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IN RISING to announce the name of the recipient of the Margaret Mann Citation at the business meeting of the Cataloging and Classification Section of RTS on the evening of June 25 in Kansas City, Norman L. Kilpatrick, the chairman of the Committee on Award of the Margaret Mann Citation, remarked that the name of David Judson Haykin had been received, in response to requests for nominations, from large university libraries and from small college libraries; from the smallest as well as from the largest public libraries. “Dave” Haykin had appeared to the Committee to be genuinely the “people’s choice” for the Citation for 1957.

It is increasingly difficult these days to be a specialist, even in one of the arts which are basic to library work, and still be known and be held in affection by a wide circle of librarians in institutions of widely differing character. That David Haykin has achieved this is the result of a combination of his special competence, of his devoted service to his profession for many years, and of an engaging personality.

David Judson Haykin’s career in librarianship started while he was still an undergraduate at the University of Nebraska, in 1917. He continued it, while he was in service during World War I, as assistant in charge of the medical officers’ reading room at Fort Riley. After the war, he returned to the University for his degree, and also to continue his work in the University Library until 1924, when he went to the New York State Library School. His well-developed interest and training in languages and in linguistic problems and his fund of all sorts of erudite information had formed him to be an ideal cataloger, and he became, immediately upon taking his BLS in 1925, head cataloger of the New York State Library. In 1927 he went to the Queens Borough Public Library as head of the cataloging department and instructor in the li-
library school there. All through his career he has combined the activities of cataloging, learning and teaching. His is the type of lively mind which is not likely to be content to take things as he finds them. Doing, in his case, leads to inquiry and to lively discussion, and thence again to doing.

It was natural, therefore, that when in 1930 the ALA was seeking someone to head up the cooperative project for placing Decimal Classification numbers on Library of Congress printed catalog cards, David Haykin was selected. This assignment gave him full scope for his particular talents for working on general problems of libraries with librarians in a wide field. The project which he started on a cooperative basis immediately proved its worth and was soon incorporated into the regular machinery of the Library of Congress, where it still flourishes.

LC, having taken over the DC work, took over Haykin also, and put him first in charge of its Division of Documents (1932-1934), and then briefly in charge of cooperative cataloging before making him head of its Subject Cataloging Division with responsibility not only for the subject cataloging but also for maintenance of the LC Classification and for the DC work which he had initiated ten years earlier. He remained in this position from 1940 until 1952 when he became LC's Consultant on Classification and Subject Cataloging. Among numerous contributions to the professional literature during this period, his book Subject Headings: A Practical Guide (Washington: Govt. Printing Office, 1951) stands out as the first elaborate treatment of this difficult and neglected subject.

But Haykin could never be far away from the Decimal Classification, and when in 1954 LC undertook, under contract to the publishers, Forrest Press, Inc., the preparation of the 16th Edition of the DC, it may be fairly said that the obligation was assumed only because David Haykin was available. He served as editor from 1954 to 1956 through a difficult period of evolving policy with respect to the DC, and when that was straightened out, returned to his duties as Consultant.

David Haykin has been among the most active in the associational efforts which have given catalogers such an effective frame of organization within which to work and such an effective journal as their professional organ, and his colleagues have given him their highest elective honors—that of President of the DC Library Association (1945-1947) and of DCG (1952-1953). That these honors were deserved on purely professional grounds none would contest, but—just as in the case of the Margaret Mann Citation—they went to a man who had also endeared himself to his colleagues by his kindliness and merry good humor, and by his enormous range of information and learning without any trace of side. One, surely, of the most approachable people in the world, he has impressed all whom he has known not only by his desire to be helpful, but by his actual delight in opportunities for being so. The Margaret Mann Citation could not have been more happily bestowed.
Local Cataloging for an Engineering Library

JOHANNA E. TALLMAN
Librarian, Engineering Library,
University of California, Los Angeles

THERE has been much discussion in recent years about cooperative cataloging and centralized cataloging. I should like to point out some of the advantages we have found in local cataloging, that is, doing the cataloging right in our own branch library.

