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Serials '74: A Review

H. W. HALL
Serials Librarian
Texas A & M university
College Station

In 1974, SERIAL TITLES CONTINUED TO BE BORN, die, merge, split, and experience all possible combinations of the above. Prices rose, discounts died, cataloging changed, literature proliferated, conferences enlightened, and awards delighted. Serials and serials activity seem to be in a state of flux at the end of the year, promising substantial activity in the year to come, especially in the areas of cataloging and computerizing.

Economics

Serial prices continue their steady climb, and with postal increases and the rising costs of paper, no relief is in sight. The annual Library Journal (LJ) survey reported a 9 percent increase in prices over 1973, with the average periodical costing $17.71 and the average serial service $109.31. It is interesting to compare some of the prices from the LJ survey with the averages found by Clasquin in his three-year comparative study. Although Clasquin did not report an overall average in Library Journal, he noted an average price of $26.56 in a communication with the author, some 33 percent higher than LJ's $17.71 average. More specific comparisons are possible for subject areas, as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Clasquin</th>
<th>LJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>$ 75.39</td>
<td>$65.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>135.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>42.52</td>
<td>24.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>12.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>42.09</td>
<td>36.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>16.56</td>
<td>13.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that Clasquin’s figures refer to titles indexed in particular indexing services; for example, his figure for chemistry is the average price of titles indexed in Chemical Abstracts. Clasquin’s figures range from 9 to 43 percent higher than LJ’s figures for specific disciplines, and the average figure is 33 percent higher.
The average price for all titles furnished by Clasquin is comparable to the average price of $31.10 furnished the author by J. T. Stephens of Ebsco Subscription Services. The figures furnished by Ebsco were further broken down to show the average cost of the 31,770 domestic titles in their file as $37.12, and the average cost of 26,480 foreign titles as $23.90. The latter figure is comparable to figures furnished by Wm. Dawson Ltd., which show the average cost of all titles in their file to be £10, or approximately $25.

The point of comparison of figures such as the above is not that one set is more accurate than the other, but rather that there are significant differences between the two. The magnitude of the differences opens to question the use of the lower figures for budgetary planning and indicates that this topic is in need of further study at an early date. In the future, provision should be made for the annual reporting of the average prices derived by the major subscription agencies from their extensive files of data.

Serials Literature

A number of publications of high potential interest to serials personnel were published in 1974, ranging from major new Library of Congress (LC) catalogs to articles of special interest.

Of greatest interest to serials librarians will be the Library of Congress Catalog: Monographic Series. Monographic Series reports monographs of any kind appearing as part of a series, whether or not traced in the cataloging. The catalog includes series in all languages cataloged by LC, with entry under series title. Within each series, entries are entered in numerical order for numbered series, or alphabetical order for unnumbered series. Cross-references are provided. The catalog is published in three quarterly issues and an annual cumulation at an annual subscription cost of $100.

The second new Library of Congress catalog is Name Headings With References. The catalog will include the references associated with all new and newly revised name headings established by LC and is designed primarily as a cataloging and reference aid for libraries. This catalog also will appear in three quarterly issues and an annual cumulation at a subscription cost of $50 per year.

The Bookdealers–Library Relations Committee of RTSD issued Guidelines for Handling Library Orders for Serials and Periodicals as the second in its Acquisitions Guidelines series. The document is intended as “a general guide for librarians, agents, and publishers in their efforts to provide good serial services to the ultimate consumer, the reader.” The pamphlet is divided into three sections: “Guidelines for Librarians,” “Guidelines for Agents (Dealers),” and “Guidelines for Publishers.” All three groups should take the trouble to obtain this document, study it, and attempt to follow its suggestions.

In a different vein, the LARC Association has initiated several new series on automated control systems in libraries, including acquisitions,
cataloging, circulation, and serials. The Computerized Serials Systems Series first appeared in 1973, and now consists of four numbers, each devoted to a specific serials system and written or edited by a person directly affiliated with the project reported. To date, the series has reported the Clarion State College system, the University of California, San Diego system, the University of Louisville system, and the Purdue serials catalog system. Each monograph runs 70 to 100 pages, and gives an adequate documentation of the system described. For libraries planning in-house development of a serials system, this is a valuable source of data.

The LARC Association has also issued the proceedings of its Institute on Automated Serials Systems of May 1973. The volume includes information on the National Serials Data Program, on “Management Problems of the Network Manager,” on the “SERLINE” (SERials on-LINE) data base developed to provide access to bibliographic and locator data for serials held by libraries in the Regional Medical Library Network of the National Library of Medicine, on the University of California, San Diego system, and four papers on the PHILSOM (Periodical Holdings in Library School of Medicine) Network, an automated record control system currently used by seven libraries.

Two relatively recent doctoral dissertations which have not been previously noted may be of interest. Runkle surveys the existing automated serials control systems, and Johnson provides a valuable survey of the organization and methods of serials handling in serials departments of forty-eight university libraries.

Another academic paper not previously reported is Shedd’s “Handbook of Serials in Selected European Languages.” Although this thesis contains much general information, its primary value lies in the calendars which provide ready reference to days of the week and written numbers in the various languages covered, and hints on how to interpret items on title pages in fourteen European languages, as well as guides to the identification of each language. An index leads from foreign words to English translation. This work is extremely helpful in aiding personnel lacking language skills to identify language, dates, editions, numbering, etc., of foreign serials.

Early in 1974 appeared the Association of Research Libraries-sponsored study by Palmer, Bellasai and Gray on access to periodical resources. This important study, which deserves wide attention, examines three alternatives for access and proposes that a single new facility with a comprehensive periodical collection offers the best long-term solution to access. Operational details for such a center and methods of financial support are suggested.

A third edition of International Subscription Agents appeared in 1974. This edition lists 177 agents offering services to over 100 countries or areas. The directory is annotated, and gives mailing address, area of coverage, materials handled, services offered, business data, and special notes. “Library response” is given for each agent, specifying the
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adequacy of the agent’s service. A geographical index provides access by country or area.

Interdok has inaugurated a new series relating to pollution control/ ecology in their Directory of Published Proceedings. The initial issue appeared in March 1974. The data for this series is drawn from the existing series, with no additional citations. The series is semiannual, at a cost of $30, and may be helpful for institutions supporting substantial research in its area of coverage.

A third supplement to Baer’s Titles in Series appeared in 1974, adding additional data to that useful work. Bowker issued a supplement to Magazines for Libraries, increasing the coverage of that selection tool and bringing it up to date.

A new column on “Periodicals for College Libraries,” a project of Evan I. Farber and three colleagues at Earlham College, first appeared in Choice of September 1974. Coverage is rather dated, since a title is not annotated until it has been in publication for at least five years. As a partial compensation, the column does list recent titles worth consideration, but does not provide annotations of these titles.

A number of important problems of special interest to serials librarians were addressed in journal articles. Under the heading of serial economics may be included Clasquin’s proposal to use “average weighted prices,” rather than simple average prices, as budget guidelines for libraries and Gabriel’s proposal of microfiche as an alternative to either roll film or binding. Papers by Spalding and Howard provide required reading for serial catalogers and Hendrick and Murfin examine the mutilation problem and suggest methods of control.

A final item of interest is the announcement of the forthcoming Serials Librarian, scheduled as “a bimonthly technical journal devoted exclusively to serials acquisitions, maintenance, and control,” with the first issue due to appear sometime in 1975.

Title Varies

There has been too little in recent years for serials librarians to laugh about (or even grin at), but now Dave Taylor of Michigan State University has given us a source of a few chuckles, along with the serious intent of his brainchildren, Title Varies and “The Worst Serial Title Change of the Year.” Title Varies is published six times per year, and features articles on title changes, cataloging, subscription rates, a roster of “awful title changes,” letters, and other miscellaneous material. Title Varies offers serials librarians a focal point, something which has been lacking since the passing of Serial Slants.

The “Worst Serial Title Change of the Year” award was presented by Dave Taylor at the Annual Conference of the American Library Association at New York in July 1974. Runners-up for the award were the following: R. R. Bowker Co., for changing Library Journal/School Library Journal Previews to Previews; the U.S. Office of the Federal Register for changing the United States Government Organization Manual.
to United States Government Manual, and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers for "a host of title changes." The award went to Williams & Wilkins for the change from International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology to International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics. The award consisted of a certificate for the winner and runners-up, and the symbolic award, a thumbs-down fist emerging from a worn and tattered volume of New Serials Titles.

*Title Varies,* at only $2 per year, is a bargain all serials librarians will want.

Conferences and Institutes

During 1974 several institutes and conferences of note for serials librarians took place. In May, the LARC Association sponsored an Institute on Serial Data Bases in Quebec. The institute focused on Canadian developments in the serial field, and included papers on the Cooperative Union Serial System (CUSS) project, on Computerized Access to Periodicals and Serials at University Laval (CAPSUL), on the University of Victoria Library's use of MARC-II Serials, and on serials developments at the National Library of Canada and the Natural Sciences Library. Proceedings of this institute are scheduled to be published in 1975.

In early July, the Library of Congress and the Resources and Technical Services Division/Serials Section cosponsored a serials workshop at the library. The workshop included presentations on serials processing at LC, national and international developments, MARC-Serials, and descriptive cataloging. Following each presentation was an ample question and answer session. Tours of various LC operations were provided, including the Serial Division, *New Serial Titles*, the National Serials Data Program, the Card Division, and others. Over 200 attendees found the workshop of particular value in clarifying some LC procedures and decisions. The workshop was repeated in October, primarily for librarians in the immediate vicinity of LC.

The Annual Conference of ALA in New York included several meetings for serials librarians. The program meeting of the RTSD Serials Section was a joint meeting with the Cataloging and Classification Section and focused on cataloging rules changes for serials and their implications. An excellent summary of this meeting has been published. In addition to the program meeting, various committees of the Serials Section met, including both the Large and Medium-sized Research Libraries discussion groups, and the committees on the duplicate exchange union and on manually maintained serials records. Finally, an ad hoc committee on Regional Serials Workshops was appointed.

In October, the Information Science and Automation Division of ALA and the American Society for Information Science cosponsored an institute on "Automated Serials Control: National and International Considerations," with discussions of cataloging rules changes, international cooperative systems, a review of serials systems, and a paper by Fasana on the impact of these developments on both technical and pub-
lic services, in which he raises serious questions about CONSER and other cooperative efforts.21

Copyright

The problem of copyright as related to library photocopy practices continues to be a major concern of the library and publishing world. The Williams & Wilkins case was appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, with no resolution as of the end of the year.

The United States is not alone in this concern over copyright. Both France and Australia have seen court action on copyright matters. In France, a case similar to the Williams & Wilkins case was decided for the copyright holders, and in a similar case in Australia the finding was against the library.22 A survey of European practice by Lottman reveals a widespread trend toward protecting authors and publishers from library use of photocopying.23 Whether these cases and their precedents will have any bearing on U.S. copyright cases and law is open to question, but they do indicate a trend in the worldwide copyright situation and may have their effects on international copyright agreements.

Returning to the United States, Congress has voted the establishment of a National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works, which shall "make recommendations as to such changes in copyright law or procedures that may be necessary to assure for such purposes access to copyrighted works, and to provide recognition of the rights of copyright owners." The thirteen-member commission is to present a preliminary report to the president and Congress in one year, and a final report in three years.24

Alternatives to photocopying are beginning to appear. Dockler reports on two such alternatives: an extension of the Institute of Scientific Information's Original Article Tear Sheet System (OATS) and McGraw-Hill's on-line service for National Technical Information Service (NTIS) documents.25 Cost and coverage seem to be the two major questions about systems such as these, especially for research libraries where demand may be high, but these systems may well be the model for future access to copyrighted material.

Cataloging

Although the revision of chapter 7 of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR) will require at least two years, serial cataloging was not static during 1974. The continuing international developments in both the cataloging and serials area are making themselves felt, as is the publication of the revised chapter 6 of AACR.26

The most significant change during the year related to the new Library of Congress practice for generic title for serials: "If the title of a serial consists solely of a generic term, that term is followed by the author statement. The two elements are separated by a space-hyphen-space."27

Of particular interest to serial catalogers will be the ISBD(S): Inter-
Ohio College Library Center

The Ohio College Library Center (OCLC) continues its developmental work as a model computer-based library processing system. The serials system, which will include serials cataloging, on-line check-in, and automatic claiming, is the next system to be developed by the center. Currently, the serials cataloging subsystem is under development. This system has been in use since 5 July 1974, with a number of libraries inputting data into the file. Other subsystems of the serials system are to be ready for testing and implementation in 1975.

Potential users should note that the OCLC serials system has no provision at this point for fiscal management. This aspect of control is a function of the OCLC 'Technical Processing' system, which may be ready for testing in late 1975.

As mentioned below, OCLC will be the host for the CONSER file of serials data. Thus far, the precise relationships between OCLC serials data, CONSER serials data, and MARC-Serials input have not been made clear.

CONSER

CONSER (CONversion of SERials) is a two-to-three-year terminal project designed to establish a relatively comprehensive bibliographic data base of serial titles quickly enough to avoid continuing redundant and expensive conversion efforts on the local, regional, and national levels. Using the Minnesota Union List of Serials as a base file, CONSER's goal is to convert 200,000 records to machine-readable form in two years. The CONSER file will be housed and maintained by OCLC, following the finalization of contracts by both OCLC and the Council on Library Resources in December 1974.

The most recent information on CONSER has been provided by Upham, but she does not speak directly to the questions of Fasan noted earlier. Richard Anable, in a personal communication in late December, has indicated that the Library of Congress Information Bulletin will be a major outlet for current data on the progress of CONSER. One hopes the questions raised by Fasan will be spoken to by CONSER staff members at an early date.

One question which requires an early answer is that of availability of the file to the library world. In what manner will access to CONSER records be provided to non-OCLC libraries?

In Summary

The year past has seen a great deal of serials activity, and several sig-
nificant developments, but in many ways “the past is prelude” to even more significant developments in the future. Copyright, CONSER, and cataloging seem to be the prime candidates for the 1975 limelight, and each has the potential to initiate major changes in the serials librarian’s world.

REFERENCES

23. Library Resources & Technical Services
GUIDELINES FOR USE IN CONSIDERING COMMERCIAL SERVICES

The Commercial Processing Services Committee of RTSD is currently engaged in preparing a manual relating to guidelines for use in considering commercial services. It has prepared draft guidelines relating to eight questions: (1) How do you decide when you should consider commercial processing services? (2) If you decide on commercial processing services, how do you identify what organizations are offering commercial services? How do you contact them? (3) When you have contacted commercial processors, how do you determine what services are available? (4) What standard options are available? (5) How are cataloging and processing specifications negotiated and established with the vendor? (6) What acquisitions services are available for books to be cataloged and processed? (7) What is the cataloging authority offered by the vendor? and (8) What methods of shipment, invoicing, reporting, and handling of the inevitable problems are offered by the vendor?

For a copy of the tentative guidelines and further information on the work of the committee, address Dallas R. Shawkey, Chairman, Commercial Processing Services Committee, c/o Technical Services Center, Brooklyn Public Library, 109 Montgomery St., Brooklyn, NY 11225.
Introduction

IN REVIEWING 1973 DEVELOPMENTS, Spreitzer singled out copyright as the dominant interest for that year. Well, this past year the overriding concern was economics. The copyright issue did not abate. It became more of a point of friction between librarians and publishers because of the financial straits of libraries and certain publishers. For library micrographics, fiscal affairs was a two-edged knife. On the one hand, microforms, particularly computer-generated microforms, were widely touted as money savers when compared with ever more expensive paper, ink, and binding. On the other hand, money was so scarce and inflation so serious that even the low-priced medium was often beyond acquisition. Educational institutions were particularly hard hit by the near ruinous increase in the cost of energy for heating, cooling, and lighting. One university librarian relinquished to his institution’s energy budget a sizeable nest egg he had earmarked for filming the card catalog.

It is disquieting to consider what may be the effects on microform collections of future energy conservation efforts in libraries. For example, if air conditioning equipment is turned off entirely or during certain hours in microform storage areas during hot humid months, the results could be repeated cycling of temperature and humidity or, worse, the growth of fungus on film.

While the virtues of microforms were often overstated by salesmen and other enthusiasts, it seems likely that in the long run 1974 will be seen as having been a watershed year for micrographics because harsh fiscal realities brought many organizations, libraries and groups of libraries among them, to look at microforms as something more than unpleasant substitutes for books, substitutes which, if shelved and for-
gotten, might not be a problem. It began to appear to some that microforms might truly be capable of saving space, energy, and dollars and, in the process, actually serve as information sources just as had been claimed all along. New evidence is reinforcing the view that once a positive attitude is established toward microform usage in an organization, the probability of successful usage is greatly enhanced.

One significant index of the rising fortunes of micrographics was the sizeable expansion of the National Microfilm Association (NMA) during the period of "stagflation." The association’s total assets in mid ’74 were $775,000, more than $200,000 greater than they had been a year earlier. Personal and sustaining (corporate) memberships were up 24 percent and 12½ percent respectively in the twelve-month period. Whether this growth can be maintained as the recession deepens is, of course, yet to be seen. An important checkpoint in this regard will be the NMA annual conference at Anaheim, California, in early April. A large part of the association’s income is derived from this affair, and attendance and exhibitor participation are directly related to each other in a circular fashion. It should be kept in mind that in spite of its central role, the NMA is not the industry. The industry is made up of a few very large companies and many smaller ones. Micrographics firms have reputations for independence. This independence and an associated tendency on the part of many of the companies to hold statistics confidential make it difficult to develop detailed figures on the industry. Therefore, the health of the NMA is often used as an indicator of the state of the business. Another revealing statistic which is more important to our immediate interest (if less accurate) is found in the annual compilation by the Association of Research Libraries of statistics from its eighty-two academic institution members. These figures show that the libraries concerned had in the 1973–74 year increased their microform holdings by about 13 percent while increasing their hard copy volume count by only about 4 percent. While these percentages are not strictly comparable, they are, we believe, in a general way indicative of a meaningful trend. (It is interesting to note that should these annual percentage increases continue, in approximately eleven years total units of microform would equal the total number of hard copy volumes.)

Two interacting factors which encouraged growth in the use of microforms were the increasing cost of computer printout paper and the continuing rapid developments in the field of computer output microfilm (COM). (Although it appears that factors which brought about the recent paper shortage have been pretty well corrected by market forces, it is not thought likely that the resulting higher prices will recede.) In particular, the feasibility of generating COM fiche and film from the proliferating machine-readable bibliographic data bases has resulted in the design and production of microform catalogs at a number of libraries. Many new, reasonably priced reading machines for COM-produced microforms have become available, the natural product of the total systems approach of the many computer technologists who
are influential in the COM industry. It seems inevitable that more and more libraries will find it advantageous to join, on an application-by-application basis, the conversion from paper to microforms as these developments continue.

Less fortunate consequences of the worsening economic situation have occurred in federal government programs. In one instance, the National Institute of Education (NIE), acting on the recommendation of a low-budget investigation into nonlibrary experience with diazo and vesicular film, decided to allow bidders on the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) contract to propose nonsilver microfiche in order to hold down the price of the fiche collection. The National Technical Information Service (NTIS) reacted in the other direction when it announced major increases in the prices it charges for both fiche and hard copy of its reports. Perhaps this increase was the economic justification for McGraw-Hill’s decision to market the NTIS materials at similar prices.

A major controversy growing out of the financial plight of libraries came about when representatives of the publishing community saw the formation of the Research Library Group (RLG) consortium as a threat to sales of monographs, serials, and antiquarian books. The RLG—comprising the libraries of Harvard, Yale, and Columbia, and the research libraries at the New York Public Library—found it necessary to issue a public statement which, in part, assured that its members would continue to “operate within the fair use doctrine as it has evolved from judicial interpretations of the Copyright Law.”

