches of cards per drawer by dividing the sum of the observations in column “x” of Table I by the number of drawers measured. The multiplication of the number of occupied drawers in the catalog by the average number of inches yields the total number of inches of cards in the catalog. To arrive at the number of cards, the number of inches is simply multiplied by 100, the average number of cards per inch.

\[ 760 \div 71 = 10.7 \text{ inches per drawer} \]

Therefore:

\[ 10.7 \times 4979 = 53,275.30 \text{ inches in the catalog.} \]

Therefore:

\[ 53,275.30 \times 100 = 5,327,530 \text{ cards in the catalog.} \]

Since a leeway of 5 percent was accepted, it is possible that the catalog contained as few as 5,061,153 or as many as 5,503,906 cards at the time of sampling.

A division of the 6,084 drawers available for an expanded catalog, excluding the top row drawers to be held in reserve, into 53,275.30 inches yields an average of 8.8 inches per drawer. However, the plan should always allow for some extra drawers, whether a sample size is computed or the entire catalog measured, simply because the mechanics of measurement are not precise. In Cornell’s experience 6,122 drawers
were needed, so an additional 38 drawers had to be taken from the top row.

To perform the critical task of marking drawer divisions, a professional librarian and two senior library assistants were assigned, all of them with considerable experience in filing. Not only were they instructed to divide the cards at average intervals but also to exercise judgment both in determining the exact point of division in order to simplify legends on the labels as much as possible and the length of cards in individual drawers in order to allow for rapid expansion of some areas of the alphabet (minimum 5 inches) and commensurately slower expansion in others (maximum 12 inches). A tally sheet giving a running figure of number of inches ahead or behind the standard measure was maintained throughout the operation. The division was performed by one person at a time working from “A” to “Z.”

The hand listing of label legends was carried out by clerks and student assistants and edited by librarians, who checked the consistency of abbreviations and the clarity of truncated headings. The separation of this task from the marking of divisions, with which it is sometimes combined, permits the allocation of less experienced staff for the former and more experienced, higher paid staff for the latter. Furthermore, many hands can list labels simultaneously after the divisions are fixed, thereby shortening the duration of that particular activity.

From the handwritten list of legends, two student assistants, working in shifts, typed temporary labels in columns on card-stock sheets, using a “Bulletin” typewriter with 6 pitch type fonts approximately the size of the original printed labels (but not of the legibility). The sheets were preprinted by the library’s offset press with outlines for each label and corner marks within each delineating the area visible in the drawer label holder. A Xerox copy of each typed sheet was produced for final editing, and the sheets themselves were cut into individual labels by a power cutter. No rearrangement of the cut labels was necessary since the sheets had been arranged in alphabetical order and the cut labels bundled to prevent disarrangement.

Preparations for the shifting of cards were completed by the end of July. For the shift itself it was felt that a maximum concentration of labor was not required so long as there was confidence that the job could be finished before the commencement of the fall term on September 1. Therefore, only two teams of two students each, working in morning and afternoon shifts, were assigned to the task. If speed is of essence, more complex routines employing several workers simultaneously can be devised. Cavender describes how this was done at another library. While students were removing and relocating cards, they were supervised by a senior clerk, who at the same time as the temporary labels were being inserted edited the Xerox copy of them. The shifting was finished exactly on schedule.

The production of permanent labels was the one component of the expansion project that had not been analyzed during the planning
TABLE 2
Expenditure for Activities Involved in Catalog Expansion at Cornell, 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and determining sample size</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$102.30</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbering division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guide cards</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>394.18</td>
<td>Professional/Clerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listing labels</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>242.79</td>
<td>Clerical/Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing labels listed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>98.51</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing labels</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>127.66</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifting cards</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>296.10</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing Xerox copy of labels</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>202.00</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing permanent labels</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>127.66</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>$1,606.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3
Expenditure for Staff Involved in Catalog Expansion at Cornell, 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$330.72</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>654.00</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>621.28</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$1,606.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

stage. It had been assumed that labels printed by one method or another which resembled the original letter-press labels in the catalog would be produced; therefore, the plan called for the typing of the rather crude temporary labels already described. Only later was it discovered that high quality printed labels were prohibitively expensive, estimates exceeding $1.00 apiece. A much cheaper method, a photo-composition technique, was ruled out primarily because lines could not be justified. In the end it was decided that the permanent labels would have to be typed, but that the highest possible quality would be achieved by using a 10 pitch "Orator" ball-type element, a special one for speech-reading, on an IBM Selectric® Typewriter. Needless to say, had this solution to the problem been obtained before the project began, temporary labels would have been unnecessary.

An accounting of labor costs is given in Tables 2 and 3 by activity and by staff respectively. Unfortunately there are no comparable figures...
recently published with which Cornell's may be compared. Cavender states quite rightly that such cost figures can be misleading and contends that there are too many variables to allow for a meaningful comparison among libraries. Nevertheless, it would have been helpful had she made some analysis of costs as the title of her report advertises. Her method of shifting, for example, appears to be well thought out. It is one which makes the process very rapid, but does it cost less than some other way such as the rather simple technique employed by Cornell?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Percentage of Time</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Percentage of Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and supervision</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>$39.36</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring size of catalog</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining tray divisions</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>118.98</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifting cards to new trays</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>140.97</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labeling trays</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>44.80</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renumbering trays</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>60.30</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>321.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>425.73</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional time</td>
<td>148.5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$262.93</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofessional time</td>
<td>173.25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>162.80</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>321.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>425.73</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no evidence that it does. Only the report of the expansion of the Duke University catalog in 1952 by Merritt and Frary gives cost figures (Tables 4 and 5), and they are very much out of date. They are included in this report, however, if only to demonstrate the striking changes that have occurred over two decades in the allocation of labor to library tasks. A comparison of Tables 3 and 5 clearly documents the transfer of many traditional library duties from professional to supporting staff. It is tempting to conclude that, given the project size at hand, Duke's expenses are higher than Cornell's. All variables, it is agreed, cannot be accounted for; but it is a fact.
that Cornell's expanded catalog is 2.6 times larger than Duke's in 1952,* and the cost of services in the United States has almost exactly doubled since then.† If the cost of renumbering drawers (a task Cornell did not have to do) is subtracted from the total cost, and the reduced figure, $365.43, is multiplied by two and the product by 2.6, a cost figure of $1,900 is reached, which permits an estimate of what it might have cost Duke in 1952 to expand a catalog the size of Cornell's at today's costs. Labor is obviously more economically allocated today than it was two decades ago. Probably the methodology of expanding a large card catalog has improved as well, but until other contemporary cost figures are provided, it is impossible to rate the cost-effectiveness of Cornell's operation.

More to the point however, it is demonstrable that such a large project can be executed without disruption of catalog use, the routines of filing and catalog maintenance, and an inordinate expenditure of funds. Key factors in the achievement of these goals should surprise no one who is acquainted with modern methods of library management: they are careful step-by-step planning, utilization wherever feasible of simplified methods of operation, measuring the requirements of each phase of the project in terms of staff expertise required, and proper timing.

REFERENCES


5. Ibid., p.107.


* 2,353 drawers after expansion.
† The Consumer Price Index for services indicates a rise from 64.5 in 1952 to 128.8 in July 1971 with 1967 as the base year of 100.
Utilizing the Superintendent of Documents System Without Reclassification

JACK W. LYLE
Cunningham Memorial Library
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana

Because the Superintendent of Documents classification system groups publications by issuing agency rather than by subject, it is difficult for library patrons to use government publications without the assistance of library staff. Effective use of staff to meet the needs of patrons involves less technical services work and more direct assistance. It is possible to avoid an ongoing reclassification program by shelving publications under their original Superintendent of Documents classification number while bringing all publications of an agency or a series together on visible record files.

By ITS NATURE the Superintendent of Documents classification scheme requires a different approach to its utilization than do the Library of Congress or Dewey Decimal classification schemes. Unlike them, the Superintendent of Documents classification is based on the principle of provenance rather than that of subject grouping. As changes are made in the structure of the United States government, the classification numbers are changed. If publications are not reclassified into the latest number, series titles are split and all the publications of one agency are not found in one place.

Unless an agency's publications stand together in one place, it may be argued, a patron cannot determine the class number he wants and then browse through the publications. But, reclassification into the latest Superintendent of Documents number does not seem to turn the collection into a browsing one because like subjects are not brought together. Thus, even if all publications of an agency were classed together, the unaided patron familiar with Dewey or L.C. might experience considerable difficulty in finding those materials organized by the Superintendent of Documents system.

In working with the government publications collection at Indiana State University, we attempt to spend as much time as possible in di-
rect service to the public by working with patrons on their reference questions and to keep to a minimum the time spent in the indirect service of cataloging and classification. Naturally, a certain amount of cataloging and classification is essential for efficient reference service. But because we have not given full cataloging to each of our government publications, we recognize that it is imperative that our patrons be given as much staff assistance as possible.

Instead of a subject catalog, we use the Monthly Catalog supplemented by subject bibliographies. Instead of reclassification into the latest Superintendent of Documents number, we use the original number assigned to the publication.

Classifying by the original Superintendent of Documents number has some advantages. One is that, when a patron has located the classification number of a publication in the Monthly Catalog or other reference aid, he can locate the publication on the shelf under that number. A more important advantage is saving staff time. In reclassifying it would seem that some time must be consumed in composing specialized schemes to keep like publications together. While simply converting to the latest number will work for many series, such as annual reports, some series offer considerable challenge to the ingenuity of those who reclassify. Even reclassification into numbers which are readily apparent consumes considerable time, involving, as it does, changing all records and the call numbers on the documents each time a series receives a new class number.

The time saved in not carrying on a continuous reclassification program is invested in assisting patrons in the use of our collection. True, some assistance is devoted to helping them find publications from the same series shelved in two or three different classification numbers. But consulting a complete series of one title is far from the most frequent concern of our patrons. Neither are they greatly interested in finding all the publications of one agency shelved together. What they usually want are materials on a specific subject or statistics on this subject. They may wish to see the publication of the preceding year in the same series to compare statistics, but this is usually the extent of their need to find all documents in a series in one shelf location.

While we shelve publications by the Superintendent of Documents classification number they were given when first issued, our visible record files for the government publications collection bring together all publications in the same series. These files are used not only to record current receipts, but also to show our complete holdings of United States government publications. Our visible record files are arranged by Superintendent of Documents classification number. We employ the Indiana University system of check-in cards. One kind of card is used for checking in a series issued in consecutive numbers. A second type of card is used for checking in series issued by year (with an insert for series issued more frequently, such as periodicals). The third
kind is a lined card for recording series issued in cuttered numbers.

These cards, which comprise our visible record files, list all publications of a series under its latest classification number with "see" references in the files referring from earlier Superintendent of Documents class numbers to the latest one. To ascertain the shelf location of a specific publication, we draw a line on the check-in card at the point at which the class number changes. We indicate the old class number above the line and the new class number below this line (see figure 1). Thus, our visible record files show at a glance our complete holdings in a series.

With greater demands on our time for direct aid to patrons to meet their informational needs and with budget restrictions not permitting expansion of staff, the utilization of the Superintendent of Documents system without reclassification seems a satisfactory expedient which effectively serves our public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIB. HAS</th>
<th>FILED: CURRENT BOUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>C 14.16:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>C 18.14:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C 3.134: Statistical Abstract of the United States
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From LC to Dewey?

Robert L. Mowery
Illinois Wesleyan University Library
Bloomington, Illinois

Even though statistical compilations published by the Office of Education imply that thirty-nine academic libraries abandoned the Library of Congress Classification in favor of Dewey during the 1960s, a survey of the libraries themselves reveals that none took such an anomalous step.

Would you believe that thirty-nine college and university libraries recently switched from the Library of Congress Classification (LC) to the Dewey Decimal Classification?

This improbable conclusion is suggested by the data found in two compilations of academic library statistics published by the Office of Education in the 1960s. Thirty-nine libraries identified by Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, 1963-64: Institutional Data (abbreviated "LSCU64") as users of the Library of Congress system were listed as Dewey libraries in the comparable 1967 edition (abbreviated "LSCU67"). Are we to suppose that these libraries had such intense "second thoughts" after adopting LC that they reverted to Dewey?

Inquiries addressed to these thirty-nine libraries yielded thirty-seven responses, all of which told quite another story—a story of erroneous data. Of the thirty-seven libraries which responded:

- twenty-three were using Dewey at the time of both surveys and were erroneously listed as LC users by LSCU64;
- thirteen were using LC throughout 1964-67 and were erroneously listed as Dewey libraries by LSCU67; and,
- one library switched from Dewey to LC in 1967 and was erroneously listed by both surveys.

None of these libraries had abandoned LC in favor of Dewey. Indeed, one of the respondents aptly commented that he could have achieved "quite a bit of notoriety" by so doing.

Two junior college librarians whose libraries were erroneously identified by LSCU64 as LC libraries offered similar humorous explanations concerning the origins of this misinformation. In the words of one, who will be quoted anonymously:

In 1964 a newly employed clerk with no experience was the total staff of the library. She was used to complete the [Office of Education] questionnaire.
Since she ordered LC cards, she assumed that we were on the LC system. And that is how accurate data are collected by the government.

When you reflect on the matter, you realize that its implications concerning the library profession are really not so humorous!

First appearances to the contrary, it has been impossible to verify a single case of an academic library which switched from LC to Dewey during the time-span between the two surveys. It is, of course, extremely doubtful if any academic library has taken such a surprising step in recent years. The author would appreciate learning of any college or university libraries which may have made such a switch in years past.
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3. Since Howard F. McGaw, “Academic Libraries Using the LC Classification System,” College & Research Libraries 27:31–36 (Jan. 1966), based his article upon data supplied by LSCU64, he mistakenly included in his list of LC libraries the twenty-four libraries found in our first and third categories.
Toward Uniformity in Exchange Communication

Isabella E. Shinn
Gifts and Exchanges Section
University of Washington Libraries
Seattle, Washington

Instant communication, characterized by brevity, should be the practice of exchange librarians trading titles on the international level. Librarians, however, have tended to adhere to the protocol of diplomacy with lengthy exchanges of letters. Considering the increase in publications output and the use of automation for acquiring purchased materials and possibly for exchanges—besides the complexities related to exchange publications—it is felt that uniformity in communication can be achieved through the use of a multilingual, many-purpose form letter. In presenting the guidelines for the form, a comparison is made with the recently proposed standard book exchange request form which has been suggested by the IFLA Committee on the Exchange of Publications.

INSTANT COMMUNICATION as translated into good service should be the customary practice among exchange librarians for handling the business of cultural barter. Just as concise communication among colleagues on the “home front” is the essence of good service, so should the remote request for materials be placed on the same service level. Unfortunately, publications exchange among the libraries of colleges, universities, learned societies, and other scholarly institutions seems to be slowed down by delays in correspondence, particularly on the international level. Perhaps this has been due to a tendency among exchange participants to adhere to some extent to the precedents set up by the protocol of diplomacy. Diplomatic etiquette, regarded as the good manners among nations, seems to have acquired a notorious reputation for being responsible for very lengthy exchanges of letters, memorandums, and notes for realizing agreements among countries.¹ All too frequently, exchange partners have tended to follow this practice rather closely in setting up exchange agreements for trading titles. After all, the international exchange of publications can rightfully be construed as one of the cultural instruments of diplomacy.
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A brief glimpse of the recent history of international exchange may show how exchange communication came to be locked into diplomatic etiquette. Over a hundred years ago, a ventriloquist, Alexandre Vattémare, gave impetus to book exchange among libraries. In the various European cities where he gave performances, it was his custom to visit libraries and eventually to discover that many of them possessed duplicates in their basements. Perturbed over the need to help librarians find outlets for these, he decided to give up the performing arts and devoted full time to his hobby from the 1830s until his death. As a self-appointed roving ambassador of exchange, Vattémare packed books back and forth across the Atlantic Ocean and sent memorials to the U.S. Congress and the entities of foreign governments. His theory was that publications exchange should be a means for nations to promote the many aspects of their foreign policies. To some extent, this idea provided the thrust for book exchange between European and American libraries. Essential to the free interchange of cultural, educational, and scientific information among the free peoples of the world, publications exchange grew and came to be sanctioned by Geneva conventions.

After World War II, exchange communication became involved in protocol when the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization assumed the role of coordinator for the dissemination of exchange information. To provide guidelines for communication, the UNESCO Handbook on International Exchange of Publications (3d ed.) advised:

Relations are established by correspondence. We write to the institutions with which we would like to make exchanges explaining our wishes in a general way—or if possible giving actual titles—preferably enclosing lists of offers, and stating how we propose to organize the dealings. . . . An exchange operation is considered to have been completed when the other participant has replied and both parties have agreed as to conditions and decided what each is to deliver.

Obviously, these suggestions were designed to be flexible in interpretation, whether by “the long or short form” approach. But, protocol had been established!

In recent years, however, speed as translated into brevity appears to have had an impact on the various media of communication, to some extent altering diplomatic etiquette. Witness the so-called hot line which was created for presidential use in urgent Russo-American communication, and very recently for scientific investigation. For publications exchange correspondence also, it seems imperative that thought should be given to brevity through some means of standardization.

First, a steady increase in publications production, perhaps leveled off by the current “economic crunch,” has provided opportunity for an expanding thrust in exchange among libraries. For the exchange
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librarian, this is probably most noted in the numerous monographs
and series from developing countries which are published in the lan-
guage of origin but usually include English, French, and German sum-
maries. Many of these are not for sale nor available as gifts, and ex-
change must be relied upon for procurement. For the professional li-
brarian, the constant increase in available titles not only necessitates
expending more time in selection but also in the daily confrontation
with correspondence related to wanted and offered material.