The Engineering Library is a branch of the UCLA University Library. For eight years after its establishment, the cataloging was done by the Catalog Department of the University Library. From the beginning I was concerned about creating a catalog suited to the specific needs of our users and which would not be by-passed because “the catalog is too difficult to use.” I was especially interested in developing suitable subject headings and cross references, as, at that time, the Library of Congress subject headings in technology were lagging considerably behind modern usage. I was able to persuade the Catalog Department that we needed to change some of the subject headings. But, as this would have meant extra work and records in the Catalog Department, we finally agreed that they would do the classification, descriptive cataloging, and preparation of cards and books; and I would decide on and add whatever added entries and cross references I wanted.

Early in 1952 the Engineering Library moved from the Library to the Engineering Building. By this time a backlog of cataloging had accumulated. Due to these and other considerations, the complete cataloging process was transferred to the Engineering Library in July, 1953, with a staff of one cataloger and one typist clerk. The cataloged collection at present exceeds 30,000 volumes.

We have found several major advantages in doing our cataloging locally. One is that the books in process are readily available for consultation. When our books were cataloged in the Library building, it was inconvenient to make the long walk there and difficult to find the item in the large Catalog Department. Another advantage is that our cataloger has daily opportunities to test the results of her work, by serving regular turns at our public desk. She works half an hour a day plus one evening a week at the desk, waiting on our many and varied clients. She learns how people ask questions, how they approach and use the catalog, what subjects they are interested in, and the terms they use. This experience has been of definite value in helping her make the catalog a more useful tool.

* Presented before the Los Angeles Regional Group of Catalogers, May 4, 1957.
Also, we have developed close cooperation between our cataloger and our acquisition librarians. The latter do careful bibliographical checking for orders and gifts, including the correct or most likely entry, the LC card numbers, etc. Such information is given to our cataloger for each item at the time the order is placed or the gift book put into process. The cataloger and I confer daily on various aspects of the cataloging, especially unusual entries, changes in classification numbers, subject headings, and similar problems. We also have close contact with our faculty and research staff. With their aid we develop changes in subject headings and classification numbers which they consider important. For example, we recently adopted the headings COMPUTERS; COMPUTERS, ANALOG; and COMPUTERS, DIGITAL, and made the necessary changes in relation to the older heading CALCULATING MACHINES.

Still another advantage is that we can make unusual changes without upsetting the entire cataloging program of the University Library. These include changes in filing rules, in classification numbers, in special marking, or other treatment. For example, we recently decided that we will no longer classify subject bibliographies in the LC classes Z5000-Z7900. Such books now receive the classification number of the subject, preceded by a Z; this is analogous to the Dewey system, where 016 precedes the subject number. Bibliographies are easier to find in relation to classification numbers for books on a subject. Another variation from the University Library practice is that we use see also cross references, which are no longer used in the main Public Catalog.

The major advantage is that we can adapt cataloging to the specific needs of our clients. We use LC cards when available, and their suggested classification numbers and added entries, but adapt them as we feel necessary.

We have kept some statistics recently on new titles cataloged in the Engineering Library. Out of 120 titles, seventy-three, or sixty per cent, were with LC cards, and forty-seven, or forty per cent, were without LC cards. In approximately half of the cases with LC cards, or twenty-seven per cent of the total, the cards were used without making any changes. (Our annual statistics confirm that forty percent of the new titles we catalog are done without LC cards.)

The changes made on LC cards can be summarized as follows:

1) In sixteen cases we added a note about bibliographies, which LC seems to be omitting more and more. In one such case we added a note about a sixty-eight page bibliography, covering the years 1936 to 1955, which was compiled by someone other than the author of the book. We also added suitable subject headings with the form subdivision Bibl. None of this important information was given on the LC card.

2) In eleven cases we changed the LC subject headings.

3) In four cases we added entries for persons or organizations which contributed to the publication, such as revisers, authors of special sections, and joint sponsors.
4) In one or two cases each, we omitted the title tracing; corrected information which was given incorrectly on the LC card; added subject headings; added series entries; added notes; added title tracings (one for a thirteen-volume set which may be referred to by its title rather than by its editor).

