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The Validity of Book Price Indexes for Budgetary Projections

H. William Axford
University Librarian
University of Oregon Library
Eugene, Oregon

A comparison of the average prices paid for books received through approval plans and the average prices listed annually in the Bowker Annual is reported. The results strongly indicate that the average price paid per title through approval plans is a more reliable guide for budgetary projections than the average price per volume or title listed in the trade sources.

On 20 May 1966, Robert W. Frase, associate managing director of the American Book Publishers' Council, appeared before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Affairs which was conducting hearings on amendments to the Library Services and Construction Act. Frase's purpose was to respond to testimony of John W. Gardner, secretary for Health, Education, and Welfare, during hearings in the House of Representatives in which the secretary had stated that "average book prices rose 45 percent between 1960 and 1965." Frase noted in his testimony that while the annual price index for books appearing in the Bowker Annual of Library & Book Trade Information, which provided the data for Gardner's assertion, "was designed for library budgetary purposes and is a useful tool in that connection" a better and more accurate measure would be the "average price per copy paid by purchasers of various categories of books... taken as a whole."

The availability of a large body of price data, derived from a detailed analysis of books received through domestic/Canadian (i.e., imprints of the United States and Canada) and English language approval plans at three university libraries between 1966/67 and 1972/73, offered a unique opportunity to test Frase's assertion. The libraries involved were
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Yeat'

University of Nebraska 1966/67
domestic/Canadian
1967/68
English language
domestic/Canadian
Florida Atlantic University 1969/70
domestic/Canadian
1970/71
domestic/Canadian
Arizona State University 1971/72
English language

In compiling the data reported in the following tables, minor problems with respect to comparability of data were encountered. First, the average prices by subject category in the Bowker Annual are derived from titles or volumes published during the calendar year while those derived from the data on approval plans are for titles received during the fiscal year running from 1 July to 30 June. Consequently, the average prices for titles received through an approval plan reflect receipts during a six-month period not covered by the average prices listed by Bowker, to which they are being compared. For example, the prices for books received at Florida Atlantic University during fiscal 1970/71 have been compared to the prices listed in the 1972 Bowker Annual covering books published in calendar 1971. While the average price for approval plan books received during fiscal 1970/71 might be somewhat lower than for similar titles received through the whole of 1971, the difference probably is not of much consequence when pricing data for the entire six-year period is taken into consideration.

Second, it was impossible to match with 100 percent accuracy the Library of Congress classification numbers assigned to approval plan books by the jobber with the subject categories used by Bowker. Consequently, some Bowker categories were omitted. However, since 80 percent or more of the titles received by the three libraries through approval plans are included in the price data, this problem should not affect the results seriously.

Third, the Bowker figures are based on the production of United States publishers only, but the library acquisition figures include British and Canadian titles also.

In computing its indexes, Bowker uses prices for 1967/69 to establish a base. As of 13 December 1972, the overall price index for trade/technical books was 148.1, reflecting a 48.1 percent increase in the price of books over a three-year period. This figure is fairly comparable to the 45 percent increase between 1960/65 cited by Gardner in his testimony. Using data from the tables below, it is possible to establish a comparable base for books received through approval plans at the University of Nebraska in 1966/67 and 1967/68, and Florida Atlantic University in 1969/70.

During this period, the two libraries purchased between them 25,119 titles at a total cost of $217,726.51. The average unit cost was $8.66. Using this figure as the base, the price index, as measured by books received through an English language approval plan at Arizona State University (averaging $10.26), stood at 118.5 as of 30 June 1972, or 29.5
### TABLE 1

Comparison of Average Prices in Selected Categories as Listed in the 1967 Bowker Annual with the Average Prices Paid by the University of Nebraska on a Domestic Approval Plan in 1966/67

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Bowker Annual</th>
<th>Library of Congress Classification Assigned by Jobber</th>
<th>University of Nebraska Purchases*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Titles</td>
<td>Average Price</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>$8.37</td>
<td>S–SD, SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>N, NB–NK, HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>GV, L, Z 4–997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>C–CS, D, E, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>BL–BX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1,885</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>12.51</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>9,882</td>
<td><strong>$9.35</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Exclusions: PZ, fiction except for designated authors, medicine, freshman and sophomore level textbooks, certain publishers, societies, and associations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Bowker Annual</th>
<th>Library of Congress Classification Assigned by Jobber</th>
<th>University of Nebraska Purchases*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Titles</td>
<td>Average Price</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>$10.23</td>
<td>S–SD, SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>$12.00</td>
<td>N, NB–NK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
<td>HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>$9.68</td>
<td>HA–HE, HG–HJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>$6.22</td>
<td>GV, L, Z 4–997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>$9.03</td>
<td>C–CS, D, E, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature (Gen.)</td>
<td>1,464</td>
<td>$7.83</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>$12.55</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>$8.65</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1,271</td>
<td>$6.02</td>
<td>BL–BX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>$11.90</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>$12.93</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11,402</td>
<td><strong>$ 9.86</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes reprints. Of the $102,923 spent for books on the approval plan, reprints accounted for 7 percent, books from the British commonwealth, 3 percent.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Bowker Annual</th>
<th>Library of Congress Classification Assigned by Jobber</th>
<th>Florida Atlantic University Purchases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>HA, HB, HE, HF</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1,593</td>
<td>C, D, E, F</td>
<td>1,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature/Language</td>
<td>2,673</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy/Psychology</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>B, BC, BF</td>
<td>578*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>BL-BX</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1,841</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology/Economics</td>
<td>4,871</td>
<td>HM, HN, HV</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>T-TR</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,191</strong></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,230†</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Average**                 |               | $13.95                                              | $9.46                                |

* Apparently books in Religion were lumped into Philosophy/Psychology by the jobber.
† 81.1 percent of the total number of titles received on the approval plan during 1969/70.
TABLE 4

Comparison of Average Prices in Selected Categories as Listed in the 1971 Bowker Annual with Average Prices Paid by Florida Atlantic University on a Domestic/Canadian Approval Plan in 1970/71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Bowker Annual</th>
<th>Library of Congress Classification Assigned by Jobber</th>
<th>Florida Atlantic University Purchases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Volumes*</td>
<td>Average Price</td>
<td>Number of Titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>$13.64</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>16.41</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>HA, HB, HE, HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td>C, D, E, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>3,937</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy/Psychology</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>B, BC, BF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>BL–BX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2,511</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology/Economics</td>
<td>4,901</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td>HM, HN, HV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>15.28</td>
<td>T–TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,856</td>
<td>$13.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 1971, Bowker began reporting prices for volumes rather than titles as was the case in the past.
† 84.2 percent of the total number of titles received on the approval plan during 1970/71.
### TABLE 5

Comparison of Average Prices in Selected Categories as Listed in the 1973 Bowker Annual with Average Prices Paid by Arizona State University on an English Language Approval Plan in 1971/72

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Bowker Annual</th>
<th>Library of Congress Classification Assigned by Jobber</th>
<th>Arizona State University Purchases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Volumes*</td>
<td>Average Price</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>$10.94</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>14.94</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>HA-HB, HB-HF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>L, GV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td>C-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature/Language</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>13.09</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy/Psychology</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>B, BC, BF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>BL-BX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2,137</td>
<td>16.05</td>
<td>Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology/Economics</td>
<td>4,532</td>
<td>16.93</td>
<td>HM, HN, HV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,183</td>
<td>$14.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 1971, Bowker began reporting prices for volume rather than titles as was the case in the past.
points less than the figure reported in the 1973 Bowker Annual for titles published in the calendar year 1972. A spread of this magnitude could not be accounted for by discounts and/or price increases in the last 5½ months of 1972. Further, it should be noted that since Bowker began reporting average unit prices by volume in 1971 instead of by title, as was previously the case, the gross spread between the Bowker and approval plan indexes was probably larger than that indicated.

Thus, it would seem that for scholarly books in English at least, Frase's assertion that a better and more accurate guide to budgeting than the Bowker index would be "the average price per copy paid by the purchasers of various categories of books" has considerable validity.
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INSTITUTE ON INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS AS RELATED TO UNIVERSAL BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL

(UBC)

The Cataloging and Classification Section of the Resources and Technical Services Division is sponsoring a one-day institute on international standards as a stepping-stone to UBC, with particular reference to Anglo-American Cataloging Rules chapter 6, on 29 June 1975 at the ALA Conference in San Francisco. The participants are Michael Gorman (British Library); Ronald Hagler (University of British Columbia School of Librarianship); Elizabeth Tate and Henriette Avram (Library of Congress). The institute is intended for practicing catalogers, cataloging administrators, systems librarians, and educators. The enrollment is limited to 200 and may be restricted to a limited number per institution if the enrollment exceeds its limit. The deadline for registration is 15 May 1975.

Registrants who have questions or problems regarding chapter 6 are encouraged to write to Elizabeth Tate (Chief, Descriptive Cataloging Division, Processing Department, Library of Congress, Washington, DC 20540) by 1 May 1975. Be sure to cite specific cases or examples. Mrs. Tate will then try to incorporate the problem areas in her presentation. No individual responses will be sent.

Persons desiring to register should send the following items: (1) name, (2) address, (3) name of institution represented, (4) position, and (5) date of application, and enclose a self-addressed, stamped envelope to LeRoy Ortopan, Head, Catalog Department, General Library, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720.

Notice of the time and place of the institute will be sent to applicants in late May or early June.
Book Selection Tools for Subject Specialists in a Large Research Library: An Analysis

GÉZA A. KÓSA
Department of Library and Information Service
Tasmanian College of Advanced Education
Hobart, Australia

In a large research library that relies mainly on title-by-title selection, 3,522 order slips were analyzed in order to determine the relative usefulness to subject specialists of various selection aids. The analysis shows that each specialist checked an average of about thirty selection aids, although almost three-fourths of the orders were selected from only six tools. The two most useful types of sources for selection were bibliographies and publishers' advertisements.

THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY was to determine the relative usefulness of the various selection aids used by subject specialists in a large research library that relies mainly on the title-by-title selection method.

Sample

The investigation was carried out at the library of Indiana University, Bloomington, during the spring of 1971. Data was collected during a three-month period from 29 March to 25 June. Six professional staff members were chosen to participate in the study: four subject specialists, selecting respectively in the fields of (1) anthropology, folklore, and sociology, (2) political science, (3) history, and (4) philosophy, history and philosophy of science, and classics; one area specialist selecting in African studies; and one departmental librarian selecting in business. These five subject and area specialists (of the eleven employed by the library) and the departmental librarian for the Graduate School of Business were chosen because they were almost exclusively responsible for se-
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lecting in their designated fields, and because the majority of books selected by them was assumed to be in English. (The term “specialist” will be used hereafter to refer to all six of these individuals.)

**Methodology**

A copy of every order slip for current material was collected from each of the specialists once a week during the data collection period. These order slips had already been checked in the specialist’s own files, and the originals sent to the order department. Each slip was dated, and the specialists attempted to indicate on each order slip the source of information for the existence of the title. All order slips were collected and analyzed.

At the beginning of the study the specialists were asked to list in rank order of usefulness the selection aids which they regularly used for the selection of current English-language monographs and to indicate good and bad features of the aids listed.

**Analysis of Data**

The results of the inquiry concerning most-used sources are given in Table 1, which lists in rank order the five titles judged to be most useful by each specialist. Sources listed by five of the six specialists were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Specialist</th>
<th>Philosophy, History and Philosophy of Science, and Classics</th>
<th>Political Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Studies</td>
<td>BNB (British National Bibliography)</td>
<td>LC (Library of Congress proof slips)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology, Folklore, and Sociology</td>
<td>PW (Publisher’s Weekly)</td>
<td>ABPR (American Book Publishing Record)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>New York Times Book Review and Times Literary Supplement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Professional journals</td>
<td>BNB (British National Bibliography)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of American History</td>
<td>ABPR (American Book Publishing Record)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library Journal Print</td>
<td>BNB (British National Bibliography)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews in professional journals</td>
<td>PW (Publisher’s Weekly)</td>
<td>LC (Library of Congress proof slips)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sources listed first in each column are those found most useful; sources listed second, the next most useful; etc.

### TABLE 2

**RANK ORDER OF SOURCES USED* (BASED ON ALL TITLES SELECTED)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Specialist</th>
<th>African Studies</th>
<th>Anthopology, Folklore, and Sociology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blurbs</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Oxford Books for East Africa</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BNB</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library of Congress, Accessions List, East Africa</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bibliographie de la France</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>362</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Source Given</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Other Sources</strong></td>
<td>179</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>566</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Sources Used</strong></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sources listed first in each column are those found most useful; sources listed second, the next most useful; etc.


Publishers' Weekly (PW) and its cumulation the American Book Publishing Record (ABPR), professional journals in their fields, and Library of Congress proof slips (LC). Sources listed by four selectors were British National Bibliography (BNB) and blurbs (publishers' announcements and advertisements in various forms and sources other than the listed bibliographies). No other source was listed more than once.

BNB was preferred by some because its entries are in classified order.

*Volume 19, Number 1, Winter 1975*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th></th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Titles</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blurbs</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Répertoire bibliographique de la philosophie</em></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>Blurbs</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gnomon</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical Review</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>BNB</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABPR</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td><em>Public Affairs Information Service Bulletin</em></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Subtotal                       | 120    | 54.5   | No Source                      | 833    | 76.9   |
|                                |        |       | Given                          | 9      | 0.8    |
| All Other Sources              | 97     | 44.1   | Sources                        | 240    | 22.2   |
| Total                          | 220    | 100.0  | Total                          | 1,082  | 100.0  |
| Number of Sources Used         | 29     |       |                                | 40     |       |

and it was thought to be more timely and comprehensive for British publications than any other source. *PW* was used mainly for advance announcements of American trade publications. The LC proof slips were criticized for their time lag, but they were used to pick up titles that were missed in the other sources. Professional journals were scanned for book reviews, and their listings of titles submitted for reviewing were also named as useful sources. *Books in Print* was used only for replacement copies or for retrospective selection.

Table 2 presents information on the six most used sources for each specialist; it is based on all titles selected, regardless of language. Library of Congress proof slips rank appreciably higher than any other source for three of the specialists and fifth for a fourth. Blurbs rank among the top three for five specialists and fifth for the sixth. Unex-

---
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TABLE 2 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Business Titles</th>
<th>History Titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABPR</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blurbs</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Journal</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Source Given</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Sources</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 2, the selection source was not indicated on some order slips, varying from 0.8 to 19.2 percent of the total orders of any one specialist. According to the specialists, most of these titles were probably selected from blurbs, and if full information were available, blurbs would possibly have replaced ABPR as the most used source for business and would have ranked second, close to first, in both anthropology and history. These findings further underline the importance of blurbs as a source of selection for all of the six specialists. Because special care was taken during the data collection to identify proof slips as a source, they constitute the only source that definitely was not affected by the unknown source category.

For each subject field the total number of sources used and the total number of orders are listed in Table 2. Analysis of the data reveals that each specialist used a wide spectrum of sources. The number of sources used ranges from twenty to forty; the least number of sources (twenty) was used by the business specialist and the largest number (forty) by the
political science specialist. An average of twenty-nine sources was used. The top ranking source yielded from 17.3 to 36.5 percent of orders among the six specialists, and in only two instances did any single source yield more than one-third of the titles. As will be seen from the table, in most instances the yield was much lower. However, in every instance the specialist selected at least half and in three instances about three-fourths of the total number of titles from the six most productive sources.

Conclusion

Title-by-title selection in a large research library involved the checking of about thirty selection aids by specialists in subject fields where most of the orders consisted of English-language monographs. However, almost three-quarters of the orders were selected by each specialist from six selection aids. Book reviews in professional or book review journals did not appear to be the most productive selection sources for the subject specialists in the sample. The usual criticism of book reviews was that there was a longer time lag between the appearance of a book and its review than the specialists could tolerate. The two most useful types of sources for selection were bibliographies (broadly defined, including LC proof slips) and publishers' advertisements.

The analysis of the data collected also indicates that the specialists were able to decide in the majority of cases whether to order a title on the basis of the bibliographical description without annotations. This was confirmed also by direct replies.

SERIALS/PERIODICALS GUIDELINES

The American Library Association has recently published


The guidelines set forth basic recommendations for librarians, agents, and publishers to follow in order to provide quality serials services to users. The suggestions incorporated in this publication result from the study and experience of many representatives of the library community and book trade, and the guidelines have been written with all types and sizes in mind.

The publication may be ordered from American Library Association, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611.
Effect of Uneven Card Distribution on a Card Catalog

ABRAHAM BOOKSTEIN
Assistant Professor
Graduate Library School
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Although the catalog is one of the most important instruments in a library, little effort has gone into analyzing its managerial problems. Among these problems are those relating to the catalog's growth and eventual expansion. This paper presents a simple model of catalog growth that allows one to estimate how many drawers will overflow in a period of time. A conclusion drawn from this analysis is that when cards are redistributed, every effort should be made to ensure an even distribution of cards.

Introduction

THE CATALOG IS ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT INSTRUMENTS in any library. For the patron, it provides an organized access route to the collection; for the library staff, it is a vital tool for the technical processing and readers services functions of the library. Yet despite the amount of activity centered about the catalog and interest in its intellectual organization, there is surprisingly little literature on managerial problems relating to its maintenance.

The growth of the catalog creates a number of problems demanding managerial consideration. One critical decision that must be made regarding the catalog is when it should be expanded. While this is recognized as a costly operation, and one which must be carefully planned, no standard analytical procedures for determining the best time for expansion exist.1 Similarly, there has been little effort to analyze the pattern of increase of catalog cards over the entire range of the catalog. This analysis, combined with the one mentioned above, would allow one to estimate the lifespan of a new catalog; it could also suggest a maintenance strategy for extending this lifespan as much as possible. The two
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components taken together would form a complete picture of catalog growth.

The present paper concentrates on the second problem, introducing a particularly simple picture of catalog card arrivals as a device for gaining some insight into catalog maintenance. Although the model is overly simple, the major conclusions should remain valid as more realistic and complex models are created.

The specific problem treated here was suggested by Hamann in his consideration of cards arriving at some drawers of a card catalog more frequently than at others. One effect of this uneven growth rate is that some drawers fill prematurely even though others have space for more cards, thereby creating a need for a redistribution of cards. This condition and its associated costs becomes more pronounced as the catalog drawers fill up. One way to alleviate this problem is by redistributing the cards among a larger number of drawers, so that there is more room in each drawer for the addition of new cards; this solution, however, is costly in terms of extra drawer and space requirements, as well as in personnel expenses. Decisions relating to the optimal timing of expansion involve balancing the costs of maintenance and the costs of expansion in order to minimize costs in the long run.

In this paper the focus is on the first of these costs, the costs of maintaining the catalog. A model of card arrivals allows an estimate of how many drawers will overflow in a period of time and has implications for maintenance strategy. Though we shall be discussing the growth of a card catalog, we should observe that a number of other library-related problems have a formal similarity with the one being considered here and that the method used here may apply for these also. Examples of such problems are the growth of books in the stacks and the growth in the number of bibliographic records on the tracks of a disc of a machine-readable file.

Model of Catalog Growth

Many factors contribute to the need to redistribute cards. Some, such as the decision to change a subject heading, are difficult to treat analytically. The effects of others, such as the temporary popularity of an author or topic, can be treated by a generalization of the approach described below.

While these complicating factors are important, it is still worthwhile to examine a simplified model of how cards arrive that ignores these complications, in order to gain a preliminary understanding of the effects of catalog growth. In particular, and this is the motivation for this paper, such an examination provides some insight into the consequences of unevenly distributing cards among drawers. It will be shown that such uneven distribution, usually resulting from an attempt to simplify the labeling of drawers, can result over time in a serious deterioration of catalog performance.
We must first describe analytically how cards arrive at each drawer. A model that has been successful in describing similar processes is that of cards arriving at each drawer completely randomly, or more precisely, as a Poisson process; that is, the probability that \( n \) cards arrive in an interval \( t \) is given by a formula of the form

\[
\frac{e^{-\lambda t} (\lambda t)^k}{n!}
\]

with \( \lambda \) denoting the rate at which cards arrive at that drawer. This model implies that if \( n_0 \) additional cards will fill a drawer, then

\[
\sum_{k=n_0+1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\lambda t} (\lambda t)^k}{k!}
\]

is the probability that the drawer being considered will overflow by time \( t \). If there are \( N \) such drawers, we would expect

\[
N \sum_{k=n_0+1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\lambda t} (\lambda t)^k}{k!}
\]

of them to require redistribution.

To proceed further, it is necessary to know the relative rate of arrival among drawers. But a little thought will convince one that if each drawer started with the same number of cards, and if the library retains its acquisition policy, then \( \lambda \) will be more or less constant throughout the catalog. For example, it may be found that the \( U \)'s arrive twice as fast as the \( A \)s; but if so, the library will initially have twice as many cards beginning with \( U \) as with \( A \), and these cards would occupy twice as many drawers. Thus, the greater arrival rate is exactly compensated for by the increased number of occupied drawers, and each \( U \) drawer will have cards arriving at the same rate as does an \( A \) drawer. This line of reasoning can be extended to any relative rate of arrival among letters, making our assertion that \( \lambda \) should be constant if each drawer begins with the same number of cards a reasonable one. The model is an approximation in that it does not include random fluctuations in the arrival rate which increase the variance beyond that expected from a Poisson distribution.