Copyright

The differences between the RLG and journal publishers pointed up the continuing need for resolution of copying issues through passage of appropriate new legislation. At year’s end it appeared that the House Judiciary Committee’s Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties, and the Administration of Justice would begin hearings in early spring on revision of the 1969 Copyright Law, but progress will probably be slow, with lengthy argument over cable television and library photocopying. The subcommittee, under Chairman Robert Kastenmeier, will have in hand the Senate-passed omnibus revision bill (S.1361) which the House failed to act on in 1974 principally because there was little time for hearings as the ninety-third Congress drew to a close.

For librarians the main copyright battle has been over the right to photocopy periodical articles for interlibrary loan purposes. While the Senate bill prohibited “systematic reproduction of copyrighted works,” its language gave only the vaguest guidance as to the definition of “systematic.”

Another vital step in the developing showdown on copying was the Supreme Court’s decision on 28 May to hear the Williams & Wilkins case against the National Library of Medicine. The hearing occurred on 17 December.
Christopher Wright of the American Library Association’s Washington office has caught up the torch Verner Clapp so nobly advanced when he wrote A Librarian’s View in 1968. Wright’s Libraries and Copyright: A Summary of the Arguments for Library Photocopying is just what its name implies and is recommended reading.

On 31 December the president signed Public Law 93573 which prohibits record piracy, extends for two years certain expiring copyrights, and sets up a commission to study new technological uses of copyrighted works. Both publishers and librarians have shown wariness of such a study commission, each appearing to feel that it would be prejudiced in the other’s favor. An alternative approach has begun with librarians and publishers meeting periodically under the auspices of the Copyright Office and the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science in an attempt to hammer out a compromise proposal.

Multimedia librarians took heart briefly from a successful amendment by Senator Baker (R.—Tennessee) to the Senate bill (S.1361). The amendment provided for continuing availability through the Joint University Libraries at Vanderbilt University of videotapes of television news programs.

Education of Librarians

The year was also marked by increased activity on the part of various agencies in educating and informing library personnel about micrographics. Allen Veaner continued with his unique educational program, a series of right-on-the-button editorials dealing with significant developments in library micrographics. One of his best dealt with the important provisions of the various standards and guidelines applicable to the production of microforms and micropublications. In a complementary step, the Photoduplication Service of the Library of Congress (LC) began enclosing with each microform order it filled a form letter advising on the proper storage of archival microforms.

The growing recession was not reflected in an obvious decrease in the number of “seminars” on micrographics. The majority of these heavily advertised meetings were of the high-priced, executive-session variety and offered relatively little of value to librarians. On the plus side, there were several micrographics seminars sponsored by library organizations. Two of these were held in Chicago in the early months of the year, one by a group of law librarians and the other by the Illinois Chapter of the Special Libraries Association. Interestingly, both came about as positive reactions to an earlier NMA-sponsored seminar for librarians which was held at Northwestern University, the first in a moderately priced series. The series was continued briefly in 1974. But the NMA, apparently having second thoughts about leaving the micrographic education of librarians in the hands of a group of librarians, switched to a new approach later in the year. The new approach (1) summarily retired the team of experienced lecturers and (2) combined a day of general microform lecture by an industry representative with a day of library-oriented
teaching. Fortunately, the second day of these meetings was presided over by a very competent librarian, Charles LaHood, head of photoduplication at the Library of Congress. In changing programs the NMA succumbed to inflation by more than doubling registration fees. (On the other hand, NMA has held the line on annual dues which remain at $30 for individuals.) This and other experience suggest that librarians can get more information for less money if they organize their own seminars and confine the speakers list to specialists from the library community.

The NMA also showed an interest in the education of librarians through its publishing program, which in the last two years has become one of the association's principal sources of income—sales of publications rose from $43,000 to $102,000 between 1972 and 1974. Regrettably, the one publication designed primarily for librarians was of questionable value; to them Gaddy's *A Microform Handbook* delivered little that was new, a good bit that was irrelevant, and some that was even misleading. Otherwise NMA's educational publications continued to be of uneven quality but, in general, appeared to be improving.

Micropublishers emphasized educational features in their house organs. Both Xerox University Microfilms and Bell and Howell's Microphoto Division had relatively meaty articles in *Source* and *Micropublisher*, their respective public relations journals.

**Standards**

The past year saw very diligent activity on many standards, a number of which are of considerable potential value to libraries. However, the mere existence of standards does not ensure conformance on the part of producers and manufacturers, for standards are not obligatory. It is the responsibility of the customer to insist that the products he buys meet reasonable standards. In order to carry out this responsibility, the acquisitions librarian should be knowledgeable about appropriate standards.

Don M. Avedon, technical director of NMA, continued to provide valuable information about standards in his column in the *Journal of Micrographics*. His articles were consistently among the best features of the magazine. A recent column dealt with equipment and procedures used for inspection and quality control of first generation silver halide microfilm. While the typical microform librarian or acquisitions librarian does not usually have occasion to perform laboratory tests of film, it is desirable for anyone who deals with micropublishers and their representatives to have an appreciation of the processes used in quality control. (The reader who doubts this might want to ask a micropublisher's sales representative which test his company uses when checking for excess hypo. The answer can be highly informative.) Another of Avedon's columns reviewed definitions and terminology used in standards work. The explanations were straightforward and should help the nontechnically trained person to comprehend micrographics standards.

---

*Library Resources & Technical Services*
Activities of the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) were also discussed.\textsuperscript{17}

NMA was given secretariat responsibilities for the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) PH5 committee in 1973 and in 1974 was very active coordinating and promoting the work of PH5.\textsuperscript{18} An important change was made in the title and the charge of the committee. The name is now Micrographic Reproduction (instead of Photographic Reproduction of Documents), and the scope is “standardization of terminology, definitions, sizes, formats, quality, apparatus, and procedures for the production and use of microform reproductions.”\textsuperscript{19} Responsibilities for nonmicrographics standards previously assigned to subcommittee PH5-3 were given to other PH groups. The American Library Association (ALA) is not represented in these groups. This situation should be rectified, for their proceedings are important to libraries.

During the year the PH5 committee worked on a variety of projects. A final draft of PH5.1-1970, “Microfilm Readers for 16mm and 35 mm Film on Reels, Specifications for,” will be ready early in 1975. The proposed revision of PH5.3-1967 (R1973), “16mm and 35 mm Microfilms for Roll Applications, Specifications for,” was circulated to all NMA members in December 1974. This new draft includes recently adopted formats for image positioning, updating of references to existing and newly published standards, and references to film types other than silver gelatin. PH5.4-1970, “Storage of Processed Silver Gelatin Microfilm, Practice for,” will be incorporated into the revision of PH1.43, “American National Standard Practice for Storage of Processed Safety Photographic Film.” PH5.1-1961 (R1970), “Micro-opaque Readers, Specifications for,” will be incorporated into the revision of PH5.1, and PH5.5-1970, “Micro-opaques, Specifications for,” was withdrawn, reflecting the decline of interest within the industry in this microform. (Presently Readex is the only company selling exclusively in micro-opaque.) PH5.9-1970, “Microfiches, Specifications for,” was not approved last May because of a lack of consensus in the committee. Subsequent discussion resolved the questions of the method of identification of the sensitized side of a microfiche, the allowable reduction tolerance (by using the ISO formula of 12X to 24X with a maximum plus tolerance of 1.5X), and the title change to “Microfiche of Documents.” The standard was to be reworded and resubmitted to ANSI for approval. PH5.10-1969, “Measuring the Screen Luminance of Microform Readers with Translucent Screens, Method for,” was not approved for distribution to NMA members for comment because of problems in measuring luminance of large screens. PH5.19 “Microfilm Package Labeling,” already issued as NMA MS6-1974, was near completion. One change resulting from the first balloting was the addition of storage conditions to the information specified to be included on the label. The task force designing the standard for cartridges for 16mm roll microfilm is making changes in that part of the standard concerned with cartridge housing. Balloting by the committee is to take place in April 1975; the ballots will cover cartridge
assembly, reel, and cassette specifications separately. Again, librarians concerned with microforms should follow the progress of these standards in order to be able to effectively evaluate descriptive material dealing with micropublishing projects.

Another standard of potential value in the acquisition of microform projects is the proposed standard for “Advertising of Micropublications.” This document, being produced by a subcommittee of ANSI Z39, “details for micropublishers the elements which will provide in their advertising the basis for a critical evaluation of their published products by prospective purchasers.”28 With industry use of this guideline, librarians will have the necessary specific items of information on which to base purchase decisions. Lack of this information often leads librarians to acquire products which are not fully satisfactory. In a move that has drawn much critical comment, the California State University and Colleges officially adopted “Criteria for the Procurement and Use of Microforms and Related Equipment by the Libraries of the California State University and Colleges.” This document statement is a rewrite of “Standards and Guidelines for Procurement of Microfilms,” published by the same institutions in 1973. The document includes criteria for operating instructions, means of loading and unloading equipment, controls, screen, image, luminance, adaptability, maintenance, and safety.29 Libraries in the California system may purchase only those products which conform to these criteria. The guidelines were drawn up in an attempt to create standardization of microform products within the state schools. It is not clear what effect these criteria will have on micropublishers, micrographics equipment manufacturers, and the users of the libraries involved.

Noteworthy Publications about Micrographics

Improvement of bibliographic control and access to information about microform publications were the purposes of several publications this year. The Five Associated University Libraries (FAUL) in New York published an inventory of their holdings.22 It is an excellent example for other libraries to follow in developing their own guides. Two important titles were produced by Microform Review. The first, International Microforms in Print, lists over 6,000 titles from forty-one non-U.S. micropublishers.23 The second, Microform Market Place, 1974/75, is the first comprehensive union list of micropublishers’ names, addresses, key personnel, and major micropublication programs. It also gives other valuable information about the micropublishing world.24 Newspapers in Microform: Foreign Countries, 1948–1972, a companion volume to Newspapers in Microform: United States, 1948–1972, appeared from the Library of Congress in 1974.25 The new work incorporates 8,260 titles and 833 cross-references. UPDATA, the first jobber service for microforms and equipment, has published Microform Reference, a useful commercial catalog.26 However, several major micropublishers are not
represented in the two volumes. Why a third party should be interposed between the library and the micropublisher is not immediately clear; communication is often difficult enough when only the two principals are involved.

Bibliographic access of a slightly different type is provided by Micrographics Index, 1974, issued by the NMA's Resources Center. It is the "key to the services" of the center and provides bibliographic access to its materials. Although the first paragraph of the introduction to the Index implies that it comprehensively covers the literature of the field of micrographics, the three remaining paragraphs spell out the Index's (and, therefore, the center's) limitations, such as noncoverage of most monographs and journal articles from library literature. For example, there are no references to Library Technology Reports of the American Library Association or Veaner's The Evaluation of Micropublications. Even the NMA Guide to Microreproduction Equipment is not included. It is worth noting that the Index has a poorly designed keyword-in-context section in which conjunctions, articles, and prepositions appear as "key words." The publication does cover, analytically and almost completely, the NMA Journal of Micrographics and the Proceedings of the NMA Annual Conference.

Two important articles about Library Resources, Inc.'s Library of American Civilization (LAC) appeared during 1974. Napier detailed George Washington University's (GWU) experience with the LAC package in an experiment supported by the National Home Library Foundation of Washington, D.C. Extensive examination was made of the ultralarge fiche, book catalogs, catalog cards, Biblioguide Index, and reading machines, but no attempt was made to evaluate the intellectual content of LAC. Napier's article is a lucid and comprehensive presentation of the lengthy study that GWU conducted and a most valuable contribution to micrographics literature. He is particularly critical of the functional difficulties of both the portable and the table model readers. He also cites the complexity of the indexing of the Biblioguide Index as a major deterrent to use of the collection. In a more general review, Rebuldela compiled the results of a survey sent to libraries that subscribed to LAC. Responses concerning cost, purchase decision, servicing, use statistics, storage, bibliographic access and control, publicity, other microforms owned, user experience with the viewers, and acceptability of the medium were tabulated and discussed.

User resistance to or acceptance of microforms is an important concern as microform collections increase in size and as a percentage of the total collection. An article by Salmon points out hardware limitations, reading room environment, and inadequate bibliographic aids as the major causes of user dissatisfaction. He urges industry leaders to work with librarians to overcome these problems. On the other hand, West and Butler found general user acceptance, indeed preference, for a microfiche set of assigned course readings. Students in one section of a library science course were given microfiche copies of the required read-
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ings while students in two other sections used the conventional information delivery system for access to hard copy versions of the readings. A questionnaire administered at the end of the course yielded some very useful information. Ready availability to all readings at the same time, "having a personal copy," "convenience in time of use," and "elimination of searching citations" were regarded as the virtues of having the fiche set. Some students who used the fiche experienced "viewing fatigue" and some termed the "viewing quality" of the fiche unsatisfactory. The experimenters ran into difficulty in maintaining quality control in the production of fiche and in the logistics and costs of obtaining copyright permissions. This experiment with "microreadings" is an interesting example of utilizing microfiche in a way that emphasizes their advantages instead of simply using the medium as a print substitute.

Development of a program to use microforms for preserving information is the subject of Darling's very useful and well-written article. This "handbook" for libraries presents a careful compilation of information of practical value for which there has long been a need. This outstanding article includes a valuable updating of an earlier bibliography and presents clear directions for obtaining microfilm publications by either purchase or in- or out-of-house filming. Cole's account of the continuing efforts of the Library of Congress to provide a growing program of preservation for foreign newspapers and gazettes is also must reading for acquisitions librarians. The detailed history of foreign newspaper microfilm projects and a thorough report on the Library of Congress' current program are presented in this article, which is especially appropriate in these days of the need for improved access to and sharing of resources.

The sixth edition of the invaluable NMA Guide to Micrographic Equipment, edited by Hubbard W. Ballou, is scheduled for publication in January, in three separate volumes: Production Equipment, User Equipment, and COM Recorders. Volume 2, User Equipment, the most useful for libraries, is $8.50 to NMA members, $12.00 to nonmembers.

The most valuable source of equipment information for librarians continues to be ALA's Library Technology Reports. During 1974 the R. A. Morgan Company provided evaluations of the following microform readers: Dietzgen 4323-20, Dukane Explorer 14, Eastman Kodak Ektalite 120, Micobra K-71, RTS Mini-Viewer Model 86, and both the fiche and roll film versions of the Xerox 2240. William R. Hawken Associates thoroughly updated a 1968 evaluation of the LMM "Superior" Model A-B roll film reader and produced a series of reports on reader/printers including the Recordak Motomatic Reader with Recordak Printer Model ERG, Xerox Microprinter, Micro Design Model RP550, OCE Model 3650, and MISI Models 1201 and 1202.

Often reading a review of a publication will obviate the need to acquire and read the publication itself. For example, Veaner's review of Auerbach on Microfilm Readers/Printers (1972) concludes, after careful discussion of the book's contents, that its general value to librarians is
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doubtful. The book review section of *Microform Review* is another source of this type of commentary.

Automated document storage and retrieval (ADSTAR) systems—which somehow continue to fascinate many people in spite of the poor track record of such hardware-based schemes—were the subjects of two reports. Harmon’s review of the Frost & Sullivan 1973 marketing report on *The Microfilm Industry* highlights the section “Markets and Applications,” which deals with library micrographics. He does not recommend the technical sections of this report.

**New Micropublishing Programs**

When one surveys the large number of micropublishing programs announced or implemented in a year’s time, it becomes evident that a review of reasonable length can deal with but a sampling. This paper concentrates on a few. Each has some special implication for libraries.

The Library of Congress plans to publish the eighth edition of *Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH)* on COM fiche as well as in the conventional printed form. This is not just another simultaneous publication scheme intended to appeal to the daringly innovative librarian. Rather, it has obvious tangible benefits. Because it will not be subject to the lengthy Government Printing Office delay, the COM edition will precede the hard copy by six to eight months. The fiche publication, a project of the MARC Development Office, will be used in a twelve-month experiment with a group of participating libraries. Other interested libraries will be able to buy the microfiche version only if they also order the printed volumes. (It is intriguing to speculate on the reaction of librarians who experience early availability of an important cataloging aid, thanks to machine-readable data bases and COM.) It is understood that during the experiments the Library of Congress also plans in-house tests with an ultrafiche edition of *LCSH*. This version will incorporate the entire listing on a single fiche. The Library of Congress states that “If the experimental offering of the 8th edition in microform proves successful, it is possible that new microform issues cumulating headings through later years will be prepared and sold separately.”

A little-publicized new journal from the Association for Computational Linguistics could be the forerunner of an important publishing technique. The first issue of the *American Journal of Computational Linguistics*, a quarterly, was distributed toward the end of the year. Each article is on a separate fiche and is accompanied by a printed card bearing a short summary. Each issue includes a table of contents card and one or more cards listing announcements of meetings and calls for papers. A newsletter fiche incorporating a sizeable bibliography is also included with each issue. The final issue for each year will include a set of preprinted index cards.

The NMA finally bit the bullet this year by publishing the proceedings of its annual conference primarily in microfiche form. The fiche
document was distributed free to the NMA membership. A hard-copy edition is available but only as an extra-cost option.42

It appears that the New York Public Library’s Schomburg Collection is at last to be safely recorded on microfiche. The National Endowment for the Humanities has provided funds to thus safeguard the unique and invaluable treasure of black literature.43 Several years ago it appeared that the NYPL-3M micropublishing agreement would serve this purpose, but when that cooperative venture was abandoned, little of the Schomburg Collection had been filmed.

The large-scale archival microfilming program of the National Agricultural Library (NAL) and the land-grant institutions of the United States moved another step forward with the signing of cost-sharing agreements by NAL and the New England Board of Higher Education (NEBHE), which acted on behalf of the state universities of the New England states. The library also signed similar agreements with three other institutions. At the end of the year, NEBHE issued a request for bids on the filming of up to 400,000 pages of agricultural publications. The New England program is viewed as a pilot undertaking which, if successful, would serve as a model for duplication at land-grant institutions throughout the nation. All told, an estimated 7 million pages of state agricultural documents are slated to be recorded for archival and dissemination purposes. To cover the costs of this enormous undertaking, the NAL hopes to persuade commercial microfilming organizations to share the costs in return for the right to market copies of the resulting film.44 A program as large and as long term as this would seem to be especially vulnerable to the vicissitudes of a troubled economy even if the funding were available at its beginning; but with the additional burden of needing to involve independent micropublishers, this program is almost certain to face serious problems downstream.

An interesting sign-of-the-times project announced by Johnson Associates was Impeachment Proceedings against President Richard M. Nixon. According to the publisher’s catalog, this subscription collection “provides a complete and continuing source of government and selected publications relevant to the analysis of political trends and events concerning the impeachment.”

Technology & Hardware

The nonsilver film controversy touched off by the distribution by the New York Times of an acid-emitting vesicular film from Kalvar Corporation continued little abated through much of 1974. The principal development was an offer to replace the offending micropublications with copies printed on another type of Kalvar vesicular film. It is understood that a number of librarians accepted the replacement offer on the basis of a strong guarantee from the Times. However, a few resolute librarians heeded the advice of library micrographics experts by holding out for and obtaining replacements on silver halide film of archival
quality. For others who have not yet settled with the Times, it is probably not too late to follow suit.