Second, to expedite the procurement and processing of purchased
materials, librarians are gradually turning to computerization. No
doubt some may now possibly be considering the inclusion of ex-
change requests. Each library, however, appears to have its own pec-
culiarity in handling the acquisitions processes, and all must some-
how be punched into the uniformity demanded of magnetic tape.
Meanwhile, those managing the exchange operation would do well to
be realistic in recognizing automation as a useful instrument for ex-
pediting exchange, especially considering a growing publications out-
put.

It is a well-known fact that exchange involves various complexities
which are going to be reflected in the daily correspondence among
participants. First, the nature of the materials traded affects the ex-
 pense of exchange, and this is obviously scrutinized by administrators.
Publications for sale are ordered and paid for through purchase
routines. A gift book is acknowledged. Exchange, however, implies reci-
procity.

At this point, it seems that a definition of “exchange publication”
is in order. Two categories of materials traded are (1) duplicates—the
original basis of exchange—and (2) titles published by libraries or the
institutions of sending libraries and not available in the trade. Usually
library policy determines the disposition of duplicates. Lists are
regularly sent to specific libraries, or selected titles may be offered for
wanted materials. For each publication requested, one or more is usu-
ally offered. Not only must partners agree on titles traded but also on
the terms of exchange, that is, the manner by which materials are
bartered: title for title (often for journals); piece for piece; comparable
value in monetary terms; or whatever else upon which the participants
may decide to base their dealings.

To arrive at these mutual agreements, there may be several ex-
changes of letters, each politely worded and with each partner having
to review the previous correspondence before concocting the next
communique. In barter, payment is realized by each partner sending
the wanted material, which involves possible correspondence and, of
course, record-keeping on the “home front.” Some years ago, Lane
noted: “One of the characteristics of exchange work is the high volume
of correspondence.” Sadly true!

Language barriers create another problem. Słabczynski stated that
letters in various languages were obstacles in exchange development.
While the majority of these are written in English and French—the languages of diplomacy—the use of German, Russian, and Spanish appears to be increasing. While most librarians may have a title-page knowledge of numerous languages and have studied at least two, few are linguists. Consequently, the necessity of pausing to translate may also delay communication.

A third problem frequently articulated by exchange librarians is the lack of bibliographic tools for determining the available status of publications—whether procured by exchange, gift, or purchase. Thanks to the UNESCO Handbook on International Exchange of Publications, updated by the UNESCO Bulletin for Libraries, lists of some series are offered. Since exchange appears to be an individual matter with each library providing its own list, and because of the frequent changes in the status of such publications, requests must be accompanied by an inquiry relevant to their current status in addition to their physical availability—out-of-stock, out-of-print, etc. Financial circumstances of the publishing institutions of sending libraries may be responsible for series or monographs being transferred from exchange to purchase or even to gift status. This situation not only complicates the procuring process but may alter existing agreements with the result of further communication to recast or even terminate exchange arrangements.

These problems—the nature of the materials traded, language barriers, and the lack of bibliographic tools—together with an increased publication production and the gradual automation of acquisitions processes in libraries makes uniformity in exchange communication essential.

Over twenty years ago, Lane revealed that for Columbia University the use of the form letter had "... effected an estimated saving time of sixty percent with a corresponding financial saving." From experience, it has been observed that some libraries, both within and outside the United States, use a form letter for publications exchange. In another area of interlibrary exchange—international interlibrary lending—the multilingual form has been adopted. Very recently Gombocz suggested, "Standardization of the different pre-printed forms used in exchange operations would simplify and accelerate the work and consequently make it more economic. The IFLA Committee is now dealing with this problem." This last part of his statement refers to a meeting of the Committee on Exchange of Publications of the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) in Moscow in 1970. Committee members looked favorably upon forms and passed a resolution to publish the standard request slip for exchanges which they had adopted. In a recent issue of the UNESCO Bulletin for Libraries, the proposed standard book-exchange request form was published.

Instant communication, as mentioned above, should be common practice among librarians handling publications exchange, especially on the international level. Close adherence to protocol, with its seem-
ingly lengthy exchanges of correspondence to formalize agreements, can create delays. For publications exchange, the problems contingent upon delay have been examined. These complexities, when compounded by a too literal interpretation of the guidelines offered by the UNESCO Handbook, tend to result in unnecessary communication. Inasmuch as the advice of UNESCO does provide opportunity for flexibility, and since the IFLA Committee on Exchange of Publications has taken action toward standardization, it seems that librarians might seriously entertain the idea of updating communication procedures. It is proposed here to go beyond the IFLA request slip for exchanges by adopting a standard multilingual, many-purpose form letter to expedite publications exchange on the international level.

The term “many-purpose” is offered pursuant to the numerous kinds of letters essential to cultural barter. In Table I, twelve types of communiques involving some seven kinds of information are shown. It should be observed that a distinction is made between “Titles wanted,” “Titles received,” “Titles offered,” and “Titles sent.” A requesting library may wish several monographs and/or serials, not all of which the sending library can supply, and substitutes may have to be suggested. “Availability status” not only refers to whether the wanted publication may be procured by gift, exchange, or purchase but also to its physical availability—not yet published, etc. The “Terms of exchange,” also described above, are usually specified only at the time when an agreement is being initiated and rarely after that, unless circumstances require recasting arrangements.

Six types of request letters are indicated. In those initiating exchange agreements, titles wanted and offered are included. But in the case of an existing arrangement, offered titles may be frequently omitted, especially if only one is requested. Some libraries seem to find that if no reply for a request has been received, a follow-up letter, sent after a specific period of time, may be effective. Claims for wanted serial issues perhaps constitute the most frequently used type of communiqué and are often sent on a printed form prepared by the individual library. If no publication(s) or reply comes back, letters of inquiry regarding the claim may be sent. The exploratory letter appears to fall into the request category of correspondence in that it is employed to discover the offerings of possible partners.

Other types of letters are included. From time to time, exchange participants survey their relations with each other, particularly if an inventory reveals an imbalance between materials received and sent. Agreements may need to be altered when serial titles cease or change status, say, from exchange to purchase. Some libraries, as mentioned above, periodically trade duplicate lists with specific partners. Occasionally participants may be obliged to notify each other of a changed address. And, of course, each type of exchange communiqué demands a reply.

The proposed form (see Form 1) is presented in one language and
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of exchange communication</th>
<th>Name and address of institution</th>
<th>Title(s) wanted</th>
<th>Title(s) offered</th>
<th>Title(s) supplied</th>
<th>Title(s) received</th>
<th>Availability status</th>
<th>Terms of exchange</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Request with initiation of exchange agreement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request if agreement exists</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up if no reply nor publications received</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim for wanted serial issue(s)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry if no reply to claim</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploratory trading of lists for partners</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of existing agreement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recasting of agreement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminating agreement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers of duplicates</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes of addresses</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to request(s)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
merely attempts to provide guidelines for setting up a multilingual, many-purpose form letter which could be employed for publications exchange on the international level. Instead of using "... a single language, preferably one widely used" or "languages best suited to the usual correspondence" to be determined by each exchanging institution, as suggested by the IFLA Committee on the Exchange of Publications, the printing of the form letter in English, French, German, Russian, and Spanish could serve many libraries. For those trading with Far and Near Eastern institutions, knowledge of Asian languages and Arabic would be useful. In each language included, wording should be worked out for clarity and be concise and diplomatic enough so as not to offend the toughest of protocol managers! To avoid the nonsense of lengthy exchanges of correspondence, allowance is made for not only the usually requested and offered titles but also availability status, terms of exchange, and possible follow-ups. Unfortunately, the proposed IFLA form omits gift status, terms of exchange, and possible follow-ups. Returning to Form 1, it is very possible that deletions of nonapplicable areas, if necessary, might be considered by some libraries if a form is computer produced for each title wanted. A decision would have to be made as to whether the "Availability status" area would be used on the multilingual form or on the library's own request slip. This situation might arise among partners from two or more countries with the same languages of origin. If flexibility is the basis for setting up the form, its use can be extended to numerous types of requests and, in addition, to the surveying, altering, and terminating of agreements, establishing duplicate lists and notifying changes of address. To expedite replies, adequate space should be provided for short answers and possible comments (as was provided in the proposed IFLA form).

As for format, the multilingual, many-purpose form letter should be set up in triplicate as the IFLA Committee suggested for its form. Instead of the small catalog card size proposed by IFLA, the customary business letter size would be necessary for the inclusion of several languages. Furthermore, the use of one side of a sheet of paper is more convenient for checking answers than relegating replies to the reverse side as proposed by IFLA. With one original and two copies, the requesting library could retain one copy and send the others. The receiving library would keep the original and return the copy. Self-carbon paper in colors would avoid the problems of carbon paper. Although the IFLA Committee suggests that each exchange center or institution print forms according to the proposed model, it is felt that the triplicate form could be manufactured in runs of over a million and sold in stipulated batches of one thousand at a nominal cost by a specified printer. This would not only result in financial savings to individual institutions but would also aid in achieving uniformity in communication.

The proposed multilingual, many-purpose form letter for publica-
FORM 1
Proposed Multilingual, Many-Purpose Form Letter
(Guidelines presented in one language)

TO: Name and Address of Institution and/or Library

Title Wanted: Monograph; Serial on continuing basis—

Availability Status:
A. Gift
   Purchase; quote price
   (Do not send publication)
   Exchange only
   Not available
B. Will send
   Not yet published; date available
   Out of stock
   Out of print
   Ceased publication with Vol.
   , dated
   Other

FROM: Name and Address of Requesting Institution and/or Library

Title(s) Offered: Monograph(s); Serial(s) on continuing basis—

We should like to exchange publications which are not available on a gift basis nor for sale if an agreement, based on the terms of exchange indicated below, would be mutually beneficial to both institutions.

Terms of exchange

Exchange agreement exists between our institutions.
This is our second request; first request dated
This is our third request; previous requests dated and

Please return copy indicating requested information.

Name
Date
Position
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tions exchange on the international level appears to be the solution for standardizing exchange communication. It has been shown that problems involved with titles traded, the multiplicity of languages, and the lack of bibliographic tools tend to complicate communication. Too long have librarians succumbed to the temptations of lengthy exchanges of correspondence, no doubt overdoing diplomatic etiquette! Today, the contingencies of computerization seem to compel uniformity in procurement for increased publications input. As roving ambassadors of exchange, librarians should give serious thought to brevity as an essential for instant communication in expediting cultural barter.
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Economics of Serials Exchanges

JOHN E. GALEJS
Resources and Technical Services
Iowa State University Library
Ames, Iowa

There is little information available concerning economic aspects of serials exchanges. The Iowa State University library has had a very active serials exchange program for over fifty years. The article estimates the costs of this library's exchange operations and attempts to assess the value of serials received, concluding that the program is economically beneficial as the value of receipts exceeds the direct costs to the library by at least $5,000. It also enumerates the various nonmonetary benefits of exchanges which might be of greater importance than the purely monetary factors.

Introduction

Among libraries, the term “exchange” is used to cover a wide variety of transactions, such as the exchanging of monographs, government documents, serials, and duplicate issues of periodicals. The relative importance of serials in library exchange transactions was emphasized in Blanchard's report on the 1955 International Congress of Libraries and Documentation Centers: “In nearly all of the discussions on the exchange question, it was implied that serials were the life blood of all such arrangements.” Although there is an abundance of literature concerning exchanges of materials between libraries, the economic aspects of such exchanges have been investigated and reported only rarely.

McIver's survey of exchanges at the University of California in 1932 and 1933 placed the total value of all exchange materials received at $23,555; the 4,025 serials received were valued at $9,179. The list prices of University of California Press publications sent out on exchange totaled $24,278. Lane estimated the value of exchange materials received by the Columbia University library during 1949-50 at $42,000 as opposed to expenditures of $7,800. Bishop estimated the costs of publications, including shipping costs, furnished annually on exchange at the University of Michigan at $5,000 and reported that the list prices of publications received on exchange totaled several times that amount. Downs describes one library which, by distributing seven journals,
received 2,000 serials per year worth about $10,000. Novak's study of exchange costs analyzed only the economic factors of exchanging duplicate issues or volumes of periodicals.

Although few economic analyses have been done and reported, there is little question that library exchange operations are numerous and widespread. Huff's survey of gift and exchange operations published in 1970 revealed that 95 percent of the responding libraries had such operations. A survey by Orr, reported in 1962, showed that almost all libraries having exchange programs considered them essential for the acquisition of certain materials. Welch, however, in 1955 had concluded that studies of exchange costs were overdue.

Examination of the literature shows that most writings about library exchanges state generally that they are or can be beneficial. A few examples: "... an exchange program is obviously much to the library's advantage in view of the ... savings to the book budget." Exchange relationships ... have proven extremely profitable." "Collections can be enriched tremendously." Libraries profit financially."

**Difficulties of Evaluation**

The absence of detailed studies of the economics of serials exchanges may be partly due to the difficulty of determining the monetary value of the materials received as well as to the lack of refined cost analyses and overhead allocations for internal library operations and services in general. Similarly, actual costs of materials furnished on exchange are not always at hand or easily obtainable.

The prices of some publications received are easily determined; more often, however, the materials are not explicitly priced at all. A library must also obtain materials for its exchange partners, and some of these may be supplied to the library free of charge or at a minimum or nominal cost. It is obvious, however, that nothing is really free. If publishing units within an institution supply materials free or at nominal cost to the library for exchange purposes, then these units are partly subsidizing the exchange operation for reasons or "values" evidently satisfactory to them. To discover the true costs of materials so furnished might be difficult. The fact is, however, that the library need not consider such costs in assessing its exchange operations if, indeed, it incurs no direct cost itself.

In addition to materials, exchange operations involve personnel, office space, miscellaneous supplies, and equipment, such as desks, typewriters, stationery, postage, etc. There is great variation in the costs of these items from library to library. Lane, in his 1947 survey, reported that personnel costs ranged from $400 to $5,030 annually and that equipment, supply, and shipping costs ranged from $16.50 to $900.00. The size of a particular exchange operation would, of course, be a major factor.
Also, the cost of the entire exchange operation needs to be weighed against the cost of processing individual orders and payments were all or some of the materials obtained on exchange to be purchased. Because many, if not most, exchange relations are with institutions located in "soft currency" countries, it is often difficult to procure the publications through regular trade channels. The lack of reliable dealers with whom standing orders can be placed in these countries is only part of the problem. Conversion of the unstable currencies, processing of payments, and numerous claims for nonreceipt (often fruitless) would in many instances necessitate an additional work load for the serials and acquisitions departments. But, once an exchange basis has been established, the materials are usually received.

Still another problem in determining exchange costs is the time element. A single year's assessment may not reveal the true value of the continuing exchange operation. As Lane has pointed out, exchanges are very much like "an investment in the stockmarket."\(^{16}\) The number of publications sent out on exchange may remain constant while the number of receipts may gradually increase. Thus, a long-term study may be necessary for realistic evaluation and perspective.

Finally, there are goals and values—not necessarily economic ones—involved in exchange operations. To attempt to put some kinds of goals and values in monetary terms would be impossible, unrealistic, or maybe even foolish. This, in addition to the lack of solid monetary data and the difficulty of getting and allocating costs figures, may be one of the reasons that so few economic assessments have been attempted and that so many writers have spoken of benefits mostly in general terms. Nonetheless, it is possible to make some assessment from even limited data—with the caveat that nonmonetary factors should also be considered, along with any other data available, if any decisions are to be based on the assessment.

Serials Exchanges at Iowa State University

The Iowa State University (ISU) library has had an organized exchange program for nearly fifty years. The library had established exchanges of doctoral theses with various colleges and universities in the United States in the early 1920s. A systematic exchange program for serial publications was organized in the late 1920s and early 1930s. In 1926, the Graduate College began depositing copies of the Iowa State Journal of Science in the library for exchange purposes. A formal agreement was made between the library and the Iowa Agricultural Experiment Station (now the Iowa Agriculture and Home Economics Experiment Station) in 1934, and the library has since served as the exchange agent for Experiment Station publications. A few years later, similar arrangements were made with the Engineering Experiment Station (now the Engineering Research Institute) and the Iowa Academy of Science. These arrangements have provided the ISU library with a number of scholarly serials for exchange purposes at no direct
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cost to the library. Having suitable materials to offer, of course, is a primary requirement for an effective exchange program.

By 1935 the exchange program was fully operational, involving 215 domestic and 293 foreign institutions for a total of 508 exchange partners, and the library received 1,143 serial titles from these institutions. By 1951-52, the number of exchange partners had increased to 1,051. The library currently exchanges serials with 1,427 institutions and receives 2,861 titles, primarily scientific and technical. Of the exchange partners, 1,150 are located in 84 foreign countries, and 277 are domestic. Most of the institutions are located in eastern Europe, Latin America, and the Far East. Many are in "soft currency" countries, which do not have an adequate supply of internationally convertible currency for the purchase of American and western European publications. Libraries in these countries, therefore, eagerly solicit exchanges with American libraries. Because the ISU library is able to offer a number of scientific serials, it receives in exchange mostly scientific serials from these countries.