The above expression treats each drawer in isolation, neglecting the possibility that a drawer may overflow in part because of cards coming to it from other drawers that overflowed. We can get an idea of the size of this effect by considering two contiguous drawers as if they were a single drawer with twice the arrival rate and twice the capacity of a single drawer. Since it is unlikely that both drawers would overflow independently, if the combined unit overflows it is because the surplus from one drawer contributed to the overflow of the other. Thus the probability that the larger unit overflow provides a measure of the interaction between drawers. This quantity is given by
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Expressions of this form can also be used to predict the overflow of banks of drawers and accordingly be of assistance in planning the placement of empty buffer drawers. (The use of buffer drawers is another practice, that, although in common use, deserves more scrutiny. It is usually argued that the use of buffer drawers allows for overflows. But it is also true that the provision of buffer drawers encourages overflows by causing cards to arrive at a greater rate in the rest of the catalog. It is not at all obvious which costs are greater in the long run. However, since this quantity is small relative to the degree of approximation inherent in the model itself, we shall no longer consider this effect in this paper. It is interesting to apply the above expressions to Hamann’s data. If we assume there are 100 cards to an inch, we find \( N = 5000 \) drawers and \( \lambda t = 700 \) cards per drawer per ten-year period. A drawer can hold about 1,700 cards, so if a drawer initially held exactly 400 cards, \( n_0 = 1300 \) is the number of cards that must arrive for it to be necessary to rearrange some cards. We can use the normal approximation to the Poisson distribution to find that the probability of a drawer overflowing in the ten-year span is the same as that of a normal variant exceeding its mean by more than twenty standard deviations. If so, it is exceedingly unlikely that any of the drawers would overflow.

In part this conclusion results from the simplified nature of our model, which reduces the variance of card arrivals. However, an additional explanation of the distress experienced at Hamann’s library may be that each drawer had only “roughly” four inches of cards. It is accordingly of interest to consider the consequences of an uneven distribution of cards among drawers. Suppose, for example, that a sizable number of drawers had six instead of four inches of cards. If so, the probability of overflowing is 1/20; thus, 5 percent of these drawers would overflow, and 5 percent of a large number could be significant. Of those drawers having eight inches of cards ten years ago, almost all will overflow. Thus the small variations in the initial distribution of cards, which both reduce the growing space in some drawers and also increase their rate of card accumulation, can explain the premature need to expand the catalog, even on the basis of the very conservative model used here; the catalog is very sensitive to these seemingly small fluctuations.

**Conclusion**

We conclude from the above development that when a library divides its cards among the drawers of a card catalog, it ought to take care to do so uniformly. Seemingly small fluctuations, perhaps to complete a run of letters within a single drawer, can considerably increase the amount of work needed later. If a uniform distribution is not possible, an attempt should be made to compensate for this by putting fewer...
cards in contiguous drawers, so that the total number of cards in the
two drawers is the same as it would be if the cards were evenly distrib-
uted. Other effects, referred to above, may also contribute to a catalog
drawer's overflowing; but even so, the above argument suggests that one
can reduce the seriousness of the problem by ensuring that the cards be
evenly distributed at the time of their initial distribution.

The formulas given above and their extensions can be used when
planning card redistribution. If the library has an estimate of the num-
ber of drawers having various numbers of cards, the formulas given
above will allow it to conservatively estimate the amount of redistribu-
tion needed later, thereby providing an upper limit on the time interval
between redistributions.5
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NEW EDITION OF REPROGRAPHIC SERVICES
DIRECTORY

The publication of the sixth edition of the Directory of Library Repro-
graphic Services, sponsored by the Reproduction of Library Materials Section of
the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division, is tentatively scheduled for
January 1976. The primary object of this publication is to provide current in-
formation about copying, duplicating, and loan services offered by the institu-
tions listed in the directory. The data gathering questionnaire is now ready and
will be forwarded automatically to all institutions listed in the fifth edition of
the directory. Other institutions offering reprographic and loan services are
urged to request the questionnaire from the editor: Joseph Z. Nitecki, Associate
Director for Technical Services, Temple University Libraries, Philadelphia, PA
19122.
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Subject Headings for a Local Catalog

H. ANTHONY RYDINGS
University Library
University of Hong Kong

The University of Hong Kong Library is compiling a union catalog of materials relating to Hong Kong available in local libraries. The main sequence is an alphabetical subject catalog, using modified Library of Congress (LC) subject headings, with author and title indexes in Western languages and Chinese. This article describes methods adopted to modify LC headings to indicate relationship of materials to Hong Kong. Examples are given of special form, subject, and geographical headings, and of the problem of Chinese names. Double entries under generic and specific headings have frequently been used; the value of this approach has still to be tested by usage.

In 1970 THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG received a generous donation, to be known as the Hung On-To Memorial Fund, for the improvement of its library. It was eventually agreed that the fund should be devoted to establishing a special Hong Kong collection, containing all materials relating to the colony. The library staff believed that an important adjunct to the collection would be a special catalog, covering not only the contents of the collection but also any related materials available in other Hong Kong libraries. The catalog was, therefore, to be a union catalog of Hong Kong materials. By including other items not available locally the catalog might eventually become a Hong Kong bibliography, though this development is still some way in the future.

Two research assistants were provided to compile the catalog under the direction of the librarian. The original plan was to appoint one person for two years, but a review of the candidates suggested the desirability of appointing one person to deal primarily with materials in Western languages and another to handle the Oriental-language materials; two assistants were appointed for ten months each.

It was assumed that about half the entries would be provided from
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the collections of the University of Hong Kong. There are two other major libraries in the colony: that of the Chinese University, founded 1963, though federating three colleges with libraries a dozen or more years older; and the Urban Council Public Libraries, opened as the City Hall Library in 1962 and renamed when it branched out as the public library service of the colony. Neither of these, being relatively newly established, have notable local collections; but there are important though small collections of specialized items in various government departmental and other libraries, while the libraries of the Colonial Secretariat, the Supreme Court, and the Secretariat for Home Affairs contain some relevant items not available elsewhere.

The purpose of the proposed union catalog is, therefore, to serve as a location list for all materials relating to Hong Kong and available in public libraries (i.e., those to which members of the public have access) in the colony. There are no limitations of language, date, or place of publication, and coverage includes books, parts of books, and periodical articles as well as nonbook materials, the only criterion of selection being that the subject matter must be related to Hong Kong. Thus, books by Hong Kong authors will not necessarily be included, but fiction with a Hong Kong setting is included, as are school textbooks written specially for Hong Kong schools. It was intended to cover as much of the currently available material as possible in the initial project, which has since been continued at a slower rate as a routine function of the library.

In view of the time limitation for the project, it was decided to reproduce the relevant existing cards in the catalogs of the University Library by xerographic copying in batches of ten, a process used by the Urban Council Public Libraries in producing their catalogs. (Grateful acknowledgment is made for technical advice from this agency, including choice of a suitable card stock.) The main catalog of the University Library was originally in dictionary form, but has since been divided into separate author, subject, and title sequences. Library of Congress subject headings are used. The Fung Ping Shan Library, which contains all the Chinese and other Oriental-language materials of the University Library, has a similar but separate catalog, in Chinese characters. Entries are arranged according to the number of strokes in the characters.

There were three interrelated reasons for basing the Hong Kong catalog on the same pattern. First, the majority of the entries were expected to come from the University Library and would need minimal adaptation; second, the catalogers were accustomed to the style; and third, the majority of the users would also be accustomed to this type of catalog. At the same time it was clear that the most frequent approach to the Hong Kong catalog would be by subject, and for this reason the subject catalog was thought of as the main sequence, with author and title indexes in Western languages and in Chinese characters. There would also be a subject index in Chinese. Thus entries in Chinese characters are given a Library of Congress heading (or variant, as described below) in the

*Volume 19, Number 1, Winter 1975*
subject catalog, with appropriate index entries in English and Chinese, avoiding the use of romanized headings in the main sequence (except for subjects with no equivalent English term). There was, too, the hope that eventually the catalog would be published, and the better examples of such catalogs and bibliographies are arranged by subject. For this reason, an extra copy of each main entry card was made, with the intention of mounting and offset printing these in the same way as the University Library produces its weekly additions lists, to form the main sequence (in subject order) of a printed catalog.

With the purpose, scope, and arrangement of the Hong Kong catalog decided, the remaining task prior to starting the actual compilation was to determine the form and style of the subject headings. Should the LC headings be used unchanged, or should the whole system be reviewed and modified? It was soon obvious that an unmodified system would not be the best way of meeting the users’ needs, and further it might not even be the quickest. The unnecessary repetition of “Hong Kong” in the headings, either as main heading or subheading, for example, would be wasteful of typing time and unhelpful to the user, who would be well aware that every entry related in some way to Hong Kong.

Fortunately, sufficient time had been left between the conception of the project and the date on which the research assistants were to begin work to develop a modified system. The system of course still must stand the crucial test, that of usage, but in the course of compiling the catalog it has been found necessary to make only one or two further modifications, to which reference will be made later.

Just as the sole criterion for selection of materials to be included in the catalog was that the subject matter should be related to Hong Kong, so the basis of modification of the subject headings was to indicate the relationship of the material to Hong Kong. This is better understood by considering two examples.

1. Scales from the Dragon: A Selection of Verses from “The Yellow Dragon,” the Magazine of Queen’s College.

In our main catalog, the subject entry for this book is English poetry—20th century—Collections, which gives no indication of the reason for inclusion in the Hong Kong catalog. For the latter, therefore, we have devised a special heading: Anthologies of H.K. authors, with references from “Authors” and “Poetry—Collections.” This heading is used for anthologies in English (and could be used for polylingual ones, if necessary), while those in other languages are indicated thus: Anthologies of H.K. authors—Chinese [etc.].


The subject entry for this in the main catalog is Science—Information services—Congresses; another heading with no obvious relevance to Hong Kong. It is, however, quite probable that someone using the Hong Kong catalog may be interested in knowing what con-
ferences, meetings, etc., have been held here, and for this reason we have devised the heading **Conferences held in H.K.** which is subdivided by the subject of the conference.

In both of these examples we have preferred a form entry (anthologies or conferences) to a topical subject heading, on the grounds that this is the best way to serve the interests of those who will use the catalog. If a reader wants to know whether the University Library possesses reports of conferences on scientific information centers, he will look under the appropriate subject heading in the main catalog. If, however, he knows that a conference on this subject was held in Hong Kong, he will check the Hong Kong catalog under the heading **Conferences held in H.K.**

The need to provide research workers with a means of locating information on certain categories or groups of subjects led to the conclusion that in many cases double entry would be preferable to references from the generic to the specific. A rather similar procedure is occasionally adopted by the Library of Congress. For example, under **Cities and towns—Planning** in Subject Headings Used in the Dictionary Catalogs of the Library of Congress (LCSH), a note indicates that when this heading is subdivided by place, reference should be made from the place with subdivision “City planning.” A similar kind of treatment, only using added entries instead of references, has been adopted in all cases when it seemed that anyone seeking information on a particular category of institution (e.g., hospitals or banks) or particular type of structure (e.g., bridges or theaters) would have some difficulty in identifying all the available material if only specific entry (e.g., Tung Wah Group of Hospitals, Lee Theatre) were made. A list of thirty-six headings to be treated thus was drawn up before the project started, and there have been a few additions since. The list has a definite local bias, including such headings as **Ferries, Temples, and Textile mills**, which may be unnecessary in other geographical situations. Headings for which the specific entries may be expected to be identifiable from available reference sources are not treated thus, particularly if the category is rather large or vague. For example, under both **Companies** and **Firms** the following reference appears:

> see also particular types of business, e.g.:  
> Grocery trade  
> Import-export companies  
> Public utilities  
> and names of individual companies.

Apart from this list of double entries, before the project started the list of subject headings was scanned to see whether any additions or variations were desirable in the special context of the Hong Kong catalog. The results fall broadly into two groups: (1) those arising from the American bias of LC headings, and (2) those peculiar to the Hong
Kong environment. For the Hong Kong catalog we have adopted the common English terminology in place of the American usage, e.g., Railways instead of "Railroads," and Tramways instead of "Street railroads." Although many of our users may be equally familiar with the American terms, Hong Kong remains a British colony, and the majority of users of the Hong Kong catalog are likely to think in English rather than American. The other, and perhaps more important, language problem, namely Chinese, will be considered in detail later.

Among the headings which are peculiar to the Hong Kong context, or at any rate more important here than they would be in most other places, attention may be drawn to the following:

**Buses** see also Minibuses (since 1967 a peculiar, and in some opinions pernicious, form of urban transport)

**Business tax** see Profits tax (the official Hong Kong terminology)

**Fishing Communities** (neither "Fisheries" nor "Fishermen" as in LCSH conveys the precise meaning required)

**Public schools** (apart from the well-known difference in American and English usage, there are other terms in common use in Hong Kong with special meanings. We therefore prefer these, e.g., Government schools, Grant-in-aid schools)

**Race relations** (we prefer this to the slightly perjorative "Race problems," on the grounds that Hong Kong is a successful example of a multiracial society)

**Resettlement estates** (this is an essential term in the Hong Kong context, additional to Resettlement)

**Textbooks for H.K.** (used as a subheading under subjects, e.g., Science—Textbooks for H.K.)

As might be expected, special subheadings have been provided under those subjects for which the Hong Kong catalog has more entries than would other library catalogs, e.g., History. The following series of subheadings by date has been adopted:

- pre 1841
- 1841-1898
- 1898-1939
- 1939-1945
- 1945-

(For those unfamiliar with the history of Hong Kong, it should be explained that 1841 is the date of its becoming a British colony and 1898 is the date from which the New Territories were leased. The more recent dates derive, of course, from world history.) One other special subheading is used under History, falling within one of the above dates, i.e.,

- 1941-1945 (Japanese occupation)

since this period has attracted a considerable literature of its own. Under this subheading there is also a reference: see also Siege, 1941.
One of the main problems of a local catalog relates to geographical names, be they names of villages or topographical features, or streets, buildings, etc. The problem is to decide upon a standard form of entry (with necessary references), since in the course of time there are likely to be changes of nomenclature or spelling. This is particularly so in the case of Hong Kong, where one is frequently dealing with romanized versions of Chinese names for which there may be as many as half a dozen or so variants, any of which may be used in the literature, and it is clearly important to file all entries which deal with the same geographical place at the same place in the subject catalog. For example, a particular area of Kowloon (originally a village) is variously known as

Sam Sui Poo
Sam suipoo
Sham Shui Po
Shamshuipo
Shum Shui Po

and possibly other permutations and combinations; the “correct” Wade-Giles transliteration of the three Chinese characters of this name is Shên Shui P‘u. Fortunately there exists an official Hong Kong government publication, *A Gazetteer of Place Names in Hong Kong, Kowloon and the New Territories* (1960), which we have been able to adopt as our authority for nearly all names of towns, villages, and topographical features. There are also lists of street names and of buildings published by the government which may be accepted as authoritative.

The special difficulties arising with Chinese names are not, of course, confined to geographical terms. Our policy in regard to both personal names and the names of societies, institutions, firms, etc., has been determined by decisions reached by a subcommittee of the Hong Kong Library Association in 1971, and recorded in a paper presented at the General Council meeting of the International Federation of Library Associations at Liverpool in that year. Briefly, in the case of personal names we adopt the general approach of *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* 40 and prefer the usage of the person concerned (so far as it can be ascertained) to any “standard” form of romanization. Although this means that the same Chinese character may be represented by a number of different romanized spellings, e.g., Eng, Ng, Ong, and Wu, depending upon the preference of the individual, it avoids the ridiculous situation of a well-known local personage appearing under a form of name which no local Chinese would think of using (references are of course provided from the more usual Wade-Giles orthography). After all, this is no more unsystematic than it is to enter Braun, Brown, Browne, etc., under the form which the given author uses, instead of trying to standardize.

Institutional names present rather more of a problem, since the approach to the catalog will depend on whether the searcher is Chinese, in which case he will look for the commonest form of the Chinese name, or a Westerner, who will look first for the usual English version (if there
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is one) rather than a romanized version of the Chinese name. As the main sequence of the catalog is basically Western, it seems logical to employ the Western approach, and to use the English version where one exists, e.g., Ning Po Residents Association, Hong Kong (not Ning-po kang t'ung hsiang hui) but Hua Ch'iao Shu Yuan (for a school which has no English translation of its name).

For the Chinese user of the catalog, for whom both the English translation and the romanized version may be difficult to remember or locate, the name in Chinese characters will be given in either the Chinese author index or the Chinese subject index as appropriate. References are also provided from the unused romanized versions to the used translations.

This, then, is the rather complicated structure devised to meet the needs of users of this highly specialized union catalog—though specialized only in its geographical and not its subject content. Obviously such a system could not be contemplated for a general union catalog. One writer has stated that "the task of keeping an alphabetical union catalogue up to date is already a heavy one, so that to do the same for one systematical union catalogue would almost certainly result in failure." Alphabetical and systematical are from the context to be understood to imply author and subject approaches, respectively. It remains to be seen whether keeping the Hong Kong catalog up to date is an insuperable problem, but the fact that most of the entries will be added from one library, that in which the catalog is housed, should help. In addition to being unusual in that the main sequence is subject, the catalog is unusual in its need for alphabetical and nonalphabetical (i.e., Chinese character) approaches. The use of character indexes is commonplace in reference works which incorporate many Oriental names, so its adaptation in this instance is hardly unique. Modification of subject headings, again, is no novel undertaking, but the particular aim which has guided the modifications described above is perhaps less usual. How far the Hong Kong catalog will achieve its aims remains to be seen—perhaps some future user survey will tell the rest of the story.

REFERENCE

A classification scheme for international, intergovernmental organizations in use in the University of Virginia's main library is described briefly. The need for such a scheme arose when the library decided to centralize intergovernmental organization documents in its public documents section. The system utilizes an acronym and type of publication scheme developed by combining some of the principles of the Superintendent of Documents and the United Nations series symbols systems.

The University of Virginia Library has developed an in-house classification for the documents of intergovernmental organizations. The need for such a scheme arose when it was decided that the publications of such intergovernmental groups as the European communities and the specialized agencies of the United Nations (not included in the United Nations Documents Index) could be more expeditiously processed and serviced through a centralized collection in the library's Public Documents Section.

From the beginning of the project the library believed that a scheme utilizing acronyms or initialisms was of primary importance because such a scheme would (1) be consistent with other schemes already in use in the Public Documents Section, and (2) serve as an "issuing organization" statement. The scheme was developed by combining some of the principles of the Superintendent of Documents and the United Nations series symbols classification schemes. A similar scheme has been used successfully with state publications at Florida Atlantic University.

The scheme consists of up to four elements separated by the virgule or slash (/). The four elements are determined in the following fashion:

Element 1 consists of a unique acronym or initialism for each
agency in the collection. Many international bodies, especially those related to the United Nations, are already better known by acronyms than their full names. Obvious examples of such agencies are UNESCO, UNICEF, UNITAR, WHO, and FAO.

*Element II* consists of a category number (1–9) identifying the type of publication (see Table 1).

**TABLE 1**

**Publication Categories in the University of Virginia Documents Classification Scheme**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Number</th>
<th>Category Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Semiannual, annual, biennial, or other dated administrative publications reporting agency activities or interests statistically or analytically. All business reports of the agency's administrative offices excluding &quot;review of activities&quot; narratives, for which see category 7. Excluded also are all legislative or governing assembly documents, for which see categories 5 and 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>All general or specific monographic publications treating any subject by the agency except (1) those reporting business, administrative or legislative activities, or policies, for which see categories 1, 5, 6, and 7; and (2) continuously numbered series or serials, for which see category 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>All continuously numbered general publications issued as a series or serial (including journals, periodicals) except those otherwise falling into categories 1, 5, 6, and 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Folders, travelogs, dated announcements, ephemeral publications, calendars of events, lists of activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Official assembly or legislative body records, minutes of meetings of whole agency or organization, plenary, verbatim transcripts or records, constitutions (or commentaries thereon), bylaws, declarations, organization or agency rules or regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Conference reports, reports of seminars, minutes of meetings of committees, study and/or ad hoc groups within the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>News or press releases, photobooks, popular descriptive accounts of the agency, its activities and work, its officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Publication catalogs, indexes, bibliographies, lists of published works, abstracting service publications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Maps, atlases, diagrams, drawings, how-to manuals, guides, handbooks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Element III* consists of a Cutter number for the "key" or most important word of the title assigned from the standard two-digit ta-
bles. Words commonly occurring in the titles of publications of a specific agency are avoided as “key” words. Examples of such words are “food” or “agriculture” for the publications of the Food and Agriculture Organization. In cases where Cuttering a commonly used term is unavoidable, especially for publications issued in several parts with varying subtitles, it has been found useful to add an additional letter from a secondary word in the title to the Cutter number.

Element IV consists of numbers based upon distinguishing features inherent in documents. Such features include volume and issue numbers, publication numbers, dates covered, and conference or session numbers. Element IV is used only when necessary to distinguish between documents.

Some publications, notably those in category 2 of element II, contain no such inherent differentiations. In such case, for the first publication on a subject, element IV is omitted. Each additional publication in the same category and on that same subject will be numbered in sequence as cataloged. For example, the first publication dealing with population would be Cuttered P81; the second, P81/2; the third, P81/3; etc. A new edition of a previously issued work receives the same classification as the previous edition plus a three-digit year code for the date of the new edition.

The scheme as outlined here lacks one distinctive feature available in both the Superintendent of Documents and the United Nations series symbols schemes, an element to indicate which office, conference, bureau, or group within an organization produced the publications. The inclusion of such a feature was considered at the time the scheme was devised; however, the element was quickly deemed not only unnecessary but also undesirable since it tended to break up subject clusters within each category. Such an element would easily be added to the scheme, however, should its use become necessary.