As more and more diazo and vesicular duplicating film was used to disseminate COM for nonarchival applications, micropublishers were encouraged by some film manufacturers to join the crowd by publishing library materials on nonsilver media. In general, micropublishers stood firm. One film company, Xidex, took the case for its vesicular film directly to librarians by means of multiple-page advertisements in library journals.46 The Micropublishing Projects Committee of the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division (RTSD) was again in the vanguard of the library forces resisting nonsilver film for permanent collections. When it was learned that the National Institute of Education (NIE) was allowing bidders for the ERIC fiche production contract to propose any of the three types of film, the committee's chairman, Lawrence Robinson, arranged for an NIE representative to discuss the situation with the committee at the ALA Midwinter Meeting. Later Robinson met with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's deputy assistant commissioner for grants and contracts in an unsuccessful attempt to persuade NIE to reconsider.

It was learned that in Great Britain the Public Record Office defended its publishing of USA Embassy and Consular Archives on diazo fiche on the grounds that no complaints had been received and that the "reproductions are made to the highest archival standard"48 (a rather revealing remark in light of the fact that there are no archival standards for diazo films). In addition to the RTSD Reproduction of Library Materials Section (RLMS) Standards Committee's plan (noted later in this review) to look into the feasibility of developing standards for vesicular and diazo films, the National Reprographic Centre for documentation has begun a project in the same area.47 The RLMS action is in large part a reaction to the fact that ANSI Committee PH1.3, which was charged in 1971 with responsibility for developing standards for vesicular and diazo films, has yet to provide any substantive information on this crucial subject.

It was reported that Xerox has found a technique for rendering documents "uncopiable" by means of a fluorescent spray.48 By year's end there was little indication of interest in the spray and no good reason to believe it would be marketed soon.

One of the most significant developments revealed at the NMA annual conference was U.S. Datacorp's COM recorder for generating 72:1 COM fiche in a single reduction step.49 Later the company was reported to have a recorder capable of producing 96:1 output. If these devices can be refined to produce good resolution, the trend of COM users to "go microfiche" may well be accelerated because many applications will require no fiche loading and unloading as a result of the increased amount of information that can be packed on a single fiche. Another noteworthy development in the COM arena was 3M's announcement of its new LBR (laser beam recorder). As suggested by its name, this unit
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utilizes a laser beam to write directly on dry silver film. As developments such as these continue and more and more companies and governmental agencies introduce COM fiche and film in order to take advantage of the associated economy and convenience, it seems certain that microforms will become a common feature of everyday life for a large number of people. In fact it would be difficult to overestimate the potential of COM as a force for changing attitudes toward microforms.

Library application of COM continued to expand as a number of institutions implemented and/or experimented with COM catalogs. Exemplary among these endeavors was the test of a roll film catalog in conjunction with Information Design's ROM II reader by the Baltimore County Public Library. It is likely that the system will be operational by the time this article is in print. Inflation has made itself felt in this instance; the ROM equipment is now priced a good bit above the figure given when it was first announced. Perhaps the competition of a similar but more stylish new reader, the LCR 500 by Auto-Graphics (of Monterey Park, California), will work to counter this price rise. Both of these motorized machines have novel index devices and each utilizes a semipermanently mounted 500-foot roll of 16mm COM film. While the test of the Baltimore County catalog was considered quite successful, it is understood that some machine failure was experienced.

American Videonetics Corporation (AVC, of Sunnyvale, California) brought an unusual 16mm film reader to the NMA annual conference. Built around a patented self-threading film transport and solid-state control circuits, the AVC Instafile moves film gently and at high speed. This permits the use of film as thin as one-half mil. Nominal capacity is 215 feet of 2.5-mil film which the unit is capable of rewinding at a maximum speed of 800 inches per second. The reader also incorporates an 18-by-12-inch opaque screen and electronic frame counting.

Persons who initially rejected Recordak's lightweight, inexpensive Ektalite readers may want to take another look. The line has been expanded to include models with larger screens and additional magnification ratios. A gratifying trend to opaque screens appears to be under way. In addition to Washington Scientific Instrument's Minicats and the AVC and Recordak readers mentioned here, an attractive front-projection fiche reader with a hole-in-the-screen projection path (similar to that of the LM Superior carrel reader) has been introduced by Canon.

Another promising product has been added to the Xerox University Microfilm (XUM) line. This is a reader table (or carrel, according to some of the publicity) having a slanted recess in its surface to accommodate the XUM Model 1414 reader. With the reader mounted, a person wearing bifocals can read without resorting to the strained-neck posture usually required for rear-projection readers. (For what are apparently photogenic reasons, publicity photos of the carrel and reader depict a user without spectacles.) To add a little icing to the cake, XUM is expected soon to offer a reworked version of the Model 1414 featuring a number of changes aimed at user convenience.

One other item deserving special notice is an accessory available with
IBM's 3890 Document Processor. This accessory, referred to by IBM sales literature simply as "microfilm feature" will film the front or both sides of documents (usually checks), or, under control of the 3890, will film only documents automatically selected according to characteristics such as names or numbers appearing on the documents. An index number is automatically generated and photographically recorded alongside each image. The sophistication of this feature is indicated by its price, more than $2,500 a month on short-term lease, and the speed with which the 3890 operates, 125,000 documents an hour.

The above are but a few of the many new pieces of hardware introduced in 1974, but they illustrate the burgeoning development that characterizes the industry today and which is generally expected to continue for some time.

Organizational Activities

As would be expected during a year when the micrographics star was on the rise, organizations in the field were very active. Various elements of the American Library Association continued work in several areas of micrographics. RLMS decided to extend the life of its ad hoc discussion group in order to provide an opportunity for interested persons to converse informally about micrographics matters. In June the RLMS Standards Committee determined to form a subcommittee to investigate the possibility of carrying out research on standards for vesicular and diazo film. The committee was formed but has not been active. RLMS also established a permanent Publications Committee to coordinate the various publishing efforts of the section. The Micropublishing Projects Committee of the Resources Section of RTSD and the Government Documents Round Table (GODORT) Microform Task Force were primarily concerned with projects begun in previous years. As yet, coordination of effort among the above groups has not developed. This is unfortunate, for a coalition in this area could be quite effective in promoting micrographic education for librarians and in proposing practical solutions to library micrographics problems.

A new organization, the Office Microfilm Management Association, surfaced briefly in January as sponsor of a symposium on "effective microfilm management." A concurrent equipment exhibition was planned but did not take place. It was reported that attendees felt the symposium was worthwhile.

The National Microfilm Association's Resource Center, established in 1973, is now operational. The center's objective is to provide access to current and relevant resource material in the field of micrographics; microfiche copies of items listed in the Micrographics Index (discussed elsewhere in this article) are supplied to requesters. At present the center's material is primarily of NMA origin, as indicated by the contents of the Index. The Wisconsin Chapter of NMA developed and undertook sponsorship of an educational program for micrographics technician apprentices. The program is to run three years and combines course work
and on-the-job training. This action speaks well of the industry's maturing attitude toward appropriate education for its personnel. The national organization was strengthened this year by merger of a COM users group, Users of Automatic Information Display Equipment (UAIDE), into NMA as the Computer Image Processing Division. This merger should further accelerate the rise of COM as a major force in the micrographics field. Librarians, on the other hand, did not feel quite so enthusiastic about the benefits to them and their institutions of a proposed special interest group within NMA. The chairman of the association's Library Relations Committee conducted an attitude survey and otherwise explored the possibilities of establishing such a division. He found primarily negative reaction to the idea.

The federal government continued to increase its use of microforms in a wide variety of applications ranging from the navy's program to film 67 million pages of personnel records by 1977 to the army's new service-wide program to coordinate and systematize the use of microforms in records management.

Of most interest to librarians was the fact that at the end of the year the Government Printing Office's (GPO) micropublishing pilot project was ready to begin distribution of microfiche copies of the Code of Federal Regulations, which, in hard copy form, consists of 119 volumes and occupies 8½ feet of shelf space. Twenty-one academic, public, and state libraries across the country are to receive the Code on standard ninety-eight-image fiche. Each library is receiving an archival copy of the fiche on silver halide film and a "patron-use" copy on nonsilver film. It is understood that if, as expected, GPO decides to publish in microfilm as a standard practice, depository libraries will be given a choice of hard copy, silver halide fiche, or nonsilver fiche. Libraries that wish to may buy copies in a second medium. The project is intended to develop cost information and to determine whether the microfiche publications are acceptable to library users, have adequate bibliographic aids and indexes, and can be as quickly and efficiently produced as expected. Putting government documents on fiche can save a large amount of money for GPO and much shelf space for libraries. At the same time, this form of publication offers the possibility of a system in which a document, once in the system, would never go out of print; hard copy and duplicate fiche can be produced efficiently from a physically small set of printing masters in fiche form even when the number of fiche in the collection is very large.

As noted earlier, the National Technical Information Service, once again citing the requirement that it be self-supporting, raised the prices of not just its paper copies but also, unfortunately, its microfiche copies. Charges for paper copies are based on the number of pages; for example, a 155-page report costs $6.25 (domestic orders), $8.75 (foreign orders). The fiche price is constant for documents of 1,000 pages or less. Any report of less than 1,001 pages is $2.25 to domestic customers and $3.75 to others. Fiche versions of documents over 1,000 pages are specially priced.
Government awareness of the utility of micrographics has led to the creation of the Federal Government Micrographics Council, sponsored by the National Archives and Records Service. The council is dedicated to promoting better and more cost effective use of micrographics in the federal government and will serve as a forum for the exchange of information about systems and applications. At one of its first meetings the group worked on plans for instructional meetings and tours of appropriate local facilities for government records officers.

The degree to which microforms have been accepted in the federal government is evidenced by the fact that the Internal Revenue Service, the only large agency that does not now accept microfilmed records in lieu of paper copy, drafted and circulated for comment a proposal to allow retention of general books of account on both COM and source document microfilm. The scheme described in the proposal would allow businesses to submit descriptions of their microform records systems to district directors who would then rule on the acceptability of those systems.

The preceding statements about new activities in the federal government are feeble indicators of the magnitude of the ongoing micrographic programs of a group of institutions that together spend money and use printing presses at rates which are nearly incomprehensible. Two statistics may help to put this matter into perspective: (1) the Bureau of the Census used approximately 5,000 miles of film to record the 1970 census forms, and (2) the Social Security Administration films about 30 million documents each year.

Innovative and Interesting

The Los Angeles Times is now available on either silver or nonsilver film according to the customer's wishes. While this seems an entirely reasonable way to market a product—it neither forces the customer to buy nonarchival film for a permanent collection nor coerces him into using the more expensive film when buying for relatively short-term, heavy-duty usage—it makes it even more important for librarians to educate themselves about certain crucial aspects of micrographic technology.

In another innovation, the Los Angeles Times experimented seriously with 20:1 microfilming of engraving negatives of the paper, thus eliminating the loss of image quality introduced by imperfections in paper, ink, and the printing process. Samples of the film looked very good as did hard copy produced from them. This technique requires less film, which can be important when many dissemination copies are to be produced. The improved image quality more than offsets the effect of the smaller image delivered to the typical reader screen.

The Council on Library Resources announced its intention to publish a handbook and associated set of microfiche with which a librarian wishing to select a microfiche reader or reader/printer for library use would be able to evaluate the suitability of the various machines available to him. Publication of this selection tool was slated to occur during the first half of 1975.
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In a commendable move which indicated one micropublisher's respect for librarians' professional judgment, Xerox University Microfilm asked a number of them to critique proposals and prototype materials for micropublishing projects. Librarians participating in the first such undertaking received packages containing a description of a "Foreign Affairs Information service," a sample thesaurus page, and a prototype subject index. The librarians' evaluations of the project and the sample items were elicited by means of a questionnaire. It appears that this new communication process has great potential for providing the company with valuable and timely advice and its customers with quality products.

Dartmouth College Library has issued an innovative publication which by use of mixed media allows the library to share unique resources with a wider audience. The item is a 5-by-6½-inch booklet containing an eighteen-page printed biographical sketch of Grenville Clark and a set of fifteen microfiche bearing an inventory of his papers. The booklet may cause a storage problem in some cases because it is ¾-inch longer than a standard microfiche, and the lack of a distinctive title may discomfit catalogers; but the benefits of this new type of publication outweigh these minor shortcomings.

People

Loretta J. Kiersky, chairman of the NMA's Publications Committee, was the recipient of the SLA's Professional Award for efforts that culminated in publication of Introduction to Micrographics, which has become the NMA's most popular title.66

The year also saw the retirement of Vernon D. Tate from his post of executive secretary of the NMA. Dr. Tate, a founder of the association, served it for thirty years and was the recipient of its highest awards. His retirement is cause to remember the beginnings of the NMA and the often forgotten fact that the association was at one time much more closely associated with libraries and the academic world.

And from England came news of the death on 3 February of William J. Barrett. Published reports of his reprographic equipment evaluations at the National Reprographic Centre for documentation had won for him a sizeable audience and much respect in the United States.

The Future

As 1974 drew to a close, all signs were that the economic winter in which we found ourselves was not likely to be a brief season. Whether it will be harsh enough to freeze out the hardy microform, we cannot tell. If the freeze is not too severe, microforms may flourish and take more solid root in an environment made less competitive by the increasing cost of printed materials.
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CATALOG CARD REPRODUCTION

Supplement 1 to the microfiche publication, Current State of Catalog Card Reproduction (RLMS Micro-File Series, Vol. 1, Supplement 1), published in 1974 was compiled by Joseph Z. Nitecki under the sponsorship of the American Library Association, Resources and Technical Services Division, Reproduction of Library Materials Section (RLMS). The compilation of nine papers on catalog card reproduction in various libraries is a continuation of the microfiche publication project initiated in 1973 by RLMS. It is intended as a working tool for the administrators of library reprographic departments and offers a forum for free and uninhibited communication on techniques, equipment, and problems related to various phases of reproduction of library materials.

The two-microfiche supplement is available from the Library of Congress, Photoduplication Service, Department C-195, Washington, DC 20540. Orders should emphasize that the supplement is being ordered and not the original 1973 microfiche publication. The price is $3.50 for microfiche editions (two sheets). Hard copy is available for $10.
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Introduction

LAST YEAR’S ARTICLE IN THIS SERIES began by suggesting that creation of the Resources Section within the Resources and Technical Services Division (RTSD) beginning in 1973/74 constituted “the most significant [development] in acquisitions work during 1973.” It was also suggested that this development might lead one to expect “new and expanded research into the principal issues of collection development which will be reflected in the literature of the next few years.” These issues include the theory of collection development, selection practice, resource allocation, and cooperative efforts of various types and orientations. Careful examination of the literature in 1974 has confirmed the suspicions of last year that, indeed, these issues have increasingly become the focus of action and research. This conclusion is reflected by the change in title for this review series to emphasize the question of resources, a term whose scope is rather more generalized and significant than that of acquisitions alone.

More specifically, it is a question of access to resources. The time is now past, if it ever was with us, when any library can be self-sufficient, and the consequence is that we are forced to think less in terms of ownership of materials and more in terms of access to materials regardless of who owns them. As evidence, the words of the Harvard librarian in 1974:

This doctrine of self-sufficiency is finally coming to be realized for what it is: a will-o’-the-wisp. We are seeing at last the gradual abandonment of this creed, even for the very largest of libraries. That any library could provide all the resources for research required by its readers is now generally recognized by scholars and librarians, albeit reluctantly, as an unattainable aspiration. Accordingly, a sharing of holdings among libraries is increasingly accepted as an ineluctable necessity and as the only realistic means of providing the full range of resources needed for scholarly research. To be effective, it goes without saying that access to materials not available in one’s own library must be reasonably quick and altogether reliable.
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This means that we need current, comprehensive information on what exists, where it can be found, and how it can be made available at the point of need reasonably quickly and cheaply. Moreover, it is a problem which is of pressing concern not only to traditional acquisitions librarians, but also to collection development officers, area bibliographers, subject specialists, order and interlibrary loan librarians, bibliographic systems experts, and network directors among others.

Complicating the picture, there is also a pervasive feeling among many library patrons, especially those in a university community, that “their” library should strive to provide in its collections all materials which are or may be of use to them—a patently absurd objective as has already been suggested. But our resources budgets are in no way equal to the task of providing “everything that is needed.” Our current attempts to provide a substitute source of supply in lieu of ownership are totally inadequate. Local regulations regarding the lending of material are hopelessly complex and unnecessarily restrictive. Information on the existence and location of materials is only marginally able to match current demands. Delivery systems are cumbersome and slow (interlibrary loan) or cost too much (facsimile transmission). In reviewing the literature on evaluation of library collections, Bonn emphasized “that no library can ever be completely self-sufficient, and that increased library cooperation may be the only possible solution to the growing problem of providing library collections adequate to meet the needs of library users, wherever they may be.”

Clearly, therefore, there is much work to be done beyond the definition of local institutional objectives with the intent, whether codified in policy statements or implied by current procedures, of meeting nearly all patron needs in the local environment. This then is what might be called the “problem of resources”; it is the question of access to materials, wherever they happen to exist, which should be the prime focus of resources librarians in the years immediately ahead. This review of work carried out in 1974 will show that the focus has sharpened, but we have a long way to go before we have a satisfactory grip on the problem.

In addition to the published evidence cited in this paper which suggests that the larger problems of resources and resource sharing are increasingly the concern of acquisitions librarians, it is also instructive to note, within the Resources Section organization, the expanding activity of the Collection Development Committee, the increasing sensitivity of the Policy and Research Committee to these and related issues, and the rapidly growing interest in collection development discussion groups of varying size and membership.

It is also useful to call attention to developments in other areas which contribute to a fostering of more interlibrary cooperation through shared resources. The Information Partnership Act, later called the Library Partnership Act, for example, was introduced in the waning days of the Nixon administration. Although this act did not receive approval from the ninety-third Congress, there were indications that it
might be revived in 1975. The purpose of this legislation is to “encourage support and provide incentive to local, state, and regional groups to work together to provide more accessible and comprehensive informational services to greater numbers of people. It is also intended to provide seed money for the library and information demonstration projects which are designed to demonstrate new information delivery systems and improved library services which can better meet the education and information needs of the population in the 1970's.”5 (italics supplied).

It is clear, therefore, that the problem of library resources, in terms of selection, purchase, accessibility, and interinstitutional sharing, has become and will continue to be one of the most pressing issues of our times. Further evidence in support of this conclusion will be found in the text below.

Resources: Access and Sharing

One of the most significant developments of 1974 related to the problem of resources was the announcement of the formation of the Research Libraries Group (RLG) whose membership consists of the libraries of Columbia, Harvard, Yale, and the New York Public Library. The directors of the four libraries jointly commissioned a study by Joseph A. Rosenthal, associate university librarian of the University of California, Berkeley, whose report recommended that “a bibliographic center be established, that communication links be improved, that a program of shared collection development be undertaken, and that interlibrary use of materials be facilitated.”6 The report pointedly asserts that even the largest research libraries are becoming less, rather than more, self-sufficient, recommends immediate and innovative cooperative efforts, and urges that particular attention should be given to the identification of objectives which can be best achieved through collective action. In expressing agreement with these observations, Bryant noted that “as librarians and scholars come to rely more and more on materials not held in their own collections, it is clear that we shall have to develop means of providing comprehensive information on what materials exist and where they may be located . . . [and] . . . By means of sharing resources, libraries can assure students and scholars use of a far broader range of research materials than could conceivably be at their disposal in their own libraries.”7

In spite of these and other considerations leading to the formation of RLG, criticism was voiced by several publishing groups who charged that “reduced sales and revenues would be inevitable results.”8 The RLG countered by pointing out that the aims of the group had been misconstrued, that acquisitions would always be one of the top priorities, but that it was essential to avoid unnecessary duplication of lesser used publications and to “deploy available funds to achieve maximum availability of material.”9

Further contributions to the establishment of a rationale for resource access and sharing may be found in the collection of papers de-
livered at a conference held in Pennsylvania. The first paper presented in this publication, by John Fetterman, is the most important and has been described by Wright as “a masterly summary of the literature on the subject with an effective interpretation of sharing.” But, as Wright further points out, a number of fundamental issues related to resources and cooperative buying are overlooked. Some of the questions raised by Fetterman remain inadequately analyzed or unanswered altogether: “How do we overcome ignorance and inexperience, psychological, traditional and historical barriers, environmental, legal and administrative difficulties?” It is to be hoped that librarians themselves will find the answers to these problems and guide the implementation of their solutions; otherwise, decisions are likely to be made by others based on political or other irrelevant considerations.