Among the ISU exchange partners are some of the world's most prestigious scholarly bodies, including the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften, Akademii Nauk USSR, and the Lenin State Library of Moscow. There are also exchange arrangements with almost all of the libraries of the scientific academies in the various Soviet republics and other eastern European countries.

Some Costs of Exchange Operations

Costs of materials furnished. Most of the publications furnished by the ISU library on exchange are available to the library without charge; they include the scientific and technical serials of the Experiment Station, the Engineering Research Institute series, and other university periodicals and irregular serials. Of twenty serial titles available for exchange purposes, the library pays for only four; the amount paid in 1970 was $375.00. Occasionally, the library subscribes to an external journal wanted by an exchange partner, but only if the serial desired in return cannot be obtained in any other way or if subscription to the desired serial would cost the library more than that of the journal to be furnished to the exchange partner. In 1970 the library spent $693.50 for journals to be furnished on exchange. Thus, in 1970, the only direct cost to the library for materials offered in exchange was $1,068.50.

Expenditures for personnel. An established, well-organized exchange operation requires relatively little professional involvement. Most serial titles arrive periodically, though sometimes more slowly than if received on a subscription basis; and, receipt is recorded in the central serials check-in file along with other titles received on subscription or as gifts. Form letters are used to process routine claims. Professional staff is involved only in instances of prolonged nonreceipt of issues, in
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review of total exchanges with an institution, in evaluation of miscellaneous materials received on exchange, and in the negotiation of new exchange arrangements. Some of the professional work entails training and supervision of the clerical staff.

The Gift/Exchange Section staff at the ISU library consists of one professional, one clerk-typist, one library assistant, and one student assistant who works about fifteen hours a week. About half of the section's total activities is devoted to exchange operations. Personnel expenditures for exchange operations in 1970 are estimated at $8,000. If, however, the serials currently received on exchange had to be purchased item by item, the serials department would have required additional, undetermined personnel hours to process the orders and payments.

Costs of shipping and distribution. There is no cost to the library at all for the shipping of most of the major publications series sent on exchange. The various publishing units on campus periodically send out their materials according to exchange mailing lists prepared by the ISU library. The library only notifies these units of additions, deletions, or address changes in their mailing lists.

The library does, however, distribute several titles directly and, in many instances, finds it of cost advantage to use the Smithsonian Institution's International Exchange Service in making shipments to many foreign countries, a practice also followed by the Experiment Station in sending exchange materials abroad. Materials are packaged and addressed to the receiving institutions and then mailed in bulk to the International Exchange Service for shipment to exchange bureaus in other countries which forward the packaged materials to individual recipients. The library or other cooperating unit pays only the transportation charges to the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. Only if a country to which materials are being sent does not have a reciprocal exchange bureau will the International Exchange Service send the materials directly to individual recipients.17

The ISU library costs for shipping and packaging of materials sent out on exchange during 1970 amounted to $710. For titles sent directly by the library, packaging and shipping is handled by the library's shipping and receiving section. Only a small proportion of the section's total effort is involved, amounting to an expenditure of $340 in 1970.

Other costs. Refined allocations of costs for equipment, storage, general overhead, office space, and other miscellaneous cost items are extremely difficult to come by or to determine from the aggregate figures of most libraries which are operated and accounted for as a whole. Furniture, record files, typewriters, etc., once purchased, serve for a number of years, and any attempt to prorate or amortize the service life and annual costs of such items is beyond the scope of this limited assessment. Accordingly, these costs are not considered.

Although minimal, costs for miscellaneous perishable office supplies,
such as stationery, forms, pencils, and even paper clips, can be obtained or estimated rather easily. These costs for exchange operations in 1970 are estimated at $125.

**Total exchange costs considered.** Except for the unallocated costs just mentioned (some of which might be regarded as fixed plant), direct costs to the library for exchange operations in 1970 are summarized in Table 1, showing a total expenditure of $10,243.50.

### TABLE 1

**Direct Expenditures for Serials Exchange Operations**  
**Iowa State University Library, 1970**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publications sent</td>
<td>$ 1,068.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>8,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping and packaging</td>
<td>1,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous supplies</td>
<td>125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,243.50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Value of Exchange Serials Received**

At the end of 1970, the ISU library was receiving 2,861 serial titles on exchange, 2,011 from foreign countries and 850 on domestic exchanges. Subscription prices could be located readily in Ulrich's *International Periodicals Directory* and other serials bibliographies for only 655 of the titles. Inspection of the remaining publications revealed prices for an additional 548 titles and also that another 475 would have been available free of charge; 247 of the last were from the various state agricultural experiment stations and extension services. These agencies make many, but not necessarily all, of their serials available without cost to certain libraries even without exchange arrangements. In the absence of exchange arrangements, copies are available to some libraries only through item-by-item requests—sometimes, for more than one copy or even single copies of expensive materials, only at cost.

Prices could not be determined for 1,183 exchange titles. Some of the publications included notices indicating availability only on exchange for similar publications or stating that "to obtain this publication, write to the library (of the institution involved)." That this group of titles is large is not surprising. A similar finding was reported by McIver in 1934.18 An average price of $5.00 per title was estimated for these 1,183 titles, based on an approximate reciprocity of the value of exchange publications received. A check of priced publications furnished on exchange directly by the library and with the cooperating ISU units furnishing materials for exchange indicated that the average cost of an ISU exchange title is approximately $5.00.

The total monetary value of materials received on exchange by
the ISU library in 1970 is summarized in Table 2. Including the estimated value of unpriced titles, the total amounts to $15,150.63.

Table 2

Value of Serials Received on Exchange
Iowa State University Library, 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of titles</th>
<th>Avg. price per title</th>
<th>Priced value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prices given in bibliographies</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>$8.57</td>
<td>$5,613.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prices located in publications</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>3,622.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No prices located—estimated</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5,915.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available free of charge</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,861</td>
<td>$5.29</td>
<td>$15,150.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obviously, this is not a precise value because of the estimate necessary for unpriced titles. The time element also affects the validity of an assessment covering only one year. Many of the serials are published irregularly, and materials on exchange sometimes arrive late, erratically, or in batches. Although no issues of a particular serial may arrive during a given year, several numbers of the same title may have been received in previous (or subsequent) years. Similarly, the volume and value of irregular serials sent out on exchange vary from year to year. An evaluation covering perhaps five to ten years might be necessary for a realistic long-term assessment.

For this assessment of monetary costs and value during 1970, the comparison is between the direct costs to the library of about $10,000 (including shipping) for materials and exchange operations and the $15,000 (excluding shipping) monetary valuation of materials received on exchange.

Other Values and Benefits of Serial Exchanges

Monetary costs and benefits are not the only considerations involved in establishing or maintaining a serials exchange operation. As mentioned, a very large number of serials cannot be obtained in any other way. The contacts and relationships formed with other institutions, particularly with foreign libraries, often yield additional and occasionally substantial benefits. The ISU library is sometimes able to procure valuable, long-sought, out-of-print books, single back issues of serials, and other materials from an exchange partner. The assessment described here takes no account of books and other special materials received during 1970 through serials exchange arrangements. Nearly 100 book titles and several substantial back sets of serials arrived on serials exchange during the year, and just a casual appraisal of their value approached $1,000.

One of the most obvious attributes of an extensive serials exchange can be easily overlooked in an evaluation focused primarily or ex-
clusively on monetary factors. Each exchange partner in an extensive network sends out only a relatively few titles, though in sizable total quantity and to many locations. An exponential number of different titles, however, are received in return from many locations. Thus, the most meaningful evaluation of this aspect may be qualitative rather than quantitative, regardless of known or unknown costs per copy of materials sent and received.

The ISU library's nationally recognized excellence of scientific serials holdings, especially in the agriculture, biology, and other life sciences, is attributable in good measure to the extensive network of exchanges begun nearly fifty years ago. Many of the serials received on exchange are held by only a few other libraries in the United States. An extensive scientific serials collection is frequently of help in attracting outstanding faculty in the sciences for which the holdings are significant. Availability of these serials for reference is of major importance in supporting graduate and faculty research in many scientific disciplines. These are some of the benefits to which monetary values can hardly be assigned. Although these benefits are not necessarily values accruing to the library per se, they certainly do increase the value and usefulness of the library for graduate students, faculty, and the institution as a whole. Undoubtedly, this is one of the reasons that cooperating publishing units on campus offer and even ship their materials on ISU library serials exchange at little or no cost to the library.

Also, the institution and its individual publishing units as well as its individual departments and authors gain in prestige and reputation from having their major scientific and technical serials and periodicals available in many foreign libraries. Additional broad and long-range objectives of international serials exchange are the contributions to the free flow of information, the presentation of U.S. scientific accomplishments to scientists abroad, and the provision of technical assistance to the so-called underdeveloped and developing countries. It is the policy of the Experiment Station, for example, to make its scientific and technical serials as widely available as possible, notwithstanding inequities in materials received in return.

From the library standpoint, too, it doesn't seem that all exchanges have to be on a quid pro quo basis. Libraries might well consider exchanges with an emerging institution in a developing country as an investment in the future rather than adhering to a principle of strict reciprocity. (Indeed, there sometimes can be a reverse problem—that of receiving "surplus" or unwanted titles on exchange; however, these should be culled in initial exchange negotiations or by routine notice to the exchange partner of unwanted titles.)

Conclusions

Despite its limitations, this one-year assessment shows rather clearly that the ISU library serials exchanges are financially beneficial to the
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library. It does not mean that exchanges of serials would be proportionally economical for all libraries. The primary requirement for a successful exchange operation would seem to be the availability of suitable materials for the library to offer on exchange. And part of the ISU library's favorable financial showing on its serials exchanges is due to publishing units on campus cooperating with the exchange operation by providing materials to be sent on the library serials exchanges. In addition to widespread availability for their materials achieved through the library serials exchanges, these units are evidently convinced that the value of the materials received in return is sufficient for them to contribute their materials for centralized exchange through the library.

From the experience here, it seems that libraries not having similar cooperative arrangements with publishing units on campus for centralized exchange might explore this possibility to mutual advantage.

Mainly, the results of this one-year assessment suggest that libraries should not ignore the possibility of exchanges as a means of serials acquisition—especially in periods of austerity and reduced funds. If benefits received truly do exceed costs, as this one-year assessment for the ISU library seems to suggest, serials exchanges should not be overlooked as an acquisitions method in contrast to attempting to obtain the materials by individual orders, the direct expenditure of limited acquisition funds, and the increased processing and overhead necessary. Although the area of serial exchanges lacks comprehensive bibliographies and lists of publications available on exchanges, there are several sources that can be very useful to libraries engaged in or contemplating exchange programs.19

Without question, there is need for more precise, detailed, and systematic studies of the monetary costs and benefits of exchange operations to be considered along with the nonmonetary advantages, disadvantages, values, goals, etc. As more and more libraries face increasing financial problems, they will be forced to look more closely at the costs of various materials and services offered by the library, and it is likely that exchange operations will have to be subject to the same scrutiny as other library activities.
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A Systems Approach to Improved Efficiency in Cataloging

ROSE STEIN
Cataloging Department
Columbia University Libraries
New York, New York

A somewhat different approach to the work of cataloging is described. It involves: pre-selection of materials into meaningful groups for economy in searching and easier identification when bibliographical sources are lacking; making decisions to catalog titles as series whenever the series has a clearly identifiable subject to save classification time; contact with the teaching staff in order to process books needed for future courses; passing along information gained during cataloging to the acquisitions department staff. The proposed system results in savings in processing, closer contact with library and teaching staff, and systematic build-up of the collection.

THE SUBSTANTIALLY INCREASED PRODUCTION of publications combined with the broadening of fields of study puts an ever growing pressure on the cataloging departments of university and college libraries. In order to keep up with the demand and to avoid being considered a bottleneck in the processing of material, new avenues must be sought and new approaches developed. These call for increased cooperation between the cataloging and acquisitions departments and a more organization-oriented attitude on the part of the cataloger.

The trend in the United States is to use Library of Congress (LC) catalog cards in order to avoid duplication of cataloging and classification work. The bulk of these cards is in English or in languages spoken in wide areas of the world. Further, emphasis is more on the detailed cataloging of monographs as opposed to serials or series—at least for the time being. A careful consideration of the cataloging trends of the Library of Congress—involving also the shared cataloging program—discloses that six categories of cataloging priority have been set up, and this in turn can help us to foresee what types of material may have LC cards in the near future.

As the goal of the procedure to be described is to reduce the load of original cataloging as much as possible, it is important to realize that this requires a broader approach than the one most currently in prac-
tice, i.e., several steps should be taken before beginning to catalog. As of now, cataloging itself is generally preceded by the following steps: The acquisitions department sends incoming material to the cataloging department where searching is done; cards are supplied if available or ordered; and, books are distributed to catalogers who are supposed to process them in chronological order of their distribution. In the following, an organizational procedure, based on the author’s experience in a specialized language field, will be described. If adapted to different language or subject fields, it may secure significant economies, improve efficiency, and better serve the teaching staff and researcher.

Books in certain specialized language areas, especially if retrospective material, are generally considered as “low priority” and consequently have a slim chance of being cataloged with LC cards. The cataloger in such a specialized area is mostly on his own and often has to perform both professional and nonprofessional tasks. Therefore, this type of material should be handled differently from that in other fields in order to speed up cataloging. The prerequisite for work done according to this method is that processing should not be done in the order of arrival of individual items to the cataloger’s desk. Instead a thorough preselection by clearly identifiable groups or subjects, combined with pertinent material from the backlog should be made whenever feasible.

Some examples follow:

Preselection of works by and about historical figures or literary authors

Advantages: Economy in searching in card catalogs and bibliographical sources; easier identification of translations, different editions, data about biographees; and consequently more efficient cataloging, catalog editing, and maintenance work.

Preselection by institutions, such as universities, their institutes, departments, schools, or by a country’s ministries, their divisions, and so on

Advantages: Time is saved in the identification of changes in names of institutions and their divisions, of geographical names, and so on. In cases where no national bibliographic or other records are available, the documents in hand can be the only sources consulted; therefore if more of these titles are handled jointly the cataloger can more easily establish correct entries and respective references.

Preselection for courses

Advantages: If the interested teaching staff of a university or college are contacted about the subjects of their planned courses, relevant works can be processed in time; e.g., a course about the comparative history of the revolutions in Europe in the nineteenth century involves preselection of pertinent historical works, biographies, memoirs, and
economic and military histories which will give a well-structured over-
view to the cataloger on the subject who then can proceed not only
more economically but also with an increased subject knowledge. Fur-
ther, the cataloger can inform readers about the relevant materials avail-
able.

If the same librarian is cataloging monographs, serials, and series, a
decision can be made as to what should be processed as serial or series
and that part should preferably be cataloged first.

**Advantages:** This method helps to clarify the corporate author,
the main entry, and so on in a unified procedure. Consequently, the
cataloger is less prone to scatter a scholarly series as separates within a
library with a card indicating: "Volumes in this series will be found in
this catalog under their respective authors with no entry under series
title," which makes the completion of such series cumbersome if not
impossible.

The "serials and series first" method also prevents some duplica-
tion of work as offprints—often cataloged as monographs—may later
turn out to be duplicates which therefore will not have to be pro-
cessed at all. Offprints should be set aside until it is reasonably certain
that this is not the case.

**Savings** in classification time can be achieved by the use of a com-
mon call number for the series when the subject is clearly defined and
narrowed down with no inconvenience to the reader if the series is
analyzed.

**Savings** in the reduction of binding costs can result from binding
together consecutive numbers of seldom called for slim volumes of a
series. Easier searching in the stacks as volumes with the same call
number are placed in sequence, less frequent mis-shelving of very slim
pamphlets, and reduced occurrence of loss are further benefits.

**Benefits** to acquisitions staff: The record of holdings on the series
card facilitates the identification of gaps and can be checked by non-
professional help. As it is hardly possible to have experts in all needed
languages in the acquisitions department, it is helpful if the em-
ployee is spared the decision of whether or not to order an offered item
and can proceed to complete a series simply by ordering missing num-
bers. The cataloger can also promote the building up of the collection
by pointing out worthwhile publications, as well as sequels or ante-
cedent volumes to the items cataloged and can pass this information on
to acquisitions. If bibliographical coverage is incomplete, it is useful
to forward photocopies of listings on publications to facilitate the
completion of sets or series. Furthermore, the chances of ordering a
title which is already in the backlog can be reduced through a better
overview of the prearranged material and the speed-up of processing.

**Benefits** to cataloger: The cataloger will develop a more thorough
knowledge of the subject field as similar works cataloged at the same time
reinforce the information acquired. The load of repetitive work such as
searching in Library of Congress catalogs and other bibliographies, preparation of authority, reference cards, and so on will be reduced. Contacts with related departments through exchange of information will benefit all the parties involved.

This system suggests the advantages of a broader approach to cataloging and of the usefulness of the thorough preparation of the material before it is to be cataloged. Let us now consider how some aspects of the above could be of use in other than a specialized language field area. The preselection of material by some criteria as language, topic or form within a broader subject would provide some perspective.

Some examples of prearrangement:

Ecclesiastical history: e.g., by denominations, dioceses, biographies, etc.

Art and architecture: e.g., by form, i.e., separation of pamphlets, which provides economy in shelving space on backlog shelves; these booklets may comprise publications of the same institution which speeds up their processing.

artists, art form, buildings, etc.

Prearrangement by institutions may be of great help to the cataloger not familiar with the works to be processed, as translations of the names of the institutions and of their divisions can be found on many of their publications.