Although there are persuasive arguments against adopting local in-house classification schemes, the advantages of the present scheme are thought to outweigh the disadvantages. By making the often extended wait for Library of Congress catalog copy or the services of an original cataloger trained in Library of Congress classification unnecessary, the scheme provided a tool for quickly and efficiently clearing a modest but troublesome backlog of uncataloged documents, for example. But more important, since the collection is located adjacent to the United Nations depository collection, it has afforded library users access to publications or organizations outside the United Nations through a scheme similar, at least in appearance, to that of the United Nations series symbols. Students and faculty have welcomed this opportunity to compare documents of the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and other intergovernmental groups without extensive librarywide searches.
EXAMPLES

UNESCO  UNESCO Statistical Yearbook.
1/Sc1/yr.
UNESCO  World Problems in the Classroom: A Teacher's Guide to some
FAO  Marketing Livestock and Meat by R. F. Burdette and J. C. Abbott
FAO  Marketing Eggs and Poultry by G. F. Stewart and J. C. Abbott
FAO  World Crop Harvest Calendar.
4/C87
UNESCO  Records of the General Conference.
5/R24/nos.
6/D62  of Legislation of Documents Executed by Diplomatic Agents and
EC  The European Community at a Glance (1972).
7/C73/2
FAO  World Fisheries Abstracts.
8/F52/no
UNESCO  The Art of Writing, an Exhibition in 50 Panels (1965).
9/W93

REFERENCES

1. U.S. Superintendent of Documents. Library, An Explanation of the Superintendent
   of Documents Classification System, prepared by Joseph A. King. (Washington:
   1955), 14p.
2. List of United Nations Documents Series Symbols. (United Nations. Dag Ham- 
3. W. L. Newsome and N. P. Sanders, "Florida Public Document Classification in the

Library Resources & Technical Services
Application of the Dewey Decimal Classification at the British National Bibliography

MELBA DAVIS ADAMS
Decimal Classification Division
Library of Congress
Washington, D.C.

The application of the Dewey Decimal Classification and its place in the subject analysis procedures followed by the British National Bibliography is described as observed by an exchangee from the Decimal Classification Division of the Library of Congress.

A BRIEF bit of background information is in order so that the reader may better understand the reasons for this article and the accompanying article by Robert Ross Trotter, “Application of the Dewey Classification at the Library of Congress.” Following earlier correspondence, discussions for an exchange of personnel between the British National Bibliography (BNB) and the Library of Congress (LC) Decimal Classification Division began in London during the fall of 1971 when Joel C. Downing, deputy director of BNB, discussed its feasibility with Benjamin A. Custer, editor, Dewey Decimal Classification, and chief, Decimal Classification Division, Library of Congress. The idea for exchange from the American side became a reality when the director of the Processing Department of LC gave his approval and the directors of Forest Press, publishers of the Dewey Decimal Classification, agreed to support financially the travel expenses of a Decimal Classification Specialist from the Library of Congress. Forest Press and BNB jointly supported the travel expenses of a staff member from the BNB Dewey Section.

The main purpose of such an exchange was to improve international working relations between the two Dewey offices. Between them, with overlap, the two offices have the responsibility for supplying Dewey numbers to over 90 percent of the works published in English in the United Kingdom, United States, and other countries, and for making these numbers
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available to the international public through card distribution centers, MARC tapes, printed book catalogs, and the BNB cumulative lists. Each exchange person was expected to observe and participate in the application of Dewey numbers in the other's Dewey section. The American exchangee was expected also to participate in the application of and to learn as much as possible about BNB's PRÉserved Context Index System (PRECIS), a unique subject indexing system developed at BNB, and the British exchangee to observe and participate in the editorial operations of the Decimal Classification Division of the Library of Congress.

BNB was formed in 1950 with a staff of approximately 100. Before moving to its present location in 1967, it was located in the British Museum. Until BNB's incorporation in 1974 in the British Library, it was a commercial corporation, the profits of which were not distributed to shareholders but rather used to develop its services. BNB does not maintain a collection of books. One copy of every book copyrighted in the United Kingdom is lent to BNB for the purpose of preparing a catalog entry for the BNB lists and cards. These lists serve as selection, cataloging, and reference aids to British libraries. Printed card services are available to the libraries.

Following receipt of a book from the copyright agent, the following activities are performed:

2. Establishing office author and subject records
3. Descriptive cataloging
4. Subject analysis (PRECIS)
5. Assignment of Dewey classification
7. Editorial keyboarding (preparation of copy for LC shared cataloging program, preparation of internal authority files)
8. Production keyboarding (input of BNB MARC data on paper tape, input of PRECIS subject data on paper tape, amendments and corrections)
9. Editorial review (diagnostic reading of BNB MARC, diagnostic reading of thesaurus (PRECIS), control of amendments and corrections)

At BNB I was assigned to work with Mr. Trotter, head of the Dewey Section, where I observed and participated in the BNB's method of assigning Dewey numbers to printed materials and its methods of subject analysis, including the use of PRECIS. Arrangements were made for me either to participate in or to talk with persons in each PRECIS operation, and to talk with Derek Austin, who developed PRECIS.

The PRECIS Section is divided into four groups: indexing, SIN (subject index number), RIN (reference index number), and key-punching. Before a book reaches the Dewey Section, the PRECIS indexers construct a string of subject concepts which is set down in a context-
dependent order on a concept card which describes the subject of the book. This string is an attempt to create a representation which is co-extensive with the subject for which index entries can be made under each of the significant terms. This is achieved through creating a single string of terms which is organized into an order in which one term sets the next into its context and can be shunted by the computer through as many subject index positions as are needed. In order to achieve consistency in the index, it was necessary to select one standard order of words for the input string. This standard order was established by considering how terms tend to adopt certain positions in a sentence depending upon their roles. The indexer proceeds as follows: (1) he determines the significant words in a subject; (2) he establishes the roles which each of the these terms has assumed (roles include: property, viewpoint, "active system" and "key system"); (3) he writes the appropriate role operator in front of each term; (4) he organizes the words into a string according to the filing value of the operators; and (5) he checks the PRECIS authority files constantly for precedents to avoid getting the same subject in two places. The string of subject concepts is then carefully checked before being forwarded to the Dewey Section.

If the string has been used at least once before, it is called a DUPLICATE, and a second subject concept card is written with the symbol "//" (two slashes) to indicate duplicate, and the original and duplicate cards are refilled together in a pocket. If the string has occurred twice or more, it is called a SINNED book and requires no further analysis treatment except checks for accuracy, because the subject data has been established and should not change. The coded formula is fed to the computer, which automatically prints out all required information. In August 1972 about 25 percent (and in May 1973, I am informed, about 48 percent) of the works received were SINNED materials and included such broad and diverse subjects as Christian life, contraception, data processing systems, economics, gardening, physics, and some literary texts in English.

The RIN group is responsible for examining each string, term by term, and any word in the string which is marked as an entry term is considered out of its context and as an entity in its own right. Associated terms, such as synonyms, higher generic terms and so on, are determined by means of dictionaries, thesauri, and special classification schemes. In this way a number of connections between terms is established, forming a first "level" of references which is recorded on a disc-held file. Each of these higher terms is then considered in the same way, so that a second level of references is set up, and this operation continues until an entire hierarchy of term associations, linked by see and see also references, has been established and assigned to the disc. One is then able to extract this entire hierarchy at any time simply by quoting, as part of the PRECIS input, a single code number which identifies the address on the disc of the lowest term—that is, the term which will actually appear in the lead position in an entry.
It is important during this operation to establish and record only those connections between terms which are neutral so far as context is concerned—that is to say, the see and see also references should record connections between terms which hold good in any syntactical situation, in the sense in which "rats" remain members of the category "rodents" regardless of the subject in which they have occurred. This means that whenever the same term recurs in another subject one can quote the term's code number and set the machine to extract and print a full set of references, confident that these will continue to be valid in the new context.

The SIN group is responsible for coding all terms (new or SINNED) in order to produce the machine-readable string, and, after these have been keypunched, to check them for accuracy.

For each document the PRECIS string acts as a neutral and intelligible subject statement. The indexing is neutral in the sense that it is not dependent on the schedules of any particular classification scheme. As a subject statement, the string is, therefore, equally acceptable to all of the remaining indexing systems (Dewey classification, LC classification, LC subject headings). The subjects of each book are identified, but not the disciplinary context.

Upon receipt in the Dewey Section, the books are sorted according to whether they represent subjects already standing in the subject authority file. Titles so represented are handled by the head of the section; those not represented are divided equally between the two assistants. Books are not usually divided by subject as the classifiers are generalists, i.e., they classify in all subject areas. Special rush books may be received at any time during the day. Since the entries are needed for the weekly lists, no backlog can be maintained. A Dewey number is assigned to each entry.

Each book to be classified has the descriptive cataloging information on a catalog sheet and PRECIS strings on concept subject cards. The Dewey specialist studies the string and then transposes its terms, according to a fixed set of rules, into a subject statement which is printed with the class number and called the "feature." This feature attempts to represent the book's exact content, a subject which cannot be expressed exactly by a Dewey number in 85 percent of the cases. Each book is allowed up to four strings, and each string is assigned a Dewey number. A book on two subjects giving equal emphasis to both is classed under both, the one coming first in the Dewey schedules being considered the primary number. A book on three subjects, all of them being subdivisions of a broader topic, will be given four numbers, one for each subject and one for the comprehensive subject, which is considered primary. In the printed bibliography the location of secondary entries is indicated under the primary entry, and each secondary entry refers back to the primary entry; however, full information appears at each place.

BNB attempts to follow Dewey principles of classification at all times except in those instances (representing about 15 percent of all titles handled) in which the staff feels that dual or unclear provisions
exist, e.g., at 320.2, 320.4, and 320.9, or those instances in which the term “other” cannot be verbalized in PRECIS, e.g., 371.39, or those instances in which works have been classed in the subdivision 03 “Man and his civilization” as the most comprehensive number for a given place in the range 914–919. Before the BNB staff decides that Dewey principles cannot be followed, it conducts a careful study of the problem area, selects a specific number which it feels best fits BNB needs, and consults with the Dewey editor for his viewpoints. This type of cooperation has resulted in the two offices becoming more standardized in the use of the Dewey schedules.

Trotter has the responsibility for checking each Dewey number before it leaves the section. His other duties include discussions of problem areas with Eric T. Finerty, head, Classification Section; answering outside queries; keeping daily, weekly, etc., statistics and reports; checking for errors in printed lists and making corrections which will appear in later lists; maintaining the LC printed card file; and correcting or writing to the Decimal Classification Division of the Library of Congress to explain or query differences of interpretation when different Dewey numbers have been used.

The reference sources chiefly used by the Dewey classifiers are the PRECIS authority file, the LC printed card file, Books in English, and National Union Catalog. The PRECIS authority file contains the concept cards arranged in Dewey number order and has a second section which has a copy of the strings arranged in alphabetical order. This file is constantly checked for precedents to avoid classifying the same subject in two places. If corrections are made to any field, all index cards for that entry must be withdrawn, corrected, and sent through with the concept card. The LC printed card file contains LC cards for those titles likely to be published in Britain. These are filed in quarterly sequences and are kept for one year; after that time the information is traceable by other means. When a title already published in the U.S. is handled, the classifier must first check this file, retrieve the card, and use the Dewey number on the LC card if at all possible. If the card is not in this file he then consults Books in English, the relatively new bibliographical publishing venture on microfiche that lists in one sequence of authors and titles every book in the English language currently cataloged by BNB and LC.

From the Dewey Section the titles for newly recorded subjects are forwarded to the Library of Congress Section, which assigns LC subject headings and LC classification numbers to the most important and popular titles. Less important works are handled according to available time and staff. In other words, this step in the process is not permitted to delay the titles to be entered in the weekly BNB list.

Since the Decimal Classification Division of the Library of Congress does not prepare subject index lists or similar works, it is not at all certain how or whether it can utilize PRECIS. It has been suggested that it might be used in the development of the index to the nineteenth edition.
of the Dewey Decimal Classification; the feasibility of this has been given a preliminary check, and it appears that no decision can be made without a more detailed study.

I feel that the Dewey classifier in Great Britain who has not had a great deal of experience in classification is hampered to some extent because he may have a tendency to classify by PRECIS rather than to adjust PRECIS to the work in hand. Of course if the string is well constructed there is no serious problem.

The benefits that accrue to the Dewey Decimal Classification and to the Forest Press as a result of this visit will be intangible but, it is hoped, substantial: closer coordination between the two central Dewey services (including greater acceptability and understanding of mutual criticism), producing better and more consistent classification guidance to the thousands of libraries throughout the world that use Dewey and consider it a basic library standard; promotion among British librarians of a better understanding of American classification philosophy; improvement of future editions of Dewey; maintenance of Anglo-American good will; and reassurance to the British of American concern for their needs. In October, between my visit and Trotter's return visit, Benjamin A. Custer and Forest Press officials John A. Humphry and Richard B. Sealock went to Britain to participate in three public meetings which were arranged under the guidance of Joel C. Downing and held in different parts of the country with librarians who were invited to discuss Dewey 18—its good and not so good features. Such intercommunication can hardly fail to signal the existence of this good will and this concern.

It was determined that each participant's stay would be six weeks in duration and that each would live for successive two-week periods with three different staff families. This served as a good introduction to both the local library profession and the culture of the community. On all occasions the hospitality of the BNB staff was not only cordial but most helpful. It has been a privilege for me to have had the opportunity of making a small contribution to Anglo-American library understanding.
Application of the Dewey Decimal Classification at the Library of Congress

ROBERT ROSS TROTTER
Dewey Section
British National Bibliography
London

The application of the Dewey Decimal Classification at the Library of Congress and the editorial procedure carried out in preparing a new edition of the classification are described by the head of the Dewey Section of the British National Bibliography. Classifiers in the Decimal Classification Division have only a shelflist to guide them in placing like books together. On the other hand, they can read between the lines of the classification by means of access to the minds of the editors. The editors themselves must walk a tightrope between the changing demands of knowledge and the need to preserve continuity.

DURING THE FALL OF 1972, as part of an exchange with the British National Bibliography, I spent six weeks working in the Decimal Classification Division of the Library of Congress (LC). It is my hope that this personal account of the division's methods of operation will be of interest as reflecting the views of a visitor and prove of interest to all who use the Dewey numbers on Library of Congress cards.

Dewey numbers have been added to LC data passing through the library since 1930. The beginnings were small—a staff of only three was provided at that time. Today the division processes about 80,000 to 90,000 books a year—still only about 40 percent of the total processing workload of the library. The division is financed from the appropriation made to the Library of Congress by Congress itself, and there is also an agreement with Forest Press, the publishers of the Dewey Decimal Classification, renewable for each new edition, whereby the press grants money to the Decimal Classification Division for development work.

It is important to remember that the chief of the division, Benjamin A. Custer, holds two offices—in addition to being chief, he is also the editor of the classification. This arrangement dates from 1954; before
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that time, although the Dewey classification was applied to books at LC, the editorial work was completely separate. The major assistants of the division are the assistant editor, Margaret J. Warren (whose only concern is editorial work), and the assistant chief, Edna E. Van Syoc (whose only concern is classification in practice). The other professional members of the division are classifiers who to some extent combine the two functions, in that they suggest areas which need editorial inspection through problems which occur in day-to-day work, and sometimes may be called in as subject specialists to help develop or update a schedule. The other three members of the division, the editorial assistants, may call attention to problems in classification when they are editing draft schedules.

Obviously this is a very helpful arrangement—to have the theoretical and practical sides of Dewey in the same hands—yet it will exist only so long as the Library of Congress allocates funds for including Dewey numbers on its cards and is not, therefore, an immutable arrangement. At the same time, there may be disadvantages. First, the classifiers in the division have constant access to the editors, can consult them for assistance in interpretation of the schedules, and determine their thinking in the construction of parts of the classification. In other words, they are able to read between the lines of the text. Well and good, but what was in the editors' minds is not always the most obvious interpretation of the schedules as they appear, and is thus likely to lead to discrepancies between Decimal Classification Division practice and the usage of other libraries which do not have the editors' minds "on tap." Also, a completely objective outsider's view of the text might spot errors which those too intimately involved in its creation have missed. Second, the inhibiting factors imposed by Forest Press on relocation and change generally in the scheme (only a limited number of relocations have been allowed per edition) seem to make their presence felt in a general tendency to preserve the status quo until it becomes absolutely untenable. This same interaction between day-to-day classifying and editorial work is shown in an increased readiness to make minor, niggling changes but a reluctance to face up to larger, more far-reaching alterations.*

For the first two weeks of my stay I worked with various members of the staff, both classifying and revising books in various subject fields. I was impressed by the skill and clarity of thought displayed by them all. The classifiers are divided into "subject specialists," although it is obvious that with only nine staff each has to "specialize" in quite a number of different areas. Thus, one person is responsible for the 100s and 200s, another for the 700s and 800s, and so on. Some deal with very disparate areas—for instance, one classifier is interested in, and so classifies in, both chemistry and music; and others work on any section of the classifi-

* Happily, in the year since this article was written, there has been a general loosening of the constraints that have governed revision of the classification and the process of change has been simplified.
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cation as needed. When the books reach the division, they are sorted by LC class numbers (already assigned) and then given to a Dewey classifier who specializes in the subject represented by that LC number. This division of classifiers into subject specialists does, of course, contain both strengths and weaknesses—on the one hand the specialists are able to delve more deeply into, and to acquire greater knowledge in, their own fields, but on the other hand they are apt to see all material in the light of their special fields and thus may not consider a better location elsewhere. This is accentuated by the primary division of books by LC class numbers—that scheme's disciplines are often different from Dewey's, and LC classifying is not 100 percent correct in any case. It is significant that I found the best classifiers in the division to be those who have the broadest subject base to cover—to my mind a powerful indication that classifiers should be trained as "general knowledge specialists."

The method of operation in the division is very straightforward. The books are sorted by LC class number and passed to the respective classifiers. They are graded by priority of urgency. Priority one is Cataloging in Publication (CIP) works which are processed from proofs and galleys. The data given on these may be inadequate for complete classing, and it seems unfortunate that later when the finished book is received by the library it is not returned to the division for checking. Priority two is American publications. All titles in these two categories must be handled. Priorities three to seven are processed as time allows (most British books fall in Priority three). However, the division makes an attempt to class all books that will appear on the LC-MARC tapes. Every work, except for those in the CIP process, has an accompanying manuscript card, which by the time the book reaches the division already bears a full typed catalog entry, together with the LC class number and subject headings. The DC number is added, and the book moves on for processing and admission to the library stock while the manuscript card goes to the Card Division for printing. Also with the book are several three-by-five typewritten in-house cards, known from their color as "buff cards." These can be removed by the various sections for filing in their own records. Depending on the experience of the classifier, his work is either passed directly out of the division or goes to a reviser for a check on accuracy. Difficulties in classing will be taken to a reviser, who may then refer the problem up to the assistant chief, who may in turn discuss it with the chief. Problems in interpretation and improvements for the schedules may be passed to the editors. Apart from reference books, the main source of information used by the classifiers is the "shelflist." This is in three parts: (1) a file arranged in Dewey number order of all books classed under the sixteenth and seventeenth editions (this file contains printed LC cards); and (2) a file arranged in Dewey number order of books classed by the present edition (these are on buff cards and contain no record of the LC class number or subject headings unless they are added by the classifier); and (3) an authority file of names in alphabetic order, showing the class numbers of biographies, literary works,
critical studies, etc., of that person (a card is made for this file every time a new name is added). The usefulness of the shelflist could be increased. Often the title in itself gives no indication of why a book has been given a particular class number, and the classifiers rarely add any subject analysis to the card in the file. A brief note of authorities used to reach a decision would also be valuable. Likewise, as there is no record in Dewey number order which has a subject index, it is difficult to appreciate how cards are building up in certain areas, how some subjects are being collocated, and, more serious, how like subjects are being scattered. The classifiers have only the annotations in their texts, and their experience, to lead to consistent placing of material—the shelflist, with no subject index, is no help to them in this regard.

During my stay at the Library of Congress, I also had the opportunity of doing some editorial work on Dewey 19. This is truly the other side of the coin. Such an experience provides an understanding of the difficulty of the editors' assignment which can be obtained in no other way. The editors of Dewey must walk the tightrope of eternal compromise between the ever-changing demands of modern knowledge for more and different numbers on one side and the need to preserve integrity of numbers and continuity on the other. In a way, the Editorial Policy Committee of the Dewey Decimal Classification and the officers of the Forest Press somewhat hamstrung the editors in severely limiting the number of relocations in each edition. The intention behind this is laudable—to still the constant criticism of the need to reclassify as each edition of Dewey appears—but in editorial practice it becomes most frustrating. On examining a given schedule, one sees the need for changes, all of which seem to be necessary; but if the entire text was treated thus exhaustively it would result in several thousand relocations. As a result, only the major and glaring inaccuracies have a chance of correction. Whether this is good or bad depends entirely on your being conservative or progressive. The earlier limitation imposed by Forest Press on the editors had a further unfortunate effect in that it tended to discourage attempts at improving the classification and led to a feeling of frustration. It is to be hoped that, with the editors given a freer hand, a more positive approach will result, which will surely lead to a strengthening of the basic philosophies of the scheme.

The methodology of editorial work is basically straightforward. The usual need is for an updating and general “spring cleaning” of a part of the text. During my visit I performed this task on 020 “Library Science” and 640 “Domestic Economy.” The first task is to study the shelflist, noting unused numbers which may be discontinued, and overused numbers. In the latter case one then examines the topics which have been given standing room, and attempts to determine what principles of division could be used to develop the number. (The term “standing room” means that the topic has no specific number and therefore must be classed at a more general place and left standing there until the schedule is reexamined to determine what further division is needed. An
example in Dewey 18 is 355.422 “General tactics,” which includes examples of several specific kinds of tactics which have been given standing room in that number. If examination of the shelflist reveals that there are at least twenty books in the number for “General tactics” that are on specific tactics, e.g., skirmishing, commando, infiltration, etc., that number is ripe for expansion.) At the same time, the existing schedule is examined for cross classification, dual provision, vagueness of headings or numbers, and similar matters. Reference books may be consulted and current literature perused in order to try to anticipate where new numbers may be necessary. This data is then worked into a preliminary draft which is examined by the editors. After their approval it goes forward to the Editorial Policy Committee and Forest Press for their consideration. A note must be kept of all relocations and the priority of desirability assigned to them, and of all discontinued numbers. Another note is made upon any new use of the 04 “General special” concept. It is inevitable that much of the editorial work is retrospective in character—it is far easier to see what material has built up and then rectify the existing situation than it is to anticipate the future needs of classifiers. Great tribute should be paid to the work of the two editors, who perform this task virtually unaided.