Resources: Personnel and Terminology

The solution to the problem of resources is complicated by a great deal of confusion over the meaning of terms and the responsibilities of resources librarians. It is not uncommon, for example, to find that “selection,” “bibliography,” “acquisitions,” and “collection development” are used more or less interchangeably. Moreover, there is considerable uncertainty and disagreement concerning the nature and role of area studies bibliographers, subject specialists, collection development coordinators, and even acquisitions and order librarians. Almost certainly, progress toward the solution of problems in the area of resources will depend to some degree on the extent to which definitions are clarified and roles are delineated. There is much work yet to be done.

Stueart, for example, made a largely unsuccessful attempt to describe the role of the bibliographer, or to use his exact terminology, the area specialist bibliographer. Unfortunately, the term “bibliographer” is never clearly defined, while the conclusions are tentative at best and lacking in substance. Since the study is based on responses to 362 questionnaires which were sent to librarians and faculty members involved in area study programs, it leads one to conclude that the respondents themselves don’t have a very clear idea of what their functions should include. As one reviewer put it, “no one seems to know just what bibliographers should be doing, or even who should decide what they should be doing.” In short, this study has not helped to clarify the picture, but it does serve to point up the magnitude of the problem of definition and responsibility.

Recent attempts to examine the role of the subject specialist in the university library include that of Coppin who concludes that “the answer will vary from institution to institution ... [and]... There can be no one answer because the varying needs and organizations will determine the different answers.” But of course this doesn’t help at all, except in so far as it supports the view that greater specification and precision are needed.

Taggart surveyed Canadian academic and research libraries and
found at least eleven different titles used to designate librarians with responsibility for resources. Obviously, he is correct in pointing out the absence of uniform terminology for these positions, but he has not helped the situation by using most of the terms found in the survey himself as well as contributing several of his own, including “bibliographer/librarians” and “librarian/bibliographers.” Curiously, he further concludes that, with reference to the faculty, this “diversity in nomenclature should not constitute a serious problem [since] regular communication with faculty is one of the essential functions of collections personnel.” Here then is further evidence suggesting that there is considerable uncertainty over just what “bibliographers” should be doing.

Selection and Acquisitions

Broadus has prepared a useful monograph on the problems of book selection with special reference to small and medium-size public libraries. This work is as much a text for use by students as a handbook or reference book for practitioners. Broadus also discusses general principles of book selection, although the comment of one reviewer to the effect that “he gives pause for thought on the philosophy behind the buying of library materials” is perhaps an overstatement. Nevertheless it is refreshing to discover a book on this subject whose scope is so well defined and which comes so close to the mark, even if a better definition of the “selection process” awaits further analysis.

A contribution by Cobb, dealing with acquisitions as well as selection, is much more limited in terms of its area of application but no less useful. Cobb’s objective is to offer “a practical guide to beginning map librarians by suggesting a basic list of materials and providing sources which will assist them in the selection and acquisition of future materials” and he urges map librarians “in this period of budget restraints . . . to request complimentary copies from all conceivable types of publishers. Many state, federal, and even foreign map publishers are . . . willing to provide single copies of selected publications free of charge.”

More recently, Galneder has analyzed acquisition tools which provide information about the availability of maps, discussed sources of supply, and included a section on evaluation.

With respect to general acquisitions principles and procedures, as opposed to selection practice, the most significant recent publication is that of Ford, who takes a very broad approach and skims a great many topics with a view toward providing both a text and a reference work for practicing librarians. The book has received mixed reviews, mainly occasioned by the author’s attempt to carry out this charge resulting in a certain “broadness, without corresponding depth.” It has also been argued that the predisposition of RTSD to tailor every effort to meet the needs of every type of library, as in this case, has resulted in the failure, once again, to reach or define any audience at all. More serious was the criticism that poor editorial work has resulted in turgid, even mystifying, phraseology. On the other hand, Ford’s book has been described
as doing "an outstanding job of isolating and examining the various acquisitions procedures and in providing extensive and carefully chosen lists of additional sources for each aspect covered." From this it is obvious that it will be some time yet before it is known whether this work has superseded Wulfekoeter's text published in 1961, a book which has been considered out of date.

Acquisitions sources for Jewish materials were identified and discussed by Meir and Edith Lubetski. Their approach included both general as well as specialized sources: publisher's catalogs, trade magazines, bibliographies, book reviews, and government publications.

Evans and Argyres attempted to demonstrate the level of effectiveness of approval plans and concluded that there is a significant difference between the "utility" of materials acquired through approval plans and those acquired by other methods. But the authors offer no general recommendations regarding the desirability of utilizing approval plans, and the basis of their conclusions rests on the question of whether or not a title is used—a factor of relatively minor impact in the case of academic libraries which are the most frequent users of approval plans and whose collection development emphasis is on long-term research needs rather than immediate utility. Recognizing this limitation, the authors adopted an approach which was considered to be reasonably objective and subject to measurement.

One of the difficulties with this and other contributions, however, is that it illustrates a confusing use of terminology of the type alluded to previously in this paper. It is not clear, for example, whether an approval plan is a means of selection, a method of acquisition, an approach to collection development, or even whether it is all or none of the above. Another example may be found in Kohut's analysis of a book budget allocation procedure wherein collection development is confused with a method of measuring collection growth.

Federal Appropriations

As Frase pointed out in his useful summary article on the subject, the story of federal appropriations for education and library purposes throughout the Nixon presidency was one of "pitched battles in every one of the five years." Library and education organizations joined with the Congress in a continual struggle to increase total appropriations above the budget. Despite strong opposition from the administration at every turn, this protracted struggle resulted in an increase of 89 percent for these appropriations between 1970 and the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. This was indeed a substantial accomplishment, but early in 1974 the prognosis for fiscal '75 was more of the same. The expectation was that the administration "would again call for reductions in federal spending for the total of education and library programs," but that Congress, with the support of the Committee for Full Funding and others, would probably "continue to resist cuts in this area and gradually to
increase total funds available for this purpose at the expense of other federal expenditures."\(^{30}\)

Even after the Nixon presidency was succeeded by that of Gerald Ford, it seemed likely that attempts to hold down appropriations would continue, if only because of the fear of inflation and a general feeling that federal spending must be reduced.\(^{31}\) Even the Congress, which had defended full funding for federal aid to education during the Nixon years, showed indications of giving in to the Ford administration’s economy drive and its consolidation of certain categorical programs. In addition, alarming signs of internal disagreement appeared in the previously united front of the Committee for Full Funding. There was little cause for rejoicing, therefore, when President Ford “signed into law the largest legislative package of federal education aid ever,”\(^{32}\) authorizing appropriations to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This bill (HR 69), which became Public Law 93-380, extended ESEA programs through fiscal 1978 and created a number of new education programs as well. The administration was well aware that authorizing legislation cost nothing in terms of actual future expenditures and sought the opportunity to ask for forward funding to carry out the 50 percent consolidation of categorical programs in fiscal 1976. In signing the bill on August 21, the president pointedly warned Congress to be conservative in appropriating money for education programs.

Congressional action on appropriations for ESEA, for the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA), for the Higher Education Act (HEA), and for other programs was delayed first by the Labor Day recess, then by the break for elections on October 17. Finally, on 2 December 1974 President Ford signed HR 15580 (PL 93-380) funding both LSCA and HEA Title II, but most observers anticipated a round of deferrals and rescissions which seemed likely to be reflected in funding levels recommended in the 1975 budget.\(^{33}\) Funding for the school library program, ESEA Title II, was to be provided in the first supplemental appropriations bill for 1975 (HR 16900) which the president signed on 27 December.

Early indications were that the effect of potential deferrals and rescissions would be a reduction in funding for HEA Title II from $12,975,000 appropriated by Congress to zero, and that the appropriation for ESEA II might be reduced from $95,250,000 to $90,250,000. The fears and other effects of impoundment generated during the Nixon years were not forgotten as librarians entered the third quarter of fiscal 1975 (January–March) with no word from the administration as to how library funding would be released.\(^{34}\)

**Postal Rates**

Late in 1973 opposition was mounted to the temporary postal rate increases scheduled to go into effect on 5 January 1975. This effort was led by the Association of American Publishers, which urged the Cost of Living Council “to conduct a full inquiry into the inflationary effects of
the proposed rate increase," and by the American Library Association, which reported to the council that "postal rate increases will result in reduction in funds for book purchases and library services." As a result of these and other appeals, the council directed the U.S. Postal Rate Commission to defer rate increases until at least 7 March, pending action by the commission after another series of hearings.

In midyear the House and Senate passed a bill (S. 411) designed to lengthen the phase-out periods for second, third, and fourth class postal increases and thus ease the burden on publishers and libraries. Optimism generated by this development was tempered by fears of a presidential veto, particularly in view of the uncertainty surrounding the chances of producing a two-thirds majority in the House. But on 30 June President Nixon signed into law PL 93-328 which had the effect, among other things, of maintaining the library rate at 6¢ for the first pound and 3¢ for each additional pound.

Copyright

Following the decision of the United States Court of Claims absolving the National Library of Medicine and the National Institutes of Health of copyright infringement in the suit brought by Williams & Wilkins, the latter announced their decision to appeal to the Supreme Court. Opening arguments were presented on 17 December 1974 in the case of The Williams & Wilkins Co., v. The United States, (No. 73-1279). Although the Court of Claims gave several reasons for its verdict, it emphasized that the decision applied only to the immediate case and that "Congress should determine the extent of photocopying permissible under the copyright law." Congressional leadership for a general revision of the copyright law once again fell to Senator John McClellan, chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights, who introduced S. 1361, a copyright bill virtually identical to S. 644 of the ninety-second Congress. The Senate Judiciary Committee ordered the bill favorably reported, and while Senate concurrence was anticipated, it was nevertheless quite clear that there was little chance that the House would pass the bill. The Senate did in fact pass S. 1361 on 9 September by a vote of 70-1, but there was insufficient time left in the session for the House to act. Once again, therefore, general copyright revision was delayed until the next Congress—the ninety-fourth. In lieu of the omnibus bill, however, the Senate passed a shorter copyright bill which included a provision for extending the duration of expiring copyrights until 31 December 1976. Following House concurrence later in the year, Congress sent a bill (S. 3976) to the president on 19 December with every expectation that he would sign it.

Another important copyright development at the beginning of 1974 was the establishment of the new All-Union Soviet Copyright Agency (VAAP) charged with responsibility for all international publishing arrangements between the Soviet Union and the rest of the world. This
followed a decision by the USSR in May 1973 to accede to the Universal
Copyright Convention. Official announcements stressed that VAAP
was not a government body, rather it should be regarded as a commercial
agency, albeit monopolistic, designed to help Soviet authors, artists, and
scientists who want to reach an international audience.

A useful article by Winn deals with the copyright problems faced by
archivists in acquiring papers and records protected by contemporary
common law literary property rights. The author urges the early pas-
sage of copyright revision legislation and suggests practices to lessen the
liabilities of the present situation.

Government Publications

Early in 1974 it was announced that Congress would move to phase
out special appropriations used to offset budget deficits of the Govern-
ment Printing Office (GPO) with the intent of improving self-sufficien-
cy on the GPO's publishing program. The Joint Committee on Printing
then proclaimed its intention to raise the prices of all government pub-
llications, and cost-saving subscription packages, and to make trade dis-
counts to jobbers unfeasible. It seemed clear that these actions would
"inevitably greatly reduce the flow of government information" and
it was suggested that the GPO price action was designed to decrease de-
mand, lighten the work load, and limit access to public information in
the future to depository sources only.

Reasons advanced to account for the sudden and dramatic changes
included skyrocketing operating costs and postal rate increases which
government agencies had to absorb immediately in contrast to the five
year phase-in period granted to commercial mailers. Nevertheless, many
of the price increases were unexpectedly large: the Monthly Catalog in-
creased from $7 to $19.85; the Code of Federal Regulations from $200
to $385; and the Federal Register from $25 to $45 per year. Nor was con-
fidence inspired by the results of a General Accounting Office investiga-
tion which found that "the GPO consistently violated laws regulating
the use of revolving fund money by using the fund for salaries and
warehouse expenses instead of for publications costs." The result was
that the GPO was ordered to face hearings on its price increases before
the congressional committee which ordered the GAO study, and the
Joint Committee on Printing was forced to review the proposed price
schedule.

As if these problems were not enough, the GPO continued to experi-
ence complaints about late or unfilled orders. Although the backlog of
orders had been cut from 320,000 to 100,000 by the end of 1973 and to
60,000 by mid-1974, the interim goal of a twenty-one-day turn-around
time still seemed optimistic, and the long-term goal of a three-day turn-
around was out of the question. Public Printer Thomas F. McCormick,
appointed by President Nixon in 1973, announced a three-point program
calling for "improvements in facilities, the system, and the people who
work in it." McCormick further proposed to control costs by raising

prices, streamlining the GPO, and eliminating waste. At year's end, the GPO prepared to occupy a new building in Alexandria, Virginia with facilities for implementing a revised system for handling orders. The new installation was described as modernized and automated with the mandatory distribution system totally separate from the sales operation. Since the space problem had long been blamed as a major factor contributing to poor order response and rising publication prices, librarians will be anxious to verify whether the improved facility will bring about better service.

On another front, the Government Printing Office initiated a survey of 1,153 depository libraries to determine the degree of acceptance for federal documents in microform. A variety of reasons, including the rising cost and shortage of paper, were advanced in support of this approach to dissemination of publications. Based on the results of that survey, which showed that 83 percent preferred microfilm over hard-copy publications in at least one category, the GPO petitioned the Joint Committee on Printing for permission to initiate a pilot program aimed at testing user response. Advantages of a micrographics program would include reduced storage space requirements for the GPO as well as swifter and cheaper response to requests for out-of-print publications. The pilot project was approved in October by the Depository Library Council with the Code of Federal Regulations designated as the test vehicle. The Public Printer's Office stressed, however, that the GPO has "no plans at present for developing an in-house capacity for production or conversion of its publications to microfiche . . . [but] . . . it appeared that the best interests of libraries and the public would be served by making appropriate government documents available on microform."46

An important article on this subject summarizing the viewpoints of a private publisher (James B. Adler), the Government Printing Office, and a government documents librarian (Catherine J. Reynolds, of the University of Colorado) is deserving of particular attention because of the many questions raised by the librarian for which clear answers are not yet available.47 Additional summary information on the question of documents in microform may be found in a contribution by Wellington H. Lewis, Superintendent of Documents.48

A new journal devoted entirely to the subject of government documents made its first appearance late in 1973. Government Publications Review aims to provide a forum for the publication of information on current practice and new developments in the production, distribution, processing, and use of government documents. It can be expected to focus professional interests in the field and has already included some articles on the practical problems of selecting and acquiring documents. Reviewers have been generally quite favorably impressed with the journal (Thornbrough calls it a "must for all libraries and librarians interested in governmental publications");49 but Rozkuszka laments the absence of a provision for Spanish contributions, though French and German as well as English are solicited. He points out that Spanish is one of
the major languages in national document control and the bibliographic problems of Spain, Latin America, and the OAS are “particularly acute and in need of review by competent specialists.”

A major change in the Monthly Catalog, frequently used by acquisitions personnel for searching and verification, was initiated with the January 1974 issue, which included the addition of separate Author and Title indexes as well as a Subject Index. Thornbrough called it the first major improvement since the addition of a classification scheme in July 1924, although he notes that the Author Index has some idiosyncracies and some of the series entries are inconsistent.

Representative articles on the problem of selection and acquisition of government publications include those of Mills, Nakata, and Hungerford. Mills recommends greater reliance on government publications during periods of economic difficulty because of broad subject coverage and inexpensive price. Nakata grapples with the problem of acquisition and organization of government documents through depository arrangements. Various procedures for acquiring U.S. government publications are outlined by Hungerford. In particular, methods for obtaining documents on deposit accounts and by means of special subscription services are covered, and recommendations are offered for each type of procurement method.

In the issue of the Drexel Library Quarterly, edited by Clifford P. Crows, which dealt exclusively with policies and practices in the area of bibliographic control of U.S. government publications, the contribution by Schwarzkopf on the Monthly Catalog and other sources of bibliographic control was particularly useful.

Publishing Industry Activities and Statistics

In view of the critical condition of the national economy, it was more than a little surprising to learn that the book publishing industry is “downright robust.” Three major factors were cited to explain the apparent paradox: (1) funds impounded by the Nixon administration were released in 1974; (2) expenditures for educational materials at the state level began to rise; and (3) the end of wage and price controls allowed publishers to recoup some of the losses of the previous two years. In spite of these encouraging developments, the industry was not without its problems, chief among which was the skyrocketing cost of paper. Most observers predicted that many publishers, in an effort to balance accounts, would reduce substantially the number of new titles produced in 1975 as compared with 1974.

On the other hand, further evidence of the basic good health of the publishing industry is provided by the boom in remaindering and reprinting, where the “major power source behind the growth is the revival of the hardcover reprint after many years of obscurity.” In addition to the small-edition reference or scholarly book of interest primarily to libraries, the reprint boom includes large numbers of mass market titles sold through remaining mechanisms. Remaindering it-
self, long viewed as a barely legitimate segment of the industry, has been sanitized and made profitable, thus contributing to the growth of reprinting with which it shares many striking similarities and complementary differences.\(^{56}\)

Mangouni reviewed current microform publishing programs at major university presses and concluded that microform is likely to come into increasing acceptance. User resistance has tended to slow the growth of this and other areas of microform publishing, but economic factors continue to create financial problems for university presses, as well as for the academic libraries that constitute their principal market.\(^ {57}\) The predictable result was expansion of microform programs because of advantages in speed and economy of production and the equally predictable sense of acceptance on the part of scholars who “have begun to take the pragmatic view that microform publication is preferable to nonpublication.”\(^ {58}\)

An interesting study of the effects of cost-plus pricing as adopted by Richard Abel & Co. was contributed by Andresen.\(^ {59}\) Although this jobber is no longer in business, nor is cost-plus pricing offered anywhere else as the normal pricing structure, the data in this article may be useful for future reference if this approach to pricing should become more widespread. The author prepared a set of graphs which can be used to determine the effects of cost-plus pricing under varying discount rates and list prices.

Neubauer and Selbmann surveyed the application of the International Standard Book Number (ISBN) in book production and for library purposes in various countries. Based on the results of a questionnaire which was sent to sixteen countries, the authors conclude that the problem of the application of ISBN in libraries has become urgent due to the rapid expansion of the ISBN system and the growing use of computerized techniques. They suggest that recent figures show that most “new books acquired are numbered with ISBN, which can be used for library processing.”\(^ {60}\) A number of specific applications are noted, including simplified ordering and accounting practices, numeric registers of holdings for interlibrary loan purposes, and control numbers for automated library processing routines.

Figures compiled for 1974 indicate another increase in the average price of hardcover books, up to $14.09 as compared with $12.20 in 1973.\(^ {51}\) Price averages, beginning in 1973, are computed according to numbers of volumes published rather than titles, and therefore are not comparable to those given in earlier tables. The increase in terms of percentage is 15.5 and may be compared with a consumer price rise of 12.2 percent in 1974. As usual, some categories of material increased at a much faster rate than the average—law, medicine, science, technology, and general works. An interesting new feature in this year’s report on industry statistics is a table showing the effects of a relatively few very high-priced volumes on averages: 951 volumes of general works, in the range of $1 to $50 per volume, averaged $15.15 per volume; but the in-
clusion of 94 volumes with prices over $50 brings the overall average to $23.01. It would be useful, and perhaps enlightening, to have more computations of this sort for other categories.