Let us also mention that if a work is claimed at any later date for "rush" cataloging, it is fairly simple to look for it in the group in which it has been prearranged, thereby saving time and inconvenience to researcher and cataloger alike.

It is generally assumed that the work of the cataloger is rated to a certain degree by monthly production reports, which by their very nature tend to direct the cataloger towards achieving higher figures. Therefore, the librarian may be tempted to process items involving less research and to neglect the more unified view of the subject or language area. However, in the long run, service to the library and the reader, which should be our main goal, would be made more efficient and economical if cataloging were preceded by the procedures mentioned above. The administration could then evaluate different noncompatible features, such as the monthly statistics of catalogers, savings in classification time, binding costs, shelving space, and so on, and, in addition, the more efficient service which can be rendered to teaching staff and researchers.
In conclusion, this paper has emphasized the processing of materials mainly by discussing the role of the cataloger. We believe, however, that the procedure outlined will serve not only the cataloging department or the library in general, but its benefits will accrue as well to the scholars, teaching staff, and students, who together are the most valuable resources of a university or college.
The Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association presents the ESTHER J. PIERCY AWARD for 1972 to Carol A. Nemeyer in recognition of her contributions to technical services: Carol Nemeyer’s professional interests have focused on an area of concern common to publishing and librarianship—the reprint industry. Her distinguished academic work has resulted in a doctoral dissertation on the subject and in the publication in 1972 of Scholarly Reprint Publishing in the United States, a new professional tool for librarians and the book trade. Her intensive survey has brought a sense of coherence to an increasingly important segment of the book world. She combines qualities of intellectual energy and professional achievement we look for in our leaders and which we fittingly salute in the name of Esther J. Piercy.

The Esther J. Piercy Award is presented to Carol A. Nemeyer (left) by Roma S. Gregory (right), chairman of the RTSD Piercy Award Jury.

I REMEMBER A DAY in the fall of 1968. In my office at the American Book Publishers Council—now the Association of American Publishers (AAP)—I was thinking about the great number of mutual concerns of publishers and librarians—and what I was supposed to be
doing about some of them—when in walked another recruit to the
cause: Carol A. Nemeyer. As a student of Dan Lacy in his course on
Modern Book Publishing at Columbia University she was considering
two important topics for her doctoral dissertation: the scholarly re-
print publishing industry or the distribution of books and other li-
brary materials. Since Lacy knew of my concern about the lack of in-
formation available in both these areas, he had suggested that Carol
talk with me. After careful consideration she elected to research the
former topic. Scholarly Reprint Publishing in the United States (pub-
lished in June 1972, by the R. R. Bowker Company) is the result of
three years of conscientious study of a field about which very little had
been written. Carol conducted over one hundred personal interviews,
analyzed many more questionnaires, and synthesized the findings into
a concise, literate, and direct description of the history and operation
of the reprint industry. She describes the publishing, editorial, and
marketing techniques presently in use and offers a thoughtful and
balanced discussion of the problems facing these publishers. Changes
are anticipated and recommendations made about ways to improve
working relations among publishers and librarians.

At the same time Carol earned her doctorate, she succeeded me at
the AAP. In that position she demonstrates not only serious concern
for the industry and the profession but also remarkable talent for
recognizing and organizing the specific tasks that need to be done, and
getting them done. Creative staff work for the publishing industry re-
quires a thorough knowledge of how books are produced and why
they are important. In her work and in her book, Carol communicates
an impressive amount of information about general and specialized
book publishing and about librarianship.

Carol Anmuth was born in New York City in 1929 and was educated
there and at Berea College (Kentucky) where she worked in the li-
brary. She received her master's degree in Library Science from Co-
lumbia University's School of Library Service in 1961 and her doc-
torate in 1971. In 1950 she married Sheldon Nemeyer, who now is in
the Newsfilm Department of the National Broadcasting Company. When
they were married, Shel was recalled to the Navy and they lived in
Norfolk, Virginia, and Washington, D.C. Their little boat figures large-
ly in their lives and they spend weekends gunkholing and holidays
“small boat cruising” on waters as far away as the Bay of Fundy.

After receiving her MLS, Carol worked at McGraw-Hill as cata-
loger/reference librarian and then as assistant librarian in the general
library. These six years helped to develop her interest in publishing
and its relationship to good library practices. To enable her to work
toward the doctorate, Carol was granted a Title II-B U.S. Office of Ed-
ucation fellowship. Because the Council on Library Resources, Inc.
placed such a high priority on research into the scholarly reprint in-
dustry, Carol received a supplemental officer's grant from them. At that
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time she was president of Columbia's chapter of Beta Phi Mu and vice-chairman of the New York Publishing Group of the Special Libraries Association.

When Carol came to work with me at the AAP and the National Book Committee in November 1970, our long-range "plot" was to encourage the industry to establish a professional library to serve serious research needs and to provide factual information about books and bookmen in general. Our immediate responsibilities, however, were to provide numerous services to AAP members and to staff the School and Library Promotion and Marketing Committee, the Trade Division (now the General Publishing Division), and the Educational Media Selection Centers Program. In addition, Carol presently works also for the Copyright Committee, whose activities are of prime importance to all publishers and librarians.

Another activity of great concern to the industry and the profession is the Cataloging-in-Publication Program launched by the Library of Congress in June 1971, with shared grants from the Council on Library Resources, Inc., and the National Endowment for the Humanities. Carol helped to plan for this unique tool to make the acquisition of current library materials much more efficient. Envisioned by the late Verner Clapp in the 1950s and implemented after the 1969 Acquisitions Preconference, the program is proceeding on schedule through the substantial efforts of Carol Nemeyer at the AAP and Glen Zimmerman and William Gosling at the Library of Congress.

One must be careful in expressing pride lest the tone be possessive, peremptory, or precious. None of these is intended. I appreciate this opportunity to testify to the intelligence, diligence, and accomplishment of a remarkable woman who has just passed the beginning of what will be, I prophesy, a unique career in the world of books, librarians, and publishers. We have learned together—and shall continue to do so—that serving talented people and communicating with them is a major responsibility and a rewarding accomplishment. It is most appropriate that an award in memory of one outstanding woman, Esther Piercy, should be given to another, Carol Nemeyer.
The Margaret Mann Citation in Cataloging and Classification in 1972 is awarded to Edmond Lewis Applebaum for his contribution to the development of the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging. NPAC has made the Library of Congress more responsive to the needs of other libraries and has brought the library community much closer to the ideal of each title's being cataloged once for all libraries. While engaged in dealing with many technical and administrative problems, Mr. Applebaum has always been ready to hear from the consumers and to adapt the program to their needs.

FOR OVER TWENTY YEARS the Library of Congress has rewarded Edmond L. Applebaum's valuable contributions both to the institution and to librarianship by adding on his willing shoulders increasing responsibilities and bigger headaches. With the awarding of the esteemed Margaret Mann Citation in 1972, the library profession and ALA/RTSD acknowledge his notable professional achievements as well. Certainly the citation was well earned and deserved, for Ed Applebaum has worked long and hard through the years to make LC's
services to libraries everywhere operate as smoothly and successfully as possible.

Ed's distinguished academic career began in his native Boston, Massachusetts, where he graduated from Boston Latin School in 1943. Active duty in the U.S. Army from 1943-46 interrupted his schooling but he likes to recall that it also included his first formal library experience. This took place in 1945 when, recuperating from the previous winter spent in freezing French foxholes, he acted as base librarian for several weeks at Base Air Depot number one in Warrington, England. After completing his active military service, he returned to Boston and attended Harvard College where he received a Bachelor of Arts degree in English literature in 1949, graduating magna cum laude as well as being elected to Phi Beta Kappa. In chance conversation with Kenneth Shaffer, dean of Simmons College Library School, he discovered the potential value of a library career during his last year at Harvard. He then attended Columbia University School of Library Service which awarded him a Master of Science degree in 1950. While at Columbia, he was again an honors student, class president, and school representative to the University Student Council.

Chosen for the Library of Congress Special Recruit Program for outstanding library school graduates in 1950, Ed was introduced to the variety and scope of LC activities through this internship program. It did not take him long to become involved in and committed to many of them. Several years of job rotation followed, with ever-increasing responsibilities through the divisions of the Processing Department. He began as the Orientalia exchange assistant in the Exchange and Gift Division in 1950. A transfer to the position of American-British exchange assistant in 1951 was followed by his promotion to assistant head of the section in 1952, and then head of the section. He was subsequently named head of the European Exchange Section.

In 1954 the Harvard University Graduate School of Public Administration granted him an Administrative Fellowship to continue his academic preparation, and during a year's leave of absence from LC, he received his M.P.A. from the Littauer Center at Harvard. He returned to LC as administrative assistant in the Processing Department where he continued to fulfill his administrative duties with distinction. He filled, in succession, the posts of head of the Orders Section of the Card Division, assistant chief of the Order Division, and was named executive officer in the Processing Department Office in 1960.

In the twelve years since his appointment as executive officer, the size and complexity of the Processing Department have increased dramatically. The number of employees expanded from 700 to over 1,700 in 1972, and the budget mushroomed from $6 million to over $20 million. As executive officer, Ed was involved with many of the department's projects and publications, through the development of budget proposals, recruitment of staff, controlling of expenditures, and handling of personnel matters.
Despite the growing demands on his time and energy, Ed always managed by noteworthy devotion to duty and tireless activity to keep pace with his proportionally increasing obligations. His alertness in anticipating problems and his judgment in solving difficulties or recommending solutions have been of great benefit to the Library of Congress. His keen intellect, knowledge of library-wide operations, thoroughness, and dedication have earned the respect and admiration of his colleagues. The Library of Congress recognized Ed's exceptional efforts through the years not only by job promotions but also by granting him an Outstanding Performance Rating in 1952 and a Superior Performance Quality Increase in 1966.

On April 4, 1966 Ed was appointed assistant director of the Processing Department. In this newly-created position, he assisted the director, then John William Cronin, and the associate director, myself, in the general administration of the growing department. During this period John Cronin's major efforts were directed to the broadening of LC's national centralized cataloging effort in response to the urgent needs of the research library community. With the enactment of Title II-C of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the first appropriation of $300,000 in mid-May 1966, his planning efforts bore fruit and the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging (NPAC) was born. Ed Applebaum was assigned the broad administrative responsibility for implementing NPAC and the Public Law 480 multiple-set-acquisitions program as well.

In 1967, the Library again recognized Ed's many contributions with the presentation of a Superior Service Award. The citation praised his "remarkable diligence, devotion and energy" in successfully administering NPAC during its early days of growth while assuming other comprehensive administrative responsibilities in the Processing Department because of the extended absence of its other two chief officers. In expressing the Library's appreciation for Ed's fine achievements and capable administration, L. Quincy Mumford, the Librarian of Congress, cited the importance of the varied operations of the department, especially NPAC, to the government and all types of libraries throughout the country.

With the retirement of John Cronin in 1968 and the reorganization of the department into three major functional areas, Ed took on managerial direction of the department's acquisitions activities and overseas operations in addition to continuing his full program obligations for the NPAC and PL 480 programs. This new charge carried with it general administrative responsibility for the Exchange and Gift Division, the Order Division, the Overseas Operations Division, and the Selection Office, with a combined staff of about 350 people, both in Washington and in the overseas field offices. He is now the second ranking officer in the Processing Department. The last few years have been critical ones for the Processing Department, the Library of Congress, and indeed the whole library profession. Throughout this period Ed
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has demonstrated his ability to deal successfully with challenge and change.

No matter how busy his schedule, Ed is always willing to accept special assignments and perform such tasks with care and skill. Within the Library he has served on numerous committees on automation, personnel utilization, preservation, and motion pictures. He acts as chairman of LC's Acquisitions Committee and the Task Force on the Impact of NPAC, and was recently appointed as one of LC's two representatives on the U.S. National Libraries Task Force on Cooperative Activities. In addition he has been a member of several intragovernmental bodies, such as the COSATI Panel on Operational Techniques and Systems, the COSATI Panel on International Information Activities and the COSATI Special Foreign Currency Subcommittee, all of which are constituent groups of the Federal Council for Science and Technology's Committee on Scientific and Technical Information. He currently serves on the Interagency Map and Publications Acquisitions Committee (IMPAC) and the Foreign Acquisitions Committee of the Association of Research Libraries.

Professional development through education and training has long been one of Ed's concerns. Within the Library he has been an active member for several years of the LC Training Advisory Committee and the LC Special Recruit Selection Committee. From 1963 to 1966 he acted as the District of Columbia representative on the ALA/LAD Recruiting Network. During his free time from 1966 through 1969 he conducted seminars on technical services at the University of Maryland Graduate School of Library and Information Sciences as an adjunct lecturer. As a practitioner himself, Ed was especially well-qualified to give his students a broad overview of library technical processes with particular attention to administrative considerations. Recently, at Dr. Paul Wasserman's request, Ed compiled an annotated Reader in Technical Services, soon to be published as a handbook for library school students as part of the Reader Series in Library and Information Science.

Ed is a life member of the American Library Association and its Resources and Technical Services Division, as well as a member of the District of Columbia Library Association, the Harvard Club of Washington, and the Washington Alumni Group of the Kennedy School of Government.

Under his able direction, the NPAC program has flourished. Its appropriations have grown from $300,000 and $3,000,000 in FY 1966 and 1967 respectively to $7,282,000 in FY 1972. NPAC shared cataloging programs now cover twenty-four major publishing countries, and NPAC regional acquisitions offices cover an additional eighteen countries in bibliographically difficult areas of the world. Since 1966 LC has cataloged more than one-half million current foreign monographs using NPAC shared cataloging techniques by adapting national bibliography entries to provide full LC catalog cards as rapidly as possible to all li-
libraries. Developing and maintaining this vast network of acquisitions and cataloging has entailed a great amount of effort and paper work, both at home and abroad, and much of NPAC's success is due to Ed's untiring efforts and skilled attention. Both in person and through correspondence Ed keeps in close touch with every aspect of the program. Though he appreciates the accomplishments of the past, he is never hesitant to suggest innovations and changes for the future.

Although Ed's career has touched on many aspects of library technical services, it has not been directly connected with the cataloging bibliographically difficult areas of the world. Since 1966, LC has cataloging community chose to honor his contributions to the profession and to their cause. With this award Ed Applebaum becomes the third Processing Department staff member to receive the Margaret Mann Citation for cataloging and classification in the last six years. The recognition and support of the American library community implied in the awarding of these citations are appreciated by the entire Processing Department team, for they bring honor not just to the recipients, but to all their colleagues in the Processing Department and the Library of Congress. We hope we can continue to meet the standards they have set so well for us.
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The whole is the sum of its parts. A summary of the work of the Resources and Technical Services Division committees, sections, and section committees provides the content of the president's annual report. This report and those of the section chairmen that follow reveal a myriad of important activities. The many librarians working hard behind the scenes on these committees are the true authors of this review and hereby receive my thanks. It is the lot of those who toil in the field of technical services to be out of sight but, we hope, not out of mind of those who enjoy the fruits of their labors.

Standardization in all areas of technical services has been the main concern of RTSD this past year, and cooperation with other organizations has been our mode of operation.

The most significant event of the year is the international agreement at the meeting of the IFLA Committee on Cataloguing in Liverpool last fall on an International Standard Bibliographical Description (ISBD) designed to facilitate the exchange of bibliographical information especially in machine-readable form. ISBD uses punctuation to identify bibliographical elements, and its application can be seen in the 1972 issues of the British National Bibliography. On behalf of ALA, the Descriptive Cataloging Committee of the Cataloging and Classification Section has endorsed the principles of the ISBD and is reviewing the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules for changes needed to accommodate the new bibliographical description. Along similar lines, RTSD with Reference Services Division and Information Science and Automation Division formed a new committee, the Interdivisional Committee on Representation in Machine Readable Form of Bibliographical Information, which is to encourage the development of standards in this area. Also active in this field is a Subcommittee of the Descriptive Cataloging Committee which is working diligently beyond the call of duty to develop rules for the cataloging of machine-readable data files and which is consulting with the AECT Cataloging Committee, Computer Media Working Party, ASIS Special Interest Group for Non-print Media, and other interested parties.

RTSD has established a liaison between its executive secretary and the newly created permanent secretariat of the IFLA Committee on Cataloguing. Through a quarterly publication entitled International Cataloguing, the IFLA committee plans to coordinate and communicate information on worldwide cataloging activities. In progress now are the development of a standard bibliographical description for serials and the creation of a committee on uniform headings for liturgical works on which American librarians are represented.

Further international cooperation has been initiated at the request of
the Library Association Cataloguing & Indexing Group which asked RTSD to organize a Committee on Computer Filing to work with its Working Party on Computer Filing toward a goal of creating an Anglo-American code of rules for machine filing.

On the home front, the RTSD Book Catalogs Committee is preparing a guideline for the formulation, production, and issuance of book catalogs. Standard times for original cataloging is the concern of the Technical Services Costs Committee which is working with the Library Technology Program to find a contractor for this research. The RSD/RTSD Public Documents Committee has cooperated with the Association of State Library Agencies by adding to its roster two members of that Association. The committee has endorsed the Indiana University Proposal to Study the Use, Bibliographical Control and Distribution of Federal and State Government Publications, and has learned that the Government Printing Office has an interest in such a study too. At the annual conference the committee discussed the matter of classified government documents and the concern of the Intellectual Freedom Committee about the recall of government documents.