While updating is the normal course of work on the schedules, occasionally the existing structure becomes totally unsuitable for the classification of present-day material. In such a case phoenix treatment may be needed. I did not have the opportunity to work on a complete phoenix schedule, but I was able to observe the progress made towards one in the work of Gregory R. New on the life sciences. A phoenix schedule always involves some extensive surgery on the existing text and so takes far longer to prepare than a routine updating. In this case the schedule will go through many drafts before reaching its final form—it must be thoroughly researched, it must provide adequately for both existing and anticipated material, and it must be thoroughly tested in practice by members of the division. Only then will it be forwarded to the Editorial Policy Committee. At the time of my visit, the life sciences phoenix had only reached a rough preliminary draft, a mere mapping out of suggested ideas, and needed months more to reach a conclusion. In all these operations the Decimal Classification Division is constantly striving to make each successive edition of Dewey more relevant to present-day needs, and to the needs of its users the world over.
The Phoenix Schedule 510 in Dewey 18

BARBARA K. SCHAEFER
Special Projects Officer
Rochester Regional Research Library Council
Rochester, New York

Claims that the 510 schedule of the Dewey Decimal Classification has been completely revised in the eighteenth edition and now reflects modern mathematical concepts, based on literary warrant, are tested by: (1) comparing Dewey 18 and Dewey 17, and (2) comparing Dewey 18 and the classification scheme of the American Mathematical Society. Dewey 18 is found to be an improvement over Dewey 17, both in content and structure, but it still is inadequate for classifying contemporary mathematical literature.

The Eighteenth Edition of the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) contains two so-called “phoenix” schedules: 340 Law and 510 Mathematics. A phoenix schedule is defined in DDC as

a completely new development of the schedule for a specific discipline. Except by chance, only the basic number for the discipline remains the same as in previous editions, all other numbers being freely reused.

The traditional Dewey policy of “integrity of numbers” has been suspended in revising these schedules in favor of the principle of “keeping pace with new knowledge.”

If a classification scheme is to retain its usefulness, it obviously must be revised periodically to reflect new developments or changed concepts of knowledge. Often this can be accomplished simply by the expansion or relocation of existing subjects. However, the subject matter of a field may sometimes undergo major transformation or reorganization that cannot be accommodated by additions and relocations alone. Furthermore, after years of revisions employing such devices, irregularities may develop in the basic structure of a scheme. It was for these reasons that the editors of the eighteenth edition of DDC undertook the seemingly drastic measure of creating the phoenix schedules.

Reviews in library journals have praised the revised mathematics schedule for achieving the goal of keeping pace with new knowledge.
and for correcting the irregularities that have developed over the years in the hierarchical structure of both the classification and the notation. It has been claimed that 510 now reflects modern mathematical concepts, with up-to-date terminology, based on literary warrant.

Three mathematicians, however, disagree with the librarians’ evaluation of DDC 18, asserting that the revision is so unsatisfactory that mathematicians should discourage libraries from adopting it.

Are structural improvements in DDC 18 of such importance to libraries that they have chosen to overlook some mathematical anomalies? Or are mathematicians so concerned with specific mathematical discrepancies that they have failed to appreciate general improvements in the structure? A point that both librarians and mathematicians may have overlooked is that a classification for research materials may be quite different from one for books. Whatever the case may be, the battle lines between the two groups appear to have been drawn, and further verbal missiles can be expected.

The purpose of this paper is to examine the 510 phoenix schedule to see if it reflects modern mathematical concepts, as the librarians claim, or if DDC 18 is merely DDC 17 “with all the sections shuffled around,” as the mathematicians claim.

Before beginning the examination, a few remarks concerning the nature of mathematics may be useful.

The Nature of Mathematics

Mathematics, like other disciplines, has its “fashions.” At different periods in time, different branches of mathematics receive more emphasis than others. In the nineteenth century, for example, geometry was a very active field, whereas today, only a small number of mathematicians are working in that area. The latest volume of Mathematical Reviews, the major abstracting and reviewing journal of mathematics, devotes only three sections to geometry, while algebra and analysis are assigned thirteen and seventeen sections, respectively.

Another characteristic of mathematics is that in recent years the boundaries between the traditional branches of mathematics have become less precise than they used to be. This blurring of borderlines has created new “hybrids” that cannot be accommodated within a classification organized solely around the traditional subdivisions of algebra, arithmetic, and geometry. New categories, coequal with the other categories, must be created for them. A case in point is topology, which originally grew out of geometry, but uses algebraic and analytic methods as well, and in this century has developed into a separate branch of mathematics.

Furthermore, mathematical research in the twentieth century has become more preoccupied with mathematics per se and less concerned with other parts of science. The tendency for core, or “pure,” mathematics as a whole to move away from its traditional relationship with physics is one illustration of this development. From being merely a tool for
other sciences to exploit—"the language of science"—mathematics has become a science in its own right.\(^9\)

Paradoxically, as mathematics has become more abstract, research in pure mathematics is providing more and more of the methodological and conceptual tools required by modern science. The current penetration of mathematical methods into not only science and technology, but also the worlds of government, industry, and business, amounts to a virtual "mathematization of culture."\(^{10}\)

These internal and external forces affecting mathematics are, of course, reflected in the literature of the discipline. The literature eventually affects libraries, which must provide for its bibliographic control.

There is considerable evidence that library systems for the bibliographic control of the literature of mathematics have been inadequate. Both the Library of Congress and the Dewey classifications have been criticized for failing to keep pace with the changing nature of mathematics.\(^{11,12}\) The reason for this failure is that both schemes are based upon the structure of the mathematics of the nineteenth century. Successive revisions of Dewey have attempted to provide for new topics and changing emphases, while retaining the structure of the original 1876 edition. The futility of this approach finally resulted in the complete restructuring of the mathematics schedule in the eighteenth edition. It has been long awaited and is long overdue.

**Method of Analysis**

One method of evaluating a given system is to measure it against an ideal, or absolute, standard. In this case, the revised 510 schedule of DDC 18 is the system to be evaluated and the standard used is the latest (1970) edition of the subject classification scheme of the American Mathematical Society (AMS), used to classify papers in *Mathematical Reviews* and other publications of the society.\(^{13}\) Because this scheme has been developed by practicing mathematicians and is frequently revised on the basis of literary warrant, it is the most accurate reflection of contemporary mathematics. The degree of similarity between DDC 18 and the AMS scheme should suggest how well Dewey reflects modern mathematical concepts, based on literary warrant.

The discussion here is arranged in two parts: (1) comparison of the general structure of the 510 division of DDC and the general structure of the AMS scheme, and (2) comparison of individual sections of the 510 division of DDC and corresponding sections of AMS scheme. Within each of these two parts the following pattern is observed: (1) comparison of DDC 18 and DDC 17 to determine changes in the new edition, and (2) comparison of DDC 18 and AMS scheme to determine if the changes have been made in accordance with contemporary mathematical concepts and based on literary warrant.

This procedure is an adaptation of methodology previously developed by the author for an unpublished study of the Library of Congress and AMS schemes.\(^{14}\)
**General Structure of DDC and AMS Scheme**

Basic structural changes in DDC 18 are immediately apparent by comparing what is called the "Third Summary," or the "Sections," of the 510 division with those of DDC 17. Only two of the nine sections, 512 Algebra and 519 Probabilities, have the same meaning in the two editions. The topic Arithmetic has been retained, but relocated from section 511 to 513. Geometry has been assigned one section (516) in DDC 18, instead of the four sections (513–516) it occupied in the previous edition. Calculus, which was 517 in the old edition, has been subsumed under the new section Analysis in DDC 18. 515 Analysis, as well as 514 Topology, and 511 Generalities are all new to DDC 18 and will be discussed later in this paper.

These changes may be seen more clearly by referring to Figure 1, which lists the numbers of the 510 sections and their meanings in the two editions.

**Figure 1**

Sections of the 510 Division in DDC 18 and DDC 17

The 1970 AMS classification consists of sixty-three classes, each of which is divided into several specific subclasses. The notation employs a two-digit number for a main class, which is then followed by a letter and a two-digit number for a subclass, e.g., 10C05 is the notation for Quadratic Forms, which is a subdivision of the class Number Theory (10).

Neither the classification nor the notation of the AMS scheme is hierarchical beyond the first subdivision of classes. However, the main classes may be grouped into larger categories that correspond to the sections of DDC. Despite the lack of notation and titles, these categories are implicit in the assignment of numbers to the classes. For example, all the classes numbered consecutively from 05 to 22 fall into the category of Algebra; no classes outside this range of numbers include algebraic topics.

The fifty-nine classes are found to fall into eight major categories. Titles and notation have been assigned to aid in discussing the categories, e.g., III.10C05 is the notation for the category Algebra (III), the
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class Number Theory (10), and the subclass Quadratic Forms (C05).

Figure 2 presents an outline of 510 in DDC 18 and the AMS scheme, listing the sections of the 510 division of DDC 18 and the corresponding categories of the AMS scheme with the inclusive numbers of the classes in each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DDC 18</th>
<th>AMS Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>510 Mathematics [General]</td>
<td>I (00-01) General [Mathematics]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511 Generalities</td>
<td>II (02-04) Logic and Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III (05-22) Algebra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512 Algebra</td>
<td>VI (54-57) Topology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513 Arithmetic</td>
<td>IV (26-49) Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514 Topology</td>
<td>V (50-53) Geometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515 Analysis</td>
<td>VII (60-62) Probability and Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516 Geometry</td>
<td>VIII (65-94) Applied Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519 Probabilities and Applied Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2

Outline of DDC 18 and AMS Scheme

The similarity in overall structure of the two schemes would seem to indicate that the AMS scheme served as the model for the revision of the DDC schedule. The same divisions of mathematics appear in both classifications, although the sequences differ slightly. Two major exceptions to this agreement between the two schedules may be noted: (1) the provision of a separate section (513) for arithmetic in DDC, with no comparable class in the AMS scheme, and (2) the more extensive provision for applied mathematics in the AMS scheme. These differences may be explained in terms of the different purposes of the two schemes. The AMS scheme, designed primarily as a classification to organize the results of research in mathematics, does not require a separate category for such an elementary topic as arithmetic, and, as a special scheme, requires a larger separate category for mathematics applied to other subjects, in order to separate pure and applied mathematics. DDC 18, as a general scheme, classes most applied mathematics with the subjects concerned, in other parts of the schedules. One section is sufficient to provide for Probabilities and the few applied mathematics topics that are classed in 510.

The sections of the 510 division of DDC 18 may be considered in three groups: (1) sections that are unchanged in DDC 18 (512 and 519), (2) sections that have been relocated in DDC 18 (513 and 516), and (3) sections that are new in DDC 18 (511, 514, and 515). They will be discussed in that order, under each first comparing DDC 18 with DDC 17 and then comparing DDC 18 with the AMS scheme.

512 Algebra

Although the heading assigned to 512 Algebra in DDC 18 remains the
same, the contents of this section have been extensively revised. DDC 17, in effect, organizes the Algebra section according to “old algebra” and “modern algebra.” 512.1 to 512.7 are assigned to specific algebraic elements, such as equations and exponents. Only one number, 512.8 Abstract Algebra (i.e., modern algebra), is provided for algebraic topics, such as number theory and group theory. DDC 18, on the other hand, is organized primarily on the basis of algebraic topics, with one number, 512.9 Pedagogical Algebra, provided for specific algebraic elements and other elementary topics. The number 512.1, Algebra Combined with Other Branches of Mathematics, illustrates a concept used in several sections of 510 to provide for the classification of materials that deal with two branches of mathematics which cannot properly be classed in either one of the branches.

The AMS scheme, unlike Dewey, is not constrained by hierarchical classification or notation. New classes and new notation symbols can be and are assigned whenever there is sufficient literature to warrant such action. The Algebra section of the AMS scheme, which had only four classes as recently as 1950, now has thirteen classes with a distinct notation for each class. Because of its decimal notation, DDC is limited to ten numbers for main classes and expansion of a number implies a subdivision of the class.

On the other hand, AMS has the freedom to eliminate old classes and old notation symbols if there is insufficient literature. Since the AMS scheme is a bibliographic classification, it need not be concerned with problems of reclassification and relocation that must be considered in a book classification such as DDC.

Although the same topics appear in the Algebra sections of the two schemes, the methods of arranging these topics differ. For example, the topics classed in one number, 512.2 Groups, and its subdivisions in DDC 18 are classed in five different classes and their subdivisions in the AMS scheme. This same example illustrates another difference in the way the two schemes arrange topics. DDC 18 assigns another number, 512.4, to the topic Rings, but the AMS scheme collocates Rings with Groups in three of the five classes mentioned above. To repeat, although the same topics appear in the Algebra sections of DDC 18 and the AMS scheme, the theories of categorization of the two schemes are quite different.

The AMS classes for Algebra (05–22) may be found in the outline of the AMS classes in Appendix I of this paper. Comparison of DDC 18 and AMS categorization methods may be seen in Appendix II, which presents an outline of the topics in DDC 18 and the locations of the corresponding topics in the AMS scheme.

519 Probabilities and Applied Mathematics

Section 519 in DDC 18 is still assigned to the topic Probabilities but has been expanded to include topics in applied mathematics other than statistics. In addition to new topics, revisions in this section include rear-
rangement of old topics within 519, relocation of old topics to other
classes of the schedules, expansion of old topics, and assignment of new
meanings to all the numbers. DDC 17 is essentially divided into two
parts: 519.1 Probabilities and 519.6-519.9 Statistical Calculations, with
topics such as Programming and Information Theory classed as subdivi-
sions of the latter part. DDC 18 not only provides a more balanced treat-
ment of topics in applied mathematics, but also restores the hierarchical
structure of the 519 section. Probabilities, Statistical Mathematics, Pro-
gramming, and the new topics Game Theory and Applied Numerical
Analysis are now assigned one subsection each, making them coordinate
within the 519 section. Information Theory, classed in both Statistical
Calculations and Communication in DDC 17, is located only in Communica-
tion (001.539) in DDC 18.

As noted earlier, the AMS scheme provides two sections for the topics
found in section 519 of DDC 18: VII Probability and Statistics, and
VIII Applied Mathematics. All of the topics located in 519 are found
in VII and VIII, but not all of the topics located in these two sections
of the AMS scheme are found in the Mathematics schedule of DDC 18.
This is explained by the fact that the two schemes differ with regard to
the universe of classification. DDC is a general classification scheme,
whose universe is all branches of knowledge, whereas the AMS scheme
is a special scheme concerned with only one branch—mathematics. Be-
cause DDC is arranged by major disciplines, various aspects of a subject
are generally not grouped together, but are classed with pertinent disci-
plines. For example, a work on hydrodynamics can be classed in four
places. If rigorously theoretical and mathematically expressed, it is
classed in Mathematics; if experimental or descriptive in nature, in
Physics; if concerned with general engineering applications, in Civil En-
gineering; if concerned with hydrodynamics applied only to the hydrau-
lics of waterworks, in Hydraulic Engineering. The universe of classifica-
tion of the AMS scheme is limited to mathematics; all other disciplines
are peripheral to mathematics. In this scheme, various aspects of a sub-
ject are considered only in terms of whether they are pure or applied
mathematics. Nonmathematical aspects of a subject need not be consid-
ered at all. Again, using the example of hydrodynamics, a work dealing
with this subject, involving the use of partial differential equations,
would be classed in Applied Mathematics; a work dealing with partial
differential equations per se, would, of course, be classed under Analysis
in the pure mathematics section; experimental and engineering aspects
of hydrodynamics, not involving rigorous mathematics, are outside the
scope of the AMS scheme.

513 Arithmetic

Arithmetic has been relocated from 511 to 513, leaving the former
number free for one of the new sections, Generalities. Arithmetic in
DDC 18 is characterized not so much by a change in the topics it encom-
passes, as by a rearrangement of the topics. The hierarchical structure
of the section has been improved by combining Factoring, Fractions, etc., under the general heading of Arithmetic Operations. In DDC 17 they are separate subsections coordinate with such topics as Numeration Systems and Business Arithmetic. One interesting addition to this section is 513.1 Arithmetic Combined with Other Branches of Mathematics.

As previously noted, the AMS scheme does not have a separate section for Arithmetic. Arithmetic tools and techniques are classed in other sections of the schedule, with the branches of mathematics that utilize them.

516 Geometry

The Geometry section of DDC 18 is significant for two reasons. First, it represents an improvement in terms of the basic structure of DDC. DDC 17 violates the hierarchy of both classification and notation by using four sections for one branch of mathematics. Secondly, DDC 18 includes topics, such as Affine Geometry, not found in the older edition. By drawing all geometries into one section, adding new topics, discarding obsolete terms (e.g., Synthetic Geometry), reassigning priorities to older topics (e.g., Trigonometry is no longer a separate section, but a subdivision of Euclidean Geometry), and relocating some topics to more appropriate sections (e.g., Abstract Algebraic Geometry is now in 512 Algebra), DDC 18 provides a better classification for Geometry than does DDC 17.

The AMS Geometry section consists of three classes: 50 Geometry, 52 Convex Sets and Geometric Inequalities, and 53 Differential Geometry. The first class includes such topics as Foundations of Geometry, Euclidean Geometry, Affine Geometry, Projective Geometry, Non-Euclidean Geometry, and Special Geometries. In other words, almost all of the topics found in the entire 516 section of DDC 18 are placed in this one class in the AMS scheme. The other two AMS classes are subdivisions of modern geometry that are now considered separate fields of study. In DDC 18, they are classed as subdivisions of the subsection Analytic Geometries (516.3).

Comparison of DDC 18 and the AMS scheme shows clearly that the emphasis in DDC 18 is still on classical, rather than modern, geometry. While DDC 18 is a vast improvement over DDC 17, it cannot be said to reflect contemporary concepts in this branch of mathematics.

511 Generalities

511 in DDC 18 has been assigned to a new section entitled Generalities, which is intended to provide for topics of general application. In DDC 17 and earlier editions such topics were classed in specific branches of mathematics, whether they had specific application or not. Many of the topics in 511 are found in the section of the AMS scheme designated here Logic and Foundations (II). Boolean Algebra, Sets, and Mathematical Models are a few examples. Many more of the topics in 511, however, are classed with specific branches of mathematics in the AMS
scheme. For example: 511.33, a subdivision of Mathematical Logic, includes Lattices and Ordered Systems, topics classed in the Algebra (111) section of the AMS scheme; 511.4 Approximations and Expansions is in Analysis (IV); 511.5 Graph Theory and 511.6 Combinatorial Analysis are found together in a single class (03) in section III; and 511.7 Numerical Analysis is a class in the Applied Mathematics section (VIII) of the AMS scheme.

DDC 18 seems to have overcompensated for the errors of earlier editions, with respect to classing generalities in specific branches of mathematics. Granted, a note in the schedule gives instructions to class generalities applied to a specific branch of mathematics with the branch, e.g., arithmetic approximation in 513.24. However, the inclusion in this section of the topics mentioned above is puzzling and at variance with current mathematical classificatory practices.

514 Topology

514, assigned to Trigonometry in DDC 17, has been assigned to Topology in DDC 18. Topology, formerly known as Analysis Situs, appears in only one place in DDC 17, as a subdivision of Non-Euclidean Geometry. This is historically correct, since Topology was an outgrowth of Geometry. In the twentieth century, however, it has developed into a separate mathematical discipline, consisting of three main divisions: (1) general topology, (2) algebraic topology, and (3) differential topology. Section 514 of DDC 18 is organized according to these divisions of topology: 514.3 is Topology of Spaces (i.e., general topology), 514.2 is Algebraic Topology, and 514.7 is Analytic Topologies (i.e., differential topology). In Section VI of the AMS scheme, 54 is General Topology, 55 is Algebraic Topology, and topics in differential topology are classed in both 57 Manifolds and Cell Complexes and 58 Global Analysis, Analysis on Manifolds. While the classification of differential topology is not as detailed in DDC 18 as in the AMS scheme, it would appear that the basic structure of this new 514 section can accommodate modern topological topics.

515 Analysis

The treatment of analysis in DDC is a good illustration of what happens when a classification schedule is poorly constructed initially, and subsequent editions compound the error by inserting new topics into inappropriate categories. The original edition of DDC may be considered poorly constructed with respect to analysis, since it was not framed in relation to the literature of the time. The heading used in all editions of DDC until the eighteenth is not Analysis, but Calculus. The number has been changed, too: from 517 in earlier editions to 515 in DDC 18. Analysis is not a new branch of mathematics, having originated in the seventeenth century. While it is true that analysis began with the invention of differential and integral calculus, other branches of analysis, such as infinite series and functions of a complex variable, had developed by the
time DDC was first devised. By using Calculus as the title of this section of the 510 division and then subdividing it by Kinds (Differential and Integral) and Branches (Functional Analysis, Functions of Complex Variables, etc.), Dewey not only misrepresented the structure of this branch of mathematics, but also violated the hierarchical structure of his scheme.

DDC 18 uses Analysis as the title of this section and has revised it completely in an attempt to correct these anomalies. Calculus is now a subdivision of Analysis, notationally coordinate with other topics in this section. Centered headings of the type mentioned above have been eliminated, thereby improving the hierarchical structure of the 515 section.

The same terms are found in the Analysis sections of DDC 18 and the AMS scheme, but here the similarity ends. The two schemes differ completely in their emphases and in their methods of arranging terms within the sections. With respect to the first difference, DDC 18 may be characterized as emphasizing classical Analysis, while the AMS scheme emphasizes modern Analysis. For example, Calculus appears in the AMS scheme only as a subclass under the class Functions of Real Variables. This class, the first of seventeen in the section, contains other elementary and classical topics and might be considered the “general works” division of this section. The remaining sixteen classes are provided for individual branches of Analysis, such as Series, Fourier Analysis, and Functions of Real Variables. DDC 18, on the other hand, devotes about one-third of the available nine numbers to Calculus. 515.1 is Analysis and Calculus Combined with Other Branches of Mathematics, 515.3 is Differential Calculus and Equations, and 515.4 is Integral Calculus and Equations. Of the remaining numbers, one is assigned to Generalities, and one is assigned to Other Analytic Methods, which contains topics found in four separate classes of the AMS scheme, leaving only four numbers for individual branches of Analysis.