Prices of paperbacks also chalked up substantial gains, with the average price of trade paperbacks increasing 17 percent to $4.38 per volume.

American book title output rose to almost 41,000 titles, or about 2.2 percent over the 1973 total. New books recorded in the Weekly Record increased 9 percent, but listings of new editions dropped by more than 13 percent. With estimates for 1974 not yet available, book sales for 1973 advanced by 6.3 percent over that of 1972.

In Summary

It is clear from this review of resources activity and literature in 1974 that the process of adjusting to rising prices and declining sources of funds has continued. Indeed, there is some evidence which indicates that a fundamental change has begun in terms of the way librarians see their responsibilities in the area of resources. The work of recent years has shown a renewed interest in meeting patron needs by methods other than simple purchase, including a more realistic view of cooperative acquisitions. And latest evidence suggests that this process has been extended to the point that librarians are beginning to realize not merely the fact, but also the necessity, of the interdependence of their institutional resources. It is to be hoped that future reviews in this series will report the continuation of this trend.
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Introduction

In 1974, the trend toward cooperation and standardization continued, with an emphasis on consolidating existing resources and on eliminating duplication of efforts. Relatively few innovative experiments were launched. Major efforts were devoted to the utilization, improvement, and refinement of existing programs and resources. Economic stringency and rising costs have made cooperation and sharing of resources and records not only desirable, but mandatory.

In some areas of library service, particularly in cataloging, standardization has been accomplished to the extent that cooperation is feasible on a much larger scale than ever before. In areas where varied practices and diverse standards still exist, efforts are being made to incorporate them into a more widely accepted uniform standard.

Literature and activities in the field of cataloging and classification in 1974 indicate a convergence of hitherto separate programs and efforts. Recent years have witnessed many regional activities, but now the time appears to be ripe for consideration of cooperative efforts and central bibliographic control on the national and even international level. Both in this country and abroad, national and international plans for library and information services are being discussed and formulated. In these plans, centralized cataloging figures prominently as a major component. Progress made in standardization and in modern technology, which enables remote access to, and utilization of, central bibliographic records, promises to turn the dream of “universal bibliographic control” into an imminent reality.

The following discussion of the major trends and significant publications in the areas of cataloging and classification in the year of 1974 includes a few items which appeared late in 1973 and were not covered.
ered in last year's article. The discussion is organized under four broad headings: centralized and cooperative efforts, bibliographic records, descriptive cataloging, and subject analysis.

Centralized and Cooperative Efforts

The major theme in this area is national and international planning, networking being the key word. Network is the title of a new serial launched at the beginning of 1974 which includes reports on networking activities around the world. Resource sharing in libraries was the theme of a conference during which network technology was discussed at considerable length. The proceedings of the Clinic on Library Applications of Data Processing include papers describing the experiences of various existing networks and cooperative efforts. Networks for Research and Education contains the proceedings of a series of three conferences on the potential of resource-sharing in a nationwide network.

Networking was also the central topic of several other meetings. The ALA/Information Science and Automation Division held an institute entitled "Alternatives in Bibliographic Networking; or, How to Use Automation Without Doing It Yourself" with the purpose of reviewing the options available in cooperative cataloging and library networks. Cooperative endeavors constituted the theme of a conference on interlibrary cooperation sponsored by the Mountain Plains Library Association. Overseas, "Information Networking and Systems Interconnection in South East Asia" was chosen as the name of a training course held in Japan. Among the topics announced was a discussion on standards and tools (machine-readable cataloging, international standard bibliographic descriptions, terminology, classification, thesauri, etc.) for the interconnection of systems and services. In West Germany, library cooperation was the theme of a conference held in 1973 which included papers on networking. The proceedings of a meeting on shared cataloging with participants from west European countries present the results of discussions on the implications of centralized production of bibliographic information to be used for cataloging purposes in libraries of western Europe and reveal a general feeling that there is need of a system of national centers united into an international network. At the first Conference on Asian Library Cooperation, it was suggested that one method of cooperation is for libraries to provide basic bibliographic information in an understandable form when sending Asian-language publications as gifts or on exchange.

The conferences were accompanied by a great deal of action. In the United States, the existing networks such as the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC) and the New England Library Network (NELINET) continue to be active and to expand, while new ones are being formed or contemplated. Many states and metropolitan areas now have library consortia and networks serving specific areas. With the advancement in modern technology, networking activities are now able to connect much larger areas. Many interstate networks are coming into existence.
bin recounts the steps in the development of the Southeastern Library Network (SOLINET), which will serve ten states beginning in early 1975. Katz reports on the planning of the Satellite Library Information Network (SALINET) being developed by NASA and a consortium of state and local groups, which will make use of the Communications Technology Satellite (CTS) to benefit the libraries in the mountain and plains states. Among the first plans of the newly formed Research Library Group (RLG), consisting of the New York Public Library and the libraries of Harvard, Yale, and Columbia, is the establishment of a Bibliographic Data Center with a computer-based catalog of holdings in the four libraries. It is hoped that this cooperative effort will result in greater library resources with less duplication. To benefit from one another's experiences, the Council of Computerized Library Networks, consisting of cooperatives with electronic capabilities such as OCLC, NELINET, and Five Associated University Libraries (FAUL), has been formed with the purpose of providing a forum for identifying and working out solutions to problems relating to library network development and operation.

It is clear from the discussion above that the trend in networking is toward ever-expanding territories. It is only logical as well as economical that the local and regional cooperatives should eventually lead to a nationwide network. The first step in that direction was taken by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) with the issuance of the first draft of "A New National Program of Library and Information Service" proposing a nationwide network. The draft was intended to be a preliminary statement for the purpose of soliciting responses and reactions from the library community and other interest groups. It became the foremost topic of discussion in the early part of 1974. Regional hearings and special seminars were held with participants from various interest groups. Many pages of discussion and comments from prominent librarians and library educators appeared in the popular library press. The draft drew heavy fire from all quarters. It was criticized for its failure to delineate federal and state responsibilities and its lack of social context, for its failure to address the users' needs, and for its over-emphasis and dependence on technology. With the comments in hand, NCLIS prepared a second version of the draft, which is much enlarged and amplified in an attempt to incorporate the needs of all types of libraries and to emphasize the user aspect. The proposal, which has grown from a single idea into a formal position paper for a total library and information service for this country, now has eight objectives, instead of the one in the original version. Nonetheless, the document still stresses heavily the development of a nationwide network, one of the eight objectives, based on the concept that individual states constitute the building blocks for a national system. When finally implemented, the proposal will have tremendous implications for cataloging. It is planned that a third and final draft will be issued in March 1975.
In other countries, regional and national networks are also active. In a series of articles, Beacock, Beckman, and Maclean discuss Canadian library networks in the 1970s with regard to public, university, and special libraries respectively.20 “Canadian Library Systems and Networks: Their Planning and Development” was the theme of the 1974 annual conference of the Canadian Library Association.21 In Britain, Buckle et al. report on the progress of the Birmingham Libraries’ Co-operative Mechanisation Project (BLCMP), a regional network designed to utilize centrally produced machine-readable bibliographic records in the MARC format in local situations and to assess the practicability of a regional data bank.22 Its monographs cataloging system has been operational since 1972. A national network in Britain is seen as a possibility with the British Library’s data base as the nucleus which contains machine-readable bibliographic information collected from the British National Bibliography (BNB) and foreign MARC records.23 In Japan, twenty-eight university libraries in the western part of Tokyo have organized an interlibrary cooperation liaison committee (Sogo Kyoryoku Renrakukai) with the aim to encourage closer library cooperation among the participants in order to eliminate wasteful duplication of efforts.24 Keren and Høffmann describe the plan for a network for scientific and technological information services in Israel.25 Library Information System (LIBRIS), the computerized network organized with the purpose to aid the research libraries throughout Sweden in performing acquisition, cataloging, serial control, and loan activities and to allow for communications with international systems such as the MARC II project, is reported to be partially operational.26

Just as the states are to serve as building blocks for a national structure of library and information service, individual nations are envisioned as parts of an international network. Efforts are being made toward achieving such a goal. Universal Bibliographic Control (UBC), the theme of the thirty-ninth International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) meeting in 1973, is being translated into action. The International Office for Universal Bibliographic Control, established in July 1974, absorbed the former IFLA Cataloguing Secretariat, with two major goals: “to catalog each item only once, as near to the source as possible; and to make bibliographic information on all publications issued in all countries available in an internationally accepted form.”27 A statement of policy and goals has been prepared by the director of the new UBC Office.28 An abbreviated version of the statement was used as the IFLA working document at the Intergovernmental Conference on the Planning of National Documentation, Library and Archives Infrastructures held in Paris in September. At this conference, the theme “National Information Systems (NATIS)” was discussed in terms of integrated planning, planning information technology, and planning manpower.29 One of the objectives of developing NATIS is the achievement of universal bibliographic control as a result of national bibliographic control based on international standards observed in each country of the world.
A similar theme, “National and International Library Planning,” was adopted by the fortieth IFLA General Council meeting held in Washington, D.C., in November. Thus, the trend is clearly toward international networking envisioned by some as “similar to the planning of an interstate highway system. Within the next few years, the pattern of information collaboration will be like a map of small country roads leading to the interstates which cross national borders.”

The networking activities involve and affect the entire library system and all facets of library service, but the implication for cataloging is particularly significant. At the heart of all the planning and endeavors is the idea of consolidated efforts in creating and distributing bibliographic records. Activities in specific areas of cataloging and classification indicate an awareness and consciousness of these movements on the national and international scale.

Bibliographic Records

An effective system of bibliographic control, particularly on the national or international level, must be predicated on standardized structure and format for records. Recent developments in this area have been encouraging. Avram reports on a series of meetings sponsored by the Council on Library Resources to discuss the implications of bibliographic data bases being built around the country and the possibilities of sharing these resources. The participants agreed that the MARC format, which has been adopted as both a national and an international format by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) and the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) respectively, should be the format for the interchange of bibliographic data. This series of meetings resulted in the forming of a group called the Conference to Explore Machine-Readable Bibliographic Exchange (CEMBI).

At the Library of Congress, the MARC system continues to expand and serve libraries across the nation. At midyear, the LC MARC data base contained approximately 450,000 records for monographs and 33,100 records for other types of materials. Progress is being made on the Multiple Use MARC System (MUMS). An initial version began operation earlier in the year, and a second version, to support the redesign of the MARC input system and the automated process information file project, was to replace the initial version later in the year.

The Canadian MARC format has been designed as a part of the Canadian/Cataloguing Subsystem. Phase I of the automation of Canadiana, limited to monographs and theses in microform, became fully operational in 1974. Its computerized cataloging system now produces the text for parts I and II of Canadiana, cards for all National Library catalogs and for a proof service, and MARC tapes for a pilot distribution project. In other countries, the Australian MARC specification has been issued, and Germany has produced a MARC format named MABI (Maschinelles Austauschformat für Bibliotheken). Devised for monographs, serials, periodical articles, and authority files, MABI has
been adopted by the data-processing subcommittee of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft as the German exchange format. Its first user is the Deutsche Bibliothek, which applies the new format in the compilation of the Deutsche Bibliographie, now also available as a tape service. The INTERMARC Working Group, with representatives from Belgian, Swiss, and French libraries, has developed a format for bibliographic exchange for French-speaking countries. The format, also named INTERMARC, follows the codes in the MARC II format as closely as possible.

We may certainly hope that these activities on the national level are converging, with the result that we may anticipate realization of the dream of universal bibliographic control. Although the various national MARC formats have been designed to be MARC-compatible, differences and variations in detail do exist. To interface the various formats in order to facilitate international exchange of bibliographic records, an international exchange format with the principal function of transferring data across national boundaries will be required. Indeed, this has been a major consideration in the minds of those working with the MARC formats. In the second of a series of working papers on content designators for machine-readable records prepared for the IFLA Working Group on Content Designators, Avram and Rather discuss the principles of format design based on the assumption that there will be a SUPERMARC which will be used for international exchange and should conform to certain conventions, particularly ISO 2709 (Documentation—Format for bibliographic information interchange on magnetic tape). Regarding the ISO format, Coward outlines the proposal submitted from the UK MARC office for revisions of the directory structure, the representation of characters, the characters allowed in tags, and the use of tag 002 (subrecord directory). It is reported that the IFLA working group has reached an agreement on the first draft of an international format for the communication of bibliographic data in machine-readable form, which will be circulated for comments in the spring of 1975.

Regarding the technical aspects of producing and retrieving bibliographic records, Fokker and Lynch describe the application of the variety-generator approach to the description of personal author names in a bibliographic data base by means of small sets of keys, and Butler presents a review and discussion of the technique of automatic format recognition of MARC bibliographic data.

Cataloging in publication (CIP), an attempt to provide bibliographic records at the source, continues to attract attention. At midyear, the Library of Congress reports over 640 publishers have joined the program, among which are eleven federal agencies. The recent inclusion of certain government publications in the program was a topic of discussion at two regional workshops on federal documents. The coverage of the CIP program continues to expand both in terms of participating publishers and the number of titles processed. Now that the pro-
gram has been in operation for over two years, its effectiveness is being assessed. A survey conducted in March, and the first of a series of regional workshops on the program held in the same month at Rutgers University, revealed librarians' desire for even greater publisher participation and increasing coverage and their wish to have the CIP entry established in a standardized format from which catalog cards can be reproduced directly. Bunnell reports on the results of an inquiry sent to New Jersey college and university libraries, which confirm those of the workshop and the survey mentioned above. A "mini-symposium" on CIP reported savings in cost and time as the immediate benefits of the program, but indicated that there seems to be a general lack of understanding on the part of many librarians about the intended purpose and scope of the program.

In addition, some users have experienced less effectiveness with the CIP program than others. Berman reports that titles acquired by Hennepin County libraries and Orange (N.J.) public libraries carried CIP data at a rate of 37 percent as compared with the projected claims of 55 to 80 percent coverage of current U.S. imprints. Scilken criticizes the program for not fulfilling the need of many libraries for swift delivery of printed catalog cards at a reasonable cost for every American trade book. An interesting view from the other side of the fence—the publishers—is presented by Pascal, who discusses the processes and the problems involved in the participation by a publisher in the CIP program and points out that there are really no immediate obvious benefits to the publisher.

Several other countries have also developed CIP programs. Brazil's program, begun in 1971, continues to expand; Australia has initiated a full-scale CIP program in 1973; West Germany has a pilot project trying out CIP with one publisher; and Canada, Great Britain, and Mexico have also expressed great interest in establishing such a program. Russia's CIP program now includes 185 central republican regional and district publishing houses which bring out books that contain a call mark and a model of an annotated card, and a number of individual publishing houses of the allied republics that produce a prepared catalog card at the same time as the book. To assist the development of CIP programs, IFLA has secured a grant from the Unesco Division of Documentation, Libraries and Archives for a study of existing systems and current proposals for cataloging in publication, and of the conditions for its successful application in countries at different stages of development.

The technique of producing catalogs, the major form of bibliographic records, continues to be a topic of interest. Micrographics has now been combined with the technology of the computer in catalog production, resulting in lower costs and more efficient updating. Computer output microfilm (COM), in particular, is attracting a great deal of attention. The proceedings of the COM Cataloguing Workshop Seminar present the results of an investigation into the use of COM for library
catalogs. Gibson describes the BIBCON system which accepts data from several different input devices and can produce a variety of output formats by line printer, photocomposition, or computer output microform. Phillips discusses the pros and cons of the computerized book catalog vs. the manual card catalog with particular reference to map collections. Tucker has compared the cost of producing different physical forms of catalogs with output from a bibliographic data base, including line printer hard copy, COM for offset/litho printing, magnetic tape for phototypesetting, 16 mm microfilm, microfiche, and ultrafiche.

Concerning the more traditional form, the card catalog, Farris describes and compares various kinds of "cataloger's cameras" and copiers used in producing complete catalog card sets and comes to the conclusion that the technique has not advanced a great deal in the last decade. However, he suggests that the equipment used by OCLC for producing complete catalog card sets, although not including a cataloger's camera, provides a better answer for the need of libraries.

With regard to the arrangement of the catalog, two activities are worth reporting. The ALA/RTSD Computer Filing Committee, using the rules embodied in Filing Arrangement in the Library of Congress Catalogs (provisional version, 1971) as a starting point, is attempting to arrive at an agreement on points common to all types of catalog arrangement. The British Library has established a Filing Rules Committee with the objectives of drawing up a code of filing rules for use by the British Library and a simplified subset for systems with less complex requirements and presenting the rules to the Library Association as a contribution toward the formulation of a national library filing standard. Also on the topic of filing is Anderson's comparison of four different methods of arrangement of Chinese-language author-title catalogs.

Descriptive Cataloging

The major events in 1974 were the publication of the first standard edition of ISBD(M): International Standard Bibliographic Description for Monographic Publications and the revised edition of chapter 6 (incorporating chapter 9) of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR). The standard edition of ISBD(M) retains the structure of the preliminary edition published in 1971. The revised text includes more details and examples and incorporates the decisions made at the ISBD(M) revision meeting in 1973. With the publication of the definitive text of ISBD(M), the four authors of AACR proceeded to complete the revision of chapter 6 of AACR, with the redrafting done by Paul W. Winkler of the Library of Congress. The major changes in the revised edition lie in the areas of punctuation, statement of authorship, and imprint. The Library of Congress began implementing the new rules in September and Tate has prepared a guide outlining the differences between the revised and the original rules.

Meanwhile, work on revising the entire AACR progresses steadily.
Joint Steering Committee for Revision of *AACR* was formed with representatives from the U.S., Britain, and Canada. The objectives of the revision have been defined: to reconcile in a single text the present North American and British texts including official changes since 1967 and to consider for inclusion amendments and changes and work currently in process, with attention paid to international interests. Work on the revision is scheduled to begin in January 1975, and the target date for publication of the revised edition is 1977.64 Paul W. Winkler has been appointed editor, with Michael Gorman from Britain serving as associate editor.

In relation to the revision of *AACR*, many questions have been raised in the area of corporate authorship. Verona's study of corporate authorship, a project of the IFLA Committee on Cataloguing, is reported to be in the final stages. This study includes an analysis of a wide range of national cataloging codes and national bibliography entries and an examination of manuals used by international information agencies and some abstracting and indexing services.65 The results will be published by IFLA. Koel discusses the difficulties involved in applying the concept of corporate authorship to cataloging because of the lack of a generally agreed theoretical basis.66 Domanovszky questions the validity of cataloging rules which assign main entry to an editor or a compiler and advocates abolishing such rules.67

One major area of emphasis in the revision of *AACR* is the cataloging of nonbook materials. Various standards are currently in use and efforts are being made to incorporate them into a uniform text to be included in *AACR*. Early in 1974, the Library of Congress began work on a revision of chapter 12 of *AACR* which includes nonbook instructional materials in addition to materials for projection. The draft has been presented formally to the Catalog Code Revision Committee.68

In the meantime, librarians are still faced with the problem of choosing among several existing codes. Massonneau offers some suggestions based on consideration of the function of the catalog in the media center, the cataloging problems presented by nonbook media, the methodology of the code, and a number of practical matters.69

In the same area, work toward international standardization has also been initiated. IFLA is sponsoring, with a grant from Unesco, a survey of existing systems and current proposals for cataloging nonbook materials.70

While the revision of *AACR* is progressing steadily, greater agreement on cataloging principles is also being achieved outside the Anglo-American sphere. The newly published Swedish and Danish cataloging rules were developed with the *AACR* as the model for the determination of the entry and the form of headings and with the *ISBD* as the basis for the descriptive section.71 A French translation of the *AACR* (North American text) has also been published.72

In German-speaking countries, efforts have been made in recent years to develop the *Regeln für die alphabetische Katalogisierung (RAK)*, in-
corporating the Paris Principles and ISBD. Tamberg provides a summary of recent developments. Some of the concepts in the new rules, particularly corporate authorship and the mechanical (rather than grammatical) title, are new to German librarians. A number of authors have discussed the rationale of the rules, with explanatory examples. Kittel explains the entries under names of persons and corporate bodies and titles. Oppen discusses the general rules with regard to the functions of the alphabetical catalog and the unit card. Kaltwasser traces the genesis of the rules, explains their structure, and discusses their application. Landwehmeyer discusses the problems encountered in introducing RAK into established university libraries. In these expositions, attempts are constantly made to compare the new rules with the former practice according to the Prussian Instructions.