Programming for a preconference and five meetings at the Annual Conference absorbed the time and energy of many people. The Association of American Publishers/RTSD Joint Committee spent the year planning for the preconference entitled: “Acquisitions Preconference II: Focus ’72.” In addition to discussions on the acquisition of print and nonprint media, periodicals, serials, antiquarian and scholarly reprints, the program also focused on economic realities and standardization. The preconference was very successful, the most popular feature being the miniconferences, a series of concurrent evening discussion meetings on a variety of topics.

RTSD sponsored a day of four program meetings on June 29 with the theme: “Manipulation of Media for Use: Standardizing Bibliographic Organization of Media.” The Acquisitions and Serials Sections presented the morning program on the “Acquisition of Serial Publications in Microform: Availability, Cost, and User Requirements” with Allan Veaner, Stanford University, and Ralph W. Lewis, Ames Research Center, NASA, Moffett Field, as speakers. In the afternoon “Rules for Cataloging Multimedia” was the topic for discussion at the joint RTSD/CCS meeting. Virginia Taylor, City Independent School District, Houston, and Peter Lewis, University of Sussex, Brighton, presented the American and British viewpoints on catalog entry and media designation. The classification of nonprint media was discussed by Ruth Bell, Shawnee Mission Public Schools, and the cataloging of data files was the topic of the report by John Byrum, Princeton University library. The Reproduction of Library Materials Section conducted two simultaneous programs in the evening: “Copyright and Fair Use Practices” with three panelists; and a two-part discussion on “Housing and Storage of Microforms and Related Media” by a panel of four and “Human and Administrative Factors in Microforms” with three panelists.

At the afternoon program Carol Nemeyer, Association of American Publishers, received the Esther J. Piercy Award, and Edmond Applebaum, Processing Department, Library of Congress, was presented with the Margaret Mann Citation.

Maintaining its interest in networks, RTSD cooperated with the Association of State Library Agencies and the Information Science and Automation Division in sponsoring a day of meetings on the subject on Wednesday, June 28, and was specifically responsible for the late afternoon session on “Net-
works: Currents in National Planning." Speakers were Burton Lamkin, Office of Education; Charles Stevens, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science; William Welsh, Library of Congress; and Russell Shank, Smithsonian Institution.

*Library Resources and Technical Services* is our most important activity. After only one year, Robert Wedgeworth leaves the editorship to become ALA executive director. RTSD's loss is ALA's gain. We are proud of his contributions to the division and its journal and of his selection to his new position. *LRTS*, the only journal exclusively devoted to the field of technical services, has gained an enviable reputation both here and abroad with its presentation of the best articles in this field of librarianship. The division members have indicated that this journal is the most important part of their membership. Therefore, continuation of the journal and its proper support rate the highest priority by the division.

RTSD is the largest type-of-activity division in ALA, due, no doubt, to the fact that the technical services have a universality in all types of libraries. RTSD is the third largest division. These facts should be remembered as ALA enters a new era under a new executive director and a period of self-study and possible reorganization. In a survey the members stated their preference that RTSD should remain a separate division with its own journal. RTSD must have its fair share of the ALA budget. Without adequate and proper technical services no type of library or other library activity can function satisfactorily. As can be read in this report and the ones which follow that recite the work of RTSD, these activities are for the benefit of libraries in general, not technical services departments in particular.

In line with the proposed study of ALA, the division will be reviewing its goals and organizational structure. Although four new committees were created this year, an equal number were disbanded. To further implement a program of self-analysis, RTSD has an ad hoc committee of younger members whose assignments are to study the ACONDA recommendations in relation to RTSD and to suggest relevant programs for the division.

A reorganization proposal submitted by the RTSD Organization Committee was approved by the RTSD Board of Directors at its annual meeting in Chicago in June 1972: that the Acquisitions Section and its committees and the RTSD Resources Committee merge to form the Resources and Acquisitions Section and that the Serials Section review its activities with a view to the possibility of becoming part of the new section.

The structure of the RTSD Board of Directors must also be studied. With the new composition of ALA Council which eliminates division representation, RTSD no longer has its six ALA Councilors as members of the Board of Directors.

Another concern of the division and its sections is the place of technical services in the library school curriculum. There is minimal availability of courses in serials, acquisitions work, and the reproduction of library materials. There is less emphasis being placed on cataloging and classification. Therefore, RTSD will form an interdivisional committee on education for resources and technical services with the Library Education Division. This committee will investigate the coverage of this field of librarianship in library schools and develop a statement of the kind of education which is considered essential.

No division president is an island, and I want to express my sincere thanks...
to the members of the RTSD Board of Directors and the chairmen and members of all of the committees. They are the ones who are responsible for the achievements of the division during this past year. A special debt of gratitude is owed to Mrs. Carol (Raney) Kelm, RTSD executive secretary, without whom no RTSD president can function. Finally, my appreciation to the members of RTSD for their trust and for this opportunity to serve as the division president. I hope that in some small way I have justified their confidence.

Executive Secretary's Report

CAROL R. KELM, Executive Secretary

RTSD has had another busy transitional year. ALA's organizational uncertainties have not kept the division from its important work. The 1971/72 RTSD president's report reflects the variety of activities in which RTSD units have participated.

As always, the RTSD Office has maintained the office records, carried on correspondence with division and section officers and committee chairmen, and made the necessary arrangements for Midwinter and Annual Conference meetings. This year there has been a heavy additional load of arranging for the 1972 Acquisitions Preconference Institute with little additional staff. Three different secretaries assisted the executive secretary during the year.

On April 28, 1972, I addressed one of the division's regional affiliates, the Ohio Valley Group of Technical Services Librarians (at the University of Cincinnati), on technical services cooperation at the national level. On May 9, 1972, I traveled to New York City to discuss the ALA sponsorship of the American National Standards Institute, Sectional Committee on Photographic Reproduction of Documents, PH5, with the chairman of the committee and various interested members of the Reproduction of Library Materials Section.

Requests for assistance on technical services matters continue to come in by telephone and letter. The most commonly asked questions relate to the organization of small office collections of materials in specialized subjects and to the cost of materials and personnel in technical services. More brief bibliographies on these and other subjects are needed.

As always, I am eager that RTSD look ahead and prepare to meet the problems of the future by planning and acting now. What will the problems be? Further centralization of processing? Increasing economic restrictions on budgets for staff and materials? How will such new technologies and concepts as cable television and the "open university" affect library technical service operations? How will the proposed issuing of federal documents in microform affect depository and other libraries? How will the outcome of the Williams & Wilkins case on copyright affect reproduction of library materials? How will Cataloging-in-Publication help to speed up the processing of library materials and change the staffing patterns in technical services units? How can the division specifically aid technical service librarians in the field?

Thanks to the fine cooperation and hard work of the division and section officers RTSD continues to serve librarianship in general and technical services librarians in particular.
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The Acquisitions Section had a busy and productive year in a number of areas, but the most significant event, in terms of its future role and responsibilities, occurred at the very end of the year, at the last meeting of the RTSD Board of Directors. At that meeting the RTSD Organization Committee included the following recommendations among those which were approved by the board:

"That the RTSD Acquisitions Section be reconstituted as the Resources and Acquisitions Section, with the following function statement:

'To contribute to library service and librarianship through the encouragement, promotion of, and responsibility for those activities of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association relating to the selection and acquisition of all types of materials in all types of libraries.'

"The Resources and Acquisitions Section shall include:

- the present Acquisitions Section and its component units;
- the RTSD Resources Committee (this committee, to prepare for the approval of the Organization Committee, a revised function statement including inter alia, responsibility for selection policy and collection development);
- the Micropublishing Projects Subcommittee of the RTSD Resources Committee as a standing committee of the new section;
- the National Union Catalog Subcommittee of the RTSD Resources Committee as a standing committee of the new section (the incoming RTSD president to confer with the present chairman of this unit on the committee's activities and membership)

"In conjunction with this recommendation:

- the National Union Catalog PL480 Group shall be discontinued and its responsibilities assumed by the new RAS Resources Committee.
- the function statement of the AS (RAS) Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee shall be revised by adding the sentence 'The term "book" in "bookdealer" is understood to include all media.'
- the present Serials Section shall review its activities and function statement with a view to the possibility that this section should become a Committee of the Resources and Acquisitions Section.
- the By-Laws Committee be instructed to prepare revisions of the RTSD by-laws as required to implement these changes for approval of the membership, where required."

The AS Executive Committee had approved this recommendation in principle at its second meeting at the June conference, with the recommendation that the specific organization of the constituent parts into committees, discussion groups, roundtables, etc., be the subject of further discussion.

This action by the board resolves a number of problems of overlapping jurisdictions which the Acquisitions Section and other sections and committees have been grappling with for some time, and establishes a framework for the resolution of others which are still unclear.

The section was co-sponsor, with the AAP/RTSD Joint Committee, of the highly successful "Acquisitions Preconference II: Focus '72," and a number of
its members were active in its planning and implementation. Alfred Lane and Carol Nemeyer of the Reprinting Committee, Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee chairman Murray Martin, and Acquisitions Section chairman Norman Dudley served on the Planning Committee, with Alfred Lane serving as chairman and Carol Nemeyer as AAP Staff Liaison. Norman Dudley delivered the preconference overview, immediate past-chairman Nona Gregory spoke on the economic realities of library acquisitions today from the librarian's viewpoint, and Murray Martin led a "miniconference" discussion group on vertical file materials.

The section joined with the Serials Section to present a program at the June conference on "The Acquisition of Serial Publications in Microform." Allen Veaner, assistant director of libraries at Stanford University, spoke on the technical aspects of serials in microform, and Ralph Lewis, of NASA's Ames Research Center, spoke on patterns of use of microform materials at his center. The program attracted more than 600 people, and the lively discussion period which followed and subsequent comments were indications of a highly successful program.

While preconferences and program meetings may offer the most visible evidence of the section's existence, it is in the section's committees that the bulk of the substantive work is done, and a brief review of these committees' activities will make that evident.

The Policy and Research Committee has been concerned for some time about the inadequacy of acquisitions courses in library school curricula and has been collecting specific data about these courses for some time. Concern for inadequate technical services training has also been voiced by other RTSD sections, and the result has been that the RTSD Organization Committee received approval of the following recommendation at the last RTSD board meeting:

An interdivisional committee on education for resources and technical services shall be formed with the Library Education Division, with the following function statement: "To investigate the coverage of resources and technical services in library schools; to develop a statement of the kind of education in these fields which is considered essential; and to seek all appropriate means for furthering such a program. ..."

The Policy and Research Committee has already met with members of the Library Education Division and plans to work closely with this new committee. It is also continuing with the preparation of an annual bibliography of publications dealing with acquisitions, in order to assist LRTS assistant editor Ashby Fristoe in his work on The Year in Acquisitions.

The Library Materials Price Index Committee reports that Helen Welch Tuttle has relinquished her responsibility for the periodicals price index to Norman Brown. The format of the book price index will be somewhat different next year, making it somewhat more difficult to compare with former years. An out-of-print price index is in preparation, as is a French book price index and an updated Mexican index; a Latin American index has just appeared. Attempts to compile a useful audiovisual index have thus far been unsuccessful.

The Reprinting Committee has been engaged in reviewing the guidelines for lending of microform reprint publications which were adopted in April 1968. A press release seeking expressions of opinion on this subject was prepared and was distributed by the ALA Public Information Office. A number of comments had been received at the time of the June conference, and these
were discussed at some length. The discussion will be continued at the midwinter meeting.

The Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee included copies of the final draft of its *Guidelines for Handling Library Orders for In-print Monographic Publications* in the packets of materials given to each registrant in the "Acquisitions Preconference." This draft was later approved by the Acquisitions Section Executive Committee and will appear as an appendix to Stephen Ford's book on acquisitions, which is due to be published about the end of 1972. The guidelines may also be published separately. The guidelines for ordering serial publications require more editorial work, but should be completed by the midwinter meeting. At that time, committee member Stuart Debenham hopes to have ready the first draft of the guidelines for purchasing antiquarian materials. The committee is also considering preparing a list of blanket and approval dealers, domestic and foreign, together with the services each offers.

At the midwinter meeting the AS chairman asked the approval of the RTSD board for the formation of an AS ad hoc committee on periodical price increases. The board approved this, subject to official action by the Organization Committee, which had the following recommendation approved by the board at the June conference:

The function statement for the Acquisitions Section Committee on Periodical Price Increases shall be "To investigate the status of serial price increases under Phase II, to elicit information from the Library Materials Price Index Committee regarding price increases since the wage-price freeze, and to report any violations to the Price Board. The appropriate ALA channel for reporting is through the RTSD Executive Secretary to the ALA Executive Board."

Roma Gregory and E. G. Hamann were asked to serve on this committee, with Mrs. Gregory acting as chairman. No comparisons are possible until the 1972 prices are available, of course, but initial correspondence has been sent to the U.S. Price Commission; and Norman Brown, who is now preparing the periodical price index, has been asked to supply complete price information on certain publishers.

This has been an interesting and challenging year for me as Acquisitions Section chairman, and I want to thank all the section members who helped make it that. Mathilda O'Bryant, incoming chairman, should have an even more interesting tenure, as we look toward a section with greatly expanded and greatly clarified responsibilities.

**Cataloging and Classification Section Report**

**BARBARA A. GATES, Chairman**

The topic that has had the greatest impact on the largest number of committees in the Cataloging and Classification Section this year is nonbook materials.

RTSD and CCS cosponsored a program on cataloging nonbook materials at the 1972 Chicago Conference. Two areas that have engendered a great deal of discussion in connection with cataloging nonbook materials and formulating cataloging rules are choice of entry and medium designation. Miss Virginia
Taylor and Peter Lewis presented views and answered questions on these topics. Mrs. Ruth Bell reported on the use of Dewey Decimal Classification for nonbook materials in the Shawnee Mission Public Schools, and John Byrum reported on work being done in the cataloging of machine readable data files.

The Descriptive Cataloging Committee continues its work on the revision of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. Meetings of the committee in April and during the Chicago conference included representatives from the Canadian Library Association, the (British) Library Association, and the Library of Congress. These meetings, with representatives of the authors of AACR, coordinate and further discussion and understanding necessary for the continuing work of the committee. The committee is focusing its attention now on AACR rules 1A and 17, and rule 43. Work on AACR rules for nonbook materials continues with representation from the authors of Non-Book Materials. Other areas of the committee's concern are approval in principle of the International Standard Bibliographic Description as set forth in the draft of May 1971; approval of Romanization tables for Georgian and for Sindhi in the Arabic script; and through its Subcommittee on Rules for Cataloging Machine Readable Data Files, such areas of concern as sources of bibliographic description, title transcription, publication and production of information, restrictions on use of media files, scope and contents notes, and collation.

The Ad Hoc Audio Visual Media in Libraries Committee is also concerned with various aspects of Non-Book Materials as well as the problems of storage, handling, packaging, and other common problems connected with audiovisual materials. This committee will continue as an ad hoc committee with its present function statement until the completion of the manual on nonbook materials presently in preparation, at which time the status of this committee will be reconsidered.

The Ad Hoc Committee on the Cataloging of Children's Materials has been continuing its discussions with representatives from the Library of Congress on matters relating to the cataloging of children's materials and has been publicizing, supporting, and interpreting Cataloging-in-Publication (CIP) to school library supervisors. Incorporation of the LC subject headings list for children's literature in the new Sears list and the inclusion of these subject headings in the appendix to the LC subject headings list as well as the announcement of a new position at the Library of Congress, head of cataloging of children's literature, are excellent examples of the continued cooperation of the Library of Congress and the recognition of the importance of cataloging children's materials. In this connection, Theodore C. Hines and Jessica L. Harris undertook a survey of commercial catalogers and processors during the spring of 1972 to determine awareness of the 1969 recommendation that LC cataloging be adopted as a national standard for children's cataloging and the effect of CIP on policies of commercial catalogers and processors. In general, responses to the questionnaire favored standardization and were enthusiastic about CIP. The committee has begun discussions of curricular subject headings with the Library of Congress and will coordinate its study with the Subject Analysis and Organization of Library Materials Committee. Action taken and agreed to by CCS and RTSD during the Chicago conference changes the status of this committee to a CCS standing committee "to study the problems of and recommend action on all aspects of cataloging of library materials for children."

The Policy and Research Committee began consideration and discussion
on ways and means of focusing attention on problems in the broad field of cataloging in order to stimulate research in library schools especially at the level of candidates for the Ph.D. The committee has set up informal liaison with the Committee on Cataloging of Children's Materials to keep abreast of its work. The MICRO Subcommittee of the Policy and Research Committee was dissolved during midwinter 1972 in view of the establishment of the RTSD/RSD/ISAD Interdivisional Committee on the Representation of Bibliographic Data in Machine-Readable Form.

The Reference Services Division's Catalog Use Study Committee is tabulating the results of its study of the St. Louis Junior College Library and Chester County Public Library. Jessica Harris, the CCS representative to this committee, reports that the final report should be completed by midwinter 1973.

The Subject Analysis and Organization of Library Materials Committee sponsored a National Federation of Science Abstracting and Indexing Services (NFSAIS) Indexing in Perspective seminar in April at the University of Maryland and considered this the best seminar to date. Plans are underway for another seminar at Pratt Institute in February 1973 and possibly one later at the University of Texas. The committee has two subcommittees: Subcommittee on Subject Headings for Correctional Materials and Subcommittee on Subject Headings for Gay Liberation. They have begun work and have discussed problems of these subject headings with LC representatives. The Library of Congress has made some changes in headings for correctional materials since the matter was raised during the 1972 Midwinter Meetings.