The subsection Generalities in DDC 18 is a good illustration of how the two schemes differ in the arrangement of terms within this section. Generalities contains five divisions: Sequences and Series, Equations and Functions, Inequalities, Properties of Functions, and Operations on Functions. The first three are branches of Analysis that are assigned individual classes in the AMS scheme. Their presence here suggests that there was no other space available for them in 515. The last two—Properties of Functions and Operations on Functions—are analytical concepts that are meaningless by themselves. For example, it is difficult to see how properties of continuity and limits of functions could be phrased except in the context of Topology, Functions of Real Variables, or Functions of Complex Variables. In the AMS scheme, such concepts are not treated in this way—in isolation, as it were—but in the context of specific application with a subject.

Since DDC, unlike the AMS scheme, is a general scheme and used to classify all levels of mathematics, the provisions for elementary and classical topics are justified. In the Algebra section such topics were pro-
vided for by using the number 512.9 Pedagogical Algebra. One wonders why this device could not have been used in Analysis also.

**Conclusion**

A comparison of the Mathematics schedules of DDC 17 and DDC 18 reveals an extensive revision in DDC 18, representing much more than a mere reshuffling of topics. Many new topics have been added, some obsolete topics have been eliminated, and some old topics have been relocated. The result, as librarians have claimed, is a completely reorganized, expanded edition, with better collocation of topics and overall structural improvement.

However, the claim that DDC 18 reflects modern mathematical concepts is debatable. The addition of modern topics and terminology is necessary, but not sufficient, to produce a revision based on literary warrant. The principles applied in the subdivision of major classes are found to be quite different from those applied in the AMS scheme, a scheme known to be based on literary warrant. It would appear that the mathematicians' criticism of DDC 18 in this regard is justified.

In summary, libraries should not be discouraged from adopting the new 510 schedule, since it is, in general, a much better scheme for classifying mathematics than earlier editions. They should realize, however, that DDC 18 still falls short of meeting the needs of contemporary mathematics and they should be prepared for continued criticism from the mathematical community.
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**APPENDIX 1**

Outline of the AMS Classification Scheme (1970)

I. General Mathematics
   00 General
   01 History and Biography

II. Logic and Foundations
   02 Logic and Foundations
   04 Set Theory

III. Algebra
   05 Combinatorics
   06 Order, Lattices, Ordered Algebraic Structures
   08 General Mathematical Systems
   10 Number Theory
   12 Algebraic Number Theory, Field Theory and Polynomials
   13 Commutative Rings and Algebras
   14 Algebraic Geometry
   15 Linear and Multilinear Algebra; Matrix Theory
   16 Associative Rings and Algebras
   17 Nonassociative Rings and Algebras
   18 Category Theory, Homological Algebra
   20 Group Theory and Generalizations
   22 Topological Groups, Lie Theory

IV. Analysis
   26 Real Functions
   28 Measure and Integration
   30 Functions of a Complex Variable
   31 Potential Theory
   32 Several Complex Variables and Analytical Spaces
   33 Special Functions
   34 Ordinary Differential Equations
   35 Partial Differential Equations
   39 Finite Differences and Functional Equations
   40 Sequences, Series, Summability
   41 Approximations and Expansions
   42 Fourier Analysis
   43 Abstract Harmonic Analysis
   44 Integral Transforms, Operational Calculus
   45 Integral Equations
   46 Functional Analysis
   47 Operator Theory
   49 Calculus of Variations and Optimal Control

V. Geometry
   50 Geometry
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>52</th>
<th>Convex Sets and Geometric Inequalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Differential Geometry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VI. Topology**
- 54 General Topology
- 55 Algebraic Topology
- 57 Manifolds and Cell Complexes
- 58 Global Analysis, Analysis on Manifolds

**VII. Probability and Statistics**
- 60 Probability Theory and Stochastic Processes
- 62 Statistics

**VIII. Applied Mathematics**
- 65 Numerical Analysis
- 68 Computer Science
- 70 Mechanics of Particles and Systems
- 73 Mechanics of Solids
- 76 Fluid Mechanics
- 78 Optics, Electromagnetic Theory
- 80 Classical Thermodynamics, Heat Transfer
- 81 Quantum Mechanics
- 82 Statistical Physics, Structure of Matter
- 83 Relativity
- 85 Astronomy and Astrophysics
- 86 Geophysics
- 90 Economics, Operations Research, Programming, Games
- 92 Biology and Behavioral Sciences
- 93 Systems, Control
- 94 Information and Communication, Circuits, Automata
- 96 Mathematical Education, Elementary
- 97 Mathematical Education, Secondary
- 98 Mathematical Education, Collegiate

**APPENDIX 2**

Outline of 510 and Locations of Corresponding AMS Scheme Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>510 Mathematics</th>
<th>DDG 18</th>
<th>AMS Scheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[standard subdivisions]</td>
<td></td>
<td>I General Mathematics [00-01]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>511 Generalities</th>
<th></th>
<th>II Logic and Foundations [02-04]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.2 Inductive and Intuitive Mathematics</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3 Symbolic Logic</td>
<td>02, 04, 06 [III]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4 Approximations and Expansions</td>
<td>41 [IV]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5 Theory and Construction Graphs</td>
<td>05 [III]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6 Combinatorial Analysis</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7 Numerical Analysis</td>
<td>65 [VIII]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8 Mathematical Models</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>512 Algebra</th>
<th></th>
<th>III Algebra [05-22]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.1 Algebra Combined with Other Branches of Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2 Groups</td>
<td>13, 16, 17, 20, 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3 Fields</td>
<td>12, 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.4 Rings, Integral Domains, Ideals</td>
<td>13, 16, 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.5 Linear, Multilinear, Multidimensional Algebras</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.7 Number Theory</td>
<td>04 [II], 06, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.9 Pedagogical Algebra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TECHNICAL SERVICES TIME AND COSTS

The Technical Services Costs Committee of the Resources and Technical Services Division is seeking to update the bibliography by Mary Tesovnik and Florence DeHart "Unpublished Studies of Technical Service Time and Costs: A Selected Bibliography" [Library Resources & Technical Services 14:56-67 (Winter 1970)]. Citations and/or copies of pertinent literature are requested to be sent to: Martha W. West, Associate Professor, Department of Librarianship, San Jose State University, San Jose, CA 95192.

---

**Volume 19, Number 1, Winter 1975**

1. **Arithmetic**
   - Topology
     - Algebraic Topology
     - Topology of Spaces
     - Analytic Topologies
   - Analysis
     - Analysis and Calculus Combined with Other Branches
     - Generalities
     - Differential Calculus and Equations
     - Integral Calculus and Equations
     - Special Functions
     - Other Analytic Methods
     - Functional Analysis
     - Functions of Real Variables
     - Functions of Complex Variables
   - Geometry
     - Generalities
     - Euclidean Geometry
     - Analytic Geometries
     - Affine Geometry
     - Projective Geometry
     - Abstract Descriptive Geometry
     - Non-Euclidean Geometries
   - Probabilities and Applied Mathematics
     - Probabilities
     - Game Theory
     - Applied Numerical Analysis
     - Statistical Mathematics
     - Programming
     - Special Topics

**VI Topology [54-57]**

**IV Analysis [26-49]**

**V Geometry [50-53]**

**VII Probability and Statistics [60-62]**

**VIII Applied Mathematics [65-94]**

---

No.
---

1. Technical Services Costs Committee of the Resources and Technical Services Division is seeking to update the bibliography by Mary Tesovnik and Florence DeHart "Unpublished Studies of Technical Service Time and Costs: A Selected Bibliography" [Library Resources & Technical Services 14:56-67 (Winter 1970)]. Citations and/or copies of pertinent literature are requested to be sent to: Martha W. West, Associate Professor, Department of Librarianship, San Jose State University, San Jose, CA 95192.
Classifying Law Materials Using the Library of Congress Classification

Suzanne Tipler
Catalog Department
Oakland University
Rochester, Michigan

The unfinished K schedule for Law presents a challenge to libraries committed to the use of the Library of Congress classification. This article suggests guidelines for the classification of law materials in a small library using the published parts of the scheme and some extrapolations from them.

Librarians continue to debate which available classification scheme should be used in a law library. The Library of Congress (LC) has assigned certain books and periodicals to its K class, without having provided full classification schedules for the subject. It is this body of material, both with and without developed schedules, which are called here "law materials." Alternative published classification schemes available to law collections include the Dewey Decimal Classification and locally developed schedules, some of which use notation similar to that of the Library of Congress.1-8 Moys's classification originated in the University of Lagos and is especially constructed for a former British territory, with emphasis on British law. The schemes of the University of Chicago and Columbia University are based on legal systems rather than national divisions. Chicago's notation resembles LC format, while Columbia's does not. Schwerin's scheme, based on an earlier work of Basset, is used by the library of the American Society of International Law and others.

A major factor in this debate is the as yet incomplete K schedule of the Library of Congress classification. Portions published to date are subclass KF, preliminary edition published in 1969, subclass KD published in 1973, and a "draft outline" of the complete class, including assignment of subclasses on the basis of national geographical subdivisions, published in 1970.9-11

Manuscript received March 1972; accepted for publication April 1972; revised August 1974.
The completion of class K and a possible revision of JX will provide classification schedules for most materials in most law collections in this country, especially if K includes a comparative law section. The attractiveness of the LC classification, even in incomplete form, may be seen in the fact that at least seventy libraries have already adopted it, including the University of California at Berkeley and several other large collections.  

Many libraries are committed to following LC classification policies closely in order to realize the economies obtained by accepting centralized cataloging. If the number of books and periodicals received that fall into the K class is relatively small, and these materials are as a result not separated from the main collection, the pressure to use the existing LC schedules rather than adopting an alternative scheme on the basis of likely lower processing costs and more efficient service is increased.

The following guidelines were used in the elimination of a backlog of unclassified law materials at Oakland University, a small state university of 9,000 students with a book collection of 200,000 volumes. Soon after the publication of KF, the classification project proceeded in the following manner.

**Step 1**

All American law materials were identified and classified in KF. It proved to be a good policy to assign this job to one person, who developed proficiency through repeated use of the schedule and the one long table which is applied throughout. It is recommended that all catalogers using this schedule read Ellinger’s explanation of the basic structure of KF, its table, and LC’s policy for comparative law, namely that works comparing American law with the law of one foreign country are classed by LC with the law of the foreign country, and works comparing American law with the laws of several countries are classed with comparative law in K.

Because the foreign law sections and the comparative law sections have not yet been published, a policy contrary to the above LC policy was followed. Comparative law materials which included American law were classed with the appropriate American law class by adding a subdivision for comparative foreign law to the table in KF which provides a subdivision for comparative state law. For example, a book comparing U.S. immigration law with immigration laws of several other countries is classed in KF4801.Z99. Works of comparative law which do not include American law could be classed by subject in a class other than K. For example, a work comparing immigration laws of India and Japan might be classed in JV6045.

The next step recommended is to continue classifying by the published schedules by identifying the British law materials and applying KD, which subclass was not available at the time of the project reported here.
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Step 2

Books were identified which could be classified in classes other than K. For example, a book about divorce laws in Sweden can be classed with other books about divorce in Sweden; accounts of famous trials can be classed with history or with biography. Further, there are alternatives suggested in other classes in the schedules, e.g., HD for labor law, HG for banking law, HJ for tax law, J-JQ for constitutional law, LB for educational law, BX for canon law, and GN for primitive law.

Law libraries may be concerned about retrieving books that receive this treatment as new sections of K are published and, therefore, may choose an alternative similar to Step 3 for this material, but it should not be a serious problem in an institution with no law school. The LC scheme often separates related material, and difficult decisions about where to classify may sometimes be resolved by noting which department has requested the book. It is suggested that subsequent reclassification be done only to keep editions of a work together, unless works on the same topic become widely separated in the collection.

Law bibliographies may be classed in Z6451-6459, although LC no longer uses these numbers. Alternatively, American law bibliographies may be classed according to KF and foreign law bibliographies treated in the same manner as other foreign law material.

Step 3

Letter designations were assigned from the draft outline of class K to foreign law materials that could not be classed elsewhere. To these were added the number from KF for a similar subject. Thus, a book containing a codification of the laws of China is classed in KQK60, a work about lawyers in France prior to the fourteenth century in KJJ359, Polish law concerning the regulation of trade in KLC1600, civil rights in the Republic of South Africa in KRM4749, and a bibliography of Canadian law in KE1.

Another possible treatment of this third group is to assign the two or three letters from the summary, leave a space blank, and then use a Cutter number to arrange the works alphabetically by main entry. This is one of the alternatives suggested by Schwartz. However, the main entry or authorship of a compilation of laws is not easily determined, especially by an undergraduate or public library patron. It would be useful to have the results of a study comparing these two methods on the point of ease in use by the library staff and the library's public. Consistency in format of call numbers and subject arrangement will probably result in better service but must be balanced against the increased cost of classification. The use of closed or open stacks and quantity of foreign law materials are also factors which will influence the choice of alternatives.

There are a number of general aids available for the determination of class numbers for law materials, including Library of Congress Cat-
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Catalogers continually balance cost efficiency of processing versus service to the library’s public. The elimination of processing backlogs should be a service with high priority. The steps described above represent a relatively inexpensive way for a small library to complete the classification of its law materials and provide a shelf arrangement by subject with call numbers that are compatible with the rest of the LC scheme.
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Recognizing national and international developments which affect all our library lives and those whom we serve, RTSD is now aggressively pursuing cooperation and commitment in its areas of responsibility. Its role, necessarily reactive, must also be in active pursuit of what is about to happen. This is no mean task in this time when discovering what is going on and where, in any area of its concern, can be a protracted process.

With the new dues structure voted by the membership, ALA embarks on a new phase of federation. The full implications for any of the divisions are unknown. While RTSD expects to maintain its happy position among the larger divisions, it will, in cooperation with ALA, project its concerns and areas for participation to insure the library community's knowledge of RTSD's responsibilities and offerings. Another ongoing activity must be helping new members of the profession realize the contribution of RTSD to their present and future experiences in daily technical service philosophy and procedures. Telling its story person to person, through the Council of Regional Groups and through Library Resources & Technical Services, the division hopes to inform and be kept informed by its members to respond, react, propose, and dispose, as suits the need and situation.

The division's journal Library Resources & Technical Services, has added more timely news items and continues its excellent, pertinent articles. Wesley Simonton, editor, and his board are to be especially congratulated for “catching up” on this quality publication and getting out the “Year's Work” spring issue well before the New York Conference.

The Council of Regional Groups has continued publication of the CRG Newsletter and worked to improve communication with the various state and regional organizations. The group held a workshop in New York on recent developments at the Library of Congress in relation to Cataloging in Publication and to the Subject Cataloging Division.

New committees for current important considerations have been appointed this year. The Nonbook Committee got underway at Midwinter with acting chairman Margaret Ayrault and identified areas of primary concern: standardization of terminology, classification and subject headings, communication channels with producers and other organizations of importance in audiovisual media, and monitoring the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR) for nonprint items. Suzanne Massonneau accepted the chairmanship, and the New York Meeting considered the draft of the new Chapter 12 of the AACR including the use of media designators and ISBD(M) in that chapter, its acceptability, and the role the committee might play in furthering its adoption by libraries. Two rep-
The Association of American Publishers/RTSD Joint Committee co-sponsored a program on "Paperbacks: Acquisition, Distribution, and Use" with the Resources Section's Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee. In New York, with the Resources Section, the joint committee sponsored tours of the book industry, a high spot of the conference, ably and exhaustingly arranged by Carol Nemeyer and her committee to whom is owed grateful thanks and much praise for remarkable success.

The most recent substantive committee approved at Midwinter is the Keyboard Committee (ad hoc), Edward Johnson, chairman. Its charge is to study the need for and feasibility of one or more standard library typewriter keyboards in the light of developments in international standard bibliographic descriptions, computerized bibliography, and the work of standards organizations, especially ANSI committees, Z39 and Z85. Its first meeting was held in New York.

The Association of American Publishers/RTSD Joint Committee co-sponsored a program on "Paperbacks: Acquisition, Distribution, and Use" with the Resources Section's Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee. In New York, with the Resources Section, the joint committee sponsored tours of the book industry, a high spot of the conference, ably and exhaustingly arranged by Carol Nemeyer and her committee to whom is owed grateful thanks and much praise for remarkable success.

Proposed amendments presented by the Bylaws Committee, as published in the spring issue of Library Resources & Technical Services, were approved by the membership at the RTSD meeting. Length of committee terms of service, the definition and procedures for the formation of intersectional, interdivisional, and joint committees were included in these amendments along with changes to clarify and to bring about uniformity of language.

The joint program meeting of the Cataloging and Classification Section and the Serials Section hosted the RTSD membership meeting in a setting too warm and too cozy, but very rewarding to the faithful who heard excellent presentations on ISBD (M), by Elizabeth Tate, and the "Implications of Proposed Changes in Rules for Entry of Serials," by Joseph Howard. Reactors Judith Cannan, Robert Balay, and Philip Greene spoke for serials librarians, reference librarians, and subscription agents, respectively.

Guidelines for book catalogs, prepared by the Book Catalogs Committee, will soon be ready for publication.

Discussion of problem areas such as hyphenation, prefixes, initials and acronyms, and numerals took place at sessions of the Committee on Computer Filing in New York. The committee is coordinating its efforts with work being done in Britain.

The Preservation of Library Materials Committee with the ALA/Society of American Archivists Joint Committee presented a program on national and regional preservation programs. The committee, concerned about the rumors that acid-free papers may be discontinued by some mills, is keeping a watchful eye on the situation. Concern, too, with an update of library binding standards in the light of recent developments, has inspired the committee to begin an analysis of the problems and to obtain objective data on the present situation and access to materials, standards for microfilming, and the development of regional preservation centers, especially the New England Document Conservation Center. Tours to conservation centers in New York have also been arranged. Active commitment to disseminate accurate information on preservation programs, techniques, and standards will keep this important committee busy for some time.
"How to Figure Costs and How to Cut Costs" in technical services was the topic presented in general terms at the Technical Services Costs Committee's program meeting. The committee will continue its efforts to identify the elements and methods for determining costs specifically.

The Organization Committee's proposals, adopted by the RTSD Board of Directors at Midwinter, included the establishment of a Keyboard Committee (ad hoc) and an Organization Study Committee (ad hoc) to consider the organization of RTSD according to form rather than function. The latter's members are to be representatives from each of the sections with the chairman appointed by the RTSD president. Approved also was a revision of the composition of the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (ad hoc) so that there are five members with one vote each from ALA, Library of Congress, the Library Association (Great Britain), the British Library, and the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing. Each organization may appoint a second member as deputy with full discussion rights, but without voting rights, except in the absence of his organization's committee member. This proposal has been forwarded to the ALA Committee on Organization (COO) for approval and transmission to ALA Council. The chairman of the RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee (ad hoc), John Byrum, will serve as the ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR. The authority for code revision will remain with the RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee until the second edition of AACR is published, at which time the CCS Descriptive Cataloging Committee (DCC), now handling matters in its area not pertaining to the second edition, will resume its authority.

The Organization Committee's items approved at the New York meetings of the RTSD Board include the addition of two voting members to the CCS Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee, the transfer of the CCS DCC Subcommittee for Cataloging Machine-Readable Data Files to the RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee. A policy statement on discussion groups and the role of the Organization Committee was approved along with the proposed addition of the Bylaws Committee chairman and RTSD parliamentarian as ex-officio members of the Organization Committee. The chairman of the Council of Regional Groups will be an ex-officio member of the RTSD Conference Program Committee. Petition for the establishment of two discussion groups, Collection Development Officers of Medium-Sized Research Libraries and Technical Services Administrators of Smaller Research Libraries, was approved.

The Esther J. Piercy Award Jury, pressed for time and unable to get out appropriate publicity materials through circumstances beyond the control of the members, wisely voted not to present an award this year, but to renew all names submitted for the previous three years for consideration in 1974/75.

"RTSD Goals for Action," submitted by the Planning Committee and approved by the Board of Directors, was published in the spring 1974 issue of Library Resources & Technical Services. The committee has related the sections of the goals to appropriate units of RTSD so that progress toward achievement may be monitored. The ALA goals statement was reviewed, and the committee requested comments for preparation of the report to the ALA Council. The National Commission on Library and Information Science (NCLIS) report "A New National Program of Library and Information Service" was discussed, and the chairman forwarded the members' comments to the deputy director of NCLIS.

The RASD/RTSD/ASLA Public Documents Committee works closely with Government Documents Round Table (GODORT) and co-sponsored a pro-
gram on government machine-readable data bases. The depository library system, bibliographic control of documents, documents on microfilm, and better methods of procuring documents are constant and continuing concerns of these groups.

At Midwinter the RTSD/RASD/ISAD Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI) became the MARC advisory committee to the Library of Congress. The LC proposals adopted appeared in the Library of Congress Information Bulletin (53:A63-64 [1 March 1974]) in an article by Henriette Avram, LC liaison to MARBI. The committee continues to identify the elements of its new role and watches closely all developments and projects in its range of responsibility.

Representatives to ALA committees and to other organizations keep RTSD informed and spread the RTSD word when appropriate to the problems discussed. Fred Blum, representative to ANSI Z39 Committee on Library Work and Documentation, published "Standards Update" in the winter 1974 issue of Library Resources & Technical Services.

An observer to the Freedom to Read Foundation has been appointed to help in keeping RTSD informed of the foundation's activities and actions, and in turn to express RTSD's concerns.