Although the various cataloging codes do not agree in every detail, they have been developed with the Paris Principles and the ISBD(M) as the bases. In this sense, greater international agreement has been achieved in cataloging than in any other area of library service.

The cataloging of government publications was a major topic of discussion at several workshops, among which were the two federal documents regional workshops mentioned earlier. Kanely reports on a workshop on the indexing and bibliographic control of government publications. Neddermeyer discusses two alternative methods for the cataloging of maps, and Bergen presents a general discussion on the classification, cataloging, and filing of maps. A similar topic was discussed by Daehn, Hansen, and Horhota. It was reported that work on developing an ISBD(Maps) has been initiated by the IFLA Committee on Cataloguing.

Several cataloging manuals were issued or revised in 1974, including Boll's programmed manual for entry headings, Croghan's manual for simplified cataloging, Piercy's classic manual as revised by Sanner, and the revised Wisconsin manual for nonbook materials.

On the scholarly side, Lehnus' attempt to determine a canon of works on cataloging by means of citation analysis has identified 184 most frequently cited works, among which six were designated "super-classics" and eight "classics."

Monographic Series, a serial publication issued by the Library of Congress beginning in 1974, listing catalog entries for individual issues in monographic series, is a most welcome tool to catalogers. It facilitates particularly the handling of analytics. The publication of another useful tool, entitled Library of Congress Name Headings with References, has been announced, also to be issued serially.

Subject Analysis

Three theoretical works on classification have appeared. Jolley presents the design of a general classification system based on integrative level theory correlated with set theory in mathematics. The field of
knowledge is divided into two perception classes, each further divided into eight integrative levels. Based on a review and analysis of a variety of classification schemes, such as enumerative schemes, faceted schemes, thesauri, subject headings, etc., Rudelson advocates the establishment of a single basic scheme for classification which could serve as the basis in designing special schemes. Jones analyzes the process of classification in terms of distinction, grouping, and hierarchy.

On the more practical side, new editions of various schedules of the Library of Congress Classification system are being prepared and new schedules for the K class are being developed. The initial step toward fulfilling the long-felt need of a general index to the LC schedules has been taken. Elrod, Inouye, and Turner have combined the individual indexes of LC schedules. However, as the introduction points out, this index, being a preliminary edition, "perpetuates many of the weaknesses of the individual indexes."

For the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC), major attention in preparing the nineteenth edition is being given to the life sciences, sociology, history and civilization, and music. A revision of the subdivisions of area notation 42, reflecting the recent changes in the local government administrative boundaries of England and Wales, has been completed. A complete version of the revision has been published for British libraries and a summary for use by libraries outside Britain has also been made available. In order to achieve a high degree of concordance in the application of DDC among the major users of the system, the Decimal Classification Division of the Library of Congress had entered an arrangement to work closely with Canadiana in assigning DDC numbers to publications. LC has made similar arrangements previously with two other major national bibliographies, the British National Bibliography and the Australian National Bibliography. The DC Division continues to broaden its coverage of titles cataloged by LC, aiming at covering, in the near future, all titles included in the MARC record. For French-speaking users, a French version of DDC 18 has been published.

Relatively few studies appeared concerning the theoretical or structural aspect of DDC. Among these is Stevenson's discussion of the reasons for and desirability of the centered headings, a device which causes a breakdown in the notational expressiveness of the system.

The Universal Decimal Classification (UDC) is now available in various editions—full, medium, or abridged—in twenty-three languages. Laan and Wijn report on the development of the Standard Reference Code (SRC) to fulfill the FID need for a new superstructure of UDC and the UNISIST need for a broad system of ordering (BSO) and discuss the influence that SRC will have on the revision of UDC. The new edition of Bliss' Bibliographic Classification has now been scheduled for publication early in 1975. According to Broughton, the new edition will represent a radical revision and updating of the original, making use of significant developments in classification theory of the
past thirty years. There is still no definite date for the publication of the seventh edition of the Colon Classification. One of the 1973 issues of Herald of Library Science was designated as "Ranganathan Memorial Number" and includes papers concerning the man and his theory.

As in the previous year, the area of subject headings was the least explored among the topics related to cataloging and classification, particularly in terms of theoretical work. The publication of the eighth edition of Subject Headings Used in the Dictionary Catalogs of the Library of Congress (LCSH), awaited by librarians across the country with some eagerness for over a year, has again been delayed until 1975, "for reasons of computerization," but the coverage has been expanded to a cumulation of the seventh edition and all supplements issued through 1973, instead of 1972 as previously announced. A new feature of the eighth edition will be an accompanying edition in microform, issued on an experimental basis, listing the headings and cross-references. Torkington reports on the project of the University of California Library Automation Program in cumulating the 1966 through 1971 LCSH supplements.

In the field of indexing, Coates discusses relational analysis as an alternative to the "categorical" view of syntactic structure. Mackenzie reports on the investigation of the suitability of Farradane's system of relational indexing as a German-language indexing tool, with the conclusion that since the method was found effective in German, it would appear that the semantic interpretation of texts is independent of the linguistic influences of the language. Crosby describes a coordinate card index system based on, but with a much larger capacity than, the optical coincidence system. Wall proposes a computer-aided method of building up an indexing language by linking the terms relevant to any special retrieval system into the UDC. Prywes, Lang, and Zagorsky report on a series of programs developed to process data bases consisting of textual items and to index and classify the data items in accordance with an automatically generated classification system. Salton and Yang review the existing practice in automatic indexing and evaluate the standard theories and techniques for the specification of term values (or weights). Sparck Jones discusses the logic of different types of index term weighting and describes experiments testing weighting schemes of these types.

In a lucid and enlightening essay, Austin deals with the development of the Preserved Context Index System (PRECIS), an indexing system based on the grammar-syntax idea of context dependency used by the British National Bibliography in its subject index, tracing its development back to its germinial origin in the research of the Classification Research Group for a general classification scheme, through various stages of application and development at BNB, and looking forward to future development and use of the system beyond BNB. The essay also includes the final schema of role operators used in PRECIS, which supersedes all those published prior to January 1974. Many examples are pro-
vided to illustrate the operation of the system. The essay is worth reading for both its historical and practical values. A manual on the system has also been published. Balnaves reports on the use of PRECIS in the Australian National Bibliography, discusses the difficulty resulting from using two systems of indexing (DDC and PRECIS) when the "gears of the two systems do not mesh perfectly," and compares PRECIS with LCSH.

On the practical side, several thesauri for specific fields and disciplines have appeared, among which is a list of indexing terms for library and information science compiled by Gilchrist and Gaster. In Cross-Reference Index, Atkins correlates selected headings for the same concepts and subjects from six sources: LCSH, Sears List of Subject Headings, Readers' Guide, New York Times Index, Public Affairs Information Service Bulletin, and Business Periodical Index. It is useful for retrieval of library materials, as well as providing interesting examples for the study of terminology and vocabulary used in indexing and subject headings.

Conclusion

Nineteen seventy-four has been mainly a year of action rather than theory. In terms of scholarly works in the field of cataloging and classification, this has not been a productive year. However, viewed from the practical aspect, much has been accomplished and cornerstones have been laid in many areas for future development and progress. Looking back, one must consider this a year of awakening to the possibilities of library cooperation on a scale never realized before.
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A New Version of Chapter 12 of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules

B. R. Tucker
Principal Descriptive Cataloger
Descriptive Cataloging Division
Library of Congress

In the last two years individuals and organizations in Canada, Great Britain, and the United States have issued four important documents which deal with the cataloging of nonbook materials. After being studied carefully at the Library of Congress, these documents were used extensively in the preparation of a draft revision of chapter 12 of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. The resulting draft is compared with the four documents used as source material, with information given concerning the coverage and structure of each and the differences in details in those rules which deal with main entry, medium designators, imprint, and physical description.

The American Library Association (ALA), the Canadian Library Association, and the Library of Congress (LC) are presently engaged in rewriting chapter 12 of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR) in order to provide revised rules for the nonbook works presently covered in this chapter and to provide new rules for instructional materials not presently covered in any chapter of the AACR. This rewritten chapter will become part of the North American text of the rules. In New York at the 1974 Annual Conference of the American Library Association, the Library of Congress presented to the Catalog Code Revision Committee a first draft of this revision of chapter 12. In making the presentation, LC pointed out the differences found in comparing the most important of the recently published standards and rules relating to nonbook material and indicated also the way in which the draft revision differed from each of the items noted below. The remarks made on that occasion have formed the basis of the text of this article, but changes made in later versions of the draft have been taken into account and the present text reflects the situation as of May 1975, following approval of the final draft by the Catalog Code Revision Committee at its meeting of 18-19 April 1975. Publication of the revised

Manuscript received November 1974; accepted for publication December 1974; updated May 1975.
Chapter 12 is anticipated in summer of this year.

The draft revision of chapter 12 of the AACR is intended insofar as possible to exploit the results of extensive earlier work reflected in four documents: Non-book Materials Cataloguing Rules, prepared by the Media Cataloguing Rules Committee of the Library Association ("British rules"), Nonbook Materials: The Organization of Integrated Collections, prepared by Jean Riddle Weibh, Shirley Lewis, and Janet Macdonald ("Canadian rules"), Nonprint Media Guidelines, prepared by a task force of librarians and audiovisual specialists under the chairmanship of Pearce S. Grove, and Standards for Cataloging Nonprint Materials, prepared by the Association for Educational Communications and Technology ("AECT standards").

The library began work on this draft with no prejudices relative to positions which might be termed "American," "Canadian," or "British," as shown in the publications cited above or in other articles, correspondence, etc. However, a study of the deliberations held since 1967 soon made it clear that LC was committed to reflecting a consensus of "North American" opinion on at least one item—the medium designator, namely that (1) every catalog entry for a nonbook item should include a medium designator, (2) the medium designator should be generic rather than specific, whenever there was such a choice, and (3) the medium designator should be positioned directly after the title. In fact the terms to be used to designate the various media had already been determined by LC in June 1972 in close consultation with the Joint Advisory Committee on Nonbook Materials. Another matter already settled was the coverage of the draft. A wholesale revision of Part IIII of the AACR will be included in the preparation of the second edition (scheduled to be undertaken in January 1975), thus precluding a total revision at this time of rules for materials covered in chapters 10 (manuscripts), 11 (maps, atlases, etc.), 13 (music), 14 (phonorecords), and 15 (pictures, designs, and other two-dimensional representations). Thus the revised draft of chapter 12 will differ from the other published rules and standards in that the latter are intended to cover all nonbook materials, while the scope of the draft is limited to motion pictures, filmstrips, videorecordings, slides and transparencies, and special instructional materials not previously covered in AACR.

An initial decision was made to write an entirely new chapter instead of revising rule by rule the existing one. Chapter 12 is strongly influenced by concepts derived from theatrical films, and it does not seem possible to fit within its framework such widely differing works as non-theatrical films, slides, transparencies, videorecordings, and a wide variety of instructional materials, including charts, dioramas, flash cards, games, kits, models, and realia. The comprehensive revision was managed by adopting a format generally in agreement with the several existing codes, i.e., general rules covering all nonbook materials, followed by special rules concentrating to a large extent on physical description for each medium.

An examination of the codes made it immediately apparent that
there was great similarity both in general philosophy and in many details of description. The major points of divergence were (1) the British placement of the medium designator in the collation area and (2) the AECT rule for arbitrary title main entry in all cases. There is of course a superficial appearance of disagreement on every page of the several codes because of great differences in approach, in wording, in details of structure, and in general style. But disagreement is not apparent in the substance of the rules. It seems necessary to say this in order to put into perspective the remainder of these remarks which concentrate on how the present draft and the existing codes differ in the matters of structure, coverage, main entry, medium designators, imprint, and physical description.

The following comparison concentrates on the publications identified as British rules, Canadian rules, and AECT standards. *Nonprint Media Guidelines*, cited earlier as a fourth source on which the draft of chapter 12 depends, is a document of six leaves which, as its title indicates, is too restricted in scope to figure in the comparison as often as the other three publications. No criticism of any of the publications is intended by statements in this article. All were invaluable in the writing of the draft and will continue to be so as work progresses toward the completion of the new chapter 12.

**Structure**

The AECT standards consist of two sections: the first is devoted to general cataloging rules, applicable to all media; the second consists of specialized rules for individual media, providing for each, information on the source and choice of title and on physical description. Examples and definitions are also provided for each medium.

The Canadian rules include general rules intended to cover all media, with individual media covered in detail by individual supplements devoted to definitions, additions, and exceptions to the general rules. These supplements always cover collation but otherwise vary from medium to medium; they may also give special directions for main entry, imprint, etc. The special rules include many examples showing complete catalog records.

The British rules also include general rules followed by special rules. The special rules are divided into three sections: "Graphics and three-dimensional representations," "Motion pictures," and "Sound Recordings." Each of these sections includes rules general to that section as well as special provisions for physical description, all of which constitute exceptions to or amplifications of the main section of general rules. The special provisions include some definitions. Complete catalog entries are not used as examples; portions of examples are given illustrating specific points throughout the rules.

The LC draft has one set of rules covering entry and all aspects of description. Some of these are subdivided into special rules dealing with certain of the media; the rules for physical description include particularly extensive and specialized treatment for each medium. Portions of
catalog records, rather than complete entries, are provided as examples throughout the draft, and definitions are provided in a separate glossary.

Coverage

As already indicated, the American, British, and Canadian rules all include rules or standards for all types of nonbook materials and are therefore more comprehensive than the draft inasmuch as they cover materials such as microreproductions, maps, pictures, and sound recordings, all of which are covered in sections other than chapter 12 of AACR. For nonbook material which falls within the predetermined scope of the revised chapter 12, the American, British, and Canadian rules cover virtually the same items. Of the many media included in one or more of the sets of rules, the draft omits only machine-readable files (included in AECT and Canadian rules and Nonprint Media Guidelines) and laboratory kits and radiographs (included in the British rules). Conversely, all of the media treated by the draft are included in each of the sets of rules with the single exception that the British rules do not include “flash cards.”

Main Entry

The AECT standards specify that “the entry for all audiovisual materials will be by title,” but also provide that “if an audiovisual work is an exact reproduction of another work . . . it may be entered in the same manner as the original work.”

In the British rules main entry is determined by the criteria for a “statement of primary intellectual responsibility.” Here a person or corporate body’s overall responsibility for the whole of the intellectual or artistic content of the work must be “both 1) clearly attributed as such in the work or other authoritative source, and 2) such that the name has a primary significance in the identification of the work.” It should also be noted that the “Motion pictures” section of the British rules includes this provision: “Primary intellectual responsibility is not normally attributed in motion pictures, and the General Rule is consequently not used.”

The Canadian rules follow the principles of main entry found in Part I of AACR, which are intended to be applied to all media, but observe that “entry under title will occur more frequently for nonbook materials because authorship cannot be established as readily for many nonbook items.” The Canadian special rule for motion pictures prescribes title main entry with few exceptions.

The general principles of authorship of AACR have been applied in the draft with the single exception that main entry under the name of a commercial firm is expressly forbidden.

Medium Designators

As already indicated, the draft prescribes that the medium designator be a generic term applying to the medium rather than to the specific item being cataloged and that it be placed directly after the title. (A
more specific designator may be indicated in the physical description or in the notes area.) The following terms are used as medium designators in the draft:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diorama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filmstrip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flash card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>microscope slide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motion picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>videorecording</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only the British rules place the medium designator as the first element in the physical description area, rather than following the title. The British medium designators tend to be specific rather than generic, e.g., “EVR,” “videodisc,” “videotape,” “flipchart,” “wallchart,” “laboratory kit,” “relief model.” This accords well with placing the designator in the area which includes other specific elements of description pertaining to the medium generally but to the example of it in hand. In the section labeled “Graphics and three-dimensional representations,” the British rules also specify adding the word “set” when a group of items is cataloged as a single unit. The only other points of variance are differences in terminology: the British “cinefilm” for “motion picture” and “specimen” for “realia.”

The Canadian rules agree with the medium designators used in the draft with a single exception: “videorecord” rather than “videorecording.”

Nonprint Media Guidelines agree except that the word “slide” is used in the Guidelines to designate both microscope and diapositive slides, whereas the draft, considering these as two different media, uses the terms “microscope slide” and “slide.”

The AECT standards agree with the draft except for the following points:

1. “Mock-up” and “model” are given separate designators, but provision is made for using “model” for both media when it is not necessary to distinguish between the two.
2. “Slide” is used for both microscope and diapositive slides.
3. “Specimen” is used instead of “realia.”
4. “Videorecord” is used instead of “videorecording,” although the single AECT example shows “videorecording” as the word used.
5. “Videotape” is provided as a separate designator in addition to “videorecord” (the draft uses one designator “videorecording” to cover all videorecordings, whether on film, tape, or disc).

**Imprint**

The AECT standards provide for a statement which may include the following items: producer, sponsor, and releasing agent. The location of an entity is excluded from this statement. The date of release is added at the end of the statement with a copyright date being equated with the release date and being transcribed with the copyright symbol omitted. A
significantly different date of production may also be given.

In the British rules the name given to the area in question is "imprint," and the following elements are given in the order indicated: place of publication, publisher or manufacturer, sponsor, date of publication, place of distribution, and distributor. The absence of any imprint data is shown in a note; there is no provision for indicating lack of a place of publication or lack of publisher or for an imprecise date of publication such as 19—?. The special rule for motion pictures (excluding loops and original videorecordings) provides for giving the name of the country of the production company as the place, the name of the production company, the name of the sponsor, the date of release or exact date of first transmission, the place where the distributor is located, and the name of the distributor. The provision for date allows the date of production if the date of release is not available but does not provide for giving both when they are different. Copyright dates are not mentioned.

The Canadian rules also use the term "imprint." This consists of the following elements:

1. place, which is the location of the producer—but place need be given only if the body is obscure, has a common name, or is a government printer;
2. the producer or manufacturer;
3. the distributor and releasing agent, if significant; and
4. date.

The special motion picture rule for "imprint" agrees with the unrevised chapter 12, providing for sponsor, producer, releasing agent, and date of release.

All three publications retain in the one statement the varied activities of sponsoring, producing, and releasing or distributing. The draft has attempted to separate out and retain in an imprint-like statement called "release/publication area" the activities of publication, release, and distribution, with activities relating to initiation of production placed in the first area of the cataloging record as a "statement of responsibility." Place is given in the release/publication area. Dates of publication, release, or distribution are given and there are provisions for copyright dates, approximate dates, and production dates for appropriate materials, with provision also for the absence of a date similar to that of the ISBD for monographs.

Physical Description

The rules or standards for physical description are remarkably similar in the American, British, and Canadian rules used in preparing the draft. This similarity is attested by the following brief list of variations, which constitute the totality of major variations over a very broad range of media.