As a result of conversations during the Council of Regional Groups luncheon, the Audio Visual Media in Libraries Committee and the Subject Analysis and Organization of Library Materials Committee are planning means to provide closer communications with librarians throughout the country about problems and developments under the committees' responsibilities. The committees will work with the Council on Regional Groups to effect this improvement.

The Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee is developing a manual of committee decisions for its use and is busy with housekeeping chores in preparation for work on the nineteenth edition of Dewey.

It is always a pleasure to present the Margaret Mann Citation, and this year is no exception. Congratulations to Edmond Applebaum, this year's recipient, for outstanding service.

The Nominating Committee which presented nominations of willing and able members for office insures the continuance of the work of CCS. The work in progress and the achievements of this year are due to the capable officers, members, and chairmen of committees, sectional representatives, and above all to the executive secretary, Carol Kelm. The chairman thanks all these people for their work and support, and also thanks an active and concerned membership.

Reproduction of Library Materials Section Report

HOWARD W. CORDELL, Chairman

The wheels of progress have appeared to turn somewhat slowly for the Reproduction of Library Materials Section during 1971/72; nevertheless, there
were several accomplishments. Although the legal machinery was set in motion for the establishment of an informal discussion group during the previous year, final action was not taken until this year when the necessary petitions were signed and the group formally recognized. Plans were made to publicize meetings of the discussion group to insure large attendance and to provide a voice for the RLMS membership in section activities. Dr. Francis F. Spreitzer, chief of the Photoduplication Department of the University of Southern California library, was elected chairman for the coming year.

RLMS provided two simultaneous program meetings, which were well received, at the Chicago conference. Edmon Low of the University of Michigan Library School served as moderator for a panel discussion on "Copyright and Fair Use Practices." William D. North, ALA legal counsel, and Charles Lieb, legal counsel for the Association of American Publishers, were the participants. The second program meeting used a two-panel format, with David G. Nevin of the Washington University Photoduplication Service Laboratory holding forth on "Housing and Storage of Microforms and Related Media," and Samuel M. Boone leading the discussion on "Human and Administrative Factors in Microforms." Participants in these two panels included Robert Veihman, Francis F. Spreitzer, Forrest F. Carhart, Jr., Judy Fair, and Charles G. LaHood, Jr.

Approval for formation of the new RLMS Standards Committee was given by the RTSD Board of Directors and committee members have been appointed, with Stephen Salmon as chairman. The functions of the new committee are to collect information as to the standards needed that relate to the reproduction of library materials; to forward this information through ALA and the RLMS representative to ANSI Committee PH-5; and to provide guidance and support to the RLMS representative to ANSI PH-5, including exploring possible additional sources of financial support.

In progress, and now officially approved by the RTSD Organization Committee and the RTSD board, is an ad hoc subcommittee (of the Standards Committee) on standards for microfilming library card catalogs. This group will work informally with a similarly constituted group from RSLD's Interlibrary Loan Committee. The functions of this subcommittee are to develop technical microfilm standards for microfilming library card catalogs which will provide archival quality microfilm capable of recreating the original file; insurance copy that can be consulted to reconstruct specific cards or portions of the file; and to develop consistency in filming specifications so as to promote effective exchange or loan of such microfilm and their utilization by researchers. Charles G. LaHood, Jr. is chairman of this subcommittee, and his group has already prepared a draft for filming standards. Initial presentation to a group of interested observers was made at the Chicago conference.

The incoming chairman of RLMS, Joseph Nitecki of Temple University, has agreed to edit a revised edition of Brinkley's Directory of Institutional Photoduplication Services. Plans were made by the RLMS Executive Committee to locate a publisher and establish an account to be used for funds accumulated by Cosby Brinkley, the original editor of the publication.

A survey of the current status of photoduplication and reprography in graduate library school curricula was presented by the RLMS Executive Committee member-at-large, Dr. H. William Axford. The section is interested in obtaining greater attention to this subject in library schools; and the results of the survey will be made known to the membership, possibly as an article in LRTS.
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The RLMS Executive Committee is maintaining a continuing discussion on the subject of sponsorship of ANSI Committee PH-5. The prevailing position of RLMS is that ALA, as a consumer-oriented organization, should continue as sponsor. The formation of the new RLMS Standards Committee is directly tied to the desire of RLMS to increase support to ANSI PH-5 to overcome delays in introducing, editing, and insuring publication of finished new standards.

Serials Section Report

EDMUND G. HAMANN, Chairman

A great deal of the RTSD Serials Section activity this year involved the establishment of two committees. Off and running is the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Manually Maintained Serial Records, chaired by Herbert Linville. It has prepared a draft of a questionnaire, which has the essential purpose of eliciting information about forms, records, and work procedures used in a variety of serials operations, and has pretested it; it is anticipated that the questionnaire will be put into its final form and sent to a selection of libraries this fall. The Ad Hoc Committee on Computer Programs for Producing a Serials Holdings List was approved at the midwinter meeting in January when it was found that the committee's functions would not overlap those of the Interdivisional Committee on Bibliographic Representation in Machine-Readable Form. Its roster of five members remains to be appointed.

With regard to the creation of guidelines and standards for serials operations, the Serials Section examined a draft of Guidelines for Publishers, Agents, and Librarians in Handling Library Orders for Serials and Periodicals, a document prepared by the Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee of the Acquisitions Section. It is a distinctive effort to acquaint both vendors and librarians with proper procedures for ordering, invoicing, claiming, etc., and should become a useful tool for serials librarians. A final draft is in preparation for review at the 1973 Midwinter Meeting.

Other activities in the area of standards include consultation by the section with the ALA Washington Office in support of the House of Representatives' bill HR 8659 to amend Title 38, United States Code, as enacted by the Postal Reorganization Act, to require that the mailing label or other cover of any publication having periodical publication mail privileges, when mailed to a subscriber, shall bear readily intelligible information regarding the name and address of the subscriber and the expiration date of the current subscription. Some question was raised over the notation of dates: the International Standards Organization Recommendation R2014 gives an all-numeric date expressed as year (four digits), month (two digits), and day (two digits); on the other hand, there is advocacy for the use of one of the two presently accepted systems, month-day-year in America, or day-month-year in Europe. At this time the outcome of the pending legislation is not known.

Subcommittee 10 of Committee Z39 of the American National Standards Institute is in the process of revising the standard, Periodicals: Format and Arrangement. The major change in the draft is the substitution of the International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) for CODEN. The revised standard
should be published sometime in 1973. The Serials Section observed that ALA serial publications generally do not conform to these standards, deploiring in particular the unsuitability of narrow inner margins for binding.

The Duplicates Exchange Union (DEU) this year worked on a new form letter to be used by the RTSD executive secretary or DEU committee members for replying to inquiries about the disposition of duplicates. The DEU has also tabulated the number of member libraries which have been supplying at least one list of duplicate periodicals a year to other members, as the terms of membership require. The relationship of the DEU to other organizations servicing out-of-print periodicals was examined in the Winter 1972 issue of LRTS by Ted Hamann in his article "Out-of-Print Periodicals; the United States Book Exchange as a Source of Supply." Continuing enthusiasm among its members is plain evidence of the usefulness of the Duplicates Exchange Union.

The Serials Section took action this winter to bring before RTSD the minimal availability of formal education in serials work in library schools and urged the division to investigate the content and character of serials instruction in graduate library schools. The RTSD board at the June 1972 conference approved of the formation, with the Library Education Division, of an interdivisional committee on education for resources and technical services to investigate the coverage of resources and technical services in library schools; to develop a statement of the kind of education in these fields which is considered essential; and, to seek all appropriate means for furthering such a program.

A major event of the year was the formation this spring of the National Serial Data Program, Paul Vassallo, director. The program is supported by the Library of Congress, the National Agricultural Library, and the National Library of Medicine. It is responsible for the development of a central machine readable source of serial cataloging information and an economically feasible system of handling serials that will eliminate the costly duplicative input and conversion projects that would otherwise be necessary. The objectives of this, the third phase of the overall national serials automation program is to provide the three national libraries and other research libraries as well, with an authoritative automated bibliographic resource upon which serials processing systems can be built; provide a base record of serial titles to which the International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) can be permanently affixed; provide a machine readable bibliographic resource for serials which will supply cataloging information to libraries and at the same time permit the uniform transfer of data on serials among libraries; and provide a serials system which will constitute the United States segment of the developing International Serials Data System. As of July the program has been actively engaged with the International Standards Organization in drafting an ISO Standard ISSN. The National Serial Data Program is designated as the national center for the assignment of ISSN’s to U.S. serials; it has made one exception in authorizing the Bowker Company to assign ISSN’s from a block of numbers to the serials listed in its own data file, which will appear in forthcoming editions of Ulrich’s International Periodicals Directory.

Because of the emergence of the National Serial Data Program, the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials has expressed interest in developing active liaison with the program. Therefore, the Serials Section will continue to appoint a representative to the Joint Committee. The program director, furthermore, has expressed interest in creating an advisory committee of
serials librarians for the purpose of keeping the program attuned to the needs and desires of librarians in the U.S. engaged in serials work.

Once again at the 1972 ALA conference the organization of the Serials Section received critical scrutiny. The Serials Section Executive Committee went on record, with two dissenting votes, as favoring the idea of merging the Serials Section, Acquisitions Section, and the RTSD Resources Committee to form a Resources Section. However, the RTSD board voted approval of its Organization Committee recommendation that a Resources and Acquisitions Section be constituted without inclusion of the Serials Section, but that the latter should review its activities and function statement with a view to the possibility that this section should become a committee of the Resources and Acquisitions Section. Thus a primary activity of the Serials Section in 1972/73 must be an examination of its role in the Resources and Technical Services Division. If its members have opinions on the usefulness of the section, whether serials activities would be better served by retention of a section with officers elected by members or by incorporating its organization into another section, they are strongly urged to communicate them to the executive secretary of the Resources and Technical Services Division. Should dissolution of the Serials Section be formally proposed, approval can only be made, of course, by a vote of the membership. The section's executive committee should have material enough in hand by the 1973 Midwinter Meeting to permit a rational, thorough appraisal of its usefulness as a separately constituted section.

The Serials Section accepted with great regret the resignation of Mary Sauer as incoming chairman of the section, effective after the 1972 Chicago conference, because of greatly increased commitment to duties at her home library. In order to fill this vacancy the incoming vice-chairman/chairman-elect, Herbert Linville, has graciously consented to accept the chairman's responsibilities, assisted by the active participation of the past-chairman in the affairs of the Serials Section.

Council of Regional Groups Report

CAROL F. ISHIMOTO, Chairman

During 1971/1972, two informal newsletters were sent to all the officers of the twenty-seven regional groups affiliated with the Resources and Technical Services Division (RTSD) with the hope of improving communication between RTSD and its grass roots: the regional groups. It is unfortunate that the ALA/RTSD budget does not permit an official newsletter as many of the regional groups have expressed an interest in receiving some kind of communication on a regular basis which would keep them informed of the activities of RTSD.

Throughout the year I have heard from twenty-three of the twenty-seven groups, some only reporting changes in their officers, and others providing information on their meetings.

The Southern California Technical Processes Group, Edward J. Kazlauskas, chairman, was again a very active group. At their July 1971 meeting Miss Katherine Laich, ALA president-elect at that time, spoke on the role of regional groups and how they relate to ALA. In the fall a dinner meeting was held at which Muriel Pollia, executive secretary to the vice-president and general

The Connecticut Library Association, Technical Services Section, Mrs. Dorothy Lockrow, chairman, sponsored a workshop jointly with the Connecticut State Library, Division of Library Development this spring. Miss Pauline Seeley, assistant director of the Forest Press spoke on the changes in the new eighteenth edition of the Dewey Decimal Classification, the regular schedules, and the tenth abridged edition.

The Resources and Technical Services Section of the Georgia Library Association sponsored a joint meeting with the Reference Services Section last fall at Jekyll Island, Georgia. Mrs. Christina Landram, chairman, introduced Dr. Jerrold Orne, university librarian, University of North Carolina, who spoke on "Microforms: Their Arrangement, Storage, and Use."

The annual meeting of the Kansas Library Association, Resources and Technical Services Division, James Soester, chairman, was held in Wichita in April 1972. Connie Saheb-Ettaba, editor of Listening Post and author of ANSCR, the phonodisc classification scheme, was the speaker. Mrs. Saheb-Ettaba, an authority on the selection and organization of records and cassettes, has been professionally associated with audiovisual materials in library work for several years.

Wentworth-by-the-Sea, New Hampshire, was the site of the fall meeting of the New England Technical Services Librarians under the chairmanship of Mrs. Marjorie McCleod. "Library Cooperation in New England: Getting Down to Brass Tacks" was the topic for the meeting. The speakers were: Ronald Diener, Boston Theological Institute: "Cooperation in a Specific Subject Area"; Paul Janaske, Research and Program Development Branch, U.S. Office of Education: "Government Grants and Programs"; Charles E. Funk, Connecticut State Library: "Political Implications and Practicalities." The spring meeting, jointly sponsored with the New England College Librarians and the New England Chapter of the American Society for Information Science, was a two-day conference at the University of Massachusetts and Hampshire College on "The Library in an Era of Expanding Technology." The conference explored the potential impact of telecommunications and instructional technology on libraries.
The New York Library Association, Resources and Technical Services Section, Jane Stevens, president, continued to be an active and dynamic group. After a study and survey of the services of subscription agencies to libraries, a program was presented at its October 1971 conference with the theme, “The Librarian and the Subscription Agent: Ever the Twain Should Meet” with Dr. Saud Matta, Pratt Institute, moderator; Stanley Greenfield, Franklin Square Subscription Agency, and Judith Nientimp, Rush Rhees Library, University of Rochester, speakers; Mrs. Janet Judd, Burnt Hills-Ballston Lake Senior High School, and A. D. Lieb, Moore-Cottrell Subscription Agencies, reactors. The Public Documents Committee of the Resources and Technical Services Section presented a panel discussion on “Order Out of Chaos: Problems and Prospects for Local Documents and Records.” Peter Paulson, New York State Library, moderator; Dr. Louis L. Tucker, Office of State History; Eugene Bockman, Municipal Reference and Research Center, New York City; and Michael Shannon, Herbert Lehman College library; speakers.

The New York Technical Services Librarians, Paul J. Fasana, president, has had two outstanding meetings during the year. The fall meeting at the Columbia University Faculty Club had Ellsworth Mason, director, Hofstra University library, and Henriette Avram, chief, MARC Development Office, Library of Congress, participating in a debate, “Perspectives on Libraries and Computers.” The texts of the presentations have been published in the Winter 1972 issue of Library Resources & Technical Services (LRTS). Dr. Richard L. Darling, dean, School of Library Service, Columbia University, spoke at its spring meeting on “Technical Services and Library Education: Changing Perspective.”

The Ohio Library Association, Technical Services Round Table, Robert A. Jones, chairman, held its fall meeting in Cleveland. Jones reported on activities of the group during the year which included a survey mailed out to members concerning their primary interest in the type of programs, a second survey of technical services practices in Ohio libraries, with emphasis on cataloging and the use of paraprofessionals, and a workshop on paraprofessionals. After the business meeting, the Technical Services Round Table combined with the Audio-Visual Round Table in presenting “Multimedia Library Programs Achieve Visibility: the Integrative Role of Technical Services.” James T. Dodson, Wright State University Library Resources Center, Dayton, presided. The panel consisted of three speakers: Mrs. Martha Petrucci, library coordinator, Diocese of Columbus, who spoke on “The Acquisition of AV Materials”; Judy Fitzgerald, Akron University: “The Cataloging of AV Materials”; Richard L. Ducote, Instructional Resource Center, College of Du Page, Glen Ellyn, Illinois, served as the reactor.

The fall meeting of the Northern Ohio Technical Services Librarians, Mary E. Earle, chairman, was held at Case Western University, Cleveland. Dr. Frederick Kilgour, director of the Ohio College Library Center, outlined the progress of OCLC to date and its future implications with serials control, remote catalog access, and circulation control.

The 1971 annual meeting of the Ohio Valley Group of Technical Service Librarians, Mary H. Stanger, chairman, was held at Berea College, Kentucky. The topic of the first day of the conference was reprints with Christopher J. Samuels, research administrator, McKinsey & Company, New York, speaking on “An Editor-Librarian Looks at Reprinting” and Howard A. Sullivan, assistant director for technical services, University Libraries, Wayne State University, speaking on “The Challenge of Reprints.” The second day of the con-
ference consisted of discussion groups on current problems in acquisitions, cataloging, government documents, and serials.

The Potomac Technical Processing Librarians, Mrs. Roberta Miller, chair-
man, met at Towson State College, Maryland, for their annual meeting last
fall. Glen Zimmerman, assistant chief of cataloging, Library of Congress, gave
a report on Cataloging-in-Publication. Miss Marion Sanner, Enoch Pratt Library,
was moderator for a panel discussion on centralized processing. Members of
the panel were: Henry Drennan, U.S. Office of Education; Mrs. Wilhemina
Price, Fairfax County Public Schools Library Service; and Mrs. Josephine Pul-
sifer, Becker and Hayes.

The Tennessee Technical Services Librarians, Mrs. Marion Sandifer, chair-
man, met in Memphis in April 1972. Participants of a symposium on "How to
Cope with Progress without Pulling the Plug" were: T. Thaxton Campbell,
chief, Technical Processing Services, Memphis Public Library and Information
Center; Mrs. Ruth Henderson, Catalog Department, Memphis Public Library
and Information Center; and Mrs. Eleanor Morrissey, systems librarian, Re-
search and Development, Joint University Libraries, Nashville. Divided cata-
logs and changing from Dewey to the Library of Congress classification were
the topics discussed.