Discussion groups continued active and very popular, and proved excellent as forums for exchange of ideas. Technical services administrators of large public, and small, medium-sized, and large research libraries aired problems and suggested solutions, as did technical services directors of processing centers. Concerns, too, in acquisitions, serials, and RLMS surfaced in New York.

The sections carried on responsibly their special areas of technical service. In the Cataloging and Classification Section, Ann Painter, chairman, the Descriptive Cataloging Committee has approved Chapter Six of the AACR which was available for purchase at the ALA Publishing Services booth in New York. DCC will act as a resource body to the RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee, and its Subcommittee on Rules for Cataloging Machine-Readable Data Files, now revising papers on title transcription, production, distribution, and size of file, to insure compatibility with recent changes in AACR Chapter Six, has been transferred to the RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee to facilitate coordination.

The Resources Section (RS), J. Michael Bruer, chairman, has done preliminary work on publishing arrangements and schedules for the list of book dealers in underdeveloped countries, prepared by Jennifer Magnus (Library of Congress).

Hope continues that Peter de la Garza's book on subscription agents will be released by ALA Publishing Services soon. The RS Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee co-sponsored with the AAP/RTSD Joint Committee a program in New York on "Paperbacks: Acquisitions, Distribution, and Use."

Serial guidelines are awaiting ALA publication, and guidelines on out-of-prints and microforms are in process, with hope of early completion while guidelines for paperbacks are projected. The RS Reprinting Committee's policy statement on lending to reprint and microform publishers, now in sixth draft, has been approved.


The Reproduction of Library Materials Section (RLMS), Harold G. Morehouse, chairman, has had its new Library Photoduplication Order Form approved and readied for distribution. The RLMS representative to the National Microfilm Association has been active in developing standards for quality control of negative microfilm, procedures for production of microforms, and 35mm microfilming of newspapers.

The RLMS Standards Committee is attempting to resolve differences between existing NMA, ANSI, and international standards concerning microfiche of documents. Computer output microfilm, screens, microfilming of maps, and especially the encouragement of the microform industry to respond to library needs are important concerns of this committee. The RLMS Program Committee will work more actively with NMA on education of librarians in microform technology.

Representation on the MARBI Committee has been requested by the Serials Section, Herbert Linville, chairman, as soon as MARBI moves into serials considerations. The Committee to Study Manually Maintained Serials Records (ad hoc) is preparing a questionnaire to gather information, from libraries of all types, for its state of the art report.

The Duplicates Exchange Union Committee (DEU) distributed an updated DEU directory in May.

The division and its sections have had, and continue to have, much to do. The year never ends with feelings of complete satisfaction, but steady progress can certainly be reported, thanks to untiring efforts of officers, committee chairmen, discussion group leaders, representatives, and members.

We mourn the loss of Pauline A. Seely whose personality and contributions have been so well expressed in Doralyn Hickey's memorial statement which will be published in *Library Resources & Technical Services*.

On a personal note I wish to thank all those who have done the real work this year. It has been a privilege to serve as your president, and I am grateful for the experience. I wish I might have had in-service training before the fact instead of during, so that I could have served you better.

On behalf of the division and myself, I thank Carol R. Kelm for her patience, encouragement, and quick response. It is difficult to express adequately the appreciation we owe Carol for all she does for us.

**Executive Secretary’s Report**

*Carol R. Kelm, Executive Secretary*

This has been an exceptionally busy and changing year for the RTSD office. The constant training of new secretaries to the executive secretary has made office activities less smooth than usual. The office has carried on the usual preparations for the Midwinter Meeting and the Annual Conference and provided information by telephone and letter about technical services matters and RTSD activities. I should say thank you to division and section officers and com-
committee chairmen who worked conscientiously and in a timely fashion without as much assistance from Headquarters as they should have had. The reports of the division president and the section chairmen show the variety of important activities in which RTSD and its units are engaged.

One of the major activities in which the RTSD secretariat participated during this year was the development of organizational machinery for revision of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules*. The RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee has been appointed with John Byrum of Princeton University serving as chairman. Other units in ALA and other organizations concerned about the code revision are being contacted about various levels of participation in the process. The Joint Steering Committee for Revision of *AACR* was established at a meeting on 29 March 1974 at ALA Headquarters. Representatives have been appointed to the JSCRAACR by the British Library, the Library Association (Great Britain), the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing, the Library of Congress, and American Library Association. Mr. Byrum, chairman of the RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee, will serve as the ALA representative, and Frances Hinton will be ALA’s deputy representative.

Because the new ALA personal dues structure has been changed by membership vote, RTSD is planning a membership drive in order to maintain the present membership and to recruit new members. With the membership year beginning in January 1975, division membership will not be included in the $35.00 basic ALA dues, but will cost each member $15.00 per division per year. RTSD activities continue to be of major importance to the profession, and we look forward to continued membership support for RTSD programs. With more direct control by RTSD of its financial resources, we can look forward to continued and more ambitious progress in the division’s area of concern.

For a number of years the division and section officers and committee personnel have gathered for an informal luncheon at the Midwinter Meeting. The RTSD Board has recommended that this luncheon be open to all RTSD members attending the Midwinter Meeting. Plans are being made to sell tickets to the 1975 luncheon at the Midwinter Meeting rather than by advance reservation.

**Cataloging and Classification Section Report**

*Ann F. Painter, Chairman*

There has been considerable activity in the section this year. A new Catalog Code Revision Committee has been appointed and will be chaired by John Byrum (Princeton University). The committee will no longer be a section committee, but a division committee, so that it may operate on an international basis with the British and the Canadians. The present Descriptive Cataloging Committee will act as a resource unit for the purpose of investigating specific problems. Carolyn McMillen is the new chairman of the DCC.

The text of *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules* Chapter Six (Descriptive Cataloging of Separately Published Monographs) was approved by the Descriptive Cataloging Committee at Midwinter and was published July 1974 as a revision of the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. North American Text*.

The Cataloging and Classification Section sponsored a program at New York
Conference on “ISBD(M): Background and Description” with Elizabeth Tate (chief, Descriptive Cataloging Division, Library of Congress) as speaker. Our program was followed by the Serials Section program on ISBD(S). The entire program appeared to be an overwhelming success and showed that librarians are vitally interested in the implications of international standard bibliographic descriptions and particularly how their everyday operations will be affected.

The Cataloging and Classification Section has also sponsored a series of seminars, “Indexing in Perspective,” produced by the National Federation of Abstracting and Indexing Services under the direction of Stella Keenan. E. H. Brenner (American Petroleum Institute) developed the syllabus. The three day seminars have been very popular and have been given in Washington, New York, London, and, most recently, in Toronto.

The Subject Analysis Committee has been concerned about changes in Library of Congress policy for subject headings. This question will be the subject of a program at the 1975 ALA Conference. The committee has prepared a questionnaire which is ready to be distributed and which should help determine the state-of-the-art of subject headings for correctional materials. They have also supported two statements on specific types of headings: (1) that the term “Negroes” is inadequate and should be replaced, and (2) that the Library of Congress should take corrective action on problems of sexism in subject headings.

The Policy and Research Committee has expressed concern that there is no reporting by ALA representatives to outside (non-ALA) committees and organizations. This communication is essential. Apparently this is also a division problem and will be investigated in the coming year.

The Margaret Mann Citation for 1973–74 was bestowed on Frederick Kilgour (Ohio College Library Center) for his superior service to the cataloging world.

The Cataloging of Children’s Materials Committee was strengthened by two voting members. They have been concerned primarily with the interaction of children’s cataloging with commercial cataloging firms and the effect of the Cataloging in Publication activities.

**Resources Section Report**

J. Michael Bruer, Chairman

Following recommendations of the RTSD Organization Committee, the Acquisitions Section of RTSD was reconstituted at the end of the Las Vegas Conference as the Resources Section (RS), with the following function statement:

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

The key phrase in this new function statement is the one referring to collection development, reflecting the increased attention being given to this subject by librarians in every type of library. As a result of this reorganization, the former Resources Committee of RTSD has become the Collection Development Committee of the new section. The Micropublishing Projects Committee and the Na...
tional Union Catalog Committee are now full standing committees of the Resources Section. The section also retains all previously authorized committees and has established an Acquisitions Discussion Group and a Collection Development Discussion Group to provide additional forums for exchanging information and discussing trends.

With the end of the New York Conference and the submission of this report, therefore, the Resources Section completes its first year of activity. Based on this experience, it is quite clear that the newly reorganized section is far better equipped to meet the needs of acquisitions librarians and to provide the framework within which resources problems may be resolved. Overlapping jurisdictions have been reduced, and functional responsibilities have been clarified. And most important, reorganization of the Resources Section signals a new and necessary emphasis on book selection and collection development, without sacrificing traditional concern for acquisitions procedures and book trade developments.

This new and enlarged function of the Resources Section is amply demonstrated by a review of programs presented at the New York Conference. The Collection Development Committee sponsored a paper by William McGrath on the subject of book budget allocation by formula. The Bookdealer—Library Relations Committee, in association with the Association of American Publishers/RTSD Joint Committee, presented a lengthy program on paperbacks, with particular attention given to problems associated with their distribution and selection. The highlight of section program efforts for 1974 revolved around the tours of the book trade jointly sponsored by the section, its Reprinting Committee and Bookdealer—Library Relations Committee, and the AAP/RTSD Joint Committee. The credit for organizing these tours is due to Carol Nemeyer and her hardworking committee composed of Sandra Paul, Shirley Sarris, Jane Chavis, John Dill, Connie Schwartz, and Howard Gordon. There were twenty-seven tours altogether, including three to Westchester, six to New Jersey, and the rest to various publishing houses in Manhattan. For keeping the groups organized, and for “bringing them back alive,” kudos are due to all those dedicated tour leaders too numerous to mention here. It is a distinct pleasure, and the best way I can express my personal gratitude to all these good people, to report that each and every tour was pronounced a smashing and unqualified success by participants, as well as tour leaders and organizers. It was, in this instance at least, a clear case of love’s labor found. And to judge from the glowing comments of the tourists, it would seem that this program should be repeated when ALA next meets in New York.

Having said all that, however, it is necessary to record here suggestions for the future based on lessons painfully learned. While it is encouraging to report that there were 850 librarians signed up and more than 500 standbys, it was nevertheless a disappointment when a number of tours had to get underway with too many places unclaimed. No-shows are always expected in a project of this nature, of course, but there were more than had been anticipated, and very few standbys presented themselves for substitution. The solution to this problem, in my judgment, is to arrange for considerably more lead time, which would have the added benefit of solving some of the other logistical problems encountered by the tours committee. It is also important to note that an undertaking of this kind requires an operating budget to cover items such as supplies, communications, and contingencies. It is strongly recommended, therefore, that both the section and the division take these suggestions into account should similar tours be planned for a future conference.
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Traditionally, and logically, most of the concentrated work of the section takes place at the committee level. It was no less true this year, and all chairmen and members are to be congratulated for their performance, the merits of which should be clear from the following review.

The Bookdealer—Library Relations Committee continued its work on the guideline series. Already published are guidelines for the acquisition of monographs (soon to be released also in French translation), and serial guidelines are presently awaiting action by ALA publishing.\(^1\) Work continues on antiquarian guidelines, and incoming chairman Harriet Rebuldele anticipates eventual publication of microform and dealer service guidelines. It is further expected that the committee will sponsor the effort to produce a pamphlet on private collections and their disposal.

The Collection Development Committee also has plans for a guideline series and is beginning to study the problems of policy statements and formula budgeting. In cooperation with several other units, the committee proposes to sponsor an all-day program on issues related to collection development during the San Francisco Conference.

In addition to giving some attention to the possible establishment of an RS award for scholarly publication in the field of college and university acquisitions work, the Policy and Research Committee continues to be concerned with the need to monitor activity in the area of cooperative foreign acquisitions and area study programs. The committee is also concerned with the lack of a national plan for collection development in research libraries, with possible gaps and overlaps in current programs and responsibilities, and with the apparent need for some kind of coordinating body at the national level.

At the request of its chairman, Henry James, the Reprinting Committee was increased in size from five to seven members. The final draft of the policy statement on lending to reprint and microform publishers was approved by the RS Executive Committee and by the RTSD Board. The policy statement will appear in *Library Resources & Technical Services* along with a companion piece on physical standards for microform production.

The Library Materials Price Index Committee called attention to a paper on price indexes for library materials, delivered by Doralyn Hickey at the thirty-ninth session of the International Federation of Library Association, and a publication by committee member Fred Lynden which surveys library materials expenditures at Stanford University libraries. The committee also discussed a periodical price study prepared by Frank Clasquin of Faxon based on that company's title inventory. Projects for the coming year include indexes for Mexican publications and for newspapers.

The Micropublishing Projects Committee continues to be concerned about the problem of the *New York Times* on Kalvar film from Microfilming Corporation of America, and the future of the Library of American Civilization project of *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Chairman Lawrence Robinson reported that the committee will have the opportunity to evaluate the pilot project announced by the Government Printing Office in connection with its microform

---


publication plans. The committee is also actively looking into the matter of microform statistics.

The Resources Section has followed closely the progress toward a standard order form by Subcommittee 36 of ANSI Committee Z39 chaired by Jennifer Magnus (Library of Congress) who is also a member of the Bookdealer—Library Relations Committee. The form is now in its fifth draft, and Ms. Magnus earnestly solicits criticism and suggestions from the library community in order to maximize effectiveness of the final product. Ms. Magnus is also hard at work on a list of bookdealers in underdeveloped countries, publication of which is anticipated sometime during the coming year.

The Acquisitions Discussion Group continued to spark a great deal of interest and, among other things, gave some attention to the draft of a standard order form. The petition to establish a discussion group for Collection Development Offices of Medium-Size Research Libraries was approved by the RTSD Board of Directors, and the group heard from Elaine Sloan regarding her investigation of collection development activities in large university libraries in cooperation with the Association for Research Libraries.

It seems likely that the section will continue to evolve during the next few years while the membership attempts to refine the organization into its constituent committees, discussion groups, etc., particularly with reference to the extremely complex problem of collection development. It would be a mistake, however, to interpret this projected evolution as the result of aimlessness or indecision. Rather, it should be seen as a clear indication of professional growth and flexibility as resources librarians attempt to deal with the issues and the times.

With that, I will end this report by thanking Carol Kelm and all the members of the section whose dedication and effort made my job an easy one, and by wishing my successor, Robert Sullivan, an experience no less rewarding than my own.

Serials Section Report

Herbert Linville, Chairperson

Increasing interest in serials and problems relating to them have been reflected in the activity of the Serials Section during 1973/74. A good start for the year was generated by the Las Vegas Conference program on serials. Every committee meeting at both Midwinter and Annual Conferences was attended by more observers than there are committee members. The first Midwinter Meeting of a serials discussion group was held in 1974, and its attendance by more than 150 proved the wisdom of scheduling such a meeting.

The highlight of the section's activities during the year was the serials workshop on 5–6 July 1974 at the Library of Congress. This workshop introduced the librarians in attendance to the procedures, policies, and problems of the Serial Record Division of LC and gave a "behind the scenes" view of what happens to a new serial. Tours of several divisions were also available to participants. A second workshop for residents of the Washington area is planned for 1–2 October 1974. As a result of the success of and interest in the workshop, the Executive Committee is studying the possibilities of regional serials workshops to
make a like experience available to a larger number of members of the section at convenient locations.

The section’s joint program meeting with the Cataloging and Classification Section provided a look at possible changes in serials entries for cataloging and records. The use and implication of the *International Standard Bibliographic Description (Serials)* and specific input relating serials to the RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee were of concern to the section during program, committee, and discussion group meetings during the year.

The two discussion groups within the section are receiving increased attention. The growing attendance at the Large Research Libraries Group is making discussion increasingly difficult. Planning for these groups must be given serious consideration in order to carry out their purpose of “discussing common problems which fall within the object of the section.” It seems the need to exchange ideas and to hear from serials librarians who are in similar situations is one of the ways to achieve the section’s mission.

The Duplicates Exchange Union Committee is planning a program meeting for the San Francisco Conference in 1975 in order to make the services of the union better known. The committee has also mailed to all library members of the union a new membership agreement specifying the requirements to exchange lists, provide postage refunds, etc. In order to retain membership, the agreement must be returned. As of the Annual Conference, only six members had asked to be dropped from membership while 223 commitments to membership had been returned.

The section’s Policy and Research Committee continues its pursuit of the proper and adequate ways in which education for serials librarians can be assured. It heard a report from a member of the RTSD/LED Committee on Education for Resources and Technical Services. The section committee formed a study group to formulate recommendations for library education for serials. Discussion at Midwinter 1975 will be centered around documents distributed at the New York Conference.

The role and functions of the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials were discussed during the section’s Executive Committee meeting. The ALA representative to this committee, who is appointed by the Serials Section, has expressed concern about the lack of action by the committee, while the great need for coordination of and preparation of union lists is apparent. This is evidenced by the interest within the Serials Section of two outside projects reported during the year to the section—the Ad Hoc Discussion Group for Large Serial Data Bases and the Gregory Directory Project, studying the feasibility of a possible revision of *American Newspapers*. The section instructed the ALA representative to investigate the joint committee’s ability to seek and disburse funds for compiling a national list of union list projects and to report to the Executive Committee at the 1975 Midwinter Meeting.

The Ad Hoc Committee to Study Manually-Maintained Serials Records has found its work overwhelming and has decided to limit its initial activity to serials record-keeping activities related to check-in and claiming. The questionnaire from which the information will be obtained is expected to be ready for distribution in September.

Having served an unexpected two-year term as chairperson of the section, I realize how indispensable are the activities and support of the RTSD executive secretary, Carol Kelm. The brief terms of chairpersons, presidents, and committee members make the continuity of the executive secretary a prime need of the division. The support of committee members, the generous help from the Li-
Council of Regional Groups Report

BETTY J. MEYER, Chairman

The Council of Regional Groups had as its major activities during 1973/74 the continuance of the publication of the CRG Newsletter and the improvement of communication with the various state and regional groups. The fall issue of the newsletter included the form for updating the mailing list for the RTSD Manual and for the use of the chairman. Throughout the year, the regional groups reported activities, and much of the information is included in this report. Through the efforts of the past chairman, Carolyn McMillen, it was possible to publish in Library Resources & Technical Services, [18:189-90 (Spring 1974)] a sampling of the type of the activity reports that were being received. During the year, the chairman received reports from twenty-three groups—some reporting change of officers and sixteen of the twenty-three reporting on meetings and programs.

The spring business meeting of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the Arkansas Library Association, was held at Ouachita Baptist University on 26 April 1974 with Marion Jones, president, presiding. The primary business was a discussion of the bylaws, and planning for the fall meeting to be held in Fort Smith, 22-24 September.

The Southern California Technical Processes Group held a workshop on "Human Relations in Labor Management," 22-23 February 1974, and on 26 March held a dinner meeting in Los Angeles with a panel discussion on the subject: "The Qualifications You Need in a Tough Job Market." On 24 April the Southern California Technical Processes Group joined with seven other groups to sponsor a Western Regional Federal Documents Workshop. During the year Phillip Wesley served as the chairman.

The Technical Services Section of the Connecticut Library Association was chaired by Lewis Lanese during 1973/74. The spring program was held 25 April 1974 in New Haven. The program was entitled "Out of time? Out of sight? Get some change out of your money saving ideas!" The participants were divided into eight discussion groups centered on new technology in technical services and concluded with a general question and answer session.

Elizabeth W. Turner served as chairman of the Resources and Technical Services Section of the Georgia Library Association and reported that the business meeting for 1973 was held in Savannah on 25 October.

The annual business meeting of the Illinois Library Association, Resources and Technical Services Section was held 15 October 1973 at which time Marilyn Satterlee was installed as chairman. The meeting was devoted to a discussion of the function of the section and its future in the Illinois Library Association. A motion was passed for the section to study itself in the next year to determine if it is a viable, contributing part of the association.

The annual meeting of the Resources and Technical Services Section, Kansas
Library Association, was held on 30 April 1974 in Topeka. The program featured Edward Blume (chief, Subject Cataloging Division, Library of Congress). His presentation was on “The Relationship between Local and Regional Libraries and the Library of Congress as it Relates to Subject Cataloging and Subject Analysis.”

The Technical Services Section of the Michigan Library Association held a “rap” session 17 May 1974 at East Lansing with Ethel Gantz presiding. David Taylor (Michigan State University library), Robert Kunnath (Wayne State University library), and Carolyn McMillen (Michigan State University library), took part in the program and general discussion on various aspects and current happenings in technical services.

The New England Technical Service Librarians, at their business meeting, 4 May 1974 at the University of Massachusetts library, voted to continue their affiliation with the New England Library Association. A two day meeting was held jointly with the New England College Librarians on the “Changing Aspects of the Library Profession.” Beverly Lynch, executive secretary of ACRL, was the dinner speaker, and Richard J. Talbot served as president during the year.

The Technical Services Section of the New Jersey Library Association sponsored several meetings and workshops during the year. The program on 14 November 1973 was a workshop with Norman Seldes describing in detail the automation of circulation procedures at the Oceanside System. Rowland Bennett, author of “A Standardized Formula for Figuring Book Preparation Costs,” outlined his formula for the group. On 20 March, the section co-sponsored a workshop on “Cataloging in Publication: An Institute for Librarians” with the Library of Congress, Rutgers, the State University, the New Jersey State Library, and the Association of American Publishers. A business meeting of the group was held 18 April with Eleanor Brown presiding. Discussion centered around the planning of additional workshops for the area and the topics which might be used for programs, presentations, and further study.

The Resources and Technical Services Section of the New York Library Association met three times during the year with Marguerite Soroka serving as president. The annual fall meeting in November 1974 will have the theme: “New Times, New Directions.” The group has several active committees on documents, manpower and personnel, and conservation, etc. The Document Committee assisted in a government document workshop at Oswego on 23-24 May.