AECT standards

1. The word "color" is not abbreviated when used in the physical
2. Under “chart,” there is no mention of “flipchart,” and specifications for charts include a description of the mounting; the draft provides for “flipchart” under “chart” and ignores mounting for charts.

3. The provision for filmstrips does not include any explanation for counting the number of frames; the draft includes specific directions for counting unnumbered frames.

4. For kits, the physical description is usually omitted in favor of a note; the draft provides for an explicit physical description area in all cases.

5. For slides, “(Glass)” is shown in an example of a microscope slide, although the standard does not specify this qualification; the draft omits any specification of the transparent material.

6. For transparencies, the overlays are specified in a note rather than as part of the collation area; the draft relates information about overlays parenthetically in the physical description area.

**British rules**

The British rules for the physical description of slides, transparencies, and all instructional materials largely agree with the draft. However, it is difficult to compare the rules for motion pictures, because the British rules give a multiplicity of specifications with the following permissive statement: “the listing of [descriptive data] . . . contains more elements than are likely to be needed in a non-specialist catalogue or bibliography, and fewer than may be needed in a highly specialized one. Some suggestions are made, but these are neither mandatory nor exhaustive.” For the “extent” of a work, length of film, number of reels, cassettes, or loops, and playing time are mentioned with the implication in an explanatory note that depending on the institution for which the cataloging is being done, only one of these several indications of “extent” would be given, e.g., for a lending library, the number of reels. For videotape also, the British rules include a multitude of data elements listed under the headings “qualifiers,” “extent,” and “enrichment.” It is presumed that as for motion pictures, not all would be prescribed in a particular case. For both motion pictures and video recordings the draft prescribes definite specifications for the physical description area, with others, only partly enumerated, given in the notes area. For filmstrips the British rule prescribes a separate count of title frames, to be included parenthetically after the total number of frames; the draft counts only content frames.

**Canadian rules**

1. For charts, the size of the mount is prescribed; the draft ignores the mount.

2. For dioramas, only the number of pieces (or “various pieces”) and color are prescribed; the draft provides for size, number of figures, etc., material, or any other specification as appropriate.
3. For filmstrips, the term “filmslip” is used as appropriate in the collation (but not as a medium designator). If the frames of a filmstrip are unnumbered, the extent is expressed as “1 roll,” “1 filmstrip,” or “1 filmslip,” but an optional rule for counting agrees with the draft. The draft does not include “filmslip” as a specific term to be used in the physical description area; it provides for counting unnumbered frames “if practical.”

4. For flash cards, the size of the mount is prescribed; the draft ignores the mount.

5. For microscope slides, the type of mount is given parenthetically, e.g., “(Glass)”; the draft ignores type of mount.

6. For slides, “stereograph” is used as a specific indicator instead of the draft’s “stereoscopic.”

7. For videorecords, there is somewhat detailed treatment for the three formats of film, tape, and disc, with recording mode and playback speed indicated in the collation area in some cases, and “line, field, and colour standards” indicated in notes in some cases. The draft’s rule for videorecordings confines the physical description area to form (reel, cassette, cartridge, or disc), number of physical units, running time, sound and color statements, and dimensions of physical units; other specifications are not enumerated although it is assumed that those which are necessary would appear in the notes area.

**Special Features**

The text as published will include (1) examples of complete catalog entries for each medium; (2) a table summarizing the provisions for physical description of each medium, similar to the table provided in the Appendix of the AECT standards; (3) a glossary of terms; and (4) an index. It is hoped that inclusion of these items will expedite the introduction and acceptance of the new practices.
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Part III of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules is not a de facto standard for the descriptive cataloging of nonbook materials because of limitations of scope, awkwardness of arrangement, and lack of successful integration of the earlier separately published rules which it consolidated in 1967. It is essential that the planned second edition of AACR be as widely accepted in this part as in its other parts. Significant postpublication revision of AACR began with an examination of Part III. British and Canadian committees, not previously involved in this part, are helping to make forthcoming rules acceptable internationally and among various sizes and types of library. Problem areas are examined in detail.

IN 1697, THE CURATORS OF THE BODLEIAN LIBRARY were advised by one of their library assistants that “a dozen or more Learned men, who are likewise supposed to know books better than others, meet so many times a week. . . . To consult whether books with gilt backs should stand with their backs out or not; whether Authors should be placed in Alphabetical order as to their names or not; . . . whether when a book contains many different Tracts of several Authors, under one general Title, Every author and Tract ought not to be expressed in the Catalogue.” Printed books had, after all, been around for only some 250 years, and title pages for a shorter period than that, and there was no use trying to adhere to a published standard of library practice, for nobody was so impatient as yet to have rushed one into print.

Manuscript received June 1974; accepted for publication January 1975. Permission to publish this edited version of a paper presented 22 June 1974 at the C.A.C.U.L. Non-Print Media Workshop of the Canadian Library Association conference in Winnipeg has been graciously extended by the association. A collection of the workshop papers is scheduled to be published soon by the association.
Today we do things more quickly. It is not yet forty years since the first motion picture film library was organized to preserve films of outstanding merit, and hardly twenty-five since anything but print materials have formed a part of the cataloged collection of the average general library. But organizers of nonbook materials no longer assert that there is "no best method to catalog maps" or that "the methods of classifying and cataloging slides found in various institutions lead us to believe that no one method can be acclaimed as the ideal solution." Now we have a positive attitude, with over a dozen fully developed manuals for the organization (including cataloging) of nonbook materials listed in a recent bibliography, each claiming, in effect, to be the "best" rules for the purpose. But do we have a standard? It depends on how you define "standard." If you mean a rule sanctioned by a national body competent to express authority in this field, the answer is "yes"—we have Part III of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AARC), which is concerned with "Non-Book Materials." If you mean a rule generally accepted in usage by libraries of many kinds and sizes, the answer is clearly "no." Not everyone has been so cavalierly abusive toward Part III of AARC as the reviewer who said "the new rules of cataloging give no more help than did the old and should not be followed," but in practice, the rules have been, to put it mildly, ignored as often as honored.

Why has Part III of AARC been so often ignored? Is it not because of its purpose and scope rather than its content? It must be remembered that AARC is designed "primarily to respond to the needs of general research libraries" and that it is limited to rules for entry and description. The history of the library use of nonbook materials has been such that the problems of dealing with these materials in general libraries (as opposed to special libraries for particular media) pressed earliest and hardest in school libraries. These libraries, often staffed only part-time and/or with nonprofessional supervision, have as often as not ignored AARC and its predecessors even for books. They look not for rules aimed at research libraries, but for shortcuts. They did not (at least in earlier years) want a series of cataloging tools, but one simple how-to-do-it manual incorporating selection, acquisition, description, subject analysis, spine labeling, card typing, pocket pasting, shelving, and perhaps even classification. Akers and Piercy have been their bibles, not AARC et alia.

It is no surprise, therefore, that most of the many manuals now in existence for the organization of nonbook materials are precisely that: "manuals" for all stages of the handling of nonbook materials in libraries; nor is it any surprise that a large majority of these manuals are cataloging manuals of individual schools or school districts. However, there is a fundamental difference between the manuals of Akers and Piercy and those for the handling of nonbook materials. This difference is crucial and cannot be overemphasized: every widely used twentieth-century, simplified cataloging manual for books and print media has been a simplification or abridgment of the full rules accepted for larger li-
braries, namely AACR or one of its official predecessors. In the case of
the nonbook manuals, almost none acknowledges itself to be an abridg-
ment, simplification, or even an extension of AACR Part III. In fact,
there is still acrimonious dispute over whether the existing formal stan-
dard, AACR, should or should not be the foundation for such a man-
ual. In other words, in the area of print and printlike materials, we have
an accepted standard and its offshoots for particular purposes. In the
nonprint area, we have an admittedly out-of-date, and often ignored,
official standard, and a growing group of mutually competing contend-
ers for the title of “standard.” Clearly the cart (or carts) and the horse
have become separated and are even in danger of mutually damaging
collision.

If we are to cooperate in cataloging, standards are necessary. The re-
mainder of this paper addresses two questions: (1) How did Part III of
AACR come into existence and what is its future? and (2) What are the
prospects of either AACR or any other set of rules becoming a true
“standard,” i.e., a document stamped with the authority of recognized
bodies, and implemented in practice in libraries?

History of AACR

The title page of both texts of AACR states that the rules were “pre-
pared by The American Library Association, The Library of Congress,
The Library Association, and The Canadian Library Association.” As a
longtime member and as chairman of the Canadian Library Association
(CLA) Special Committee on Revision of the ALA Catalog Code at the
time of publication of AACR, I can attest to the inaccuracies in this
statement. It is true only in relation to Part I: Entry and Heading;
Part II: Description is the product of the American Library Association
(ALA) and the Library of Congress (LC) in the North American Text,
and of the Library Association (LA) in the British Text; no consulta-
tion with CLA took place. Part III: Non-Book Materials represents al-
most entirely the work of the editor, C. Sumner Spalding, with some in-
put from LC and even less from specialized associations such as those
concerned with music and maps, which could be briefly consulted in the
late stages of editorial work. AACR notes merely: “Rules for the
treatment of special classes of materials, such as manuscripts, maps,
music, etc., which have been issued from time to time by the Library of
Congress, have also been revised and included in Part III.”10 In the
preface of the British Text, there is almost a disclaimer: “Sufficient time
has not been available for the British committees to establish their own
text for certain classes of non-book materials and in these cases the
North American texts have been incorporated…”11

The origins of Part III, then, go back quite a number of years, with
most of the chapters originating in LC discussions with associations or
other outside experts in the particular medium, as library demands for
cataloging rules became pressing. Music cataloging, discussed seriously
in ALA as early as 1920, was finally codified by the Music Library Asso-
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ciation in 1941; maps and atlases were briefly treated in the 1941 ALA code. The 1949 Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress added an ill-fated chapter for facsimiles, photocopies, and microfilms, and pamphlet supplements to the Rules subsequently added phonorecords (1952), motion pictures and filmstrips (1952), books in raised characters (1953), manuscripts (1954), and pictures and other two-dimensional representations (1959). The table of contents for Part III of AACR identifies these same components, with two exceptions: rules for books in raised characters were omitted as unnecessary, and facsimiles, etc., were moved into Part II.

The significant points to note here are: (1) since 1959, no new medium has been added to the list of separate chapters which cover the media collected by the large research libraries, and kits, specimens, and other typical school library acquisitions remain notably absent from the rules and (2) the several chapters of Part III have remained just that: discrete units, independently revised, which critics say do not coalesce to form a unified totality.

True, through the early 1960s, most world-wide cataloging efforts were being directed toward the basic revision of rules for entry and toward international agreement. But on publication of AACR in 1967, the Library of Congress itself was well aware of the inadequacies of Part III. Its first major proposal for updating AACR as published was a presentation of a new chapter 12 (motion pictures and filmstrips) in mid-1968 to the code revision committees of the four corporate authors of AACR. The major purpose of the proposal was to provide for slide sets and other audiovisual materials similar in form to those already covered by the chapter. Within months, the lid blew off the Pandora's box of Part III, and all subsequent efforts to replace it have proved availing. The significant events of the period, in chronological order, were: (1) LC's retraction of its chapter 12 proposal for resubmission in 1969 after further work on rules relating to other new media; (2) the presentation of a proposal for the revision of Part III in June 1969 by Jean Weih of the Canadian code revision committee, who had concluded that "any piecemeal revision of the rules will not solve the problems inherent in the creation of a useful multi-media catalogue. Therefore, Part III should be restructured . . ."; (3) the decision of the British committee in November 1969 that they "would not, as a general rule, consider proposals for smaller, specific or piecemeal amendment of the rules for non-book materials until the comprehensive proposals recommended . . . had been completed and considered."14, 16

The June 1969 ALA Annual Conference in Atlantic City provided the first opportunity for representatives of all four authors of AACR to meet together since the publication of the code and the first occasion on which any rules for nonbook materials were officially discussed among the four. The initiative in formulating rules for nonbook materials began to shift away from the Library of Congress/specialist association collaboration which had been responsible for most of the ex-
isting rules, and it must be said that the burden lay now insecurely and uncomfortably on new shoulders. The Library of Congress was not anxious to put time into the formulation of rules it would not itself use and claimed to have no expertise in dealing with media other than those already provided for. The Canadian committee let one of its members (Jean Weihs) carry the ball on nonbook rules almost alone, partly because of her previous work, but also because the others felt little competence to participate actively. The American committee's minutes show a general feeling of inability to pass judgment on rules outside those for the more traditional formats until the much later appointment of a nonbook specialist to the committee. They did, however, appoint in 1970 a Subcommittee on Rules for Cataloging Machine-Readable Data Files, which remains the only group working in this field. The British formally organized a new Media Rules Committee of thirteen nonbook specialists in 1971 and charged it to produce in fairly short order a working draft for submission to the official code revision bodies “for legislation into the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules. It was hoped that, through agreement with the Canadians, an international code of practice in the cataloguing of non-book media would be achieved.”

Since 1969, CLA, ALA, and LC representatives have met twice a year or more on code revision, and at least once a year were joined by one or more LA representatives. The minutes of these meetings show a high proportion of time spent on nonbook rules between 1970 and early 1973, when attention had to be diverted to urgent matters in Part II of AACR.

What was accomplished during this three-year period? Inasmuch as we still do not have a new Part III of AACR, the cynic (or the discouraged committee member) might well say “[explicative deleted].” But in fact much has been accomplished, though we have not yet succeeded in sticking it all together. The controversial issues have been thrashed out in all possible contexts and with all possible arguments, and it remains now only to vote on the alternatives.

Controversies Relating to Nonbook Rules

The controversies over the substance of nonbook cataloging rules may be analyzed under six headings: (1) scope: Which media are included in nonbook materials? Are microforms, for example, to be treated here or as books? (2) main entry heading: Should there be one? How far should the principle of authorship entry extend into the nonbook area? (3) terminology: What should the various media be named when the cataloger is called upon to describe them in the collation or elsewhere? (4) existence and location of a medium designator: Where should one put the word “filmstrip” (for example) in the catalog entry? (5) credits: In a medium portraying performance, as well as a work being performed, how should the credits relating to the work and those relating to the performance be separated and cited—in fact, how much detail is desirable for either group in view of the large numbers of indi-
viduals often involved? (6) coherence: To what extent is it desirable (or possible) to make the bibliographic descriptions of the various media uniform or compatible with each other—and how much effort should be made to ensure compatibility between records for nonbook materials and records for books in a multimedia, or “omni-media” catalog? These, then, are the controversies, for though there are many other problems, they are not by and large contentious.

Despite its critics, the existing Part III of AACR does have a marked unity. It rationalizes terminology and the location of the medium designator. It draws many analogies between book and nonbook presentations of bibliographic data and treats them as uniformly as possible. Most important, it specifies that “the rules for entry, heading, and description for books and booklike materials (Parts I and II) apply also in the cataloging of non-book materials (Part III) to the extent that they are pertinent and unless they are specifically contravened or modified by the rules in the following chapters.”

Although I have cited “coherence” as the sixth and last controversial area in the cataloging of nonbook materials, it is in fact the first and most important issue to settle. Many persons and bodies involved in cataloging nonbook materials either ignore or actively discount the necessity of unity of approach among the various nonbook media, or between them and print media. There exist excellent sets of rules for separate catalogs of films, of recordings, etc. And many of the school-library developed manuals for nonbook materials mentioned earlier consider the uniform cataloging of these media, but separate these entries from those for books. This fundamental difference of approach is summarized here in statements taken from the introductions to the two most significant draft “standards” for cataloging of nonbook materials, the Canadian-based work by Jean Weihs and her many associates, and the British-based product of the LA Media Cataloguing Rules Committee, both of which were published during 1973. The former addresses itself “to libraries and media centres which wish to have an omnimedia catalogue,” posits that “in order to integrate all entries successfully the same cataloguing principles should apply to all media,” and recommends that the practical way to achieve this is to develop rules “according to the precepts of Parts I and II of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, varying these rules only when the nature of the material demands it.”

The British committee saw “a single prime objective which was to establish, as far as possible from first principles and the evidence of current needs and practices in Great Britain, a comprehensive set of rules having the widest practical utility in those institutions in which the documentation of non-book materials is a substantial and significant activity. While there was a need for these rules to retain a basic compatibility with those for books and printed materials, a satisfactory relationship with the general principles of AACR would best follow from—rather than precede—the attainment of this primary objective.”

The two are certainly different viewpoints, though they are not in
actual conflict with one another in principle. Because both acknowledge
the need to provide an effective interface with Parts I and II of AACR,
you are the most significant draft standards now in print. With full rec-
ognition of the thoughtful work of individuals such as Antony Croghan
and of associations such as the Association for Educational Communica-
tions and Technology, we must recognize that the two projects discussed
here are the only ones to have been developed in direct consultation with
the official bodies responsible for the maintenance and revision of
AACR. It is important to note that neither of them has yet received the
official sanction of these bodies jointly, and it is evident that work re-
 mains to be done to reconcile the differences in detail between the two,
perhaps even drawing on some other evidence in the meantime. It is
clearly the intention of the code revision committees to produce a single
uniform text for Part III, as for all other parts of AACR, in the near-
est possible future.

The significance of this will be particularly evident to academic li-
brarians, whose commitment to AACR is probably greater than that of
public or school librarians. But to any who remain skeptical of the need
to work within the administrative structure of the corporate agencies
concerned with AACR revision, in view of the complexities and particu-
larly the seemingly interminable delays that this involves, the answer is
that now more than at any time in the past, it is essential to take the
time to achieve an international standard, rather than one which is local
in terms of either geography or type of library. Modifications and
abridgments of the international standard can come later, as they have
for book and booklike materials; but as we look forward to machine-
readable records for all library materials, to compatibility with the pur-
poses and precepts of the International Standard Bibliographic Descir-
pition, and to cooperative cataloging programs involving our national li-
braries and more regional groupings, it is unrealistic—indeed irrespon-
sible—to proceed outside the only framework we have for international
agreement in cataloging, including as it does not only the process of
AACR revision, but also the related work of the IFLA Committee on
Cataloging. It may constitute a ponderous administrative procedure, but
it is indispensable.

One of the reasons it is ponderous, incidentally, is that it tries to be
representative of so many constituencies. In the area of nonbook materi-
als alone, the joint advisory committee to the authors of the Canadian
work comprised representatives of five associations, and the British me-
dia rules committee brought together people from a very wide range
of libraries specializing in nonbook materials. It is sometimes charged
that a handful of people meet in secret and change the cataloging rules.
Indeed, it has been fewer than twenty-five persons who held voting pow-
er on the revision of AACR, but we listened to all sides of every issue
conscientiously (and at length). Would anyone suppose that each cata-
loger, or each catalog user, in North America and the United Kingdom
should be polled for each decision?
Where do we stand, then, in mid-1974, both in matters of substance relating to the rules, and in the timetable for completing a "standard" for nonbook materials? First, with regard to the latter. Both the Canadian and the British works have some considerable status already as de facto standards, some sixteen thousand copies of the former work having been sold to date around the world, for example. (In part its popularity is due to the fact that it is not just a set of descriptive cataloging rules, but a complete manual of practice for handling nonbook materials.)

The rewriting of AACR Part III in the light of the experience of using these two works is proceeding dishearteningly slowly. It has become clear that in practice the writing of draft after draft can only be done at the Library of Congress, or (now) the British Library. No smaller organization can release professional time in the enormous quantities required, as witness the eleven years it eventually took to rewrite Part I. Despite the mild protests of the Canadian and British committees that a revised overall plan for Part III, accommodating all media, should be agreed upon first, the decision has been made to draft a new chapter 12 for motion pictures, filmstrips, slide sets, and related visual media.