The Texas Regional Group of Catalogers and Classifiers met at Galveston
this spring with the Texas Library Association. In the absence of Mrs. Ann
Landtroop, chairman, Miss Daisy Ashford, vice-chairman, presided at the
business meeting. A series of tutorials were held at the conference, two of
which could be said to have been sponsored largely by the regional group.
Dr. Doralyn J. Hickey, associate professor of library science at the University
of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, gave two tutorials: (1) The relationship be-
tween technical and public services in the library; and (2) Dewey decimal
classification, eighteenth unabridged edition.

The Wisconsin Library Association, Technical Services Section, Mrs. Leora
McGee, chairman, held its annual business meeting in Chicago during the
Midwest Library Conference in November 1971. A Communications Commit-
tee was formed to keep members informed of the developments in their re-
spective libraries. In addition to functioning as a clearinghouse for receiving
information and communicating information to members, the committee drew
up a questionnaire designed to find the types of information the members
would be interested in and whether this type of committee would be of service
to its members. The annual spring meeting was held at the Waukesa Pub-
lic Library. The program theme was "Cooperative Processing: a Facet of In-
terlibrary Cooperation." The following speakers participated in the program:
Bernard Schwab, director, Madison Public Library: "Trends in Cooperative
Processing in Wisconsin"; Donald K. Lamb, coordinator, Dane County Li-
brary Service: "Dane County—Madison Joint Processing Project"; James P.
Riley, director, Marquette University Library and Richard Harris, senior ac-
count manager, Xerox Information Systems: "Shared Cataloging System: a
Discussion of the Ohio College Library Center."

At the annual ALA convention in Chicago in June a luncheon meeting
was held for the regional groups. The winners of the Margaret Mann Citation,
Edmond L. Applebaum, assistant director for acquisitions and overseas opera-
tions, Library of Congress, and the Esther Piercy Award, Mrs. Carol A. Ne-
meyer, senior associate, Education and Library Services, Association of Amer-
ican Publishers, Inc., were guests at the luncheon. The theme of the meeting
was "Communication between Regional Groups and RTSD." The speakers
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were: Edward J. Kazlauskas, chairman, Southern California Technical Processes Group; James Soester, chairman, Kansas Resources and Technical Services Division; Mrs. Jacqueline Colby, president, New England Technical Services Librarians; David Remington, chairman, RTSD Cataloging and Classification Section; Audiovisual Materials in Libraries Committee; Mrs. Connie Dunlap, president, RTSD; and Mrs. Carol Raney Kelm, executive secretary of RTSD.

I would like to thank all the regional groups for having sent me information regarding their officers and their activities during the year. It has been a great pleasure for me to have the opportunity to correspond with you and to meet some of you at the annual ALA convention. To Mrs. Carol Raney Kelm, for all the assistance and guidance she has given me throughout the year, I am very grateful.

Decentral Classification Editorial Policy
Committee Report

FRANCES HINTON, Chairman

The Decentral Classification Editorial Policy Committee met in Washington, D.C. at the Library of Congress on April 21, 1972. Because no meeting had been held in October 1971, this meeting was declared to be the annual meeting, required by its Regulations for the Conduct of Committee Business.

Continuing members of the committee are: William J. Welsh, representing the Library of Congress; John A. Humphry, representing Forest Press; and Clare E. Ryan, representing the American Library Association. Other members are Margaret Cockshott, Betty Croft, Doralyn Hickey, Frances Hinton, Mary Louise Mann, and Marietta Daniels Shepard. Joel C. Downing represents the (British) Library Association, but is not a voting member of the committee. All members were present on April 21 except Miss Mann.

At the April meeting Frances Hinton was reelected chairman for a two-year term. Reports were received from John Humphry and Richard Sealock, executive director of Forest Press, to the effect that both Edition 18 and Abridged Edition 10 are selling rapidly. This is attributed in part to the prepublication use of Edition 18 by the British National Bibliography and the Library of Congress.

In an effort to make ALA's representation on the committee more meaningful, a request was made to the Cataloging and Classification Section of RTSD that the ALA representative to the Decentral Classification Editorial Policy Committee be made an ex-officio liaison member of the Subject Analysis and Organization of Library Materials Committee of RTSD. This was approved, so that now both major classification systems have official representation on that committee.

Plans are under way for an exchange of personnel between the British National Bibliography and the Decimal Classification Division of the Library of Congress.

Most of the meeting was spent discussing a draft manual of editorial policies and decisions. The completion of this manual should make the work of the Decimal Classification Division, the committee, and Forest Press much easier.
An article in the spring issue entitled, "The Year's Work in Cataloging and Classification" (LRTS 16:155-64) by Suzanne Massonneau was read with great interest.

In regard to the reference to the final report of the Colorado Academic Libraries Book Processing Center Project, a more recent investigation partially refutes the conclusion that "the concept of centralized processing in Colorado proved economically sound and acceptable to participating libraries." A study by Allen Veane suggests several alternative avenues to follow for a processing center. It was concluded, furthermore, that many of the original concepts were not "economically sound and acceptable."

We hope fervently to get the results of this study as well as comments from Center members into print soon. The larger library community should be informed in detail of this latest evaluation of the pioneering effort in Colorado.—LeMoyne W. Anderson, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado.

The DDC 18 transfer of auxiliaries wholesale from the schedules (v.2) to the preliminary matter (v.1) reveals the peaking of a process long in the making but not given much attention in the discussions known to me. A look at the awesome assemblage of auxiliaries will readily disclose that facet analysis is being added massively, somewhat akin to the development of the Universal Decimal and Colon Classifications.

Questions arise accordingly from a number of viewpoints:

1. the theory of cataloging
   a. Is such detailed coding necessary in catalogs which also have subject headings? (As usual, in recent times, not mentioned in the DDC prefatory matter.)
   b. If yes—because subject heading assignment is so often insufficient—is DDC coding a better way to meet the need than many more and narrower subject headings?
   c. If yes again, how is that known—is it demonstrably cheaper, more satisfactory to users, or what?

2. practically
   a. How many libraries are or soon will be using DDC 18 mainly (if not exclusively)?
   b. How many DDC 18 users have assigned even once, to a piece of library material, any of the following auxiliary numbers (sample to be agreed upon for a survey):

3. the sensitivity of the editorial committee and the advisors:
   How many DDC Editorial Committeemen and Advisors of the last twenty-five years have done any research utilizing subject heading cards, or studied systematically a major aspect of the subject heading apparatus? (Meant not perjoratively but scientifically.)

4. education for librarianship
   a. How much DDC 18 knowledge will be expected of a new graduate (employed in a DDC-using library)?
   b. How many library school class hours (in a "twelve-month")
program) are thought of as an appropriate investment in such instruction?

c. If that number exceeds the existing allocation, what do employing librarians reckon could do with less, to compensate?

—Sidney Jackson, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.
In addition to bringing back into print Palmer's earlier collection of six essays on classification, this new edition presents a forty-page essay by Derek Austin that shows the ways in which the views of classification theorists have been modified in the ten-year period since Itself an Education was first published. The essays by Palmer have been reprinted unchanged. The only difference is that the bibliography of twenty works given by Palmer in the 1962 edition has been omitted from this new edition. These essays cover the formation and reasoning behind main classes; development of notation; Ranganathan's ideas on classification and his Colon Classification; and classification as a subject for research.

Austin's essay "Two steps forward . . ." is general and covers briefly such topics as: the American trend of converting to the LC classification; coordinate indexing; the Aslib-Cranfield experiments; MARC services; PRECIS (Preserved Context Index System); and some of the work carried out by the Classification Research Group in England. One can see underlying all this, an emphasis being placed on the interworking of index terms and classification.

The first six essays by Palmer are just as timely and important today as they were when they were first published. Austin's essay reports on the important events in classification and indexing in the past decade. All seven are quite readable and of utmost interest to all classifiers and classificationists; others interested in this general area of library and information science will find this collection very informative.—Donald J. Lehnus, Case Western Reserve University, School of Library Science, Cleveland, Ohio.


 Appropriately designated as a "simple guide," the book is a concise introduction to information sources, services, and the literature of psychology. It is addressed to students, psychologists, social scientists, and specialists in related applied endeavours, providing an entry point to information in areas outside their expertise. It does not cover systematically texts, journals, treatises, and reference tools, nor does it compare, evaluate, or annotate. Dr. Elliott does not attempt to update Louttit's thorough inventory and analysis of the literature of psychology, nor some of the "guides to the literature" chapters on psychology published within the past fifteen years. His aim is not to overwhelm one with the literature, but to present it as part of the life of any scholar. He emphasizes that every research project must begin and end in the library since literature contains important empirical and procedural information and provides a conceptual background for any inquiry. In the body of the book he instructs in the use of the literature, illustrating his explanation only with names of books, and appends selective lists of journals, reviews, abstracting and indexing services, hand-
books, and reference works.

A general framework is presented for the overview of "documentary aids" as primary, secondary, and tertiary sources of information. The author points out their diversity, illustrates some of their characteristics, and hints at their profitable exploitation. Primary aids are the original sources, such as new facts reported in journals, new concepts introduced in books, data, statistics, standards, organizations, and individuals. Secondary tools, which organize and digest primary information, include directories, reviews, catalogs, information clearinghouses, national bibliographies, and the complete arsenal of the reference librarian. Bibliographies of bibliographies, guides, and directories of directories further systematize secondary sources; thus they are designated tertiary sources. This approach and the subsequent characterization of each type of tool is oriented to the scientist, but the awareness of this point of view could be valuable to the librarian. The author is consistent in assuming that those who want to go beyond his brief lists and highlights can do so by following his advice on consulting secondary and tertiary documentary aids, as well as using other guides which he does not wish to summarize. These books are listed for use in conjunction with the present work: The Harvard List of Books in Psychology, Brittain Information and Its Users, and some of Foskett's and Collison's works. Aside from introducing Science Citation Index, MEDLARS, and plans for NISP, the book has nothing about automated information systems or existing SDI services. Informal communication practices receive some attention.

A chapter is devoted to describing the organization of libraries, catalogs, and classification systems. A unique feature is the listing of associations and societies concerned with psychology. Although British audiences will benefit from the names of British agencies that provide information about research in progress and grant support, American agencies and clearinghouses are not mentioned (NTIS, SIE, ERIC) in this otherwise cosmopolitan guide.

Elliott is an advocate of thorough literature searches, complete retrieval, and the keeping of detailed bibliographic records. The chapters "Functions of information" and "Comprehensive searching sequences" could provide insights into an area that user studies aim to explore: how does the client relate to his literature? what does he need? and what does he expect of libraries? The treatment of these topics here, alas, is more normative and instructive than descriptive. Elliott advises the novice in the proper regard and complete perusal of every possible source of information, starting with bibliographies of bibliographies and maintaining copious files—the text abounds in the auxiliary "should." For the individual thus inclined, his advice may establish habits that might guarantee the use of all these tools. For others the leads to shortcuts to the comprehensive search will be even more valuable.

The publishers could maximize the use of this book in this country by issuing a softbound and commensurately priced edition with an addenda-type insert that adds the names of U.S. equivalents of government agencies, directories, catalogs, and standards. A good reason for LRTS readers to be aware of this item is that, though it is not the ideal aid for collection development nor for the study of the literature of psychology, its approach might be used in the orientation of the library's patrons. In addition they should be aware that the information in it needs updating and supplementing from the subject librarian's storehouse of knowledge.

—Susan G. Emerson, Case Western Re-
serve University, School of Library Science, Cleveland, Ohio.


The French and German titles, Liste Commune de Descripteurs and Gemeinsames Schlagwortverzeichnis, express more fittingly the aims and purposes of this descriptor list than the English translation into Aligned List of Descriptors. Common or Joint List of Descriptors would come closer to the intended meaning, while "aligned" according to the Oxford and Webster's dictionaries does not have the same meaning as "commune" and "gemeinsam," but perhaps it will acquire it in the future if the list is successful!

This descriptor list is remarkable not because of its present achievements—these are regarded as a temporary and transitional stage on the way to a revised and amended version which is in preparation—but rather for its unusual origins, methods of international cooperation and documentation, trilingual coverage, modest claims, and critical self-evaluation, rare qualities in the field of information retrieval.

The work consists of three parts which are presented in five separate volumes. The core volume (307 pages) contains an alphabetico-structured vocabulary in three languages—English, French, and German—preceeded by explanations and outlines of the list, also in the three languages. It is supplemented by three volumes of alphabetical KWIC-type lists of descriptors in each of the languages, and by one volume of "Annexes" comprising (a) geographic descriptors and (b) lists of titles and abbreviations of institutions as used by the three main participating institutions, plus suggestions for a "common" list of such terms. The total number of descriptors amounts to about four thousand in each of the three languages.

The origins, development, and stages of the project, the sources used, the structure of the lists, and the fields covered are described most clearly in the French "Introduction" by Jean Viet, which is followed by English and German translations. The Liste Commune de Descripteurs is the result of the pooled experience of five organizations: The International Labour Office (ILO), International Committee for Social Sciences Documentation (ICSSD), Deutsche Stiftung fuer Entwicklungsländer (DSE), Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), and the Development Centre of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). OECD acts as the coordinator of this project for an international lexicon of economic and social development, an urgent and major theme that reaches into nearly all fields of human endeavor. Although existing vocabularies from all five organizations and suggestions by experts were used, the main contributions to the Liste Commune come from those of the FAO, ILO, and DSE. The provenance of most terms is indicated in the structured vocabulary by the corresponding acronyms: FAO, ILO, etc.

In an effort to ensure compatibility of the different vocabularies, the descriptors are grouped into "semantic fields" in a structured list. However, in the 1969 edition, these fields are rather unconvincingly "arranged in ten major blocks numbered from I to X." (According to a "Provisional Outline for the Revised Version" (Aug.-Sept. 1971) the present arrangement and sequence of the blocks and fields will be completely changed.) Each of the ten blocks is then divided into varying numbers
of "relatively extensive semantic fields" which are further broken down into numbered smaller sections. The descriptors themselves are listed alphabetically under these third level heads, and most of them are given simultaneously in English, French, and German, together with their corresponding source codes. For example, Agriculture (Block IV) comprises six large "semantic fields": Agriculture; Animal; Animals; Fishing, Fishery; Forest, Silviculture, Tree; Plant. The smaller units under Fishing, Fishery are numbered 0, 1 (Fishing ground), 2 (Fishing operation), 3 (Fishing gear, Fishing net), 4 (Fishing economics, Fishery management). Under these the specific descriptors, such as "Coastal ground/ Pêche Côtière/ Küsten-Fischerei," followed by their source code, e.g. FAO 06, are listed in alphabetical order. In some cases, conceptual descriptors with multiple meanings are clarified by "USE" notes and examples which seem to originate mainly from the ILO List of Descriptors. The structural part of the trilingual list of descriptors is, therefore, not really structured, but assembles several alphabetical sequences of concepts and terms into broader and narrower groups. At present, there is also no indication of semantic relationships except synonymy.

Alphabetical lists in each of the three languages provide users with additional means of access to the structured list and its language equivalents. This is done in the form of three separate volumes of computer-produced, permuted term lists which refer to the structured list by means of a two-part numerical code consisting of page and line numbers. Synonyms lead to the preferred terms by means of USE-references.

The authors of this promising cooperative enterprise know that the 1969 version of the Liste Commune de Descripteurs is imperfect. They regard it as a working tool that will be improved by cooperative and critical feedback. The most striking defects of the 1969 edition are obviously the inappropriate and unhelpful alphabetical sequences in the structured list, the lack of a more thorough systematic grouping of its "semantic fields" and subfields, and the omission of semantic relations in the structured displays. There is no justification for introducing mechanical alphabetical order into a basically systematic structure, especially when the systematic approach is complemented by separate alphabetical word access.

In spite of these and other transitional shortcomings, the list exemplifies a significant step towards the ultimate aim of all thesaurus production, namely compatibility between different indexing vocabularies, covering different and interdisciplinary fields as well as different languages. This cooperative effort of several important international organizations and institutions thus shows one possible method for creating a simultaneous multilanguage indexing, retrieval, and eventually translation aid. However, one question remains unanswered: Will this project achieve a new intellectual approach to creating a truly structured indexing vocabulary that will initiate more versatile uses of computers? Or, will it remain just another arrangement of words, using the computer as a mechanized filing and checking tool?—Gertrude London, School of Library Science, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.
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The 116 citations on book catalogs are divided into the following sections: (1) Selected References, in alphabetic sequence by personal or institutional author and (2) Anonymous Entries, in alphabetic sequence by title. One hundred and seven of the citations cover the years 1960 through March 1969. There are five scattered citations in the 1950s and two citations with no dates. There is also one citation for 1915 and one for 1938. The citations cover the following aspects of book catalogs: preparation; preservation and maintenance; economics and cost data; mechanization; conversion to machine-readable form; the book catalog versus the card catalog and the computerized catalog.