During the 1973/74 year, the New York Technical Services Librarians held two meetings, fall and spring. On 30 November the topic was “Task Force on Library Data Centers: Programs and Prospects” by Glyn Evans, and on 5 April, Forrest Carhart spoke on “Metro and the New York Technical Services Librarians.” At this meeting, a citation for distinguished contributions in the area of technical services was presented to F. Bernice Field. Early in 1974, NYTSL was a co-sponsor with METRO of a series of lectures.

The Northern Ohio Technical Services Librarians met at the University of Akron on 3 May 1974. The program was by Fred Davenport on the topic: “A Public Library Practices Management by Objectives.” Mr. Davenport served as chairman for the group during the year. At its annual meeting on 10 November at Charlottesville, the Potomac Technical Processing Librarians celebrated its fiftieth anniversary. Ted Slate (Newsweek, Inc.) presented the program which was a lively, informative, lecture-slide presentation dealing with the magazine’s library. Martha T. Jett served as chairman during the anniversary year.

The Tennessee Technical Services Librarians met in Memphis on 26 April
1974 with LaNelle Vandiver as chairman. The program was presented by Barbara Gates, currently Library Coordinator of Interuniversity Council of North Texas Area, on the topic “Networks: the User's View,” with special attention to implications for SOLINET.

The twenty-sixth annual meeting of the Texas Regional Group of Catalogers and Classifiers met at the San Antonio Convention Center on 28 March 1974, with Sarah T. Hogan serving as chairman. The program was by John Corbin, who discussed the machine-readable data base in cataloging in regard to planning, implementation, cost analysis, and evaluation.

In completion of the year, the New York workshop for the Council of Regional Groups representatives was held on 11 July at the New York ALA Conference. It was a continuation of the “CRG/Library of Congress Interface” with William Gosling (project manager, Cataloging in Publication, Library of Congress) and Edward Blume (chief, Subject Cataloging Division, Library of Congress) presenting the progress in their areas of technical services. A lively question and answer period followed at which time Mr. Gosling responded to requests for scheduling workshops on CIP in various regions, and Mr. Blume discussed closing the catalog at the Library of Congress and the continued need for communication between the members of the Library of Congress and the members of the general library community. Also present for the question period was Nancy Williamson (University of Toronto Library School), chairman of the CCS Subject Analysis Committee. The incoming CRG chairman, James Soester (Central Kansas Library System), was introduced, as was the newly elected vice-chairman, Helen F. Schmierer (University of Chicago library).

Whatever success was accomplished in the communication field was due to the active cooperation and assistance of the past chairman, Carolyn McMillen, and the 1974/75 chairman, James Soester. I wish to express my gratitude to them, and to Carol R. Kelm for her assistance during this period. My role as chairman was not preceded by a year as vice-chairman, due to circumstances over which the RTSD Board had no control, and so the assistance given me was invaluable.

Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee Report

FRANCES HINTON, Chairman

The Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee (DCEPC) held its annual meeting on 1–2 November 1973. Frances Hinton was re-elected chairman for a two-year term, through October 1975. A second meeting was held on 25–26 April 1974. Both meetings were at the Library of Congress, and all members were present except Marietta Daniels Shepard, who was unfortunately forced to be out of town on both occasions.

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. Regular members are Margaret Cockshutt, John Comaromi, Betty Croft, Joel Downing, Doralyn Hickey, Frances Hinton, and Marietta Daniels Shepard. The editor and assistant editor of the Dewey Decimal Classification, the executive director of Forest
Press, and members of the staff of the Decimal Classification Division of the Library of Congress also attend the meetings.

At the November meeting a resolution of appreciation in honor of Pauline Seely, former committee member and assistant executive director of Forest Press, who died 21 September 1973, was made and transmitted to Miss Seely's sister.

At the same meeting Mr. Humphry reported that the 1968 agreement between the Lake Placid Education Foundation and the American Library Association had been amended to add the Library Association (Great Britain) representative, Joel Downing, as a voting member of the committee. It was also announced that approval had been given to the committee's request that the ALA representative to DCEPC, Clare Ryan, be made a liaison member of the Subject Analysis Committee of the Cataloging and Classification Section of RTSD. Her attendance at meetings of that committee is already providing increased input from the profession of DCEPC's deliberations.

A major policy question raised in the Subject Analysis Committee had already been called to the attention of DCEPC. The abridged edition number is not always the same as the first segment of the full edition number on LC cards. This creates difficulties for libraries using the abridged edition, especially those relying on processing centers. One solution would be the application of numbers from both editions, but this would mean that many fewer titles could be classed by the Decimal Classification Division, creating another and even more serious problem. The question is being given serious thought and, while it may prove to be insoluble, every effort is being made to satisfy users of both editions.

The increasing number of options offered in the printed schedules was examined. These also create consumer problems because the Decimal Classification Division applies only the preferred number, while many libraries use the optional one. Most options represent an entirely valid attempt to provide for conflicting needs of different national users. This area is still under discussion and reactions from the field will be of great assistance to the committee.

Several major changes recommended by the committee have been approved by Forest Press and publicized in recent issues of Dewey Decimal Classification Additions, Notes and Decisions. Most notable are: a new option for arrangement of 342-348 by jurisdiction, provided in response to widespread demand; and a revision of area notation 42, necessitated by the reorganization of British local administrative divisions, which took effect on 1 April 1974. The revision of area notation 42 for Scotland and Northern Ireland will be completed when the reorganization of those areas has been made final. Work continues on the total revision of life sciences (560-599).
Progress on Code Revision

REVISION OF THE Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR) is proceeding on a number of fronts. (For an earlier report, see Library Resources & Technical Services 18:400-401 [Fall 1974].) The function of the Catalog Code Revision Committee (CCRC) of RTSD has been established as

To propose additions to and modifications of AACR for inclusion in the second edition; to review successive drafts presented by the editor and summarize the ALA point of view for presentation to the Joint Steering Committee; to designate consultants and appoint ad hoc advisory committees to deal with specific, defined problem areas, as needed. Such consultants and the chairman of each ad hoc advisory committee, if not members of the parent committee, serve as non-voting, ex-officio members of the Catalog Code Revision Committee. The committee shall have final authority within ALA to speak for ALA, through its chairman or delegate, in the revision of AACR. The chairman of this committee shall serve as the ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee. The authority for code revision is vested in the RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee until the second edition is published, at which time the authority shall revert to CCSDCC.

The chairman of the committee is John Byrum, Catalogue Division, Princeton University Library, Princeton, NJ 08540. Other members include: Lizbeth Bishop, Winifred Duncan, Neal Edgar, Doralyn Hickey, Frances Hinton, Carol Ishimoto, Paul Kebabian, Ake Koel, Edith S. Scott, and Gordon Stevenson.

A number of ALA units have appointed representatives to the committee: AASL, Robert Little; ACRL, LeRoy Ortopan; ALHRT, Constance Rinehart; CSD, Annette Shockey; FLIRT, Mary Sauer; GODORT, Bernadine Hoduski; HRLS, Dallas Shawkey; IFRT, James Dwyer; ISAD, Barbara Gates; LAD, Morris Schertz; LRRT, Helen Schmierer; RASD, Concetta Sacco; SRRT, Sanford Berman.

In order to inform the profession about developments related to code revision, the committee decided to provide regularly reports on its activities. For this purpose, Frances Hinton has been appointed to prepare summaries of CCRC minutes. Inquiries concerning matters mentioned in these summaries should be directed to the committee chairman.
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The ALA/RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee held its first meeting in three sessions on 7 July and 11 July 1974 during the ALA Annual Conference. Ten of the eleven members were present. Also attending were eleven representatives from ALA divisions and round tables.

The committee reviewed the Memorandum of Agreement drafted at a meeting held in Chicago to plan the project of preparing a second edition of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. This document names the five authors of the revised edition, which are the American Library Association, the British Library, the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing, the (British) Library Association, and the Library of Congress. The objective is the reconciliation in a single text of the present North American and British texts, incorporating all amendments and changes agreed to since 1967. The final content will be determined by negotiation among the authors, which will consider for inclusion proposals for change already in process and amendments proposed no later than July 1975, and will make every effort to provide for international interests. The timetable calls for editorial work to begin 1 January 1975, with completion of the text by 31 December 1976, and publication in 1977. The memorandum establishes a Joint Steering Committee, made up of one representative for each of the five authors, which will appoint an editor and assistant editor, determine policy, consider proposals in relation to the timetable, facilitate adequate communication among all interested parties, assess rules framed by the editors, and present the revised text for publication. Each author may name one non-voting deputy, who would assume voting rights in the absence of the representative. It was announced that the Library of Congress had designated Elizabeth Tate as its deputy and that the RTSD president had designated Frances Hinton as the ALA deputy representative.

The committee recommended that the Joint Steering Committee provide for the announcement, before publication of the second edition, of any new rules for which an urgent need has been demonstrated at the time they are approved, and urged flexibility in regard to the July 1975 deadline for new amendments so that any important proposals received after that date could be considered. The committee next reviewed its own statement of function, timetable, and procedures. The committee agreed to hold four meetings during 1974–75, two of which will precede the ALA Midwinter Meeting and Annual Conference to facilitate com-
munication with other ALA groups. It approved a scheme for dissemination of its internal communications and communications with the Joint Steering Committee. It determined that mail ballots should be restricted to questions requiring action because of externally imposed deadlines and to routine matters not requiring discussion.

As a method of reviewing AACR, the chairman proposed that CCRC members and ALA representatives be assigned as teams to investigate single rules and blocks of rules, to determine the adequacy of existing provisions and prepare proposals for their improvement for committee review not later than Spring 1975, to review revisions offered by others and recommend committee action on them at the meeting following receipt of the proposal.

The committee next considered means of making contact with groups within and outside of ALA which might wish to play an active role in the proposed code revision. The Descriptive Cataloging Committee, to which ALA’s authority for code revision reverts after publication of the second edition, has agreed to cooperate with CCRC in this effort. In addition, each ALA division and roundtable has been invited to send a non-voting representative to CCRC meetings. Because the appointing organization must finance such participation, some groups may prefer an arrangement whereby CCRC minutes would be distributed to all members of the group and all proposals affecting rules would be sent to a designated individual who would be responsible for alerting his organization to any changes affecting its special interests and for communicating its reaction to CCRC. A tentative list was made of organizations in the U.S. with an interest in bibliographic control of library materials. The RTSD executive secretary will be responsible for contacting these bodies in order to determine those which wish to maintain liaison or participate actively with the committee and for issuing an ALA press release as an invitation to any body unintentionally overlooked.

B. R. Tucker of the Library of Congress presented a draft revision of AACR Chapter 12, “Audiovisual Media and Special Instructional Materials.” This is an entirely new chapter, covering most nonbook media not treated elsewhere in AACR. In its preparation Mr. Tucker studied and used as far as possible the applicable parts of Non-book Materials Cataloguing Rules; Nonbook Materials, the Organization of Integrated Collections; Standards for Cataloging Nonprint Collections; and Nonprint Media Guidelines. The committee discussed its role in this revision and concluded that the need for these rules is so urgent that the revised Chapter 12 should be given priority by the North American authors and be issued as an interim cataloging standard to be considered in the preparation of the second edition of AACR.

The committee endorsed ISBD(S): International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials in principle as a base from which to revise AACR Chapter 7. S. Berman asked that the ALA Social Responsibilities Round Table be recorded as objecting to the imposition of ISBD
as an obligatory norm in *AACR*. It was proposed that CCRC hold an open meeting during the 1975 ALA Midwinter Meeting to debate the CONSER (CONversion of SERials) project recommendation that all serial publications be entered under title.

Finally the committee discussed a series of proposals for rule revision presented to the Descriptive Cataloging Committee in the spring of 1973 by the Cataloguing Rules Committee of the Library Association. Ake Koel reported DCC's latest recommendations at the morning session on 11 July. At the afternoon session, C. S. Spalding, Library of Congress, P. Escreet, Cataloguing Rules Committee chairman, and J. Lunn, chairman of the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing, were present to discuss revision of rules 4, 5, 11, 33F, 43, 52, and 53 as well as a new rule for Malay names. Changes on which all parties agreed were authorized for publication in *Cataloging Service* and implementation thereafter.
Proposed Amendments to Division
Bylaws, 1974

Below are presented proposed amendments to the bylaws of the Resources and Technical Services Division. These amendments will be voted upon by the members of RTSD at the 1975 ALA Conference in San Francisco. (Refer to Library Resources & Technical Services 17:458–66 and 18:182 for present RTSD bylaws.)

Two groups of changes are proposed: (1) to change the term of office of the presiding officer of the Council of Regional Groups from three years (one year as vice-chairman, chairman-elect; one year as chairman; and one year as past chairman) to four years (two years as vice-chairman, chairman-elect; two years as chairman; and no years as past chairman), and (2) to change certain language of the bylaws in order to clarify certain provisions.

1. Change in term of office of presiding officer of the Council of Regional Groups.

   Article VII.

   Sec. 3. (c) Strike out the words “one year” and insert “two years” after “shall serve for”.

   Article VIII.

   Sec. 1. Strike out the words “and the immediate past chairman” before “of the Council of Regional Groups” in the first and second sentences.

   Sec. 2. (c) Strike out “one year” and insert “two years” after “and to serve for” in the second sentence.

Sec. 2. (d) Strike out “one year” and insert “two years” after “and to serve for” in the first sentence.

Sec. 3. In the first sentence of the second paragraph, strike out “year” and insert “and second years” after “shall serve for the first”; strike out “second year” and insert “third and fourth years” before “as chairman”; and strike out “year” and insert “years” before “he shall be an officer”.

   Strike out the second sentence in the second paragraph.

Article XI.

Sec. 5. (a) Strike out “its immediate past chairman,” before “and the chairman of each group” in the first sentence.

If these amendments changing the term of office of the presiding officer of the Council of Regional Groups are passed the change in term of office shall be effected as follows:

1. The amended bylaws shall take effect as of the 1975 election. The successful candidate for the office of vice-chairman (chairman-elect) shall serve a three year term—one year (1975/76) as vice-chairman (chairman-elect), two years (1976/77–1977/78) as chairman.
2. In the 1976 election, there shall be presented candidates for the office of vice-chairman (chairman-elect) of the Council of Regional Groups. The successful candidate for the office of vice-chairman (chairman-elect) shall serve a four year term—two years (1976/77–1977/78) as vice-chairman (chairman-elect), two years (1978/79–1979/80) as chairman.

3. After the 1976 election, the next election for presiding officer of the Council of Regional Groups will be in 1978 and thereafter in alternate years.

4. The current chairman of the Council of Regional Groups (James Soester) shall not serve a term as past chairman.

5. The incoming chairman of the Council of Regional Groups (Helen F. Schmierer) shall serve as chairman in 1975/76 and shall serve no term as past chairman.

2. Other changes to the Bylaws

Article X.

Sec. 1. Strike out the second sentence and insert as the second sentence: “Members of a group in the American Library Association who are not members of the Division and who are newly affiliating with the Division as a section must become members of the Division within three months after such affiliation, or lose their membership in the section.”

Article XII.

Sec. 1. In the first sentence, insert “,” after “responsibility of a single section.”
RTSD Program Meetings at the 1975 ALA Conference in San Francisco

Membership Meeting
Monday, June 30, 8-9:30 a.m.
Sponsored by RTSD.
An informal coffee hour giving members and friends of RTSD an opportunity to meet and talk with RTSD division and section officers. A short business meeting to include the presentation of the 1975 Esther J. Piercy Award will also take place.

The Anglo-American Cataloging Rules: Past, Present, and Future
Monday, June 30, 10 a.m.-12 noon
Sponsored by RTSD.
Speakers: "AARC: A Historical Perspective" by Wyllis R. Wright (chairman of the 1967 AARC Code Revision Committee), "Revision of AARC in Relation to UBC" by Dorothy Anderson (director of the Universal Bibliographic Control Office, International Federation of Library Associations, London).

CRG/LC Interface
Thursday, July 3; luncheon at 12:15 p.m. and workshop from 2-4 p.m.
Sponsored by RTSD Council of Regional Groups.
An informal exchange of program ideas among officers of CRG member groups and an opportunity for "grass roots" interaction with Library of Congress Processing Department staff.

Institute on International Standards as Related to Universal Bibliographic Control
Sunday, June 29, 10 a.m.-12 noon and 2-4 p.m.
Sponsored by RTSD Cataloging and Classification Section.
Attendance limited to 200; preregistration required by writing to Le-Roy Ortopan, Catalogue Department, University of California Libraries, Berkeley, CA 94720.
Speakers: Michael Gorman (British Library); Ronald Hagler (University of British Columbia, School of Librarianship); Elizabeth Tate (chief, Library of Congress Descriptive Cataloging Division); and Henriette Avram (chief, Library of Congress MARC Development Office).

Geographic Elements in Library of Congress Subject Headings: Implications of Change for Reference, Cataloging and Catalog Management
June 30, 2-4 p.m.
Sponsored by RTSD Cataloging and Classification Section.
Presentation of the 1975 Margaret Mann Citation.
Speaker: Edward Blume (chief, Library of Congress Subject Cataloging Division).
Reactors: One library school teacher, one academic reference librarian, and one public library reference librarian.
Order Out of Chaos
Thursday, July 3, 10 a.m.-12 noon
Sponsored by the RTSD Reproduction of Library Materials Section.
A discussion of library microform problems and a solution proposed by the California state universities and colleges.
Speakers: William R. Hawken; Robert Morgan; Allen Veaner; others to be announced.

Book Marketing and Library Selection: A Publishing/Library Forum
Tuesday, July 1, 8 a.m.-12 noon, 1:30-4 p.m., 8:30-10:30 p.m.
Sponsored by the RTSD Resources Section and AAP/RTSD Joint Committee.
Attendees may select two small group discussions during the evening segment of the program.

West Coast Publishing
Thursday, July 3, 1975, 2-6 p.m.
Sponsored by the Association of American Publishers/RTSD Joint Committee and RTSD Resources Program.
Speakers: to be announced.

CONSER
Tuesday, July 1, 10 a.m.-12 noon
Sponsored by the RTSD Serials Section.
Speakers: to be announced.
The last 40 minutes of the meeting will be set aside so attendees can gather around experts stationed in various parts of the program room to ask specific questions on such topics as "superimposition," AACR Rule 6, holdings statement, etc.

Filling the Gaps
Tuesday, July 1, 2-4 p.m.
Sponsored by the RTSD Serials Section, Duplicates Exchange Union.
Speakers: to be announced.

STANDARD MICROFILMS, SPOOLS AND REELS

The British Standards Institution (BSI) has recently published BS1371:1973 35mm and 16mm Microfilms, Spools and Reels. This standard, a revision of the more important features of the 1956 edition, incorporates the requirements of the International Organization for Standardization's ISO/R1116-1969 35mm and 15mm Microfilms, Spools and Reels and at the same time brings the BSI standard into line with current American standards.

Although the reel and spool dimensions in BS1371:1973 differ from those in the 1956 edition, the 1956 standard is compatible with the new standard. Therefore, existing microfilms may be handled by equipment designed to meet the 1956 standard.

Because the use of 70mm film has not become widespread, it has dropped from the standard. References to microfilm readers and reader screens have also been deleted, and a BSI committee is working on a separate performance standard to cover the essential aspects of microfilm readers.