Revision of AACR

It therefore appears that a concerted effort on Part III will await the total review of AACR for a new edition, which is now well under way. At what stage of this review nonbook materials will be dealt with has not been determined, and the earliest completion date suggested for the whole revision is 1977. However, everyone is well aware of the pressures from media resource centers, commercial processors, and everyday catalogers to promulgate some improvements early. We are also painfully aware that too long a delay could result in the cart drifting so far away from the horse that they will be forever separated. But the urgency to incorporate the provisions of the International Standard Bibliographic Description (Monographs) into Part II has recently delayed almost all other committee work on AACR by nearly two years, and ISBD should also be considered a part of any new nonbook rules. We will not have our rules tomorrow.

The organization for further AACR revision is as follows: an editor (Paul Winkler of the Library of Congress) and an associate editor (Michael Gorman of the British Library) will work directly with a Joint Steering Committee of five representing ALA, LC, LA, the British Library, and the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing. Other committees for feedback and response in each country will report to the profession through the library associations of which they are a part and seek response to transmit to the Joint Steering Committee. In the American Library Association, there is a considerable proliferation of sometimes overlapping committees dealing both with cataloging and with nonbook materials. In Canada, as of 8 March 1974, the functions formerly vested in CLA with regard to the cataloging code were transferred.
to the new Canadian Committee on Cataloguing/Comité canadien de catalogage (CCC) which comprises representatives of CLA, the Association pour l'avancement des sciences et des techniques de la documentation (ASTED) and the National Library. The secretariat is in the Office of Library Standards at the National Library, and comments from any Canadian librarian will always be welcome.

How, then, will we catalog nonbook materials in the future? Details are of course not yet clear, but some general directions seem at the moment well enough established that I can hazard personal opinions—and I emphasize that these are personal forecasts, without the sanction of committee authority:

1. “Nonbook” will be defined differently. In all likelihood, music, manuscripts, and perhaps even maps will be transferred from Part III to Part II of AACR, where microforms and other photographic reproductions have already been more closely integrated with the treatment of books and booklike materials. Then what is left will be divided into more general groups, such as visual materials and sound recordings, with more attention paid than at present to overall patterns of handling the data applicable to each major grouping (the British draft rules illustrate this arrangement well).

2. Some of the present AACR terminology will definitely be changed: for example, “phonorecord” will probably become “sound recording” (don’t cringe unless you have surveyed all the current terminologies in context and in perspective).

3. Despite strong and logical arguments by the British that designation of the medium belongs only in the collation, the long-standing North American practice of placing a designator in parentheses after the title will probably prevail, at least as an alternative rule. However, the designator in this location will in most cases be a more generic one than at present (e.g., “sound recording,” instead of “phonotape” and “phonodisc” and “phonocassette,” etc.) because of the proliferation of different media which makes the search for brief distinguishing names fruitless. Further specification of the generic medium designator which follows the title will be given in the collation as at present, and this practice will also make it possible to more easily construct a general entry which need be modified only in the collation and/or notes to take care of several technically variant formats for the same performance of a work.

4. There will be alternatives allowed for simplification or modification in libraries which have valid reasons for not wishing to follow the standard international practice (school libraries may wish to treat microforms as a nonbook medium with a medium designator after the title; or map libraries may wish to use a geographic heading rather than apply the authorship principle for a main entry heading). In any case, whatever alternatives are authorized
for publication in *AACR* will be carefully controlled ones which do not contradict the guiding principles of the code.

Let us conclude with further consideration of the analogy from the cataloging of books in the late seventeenth century with which we began. It seems ludicrous today to consider any method of arranging authors other than by surname alphabetically or titles other than under their first word excepting an article. In 1697, these were contentious matters. Today, there are detailed areas of cataloging where in fact many libraries do not adhere to the standard to which they have implicitly or explicitly subscribed. Some do not transcribe a title in the body of the entry fully, preferring to omit an initial article. Many do not cite roman numeral paging in the collation, even when it forms a separate sequence. A standard such as *AACR* does not command obedience by virtue of existence or legislation, but only by virtue of example. Most of us catalog the way we do (sometimes not without grumbling) because in the early 1700s Sir Thomas Bodley and his librarian fixed on certain patterns for their catalogs, and more directly because today the Library of Congress, the National Library of Canada, and (finally!) the British Library present us with a uniform practice which invites imitation in the interests of catalog consistency.

Cataloging rules for nonbook materials are so long a-borning because before they can be fixed as a standard, they must be more patently acceptable than the ill-fated present Part III of *AACR*. Time caught up with that document, and we may not be given a third chance after another insufficient product. Our greatest difficulty, of course, is not that we don’t know our own minds, but that the material we are trying to catalog adequately is still in a state of flux as to its own indicia of identification. We are, by analogy, trying to catalog the book before the title page came into existence. How much more adequately we can do it with the benefit of 400 years of hindsight.

How, then, to deal with the nonbook backlog in your library? My recommendation is to adopt the Weihs/Lewis/Macdonald manual and hope that the changes from this style when the new *AACR* finally appears will not be too great. Canadian librarians have already adopted this work in large numbers, spurred perhaps by nationalism in some cases. In any event, it seems to represent the choice least likely to lead to serious disappointment in the future.
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Progress on Code Revision

EARLIER REPORTS ON REVISION OF THE Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR) have appeared in this journal in the fall 1974 and winter 1975 issues. The following account of recent activities is based on summaries of minutes of meetings of the Catalog Code Revision Committee (CCRC) in November 1974 and January 1975 prepared by Frances Hinton of the Free Library of Philadelphia.

Rules Changed

Major revisions of rule 3 (works of shared authorship) and 4 (works produced under editorial direction) appeared in Cataloging Service 112, which also announced the deletion of rule 5 (collections).

Rules under Discussion

The committee has established a number of Rule Review and Revision Proposal (RRRP) teams to expedite consideration of the rules. RRRP Team 22 has recommended that proposals for change in chapter 14 (phonorecords), prepared by the Library of Congress (LC), be accepted in principle subject to later consideration. The team noted two issues requiring further discussion: (1) the possibility of using the performer as main entry and (2) the terminology for the medium designator.

At the 1975 ALA Midwinter Meeting, the committee sponsored a program attended by several hundred persons at which Richard Anable, Paul Fasana, Joseph Howard, and Michael Carpenter debated the merits of the CONSER (CONversion of SERial Data Bases) proposal of arbitrary title main entry for serials. Mr. Howard supported Mr. Anable in favoring entry under title, but offered as an alternative a policy of entry under issuing body for a serial whose title consists solely of a generic term or begins with a generic term followed only by the name of the issuing body. Both argued against the present rule 6 because it is difficult to apply and because the criterion for creating a new record differs from that of the International Serials Data System (ISDS). Mr. Fasana asserted that the abandonment of rule 6 would have an adverse effect on the integrity and continuity of existing library catalogs. He pointed out that the emerging international standards are in fact standards for bibliographic description only and should not be considered as replacements for cataloging rules and codes. Mr. Carpenter proposed deletion of the
special rule for serials on the ground that the form of a publication should not determine its entry. He felt that both the present rule 6 and the proposal to require title main entry defeat one of the primary objectives of the catalog: identification of the publications of a given author. He pointed out that application of the recent revision of rule 4, which calls for entry under title of collections and works produced under editorial direction, would result in title entry for most serials without endangering the concept of corporate authorship. Questions and comments from the audience revealed general agreement that a rule requiring title main entry would be easier to apply. It would not, however, eliminate the problem of determining what the title is. Examples cited included change in the name of an issuing body whose name is linked to a generic title, lack of a clear definition of “generic,” and variations in typography and word order in different issues of the same serial.

Discussion in November of a proposal to modify rule 43 (fullness of name) to make it reflect more closely the Paris Principles centered on a conflict between preference for the fullest form of a name as the most permanent heading and preference for the form commonly found on the title page as the form most responsive to user needs. The committee approved the text proposed by the Library of Congress with the addition of instructions to be applied in case of doubt.

C. Sumner Spalding, who has been appointed permanent consultant following his retirement from the Library of Congress earlier this year, has proposed adoption of the U.S. Postal Service abbreviations for state names to replace those in Appendix III.F. A motion to this effect was passed unanimously in November, but the change must also be considered by the MARC Development Office before implementation in LC cataloging can be effected. The Canadian Committee on Cataloguing will consider the use of U.S. Postal Service abbreviations for the names of Canadian provinces, to replace those given in Appendix III.G.

Recommendations Received

In January, the committee discussed at length the 15 November 1974 letter of Maurice Freedman, Marvin Scilken, Sanford Berman, and Joan Marshall to ALA councillors, which suggested that the ALA Council “request that the Library of Congress continue to make non-ISBD cards, MARC tapes, and other bibliographic records available to library consumers who prefer the present format; and recommend to the RTSD Catalog Code Revision Committee that ISBD be incorporated into the revised AACR as an optional, rather than obligatory, element.” Discussion centered on the draft statement of response prepared by Doralyn Hickey and distributed in advance to the committee and representatives. Mr. Berman asserted that ISBD is unsuitable for public and school libraries, that its punctuation is confusing, and that it provides information not needed by the users of nonresearch libraries. Ms. Hickey pointed out that there is no evidence to support his assertion because there has been no use study. Other members of the committee supported
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the view that varying patterns of description do not disturb users of a catalog nearly as much as changes in the choice and form of entry. Several members reported greater ease in explaining bibliographic description using ISBD(M) than the previous provisions of AACR. Mr. Spalding noted that, while providing alternate cards was technically possible, it was not economically feasible because to do so would require maintenance of two data bases. It was moved, seconded, and carried unanimously (Ms. Hickey abstaining) that CCRC endorsed in principle the Hickey response. (The Hickey statement, revised to include the committee’s editorial comments, was adopted unanimously by the Board of Directors of RTSD at its meeting on 20 January.)

Mr. Berman presented a proposal from the Social Responsibilities Round Table (SRRT) urging CCRC to recommend editorial policy which would eliminate sex biases in the second edition of AACR. After some discussion of the advisability of broadening the recommendation to include other groups, a motion was carried unanimously that CCRC affirmed its intention to work toward (1) elimination of sexist terminology in the rules themselves and (2) achieving greater parity in the distribution of examples among male and female entries.

In January the committee received a statement from the Government Documents Round Table Committee on the Revision of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules recommending that (1) the name of jurisdiction of the governmental unit should always appear first in the main and added entry, (2) the complete hierarchy of a government author should be given in the main entry, with variations as added entries or references; and (3) main entry of government author be preferred.

**Actions Taken and Proposed**

Ms. Hickey reported that she had presented to the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) the draft revision of chapter 12, with CCRC’s recommendation of its standardized punctuation as the basis for the International Standard Bibliographic Description for Audiovisual Media. After discussion of the importance of ALA’s participation in activities related to Universal Bibliographic Control, CCRC voted to recommend to the RTSD Board of Directors that it establish necessary funding and procedures for regular and official representation at international meetings and urged ALA to work toward a reorganization of IFLA that provides for adequate representation of professional bodies within the member associations. In a related development, Dorothy Anderson of the International Office of Universal Bibliographic Control has written to national cataloging committees in countries known to be using AACR or codes based on AACR seeking general input from those bodies.

Neal Edgar of RRRP Team 2 reported in January the major conclusions regarding ISBD(S): International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials. The chairman noted the general feeling that American input seems to have been insufficient and that this factor has led to recommendations that go beyond problems in the wording of the text,
although the team generally accepted the fundamental features of the standard. The committee authorized the chairman and Mr. Edgar to represent CCRC in negotiations with the Library of Congress and the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing to produce a statement of recommendations of ISBD (S).

The ALA Publication Office proposes to have the text of the new edition typeset and to manufacture books for marketing by ALA in the United States and the Canadian Library Association in Canada. It will offer a film of the set pages to the Library Association for printing and sales in the United Kingdom and Europe. The three associations will be the copyright holders and will share, one-third each, any fees received for translation rights. The chairman agreed to present questions concerning the possibility of a paperbound edition and an abridged edition to the Joint Steering Committee.
ATTENTION CATALOGER!

We take this opportunity to introduce you to our new Enlarger III. This remarkable unit will enlarge your desired N.U.C. entry to catalog card size in seconds. All you have to do is place the catalog on the exposure glass and push a button! In 7 seconds out comes a sharp, clear enlargement for your catalog card production. You may even want to place a completed card on the exposure glass and enlarge that. Great for Computer entry, Search purposes, Inventory or Instructional material. Imagine all of the possibilities!

We would really appreciate it if you drop us a line so that we might send you some sample copies and additional information on the Enlarger III. The more catalogers we talk to, the more we can improve on our unit to be of better service to you.

Hope we see you at the ALA meetings!

vend-a-copy, inc.

405 SOUTH BOULEVARD • OAK PARK, ILLINOIS 60302
As your budget gets tighter you need the best advice you can find.

You just found it. Consumers Index and Media Review Digest provide the advice you need, compiling evaluative information on media software and equipment of value to libraries, schools, and consumers. Each is the most significant reference and selection tool in its field. Purchasing based on advice from these works could save many times their modest cost.

- Digests the contents of articles from over 100 consumer-interest and general information sources.
- Indexes and codes all product tests and evaluations in these sources by brand name.
- Digests the contents of new books, pamphlets and other publications related to consumerism.
- Covers cars, cameras, stereo equipment, tape recorders, boats, camping trailers, insurance, furnishings, and equipment for business, educational and library use, personal investments, health care and much more.
- Designed for use by the general consumer, educational institutions and business offices.
- Published quarterly and cumulated annually: Quarterly subscription, $25.00; Annual cumulation, $55.00; Combined subscription, $65.00
- 10% discount to libraries ordering 10 or more subscriptions direct from Pierian Press. Foreign postage extra.

- Is the most comprehensive and current selection, acquisitions, cataloging and reference tool in the field of non-book media.
- Covers both educational and feature films, filmstrips, records and tapes (popular, classical and spoken-word), and miscellaneous media including slides, transparencies, overlays, games, kits, etc.
- Catalogs all educational items, providing: descriptions of subject content, Library of Congress headings, Dewey decimal numbers, grade level indications, and award citations.
- Includes an estimated 50-60,000 review citations per year, and digests many thousands of critical and evaluative reviews from major reviewing sources.
- Both an alphabetical Library of Congress and a classified Dewey decimal subject approach are provided for all educational media.
- Annual cumulations are updated by quarterly supplements, all of which include subject indexes.

OTHER SUBSCRIPTION PACKAGES AVAILABLE:

Serials Review and Reference Services Review provide similar advice on serials and reference materials. 30-day examination privileges. Send for complete information.

pierian press 5000 washtenaw
ann arbor, michigan 48106
Better is Smaller... when it comes to book catalogs from Xerox University Microfilms

Perhaps you’re already convinced that book catalogs are better than card catalogs. You know they’re cheaper, more serviceable, and more convenient to use. And they’re the only catalog you can take on the road.

Now, Xerox University Microfilms is making the better catalog even better—by making it smaller! The book catalog we recently produced for the Oregon State Library, for example, incorporates an eight-and-a-half-year cumulation—over 55,000 titles—in just 8 volumes: 3 author volumes, 2 title volumes and 3 subject volumes. The library’s original book catalog comprised 25 subject volumes alone!

Think what this condensation can mean to you in terms of convenience, distribution of copies, and space conservation in mobile units!

So, if you’re already convinced that smaller book catalogs are better than bigger card catalogs, give us a chance to tell you how Better can be even Smaller for you! We’ll send a price estimate, too, if you’ll tell us the size of your current collection, your annual acquisitions rate, and the number of catalog copies you want. Just write to: Michael M. Misna, Manager, Automated Bibliographic Services, Xerox University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106.

Mrs. Eloise Ebert of the Oregon State Library examines one of eight volumes comprising more than 55,000 titles in library holdings. Three author volumes, two title volumes, and three subject volumes are included.
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 MCGRGOR PERIODICALS BULLETIN
OUR 42nd YEAR
MOUNT MORRIS, ILLINOIS 61054

LIBRARY EDUCATION IS EVERYBODY’S BUSINESS . . .

We invite you to join in our exchange of ideas between library educators and practicing librarians, trustees and administrators.

Our concerns are your concerns! Are you interested in continuing education, for example? Become involved in the

LIBRARY EDUCATION DIVISION

American Library Association
50 E. Huron, Chicago, Ill. 60611

(If you’ve already joined ALA, you can still add LED to your membership for an additional $15.)

BOOKS FOR COLLEGE LIBRARIES

Second Edition

The new edition of this essential publication for college libraries comprises six paper-bound volumes:

Volume 1 HUMANITIES
2 LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
3 HISTORY
4 SOCIAL SCIENCE
5 PSYCHOLOGY, SCIENCE, AND TECHNOLOGY
6 INDEX

The preparation of the Second Edition, a project of the Association of College and Research Libraries, a division of ALA, was funded by the Council on Library Resources. The nearly 40,000 titles selected are considered to be the minimum essential for the four-year undergraduate library. Subject specialists evaluated the titles in the earlier edition and titles published between 1964 and 1972.

ISBN 0-8389-0178-6 $65.00
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We believe what we do for you and how we do it should be determined by your needs. We have suggested procedures and formats. Our order processing and records are computerized, and we are able to employ our computer to service any special requests you may have. In the event you have a request which a computer, for some reason, cannot honor, we keep our typewriters handy and a perfect willingness to do whatever is necessary to suit your needs.

PERSONALIZED SERVICE
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Access to the World of Foundations
New revised edition of the definitive reference:

The
FOUNDATION
DIRECTORY

Published by The Foundation Center,
Marianna O. Lewis, Editor, Analytical Introduction by Thomas R. Buckman

Complete listings of 2533 foundations with assets of $1,000,000 or more or that award grants of $500,000 or more annually. Each listing includes:

- Foundation name and address
- Date and form of organization
- Names of donors
- Statement of purpose and description of activities, including special limitations
- Names of officers and trustees or directors
- Financial data for the year of record (1972 or later)

Special features of Edition 5 include four indices (fields of interest, state and city location, personnel, and foundation name), a guide to the services and publications of The Foundation Center, and useful pointers on how to apply for grants.

540 pages, 15 tables, 8½x11 inches $30.00 including four semiannual Supplements

Distributed by
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
Address for orders:
136 South Broadway,
Irvington, New York 10533
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 (audio-visual 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
Gale's Standing Order Service

By placing standing orders for the up-to-date reference books published and distributed by Gale, librarians will be certain that their patrons will have prompt use of new editions and new volumes in continuing series.

Standing Order Service is available for all Gale books of a continuing nature, such as the titles listed below. New editions of selected books published by Europa Publications are jet-freighted from London to Detroit, and are available through Gale’s Standing Order Service.

All books sent under Gale’s Standing Order Service come to you on 30-day approval. You may cut back or cancel your standing orders at any time.

If you wish to know whether you have specific titles on Standing Order Service with Gale, or if you have other questions, please contact our Library Services Department. (Phone collect—(313) 961-2242.)

You may place standing orders for the following reference books. Write for our complete catalog for full descriptions of these and other titles available by standing order.

---


Consumer Sourcebook, 1st Edition (in print), $35.00.

Contemporary Authors, Vol. 53-56 (just published), $35.00.

Contemporary Literary Criticism, Vol. 4 (just published), $35.00.


Encyclopedia of Governmental Advisory Organizations, 2nd Edition (just published), $75.00.


Library of Congress Classification Schedules: A Cumulation of Additions and Changes through 1973 (all 32 cumulations in print), first set, $650.00; each additional set, $375.00.


Something about the Author, Vol. 7 (in print), $22.50.

Statistics Sources, 4th Edition (in print), $45.00.


---
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BOOK TOWER • DETROIT, MICH. 48226