Two specific approaches to evaluate an information retrieval system are explored. The first is a mathematical model for use in studying how to minimize operating costs. The model provides a method for comparative evaluation between systems. The cost model divides the costs of a retrieval system into two components: system costs and user costs. The second approach is the development of a simulation model as a preliminary step toward the creation of a tool for system design and evaluation. The simulation program creates a well specified collection of documents and analyzes the effect of changes in query file characteristics on system performance. Employing the thesaurus, pseudo-documents and pseudo-queries are compared to see the effect of various query file parameter changes on the quantity of material retrieved. Evaluation of the simulation output indicates that there are small differences between the results of the experimental runs. It is concluded that one method for generating pseudo-queries is not clearly better than another. It is believed, however, that the simulation model as an approach to the evaluation of retrieval systems provides a limited but useful framework for the evaluation of information retrieval systems.

Copyright Program Information. 1971. 14p. ED 057 845. MF $0.65, HC $0.10.

Institution: National Center for Education Communication (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.

Institution: System Development Corp., Santa Monica, California.
Sponsor: Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

Phase II is a case-study analysis of fifteen selected consortia to help determine the usefulness and effectiveness of academic library consortia. The two major products resulting from the project are Directory of Academic Library Consortia and Guidelines for the Development of Academic Library Consortia. This Phase II report presents the summary for both Phase I and Phase II activities and findings, the survey findings, and dissemination of the findings.


In addition to reviewing the characteristics of document processing systems, this paper describes a system via a feature list approach. This report presents features of the systems in parallel fashion to facilitate comparison, so that a potential user may have a basis for evaluation in terms of the capabilities which his requirements demand. Because of the lack of tools to determine precise performance measurements, the problem of system performance evaluation is not considered.

Hurlburt, Charles E., and others. The Intrex Retrieval System Software. September 1971. 633p. ED 057 829. MF $0.65, HC $23.08.

Institution: Massachusetts Inst. of Tech., Cambridge. Electronic Systems Laboratory.

This report describes the general structure of the Intrex Retrieval Systems and each of the component subroutines. The report is not an introduction to Intrex. In ad-
This report is concerned with the implementation of two interrelated computer systems: an automatic document analysis and classification package, and an on-line interactive information retrieval system which utilizes the information gathered during the automatic classification phase. Well-known techniques developed by Salton and Dennis have been adapted for the automatic classification. For those interested only in performing retrievals from the on-line console, a short instructive manual is provided in Appendix B. Since this report is to serve as a maintenance manual as well as a description of the work performed and general findings, program listings, and other detailed information have been included.


In this handbook microform retrieval equipment is defined as any device that is used to locate, enlarge, and display microform images, or equipment that produces enlarged hard copy from the images. Only equipment widely available in the United States has been included. The handbook provides information about the most widely used microforms, equipment requirement considerations, factors that affect equipment selection regardless of the type of microform, and the equipment available for a given microform. The appendix lists manufacturers who supplied information about the equipment included in the handbook.

Moore, Lorna, and others. Distinction Is All; NTIS from a Technical Librarian’s Point-of-View. November 1971. 10p. ED 058 913. MF $0.65, HC $3.29.

Difficulties encountered by users of the National Technical Information Services (NTIS) indexing and abstracting services are: (1) coverage too broad for a single index, (2) duplication of material indexed or distributed elsewhere, (3) multiple number series, (4) inconsistency of bibliographic entries, and (5) unpredictable coverage. The difficulties encountered in NTIS are symptomatic of problems in the entire government information system. Significant improvements in the system as a whole, or in NTIS as a part of that system, can only be accomplished by significant changes in the handling of government sponsored publications. It is proposed that all government research reports be processed and indexed by a network of information centers and that these centers feed their documents and bibliographic tapes into NTIS. It is further proposed that NTIS become the national distribution center for all unrestricted research reports and that it be responsible for the printing and distribution of separate indexes to these reports. To accomplish this, NTIS must make major changes: its relationship to the rest of the federal information com-
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The community must be restructured, and it must act as the cohesive core of a network.


The following papers were presented at an invitational conference on cataloging standards: (1) "Canadiana Meets Automation"; (2) "The Union Catalogues in the National Library—The Present Condition"; (3) "A Centralized Bibliographic Data Bank"; (4) "The Standardization of Cataloguing"; (5) "The Standardization of Cataloguing: a Summary"; (6) "Standardization of Classification and Subject Headings"; (7) "Standardization of Input and Retrieval in an Automated System"; (8) "Standardization for Serials"; (9) "Standardization for Government Publications"; and (10) "The Means of Achieving Standardization." Resolutions based on the conference are also included.


The final report on the New England Library Information Network (NELINET) is divided into three parts: Section one is a general commentary on the NELINET project, which was conceived to test the viability of creating a centralized, regional capability to use electronic data processing techniques for technical processes and other service requirements of a network of libraries. The philosophy of the total project and of the system design planned to achieve project objectives is discussed. The NELINET system design and its transferability is reviewed in section two. Section three is a technical report on the hardware, software, and system design of the project.


Three speakers present different points of view in considering the implications of a GPO micropublishing program: a librarian’s, an information publisher’s, and a micropublisher’s. A brief introduction and discussion among the forum attendees are included.

Richmond, Phyllis A. Reading List in Classification Theory. 1970. 37p. ED 057 804. MF $0.65, HC $3.29. Institution: Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio. School of Library Science.

This reading list contains 180 references and serves as an introduction to classification research literature. While the list includes major viewpoints on basic work in the field of classification as well as related areas, it excludes critical literature. The major divisions of the reading list are: (1) Definition: What Is Classification, (2) Bibliographic Classification, (3) Types of Non-Bibliographic Classification, (4) Recent Views of Classification, (5) Subjects Related to Classification, and (6) Miscellaneous Background Material.
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Library Resources & Technical Services
Institution: Southampton University (England), Library.

Automated systems for acquisitions and catalogue production for the Wessex Medical Library are outlined in this interim report, with some account of why particular decisions were made. Section A describes the acquisition system and Section B describes the cataloguing system. The appendices contain: (1) computer configurations, (2) flexowriter specifications, (3) specifications of Justotex 70, (4) samples of catalogue entries by Justotext, (5) system flow charts, and (6) bibliography.
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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, 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.

(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.

(6) “ERIC/CLIS Abstracts” have been indexed under author and subject only, except for a few distinctive title entries.
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What to choose? 
What to use? 

PERIODICALS FOR SCHOOL LIBRARIES

Revised Edition
Compiled and edited by Marian H. Scott

This second edition, revised and up-dated from that of 1969, is your most reliable guide to more than 500 periodicals for young people from kindergarten through grade 12. Acknowledging curricular demands and the wide range of reading levels and students' interests, the editor presents a highly selective choice which includes foreign and ethnic periodicals. In addition, periodicals for central and special subject resource collections are included, plus a section on building and using periodical collections.

Selections meet the recommendations of the Standards at all grade levels, and titles are coded to identify suitability for the various grades.

ISBN 0-8389-0139-5 Winter

American Library Association
50 E. Huron St., Chicago, Illinois 60611
BOOKS FOR COLLEGE LIBRARIES, published by the American Library Association, cites approximately 53,400 titles, and, as stated in the preface, is essentially "a list of monographs designed to support the college teaching program that depends heavily upon the library, and to supply the necessary materials for term papers and suggested and independent outside reading."

NCR/Microcard Editions is reprinting works cited in BOOKS FOR COLLEGE LIBRARIES on microfiche and offering them in subject-oriented groups based on BCL chapters. Each group is available separately and for each group there is a list of titles which is why we call it the "unpackage plan"—you know IN ADVANCE what you are getting, you choose the sections you need and those that fit your budget, and you receive immediate delivery. How?

1. **SELECTION:** Only titles already selected by qualified experts are included in our program. With a copy of BCL, anyone can assess the titles chosen, the basis of selection, and the qualifications of the selectors.

2. **NO LONG-TERM COMMITMENT.** Groups are small ($200.00 to $600.00) and independent of each other. A library can either buy or not buy each group depending on its needs and budget.

3. **EQUIPMENT.** Standard 4" x 6" microfiche are being used. Therefore, there is no need to purchase or lease new reading equipment. Since not more than one title appears on a fiche, titles can be filed in any sequence.

4. **DELIVERY.** Several groups are ready for immediate delivery:

   - HISTORY: Great Britain (BCL-1), AMERICAN LITERATURE (BCL-2), ENGLISH LITERATURE (BCL-3), HISTORY: United States (BCL-4), HISTORY: Europe (BCL-5), EDUCATION (BCL-6), POLITICAL SCIENCE (BCL-7), ECONOMICS (BCL-8), and more are on the way!

---

For further information on any or all our subject groups, send this coupon in today to Dept.C11-10
NCR/Microcard Editions, 901 26th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037

Please send information on the following:

- □ BCL-1 History: Great Britain
- □ BCL-2 American Literature
- □ BCL-3 English Literature
- □ BCL-4 History: United States
- □ BCL-5 History: Europe
- □ BCL-6 Education
- □ BCL-7 Political Science
- □ BCL-8 Economics

---
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The LC Card Number Index to the National Union Catalog. It lists for you by LC card number entries in the NUC.

- Search the NUC by LC Card Number
- Reduce your search time
- Easy to use — No special training required
- Save time and money

Write now for free
descriptive brochure

LISCO
2464 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02140
Tel. (617) 868-0500
The answer is YES...
provided specific easy-to-attain cost reduction targets are considered prime objectives of network development.
Mr. David P. Waite, Systems Engineer, President of his firm, and author of this penetrating booklet has drawn on the thousands of man hours of information systems experience of the professional team working under his direction as technical consultants to major libraries in the USA and Canada. His group has worked with the three great US National Libraries and others active in information network development including NASA and the National Science Foundation.
The material presented has been favorably reviewed by five of the most widely recognized library directors and national leaders active in both public and academic library developments.

CHAPTER CONTENTS INCLUDE
• The Network Idea
• Priorities for Building Library Networks
• Who Will Build and Who Will Operate Library Networks
• Configuration and Other Bibliographic Network Design Considerations
• Service Support for Library Networks

48 pages, paper bound
Order from Information Dynamics Corp., 80 Main Street, Reading, Massachusetts 01867. Enclose check for $2.50 and publisher will pay postage. We will bill later, if preferred, with postage and nominal handling charge extra.
BIBNET blends the two “recommended”* technologies of low cost micrographic storage and high speed all purpose interactive minicomputers.

BIBNET provides an in-house self-contained bibliographic control system for each library and can give CRT console access to library networks at the same time.

BIBNET systems excel all other computer based library systems formerly designed for use in technical processing when it comes to:

- Comprehensiveness and completeness of MARC files plus all other LC cataloging data
- Reliable file access to LC cataloging from 1953 to the most current cataloging data available
- Operating improvements that sharply increase net productivity
- Low drain on expense budgets

A BIBNET representative is ready to show you how your library and your network group can use this powerful system.

INFORMATION DYNAMICS CORPORATION
80 Main Street, Reading, Mass. 01867

"The leader in bibliographic support systems."

BLANKET coverage of all Western European countries, all languages, all subjects and all types of publications, including those that are not readily available through trade channels.

ORDER either the books themselves sent on approval, returnable for full credit;
or bibliographical forms for the titles selected;
or bibliographies with our suggestions clearly marked.

PROGRAMS are arranged to fit all your needs and any special wishes you have can be accommodated.

We will be glad to
- send you a brochure with more information
- prepare a quotation (without obligation) based on your needs.

SWETS & ZEITLINGER
East Coast office
Box 517, BERWYN, Pa. 19312
Telephone: 215-644-4944

West Coast office
Box 1781, SANTA CRUZ, Cal. 95060
Telephone: 408-426-2198
The computer-to-microfilm system that lets you view all Library of Congress MARC II data and reproduce full sets of catalog cards at the touch of a button.

THE DATA BASE . . . The CARDSET microfilm file contains full sets of completed, headed cards for each title provided in MARC II by L.C. This permanent reference source of current cataloging material provides easily accessible bibliographic data with speed and convenience.

CATALOGING REFERENCE . . . Quick location of data in CARDSET is provided by cumulated title and L.C. number indices.

CARD REPRODUCTION . . . Print a fully-headed card set on quality stock, in seconds.
WHAT IT DOES
The CARDSET system provides the library with an easily accessible, permanent reference source of the data required for cataloging current American books. It enables you to quickly locate authoritative bibliographic data and to reproduce completed sets of catalog cards simply and inexpensively.

Accuracy, authority and standardization of the data is assured because all of the cataloging is generated from original MARC II tapes. The speed and convenience of the CARDSET system enables libraries to get their books to their patrons rapidly. The simplicity of the operation means that the great majority of cataloging can be done without the need for trained catalogers operating the system.

HOW IT WORKS
All MARC II magnetic tapes are processed by Information Design into microfilm images. The microfilm file then contains a full set of completed, headed cards for each title. The layout is 6-up on 16mm microfilm. The file is updated twice a month.

Two indices are provided on microfilm: (1) an index of L.C. Card Numbers for convenient look-up of most English language titles and (2) a Title Index which also provides certain selected cross references.

The indices provide the location of the cataloging data in the file by cartridge number and frame number. Both indices are updated and cumulated twice a month.

A Xerox Microprinter is used to view the microfilm and print-out the fully headed L.C. card set with excellent quality on stock of the library's choice. The per-set cost is low and production rapid.

WHAT IT COSTS
The CARDSET system is an annual subscription, starting with January of the current year and extending twelve months from installation date.

The base subscription includes the microfilm data base, the microfilm Title and L.C. Number indices, cartridges and a storage carousel. Also included is use of the motorized cartridge drive for the Xerox Microprinter, and the reader for index look-ups.

An additional retrospective data base covering all English language cataloging done by L.C. during 1968-1971 is also available. The indices for this data base are cumulated with the current indices.

Subscription prices, effective through December 31, 1972, are as follows:

1. Annual subscription \$360
2. Retrospective file \$1,980

Multiple-year subscriptions are available at significant savings.

WHAT IT SAVES
Cost saving is a major benefit of the CARDSET system. The basic microfilm file is a permanent reference source and the per-card reproduction costs are extremely low.

Time saved is substantial. All cataloging material is forwarded to the library as quickly as it is made available by L.C. Individual orders and delays are eliminated. Typing, proofing and correcting cards are eliminated.

Technical processing is more efficient; matching and holding operations are simplified; the problems of ordering, receiving and checking in L.C. cards are eliminated; depository set maintenance can be sharply reduced; filing and look-up errors common to manually maintained reference files are eliminated.

For complete details on the CARDSET system write today for our Users' Manual and sample card sets.
Information Retrieval and Library Automation

This monthly review is unique in its extensive U.S. and international coverage of the many specialized fields which contribute to improved information systems and library services for science, social science, technology, law and medicine; these fields include:

- computer technology and systems
- library science and technology
- library administration, photographic technology and microforms
- facsimile and communications
- library and information networks
- reprographic and printing technologies
- copyright issues, indexing systems, machine-aided indexing and abstracting, documentation and data standards, databases and analysis centers.

Subscription is $24.00 per year (overseas subscribers add $6.00). Orders and inquiries should be directed to:

LONDON SYSTEMS, INC.
MT. AIRY, MARYLAND 21771

OVER 5,000
NOW
NEARLY 7,000
CORE COLLECTION
REPRINT TITLES
PLUS:
- original trade books
- tape cassettes
- large print editions
- microfiche

All this and no gimmicks... just good service from the library-oriented publisher.

For Catalogues, Write or Call Collect
- 576 -
It is now possible to reproduce all entries from the National Union Catalog in full catalog card size, with our new Copy Cat. cataloger’s camera. The reproduction from our camera can be used for card set production by several available methods. (Xerox, Offset, Copyflo, Duplicating service, etc.)

Our Copy Cat. camera is the answer to the Cataloger’s dreams. It offers the following advantages over present systems of obtaining catalog card sets.

1. Rapid production. All books cataloged by Library of Congress can be immediately processed. Libraries currently ordering card sets from L. C. would be less dependent on the L. C. supply of printed sets.

2. Economy. The output of the Copy Cat. camera is less than 7¢ per master print. This compares with approximately 30¢ for a Polaroid print.

3. The print from the Copy Cat. camera is clear and sharp, making for excellent reproduction. It is also full catalog card size. In as much as this is a photographic copy there is no proofreading necessary. There is no cutting, masking or mounting necessary when using the Copy Cat. print. Just type your call numbers directly on the print and you are ready for card production.

4. The Copy Cat. camera is compact and easy to use. Any clerical help can be taught to operate this camera within 30 minutes time. There is no darkroom needed.

5. The master print from the Copy Cat. camera can be used as an ordering tool for receiving card sets with books from our affiliate company, Midwest Library Service.

6. All parts of the Copy Cat. system (equipment, supplies, maintenance, etc.) are supplied by Copy Cat. Inc.

For additional information on our Copy Cat. camera please call us collect and ask for Mr. Lesser. Our telephone number is 314-739-2536.

COPY CAT. INC.

11400 Dorsett Road
Maryland Heights, Mo. 63042
IF YOUR LAST ORDER HAD FILLED BY BAKER & TAYLOR,
THIS SPACE WOULD BE FILLED WITH BOOKS

...because you pay less when you are a Baker & Taylor customer. Any type of book or edition, it doesn’t matter—you get the most competitive discounts in the industry. So the money you save can be used to buy extra books—very important in these days of higher prices and tighter budgets.

Would you like proof of the savings we offer?

Just send us a copy of a recent order filled by another source. Mask out the prices if you like, and ask us to give you a computer print-out of our prices, book by book. Then you’ll see how many more books you can get for the same dollars—at Baker & Taylor.

No obligation, of course. Address your nearest Baker & Taylor division.

The Baker & Taylor Co.