Copies of the standard may be ordered from: BSI Sales Department, 101 Pentonville Road, London N1 9ND, England.
# RTSD Board, Committee, and Discussion Group Meetings

## San Francisco Conference

### 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Date/Day</th>
<th>Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Board of Directors</td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 3, Thurs</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 3, Thurs</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 30, Mon</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 27, Fri</td>
<td>8 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 27, Fri</td>
<td>1-5 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 28, Sat</td>
<td>8 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 28, Sat</td>
<td>1-5 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>8:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 28, Sat</td>
<td>9 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 28, Sat</td>
<td>2-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>9 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 3, Thurs</td>
<td>10 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Bylaws Committee</td>
<td>June 30, Mon</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee</td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>8:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 30, Mon</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 2, Wed</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 30, Mon</td>
<td>8 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 3, Thurs</td>
<td>12:15 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 3, Thurs</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>10 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 3, Thurs</td>
<td>10 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 2, Wed</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 29, Sun</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 30, Mon</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 2, Wed</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 30, Mon</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 2, Wed</td>
<td>10 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 3, Thurs</td>
<td>10 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 30, Mon</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 2, Wed</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>10 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee, Subcommittee for Cataloging Machine-Readable Data Files</td>
<td>June 28, Sat</td>
<td>10 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Commercial Processing Services Committee</td>
<td>June 28, Sat</td>
<td>2-5 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 29, Sun</td>
<td>9 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>9 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>2-5 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Committee on Computer Filing</td>
<td>June 30, Mon</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD/LED Committee on Education for Resources and Technical Services</td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>8:30-10:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Committee on Interlibrary Networks</td>
<td>June 30, Mon</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Conference Program Committee</td>
<td>July 2, Wed</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Council of Regional Groups Luncheon</td>
<td>June 30, Mon</td>
<td>8 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Council of Regional Groups Workshop</td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Keyboard Committee</td>
<td>July 3, Thurs</td>
<td>12:15 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 3, Thurs</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>10 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 3, Thurs</td>
<td>10 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 2, Wed</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 29, Sun</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 30, Mon</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 2, Wed</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 30, Mon</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 2, Wed</td>
<td>10 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 3, Thurs</td>
<td>10 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 30, Mon</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 2, Wed</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>10 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD LRTS Editorial Board</td>
<td>June 28, Sat</td>
<td>10 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD New Officers Orientation</td>
<td>June 28, Sat</td>
<td>2-5 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Nonbook Committee</td>
<td>June 29, Sun</td>
<td>9 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>9 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>2-5 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Organization Committee</td>
<td>June 30, Mon</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Organization Study Committee</td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 2, Wed</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>10 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Piercy Award Committee</td>
<td>June 28, Sat</td>
<td>10 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Planning Committee</td>
<td>June 28, Sat</td>
<td>2-5 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 29, Sun</td>
<td>9 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>9 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>2-5 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Preservation of Library Materials Committee</td>
<td>June 30, Mon</td>
<td>4:30-6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD/ISAD/RASD Representation in Machine-Readable Form of Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI)</td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>8-9:30 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 2, Wed</td>
<td>2-4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>10 a.m.-12 noon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Date/Day</th>
<th>Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Technical Services Administrators of Large Public Libraries</td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>10 a.m.–12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Technical Services Administrators of Medium-Sized Research</td>
<td>July 1, Tues</td>
<td>4:30–6 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries Discussion Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Technical Services Administrators of Smaller Research Libraries</td>
<td>June 29, Sun</td>
<td>2–4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Technical Services Directors of Large Research Libraries</td>
<td>June 28, Sat</td>
<td>9 a.m.–12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Group</td>
<td>June 28, Sat</td>
<td>1:30–4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTSD Technical Services Directors of Processing Centers Discussion</td>
<td>June 30, Mon</td>
<td>10 a.m.–12 noon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>July 3, Thurs</td>
<td>2–4 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CATALOGING AND CLASSIFICATION SECTION**

| CCS Executive Committee                                              | July 1, Tues  | 8–9:30 a.m. |
| CCS Cataloging of Children’s Materials Committee                    | July 2, Wed    | 4:30–6 p.m. |
| CCS Descriptive Cataloging Committee                                | July 3, Thurs  | 4:30–6 p.m. |
| CCS Policy and Research Committee                                   | June 29, Sun   | 4:30–6 p.m. |
| RRMS Executive Committee                                             | June 30, Mon   | 2–4 p.m.    |
| RRMS Policy and Research Committee                                  | June 30, Mon   | 4:30–6 p.m. |
| RRMS Standards Committee                                             | July 2, Wed    | 4:30–6 p.m. |
| RRMS Telefacsimile Committee                                         | June 30, Mon   | 4:30–6 p.m. |
| RRMS Discussion Group                                                | June 30, Mon   | 4:30–6 p.m. |

**REPRODUCTION OF LIBRARY MATERIALS SECTION**

| RLMS Executive Committee                                             | July 1, Tues  | 8–9:30 a.m. |
| RLMS Policy and Research Committee                                  | July 3, Thurs | 4:30–6 p.m. |
| RLMS Standards Committee                                             | June 30, Mon  | 2–4 p.m.    |
| RLMS Telefacsimile Committee                                         | June 30, Mon  | 4:30–6 p.m. |
| RLMS Discussion Group                                                | July 2, Wed    | 4:30–6 p.m. |
| RLMS Library Materials Price Index Committee                         | June 30, Mon  | 2–4 p.m.    |
| RLMS Micropublishing Projects Committee                             | June 30, Mon  | 8–9:30 a.m. |
| RLMS Policy and Research Committee                                  | June 30, Mon  | 4:30–6 p.m. |
| RLMS Reprinting Committee                                            | July 1, Tues  | 4:30–6 p.m. |
| RLMS Acquisition of Library Materials Discussion Group               | June 30, Mon  | 10 a.m.–12 noon |
| RLMS Collection Development Officers of Medium-Sized Research        | June 29, Sun   | 2–4 p.m.    |
| Libraries Discussion Group                                           |               |             |

**RESOURCES SECTION**

| RS Executive Committee                                               | June 30, Mon  | 4:30–6 p.m. |
| RS Bookdealer-Library Relations Committee                            | July 2, Wed    | 4:30–6 p.m. |
| RS Collection Development Committee                                  | July 2, Wed    | 2–4 p.m.    |
| RS Library Materials Price Index Committee                           | June 30, Mon  | 2–4 p.m.    |
| RS Micropublishing Projects Committee                                | June 30, Mon  | 8–9:30 a.m. |
| RS Policy and Research Committee                                    | June 30, Mon  | 4:30–6 p.m. |
| RS Reprinting Committee                                              | July 1, Tues  | 4:30–6 p.m. |
| RS Acquisition of Library Materials Discussion Group                | June 30, Mon  | 10 a.m.–12 noon |
| RS Collection Development Officers of Medium-Sized Research Libraries Discussion Group | June 29, Sun | 2–4 p.m. |

**SERIALS SECTION**

| SS Executive Committee                                               | June 30, Mon  | 4:30–6 p.m. |
| SS AACR Revision Study Committee                                    | July 2, Wed    | 4:30–6 p.m. |
| SS AACR Revision Study Committee                                    | July 1, Tues  | 4:30–6 p.m. |
| SS AACR Revision Study Committee                                    | July 2, Wed    | 2–4 p.m.    |
| SS AACR Revision Study Committee                                    | July 3, Thurs | 10 a.m.–12 noon |
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SS Committee to Study Manually Maintained Serials Records
SS Policy and Research Committee
SS Regional Serials Workshop Committee
SS Large Research Libraries Discussion Group
SS Medium-Sized Research Libraries Discussion Group

MISCELLANEOUS MEETINGS

Chief Collection Development Officers of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group
Heads of Preorder and Precatalog Searching in Research Libraries Discussion Group
LC Foreign Acquisitions Program Participants/PI.480 Program

June 30, Mon 8-9:30 a.m.
June 30, Mon 10 a.m.–12 noon
June 29, Sun 10 a.m.–12 noon
July 1, Tues 4:30–6 p.m.
July 2, Wed 10 a.m.–12 noon

HUMANITIES ENDOWMENT SUPPORTS NATIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY PROJECT

The National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) has offered to support the National Union Catalog Project of the American Library Association (ALA) by matching up to $900,000 in gifts made to NEH on behalf of the undertaking for a potential total of $1,800,000.

The award was announced by Dr. Ronald S. Berman, chairman of the Humanities Endowment.

The NEH grant will support the editing for publication of the final 240 volumes of the 600-volume catalog. The editorial work required to eliminate errors, duplications, and other irregularities inevitable to such a list will be done by a special editorial staff at the Library of Congress under the direction of the ALA’s National Union Catalog Committee, which is chaired by Gordon Williams, director of the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago.

The endowment's grant therefore will assist in the production of the catalog at a time when inflation and other economic factors have made it increasingly difficult for libraries to support its completion without other assistance. NEH’s offer to match gifts will, it is hoped, serve as a challenge to other foundations and sources of support to join with the endowment in ensuring the successful completion of the National Union Catalog, which is a major national resource vital to educational and research purposes.

The first 314 volumes of the projected 600-volume catalog have already been printed and distributed, and the remaining volumes are being published at a rate of five per month. When completed the catalog will enable a researcher in any part of the country to locate the nearest library containing the material which he needs.

Volume 19, Number 1, Winter 1975
**RTSD Nominees—1975 Election**

*Resources and Technical Services Division*

Vice-president (President-elect) (1975–77):

- Allen B. Veaner, Stanford University Libraries, Stanford, California.

Vice-chairman (Chairman-elect) Council of Regional Groups (1975–77):


[Nominating Committee: Frances Hinton, chairman; Hendrik Edelman (RS); Judy H. Fair (RLMS); Elizabeth S. Greer; Robert M. Hiatt; Carolyn McMillen (CCS); Helen W. Tuttle (SS).]

*Cataloging and Classification Section*

Vice-chairman (Chairman-elect) (1975–77):


Member-at-Large (1975–78):

- Mary K. Dewees, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.
- Frances Wright, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

[Nominating Committee, CCS: Carolyn McMillen, chairman; Jack Cain; Elizabeth Herman; Margaret M. Marquart; Eldon W. Tamblyn.]

*Reproduction of Library Materials Section*

Vice-chairman (Chairman-elect) (1975–77):

- Jane Garner, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

[Nominating Committee, RLMS: Judy H. Fair, chairman; Albert J. Diaz; Donald E. Talkington.]
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*Library Resources & Technical Services*
Resources Section

Vice-chairman (Chairman-elect) (1975-77):
Abigail Dahl-Hansen, University of California, Riverside, California.
Edna Laughrey, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Member-at-Large (1975-78):
David Zubatsky, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.
[Nominating Committee, RS: Hendrick Edelman, chairman; Juanita S.
Doares; Jane Garner.]

Serials Section

Vice-chairman (Chairman-elect) (1975-77):
Hans H. Weber, University of California, Riverside, California.
Elizabeth S. Greer, Joint University Libraries, Nashville, Tennessee.

Member-at-Large (1975-78):
Miriam Bright, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.
Charity Chang, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut.
[Nominating Committee, SS: Helen W. Tuttle, chairman; Dianne
Ellsworth; David Taylor.]

Revision of Anglo-American Cataloging Rules

The Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (1967) is being revised. The target
date for publication of the revision is 1977. Organizations and individuals
wishing to propose changes in the AARC are encouraged to contact John
Byrum (Princeton University Library), who is chairman of the American Li-
brary Association, Resources and Technical Services Division, Catalog Code Re-
vision Committee.

An interested organization may choose one of two mechanisms for partici-
pating in the AARC revision. An organization may appoint to the RTSD
Catalog Code Revision Committee a representative with discussion but not
voting rights. The appointing organization would be responsible for financing
the participation of its representative. The RTSD Catalog Code Revision Com-
mitee will meet four times in 1975 and four times in 1976. Two meetings each
year will be held in conjunction with the semiannual meetings of the Amer-
ican Library Association. As an alternative to appointing a representative, an
organization may choose to request receipt of materials relating to the AARC
revision and send specific comments on particular documents to the chairman
of the RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee. Organizations wishing to
participate in the AARC revision in one of the ways listed above should con-
tact the Resources and Technical Services Division, American Library Asso-
ciation, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611.
IN MEMORIAM: PAULINE SEELY

On first acquaintance, Pauline Seely, conveyed the impression of being a polite, soft-spoken, extremely well-bred lady. While further acquaintance regularly substantiated the truth of that initial impression, it also revealed the shallowness of such an assessment. Pauline was indeed a lady—she might become annoyed or dismayed with her colleagues but she never resorted to personal attacks on those with whom she disagreed, and truly harsh words seldom escaped her lips.

Still, Pauline’s character cannot be measured adequately in terms of her personal gentleness. Those who mistook her ladyliness for weakness lived to regret the error, for Pauline was a tough-minded professional. She took her librarianship seriously and made it quickly clear to all new colleagues that she expected them to take it seriously, too.

Perhaps the qualities most significant in Pauline, as far as her profession was concerned, were her relentlessness in the pursuit of truth and her tirelessness in the attention to detail. No one who entered a discussion with her could expect to be released until he had produced and substantiated all of the arguments for his point of view. Even after the discussion ended, Pauline might be observed seeking out further data to confirm or deny her colleague’s stand, and that colleague could expect in the next few weeks to receive a pleasant but business-like letter showing precisely where he had been mistaken and supplying a number of specific examples contradicting his point!

Those of us who like to direct our attention to the broad sweep of ideas and not have to muddy our thinking with the details of whether our schemes will work, found Pauline to be a nemesis. She could bring us down to earth all too quickly by her insistence upon a detailed consideration of the consequences of our grandiose schemes. Whether the topic was classification or filing rules or place-names or technical services management, Pauline kept us practical. It is sometimes intriguing to try to imagine the interchanges which she must have had with foreign librarians about their use of the Decimal Classification, as she assisted in the Dewey survey. If anyone could learn exactly what practicing classifiers were doing and why, Pauline would, and she did, no matter what their nationality might be.

A Margaret Mann Citation winner and long-time contributor to the American Library Association through its Resources and Technical Services Division, Pauline A. Seely will long be remembered by her colleagues for her ceaseless efforts on behalf of the library profession through her leadership in ALA, her work at the Denver Public Library, and her many bibliographic and interpretive publications. Even in her relatively brief tenure with the Forest Press, after her retirement from Denver, the impact of her professionalism was evident in the production of Edition 18 of the Dewey Decimal Classification. The members of the Resources and Technical Services Division are thus proud hereby to honor the memory of one of their most dedicated, consistent, and productive colleagues.

As we proceed now to wrestle with the revision of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, the preparation of Dewey 19, or the compilation of new filing rules, many of us who knew Pauline Seely will keep ourselves honest by asking of each decision: “I wonder if Pauline would let me get away with that?”—RTSD Board of Directors, 21 January 1974.
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Library Resources & Technical Services
The Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) that is used by librarians in 123 countries was introduced by Forest Press this month in its first French edition. Librarians in Canada and France translated the entire edition 18 of DDC from English into French for the new two-volume, 2,985-page edition.

John A. Humphry (chairman of Forest Press), Richard K. Gardner (board member), and Richard B. Sealock (executive director) presented the new edition to librarians in Canada and France. The book was displayed in Quebec City during the 3-5 October conference of ASTED (Association pour l'avancement des sciences et des techniques de la documentation), a Canadian library and information science association. At a 3 October reception Forest Press honored the librarians from the Collège de Sainte-Anne-de-la-Pocatière, Sainte-Anne-de-la-Pocatière, Québec, who worked on the translation. The translators included Raymond Boucher (library director) and Réal-Leonce Levesque (a member of the staff).

Humphry, Gardner, and Sealock then flew to France for the 8 October introduction of the French edition in Paris and Lyon. Groupe Lyonnais de Classification, which librarians formed for the DDC translation project, worked under the leadership of Geneviève Guillian (retired city librarian of Lyon).

The new French edition is of major importance to libraries in the countries whose populations include the world’s 200 million French-speaking people. The book is distributed in France and Africa by Cercle de la Librairie, a publishers’ association with headquarters in Paris, and in the Western Hemisphere and Asia by Forest Press, Albany, New York.

During the ninety-eight years since Melvil Dewey’s classification system was first published in the United States its use has spread throughout the world and it has been translated into many languages. Today 40 percent of the copies of the English complete edition and abridged edition are sold outside the United States. To meet some of the demand for the DDC in other languages, Forest Press will begin production on a Hindi edition soon and on a Spanish edition next year.

With the publication of the new French edition Forest Press opened the Dewey Decimal Classification’s 1976 centennial observance. Activities will include publications on the history and use of DDC, exhibits, and the awarding of plaques to libraries that have used DDC continuously since its early years.
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Pretty plastic paper clips that never mar, rust or tear important papers. 3 sizes. 7 colors. Great for coded filing. Will not harm postage meters or reproduction equipment. See your stationer or write:

Baumgarten International
1190-A N. Highland Avenue, NE • Atlanta, Georgia 30306

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA BERKELEY SERIALS KEY WORD INDEX 1974 EDITION

- over 60,000 current non-document serial titles
- over 65,000 document serials, current and inactive
- half a million entry points
- law and medical titles
- upper/lower case printing

10 volumes $175

Send orders and inquiries to:
Systems Office, 416 Main Library,
University of California, Berkeley,
California 94720
Phone: Area Code 415, 642-4664

Statement of Ownership and Management

LRTS is published quarterly by the American Library Association, 50 E. Huron St., Chicago, IL 60611. American Library Association, owner; Wesley Simonton, editor. Second class postage paid at Fulton, Missouri. Printed in U.S.A. As a nonprofit organization authorized to mail at special rates (Section 132.121, Postal Manual), the purposes, function, and nonprofit status of this organization and the exempt status for Federal income tax purposes have not changed during the preceding twelve months.

Extent and Nature of Circulation

("Average" figures denote the number of copies printed each issue during the preceding twelve months; "Actual" figures denote number of copies of single issue published nearest to filing date—the Fall 1974 issue.) Total number of copies printed: Average 12,250; Actual 12,500. Paid circulation: not applicable (i.e., no sales through dealers, carriers, street vendors, and counter sales). Mail Subscriptions: Average 10,779; Actual 10,691. Free Distribution: Average 860; Actual 888. Total Distribution: Average 11,639; Actual 11,579. Office use, leftovers, unaccounted, spoiled after printing: Average 811; Actual 921. Total (sum previous two entries): Average 12,250; Actual 12,500.

YOU WILL HAVE—
“CONFIDENCE”
In Our Complete
Periodicals Service—
All American and Foreign Titles
Promptness is a Traditional part
of McGregor Service... as well as:
• EXPERIENCE
• TRAINED PERSONNEL
• FINANCIAL STABILITY
• AMPLE FACILITIES
• RESPONSIBLE MANAGEMENT

An attractive brochure is
available for the asking.

SUBSCRIBE TO
McGREGOR
PERIODICALS
BULLETIN
OUR
42nd
YEAR
McGREGOR
Magazine Agency
MOUNT MORRIS, ILLINOIS 61054

Machine Readable Data

Faxon, the world’s only fully
automated library magazine sub-
scription agency, offers serials
control information in machine
readable format. If your library
has data processing support,
or if you plan to make use of
automation, Faxon will
supply this service
for your library.

For more information, write:

F. W. FAXON COMPANY, INC.
15 Southwest Park, Westwood, Mass. 02090
or call: (800) 225-7894 (toll-free)
(617) 329-3350 (collect in Mass. and Canada only)

SIMPLIFY
AND SAVE

With EBSCO Subscription Serv-
ces you simplify your serials
acquisition. We’re part of a
multi-million dollar corporation
which maintains processing and
title search departments, and a
fulfillment center. We have the
experience to handle all types
of serials.

You save because EBSCO makes
a single annual order serve your
complete serial needs. (Consid-
er the cost of issuing and proc-
cessing a purchase order for
each acquisition!)

WRITE OR PHONE TODAY FOR FULL DETAILS.

EBSCO SUBSCRIPTION SERVICES

826 South Northwest Highway
Barrington, Illinois 60010
(812) 381-2140
P. O. Box 2543
Birmingham, Alabama 35201
(205) 879-2113
161 Forbes Road
Braintree, Mass. 02184
(617) 843-2383 or 843-2384
415 Douglas Plaza Building
Dallas, Texas 75225
(214) 369-7591 or 369-7592
Suite 110 B Diamond Hill Complex
2480 W. 26th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80211
(303) 433-3235
P. O. Box 92901
Los Angeles, California 90009
(213) 772-2381
512 Nissett Building
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 333-5081
EBSCO Building
Red Bank, New Jersey 07701
(201) 741-4300

EBSCO Buildings
Red Bank, New Jersey 07701
(201) 741-4300

681 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94105
(415) 391-3500

5406 A Port Royal Road
Suite 200
Springfield, Virginia 22151
(703) 321-7516 or 321-9630
17-19 Washington Avenue
Trenton, New Jersey 08611
(609) 569-2600

Six Thorncliff Park Drive
Toronto, Canada M4H 1H3
(416) 421-9000

division of
When you need objective information on library equipment, furniture, and supplies, there is only one published authority—Library Technology Reports.

Library Technology Reports is a unique bimonthly consumer publication of the American Library Association. LTR is designed to provide critical, objective evaluations of products used in libraries, media centers, and other educational institutions.

Testing and evaluation are conducted by nationally recognized independent testing laboratories and consultants, among which are R. A. Morgan Company (microform readers); United States Testing Company (audiovisual equipment); William R. Hawken Associates (microform reader/printers); and Buyers Laboratory Inc. (photocopiers, typewriters, steel library shelving, and library furniture).

For additional information and a sample issue, write to:

LIBRARY TECHNOLOGY REPORTS, AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION
50 EAST HURON STREET, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611
*Product of the Month Award
For Libraries: CRYSTAL SHIELD BOOK COVERS

1. Remarkable Time & Budget Savings: The developers of CRYSTAL SHIELD Covers are library oriented technicians. They created the new covers especially for much abused high-traffic paper backs, such as best sellers, educational and reference volumes, civil service texts, etc. They claim that perma binding such books presently costs up to $2.00 each and takes up to 6 weeks while Crystal Shielding takes 30 seconds and runs between 19 and 49 cents, according to size.


3. New Material: Designed to protect the entire book - not just the jacket - Crystal Shield covers are made of heavy duty 8 gauge super crystal vinyl which is many times thicker and stronger than conventional mylar covers.

4. Nine Lives and Preserve Magazines, too: The makers further state that there is no better, cheaper way to preserve magazines and to bring neatness into tattered library magazine sections. The re-useable feature of CRYSTAL SHIELD Covers makes them especially suitable for this purpose, as well as for use on periodically re-issued reference volumes, including telephone directories, etc., etc.

Available in the 13 most published sizes from VISIONS, 10871 Thorley Road, Santa Ana, Ca. 92705. Tel. (714) 544-4450. Telex 685666
BOOKMAN’S PRICE INDEX SERIES

VOLUME 10 TO BRING SERIES TOTAL TO NEARLY 420,000 ENTRIES

Slated for publication in March, 1975, Volume 10 will add about 35,000 listings to the BOOKMAN’S PRICE INDEX series for a total of nearly 420,000 antiquarian books selected from the catalogs issued by the world’s leading rare book sellers, specialist dealers, and O.P. bookmen.

*BPI* furnishes an accurate guide to recent prices quoted by representative dealers . . . *BPI* is the only index to the bibliographical data included in dealers’ catalogs . . . *BPI* constitutes a master finding list of thousands of books.

So that users may quickly and easily determine the approximate value of a book, the offerings of the dealers are arranged in a single alphabet by author. Each entry gives: author, title, place and date of publication, pagination or collation, condition, dealer’s name, catalog number, item number, year the catalog was issued, and price of the book.

*AB Bookman’s Yearbook:* “This is still the most comprehensive, clearest general price guide of its kind!”

*American Book Collector:* “. . . a standard work for all college and university reference libraries.”

*Booklist:* “In the simplicity of its organization, the clarity of its presentation, and its focus on the out-of-print dealers’ market rather than the more limited auction world, it makes a valuable contribution and is recommended to all libraries regularly purchasing scholarly out-of-print books.”

*American Reference Books Annual:* “This set is recommended as a must for all larger public and university libraries.”

BOOKMAN’S PRICE INDEX SERIES $52.00 per volume

Volumes 1 to 9 are in print and available on 30-day approval. Volume 10 ready March, 1975.

A STANDING ORDER WILL ASSURE AUTOMATIC DELIVERY OF FUTURE VOLUMES.

GALE RESEARCH COMPANY

BOOK TOWER • DETROIT, MICH. 48226