There were several reasons for making our own cards for the group for which we did not use LC cards. For example, LC now frequently sends only one card for "Information," and we must make our own copies. We catalog many foreign publications and unusual domestic items for which LC doesn't have cards, at least not by the time we are ready to catalog the books. In some cases we don't agree with the entry or the descriptive cataloging as done by LC. Another category is our "recreational reading" collection, for which we type only a brief author and a shelf list card.

As for classification, we find it convenient to choose the best number as well as the corresponding subject headings to represent the reason we acquire certain titles. For example, the glass blower in the Department of Engineering asked us to acquire an expensive book on insecticides. We found that a copy was in the Agriculture Library and suggested he borrow it. But he insisted that the book contained a lot of information he needed to refer to frequently. So we ordered the book, entitled *Analysis of Insecticides and Acaricides.* LC assigned it the number for insecticides (SB951) with only the subject heading INSECTICIDES. We found that the book included considerable information, with numerous illustrations, on the chemical apparatus, chiefly made of glass, used in the analysis of insecticides. This was what our glass blower was so interested in. We therefore gave the book the number for chemical apparatus (QD117) and the subject headings CHEMICAL APPARATUS and CHEMISTRY, ANALYTIC—QUANTITATIVE.

In general, we catalog books in monographic series by their specific class numbers and authors, rather than as a serial set. In this way each book gets its specific subject headings and added entries, and is shelved with other books on the subject.

A few months ago we prepared a report on the variations we make from designated LC subject headings for specific books. Some of the most important and frequent changes we make are:

1) *Shortened, simplified or more suitable words or phrases.* AIRCRAFT INDUSTRY, instead of AEROPLANE INDUSTRY AND TRADE; ELECTRIC CODES, instead of ELECTRIC ENGINEERING—INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS.

2) *Combine two general headings or subjects into one specific one.* MATHEMATICS (AERONAUTICS); MATHEMATICS (BALLISTICS); MATHEMATICS (ENGINEERING); AUTOMATION (ELECTRONICS INDUSTRY); AUTOMATION (AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY)

3) *Avoid catch-all headings where specific headings are suf-
icient. For example LC may use: 1. METALS—FATIGUE. 2. STRAINS AND STRESSES; or, 1. SILICATES. 2. CHEMISTRY, PHYSICAL AND THEORETICAL. In each case we feel that the first, specific heading is adequate.

4) Omit identifying word. FANS, instead of FANS, MECHANICAL; DIES, instead of DIES (METAL-WORKING).

5) Omit hyphen in compound words. Make two words, unless first part is a prefix. STEAM BOILERS, ELECTROACOUSTICS.

6) Omit form subdivision ADDRESSES, ESSAYS, ETC.

7) Change form subdivision for bibliographical publications, according to suggested rules published some time ago in the Journal of Cataloging and Classification.4

It has been the policy to limit the cards in the Public Catalog in the main Library to just the main entry card for books in branch libraries. About a year ago we made a study concerning added entries other than subject, joint author, series, and title, which might well be added to the Public Catalog. Many of the publications we acquire are proceedings of symposiums, or publications sponsored or published by one or more technical and scientific societies. For many such publications the main entry selected for cataloging purposes is not always the one under which the various users of the catalog will look, but is often a compromise chosen by the cataloger for technical or even arbitrary reasons. Additional entries or cross references under sponsoring bodies, editors, societies or associations as publishers, etc., are often useful, as the item is apt to be listed under any of these in bibliographical citations. We felt that such additional cards would prove useful to the many library staff members and other users of the main Public Catalog.

For several weeks we kept a record of all added entries other than subject, joint author (joint editor, etc.), series, and title, for new books cataloged in the Engineering Library. A total of 149 main entry cards were prepared, plus an additional twenty-seven added entries, as defined. Of these added entries, fourteen were sponsors or co-sponsors; five were societies or associations as publishers; four were editors; two were institutions where meetings were held; and two were miscellaneous reasons.

In this connection I might mention our rules for entering symposiums. The Library of Congress has no discernible rules; it enters sometimes under name of a sponsoring agency, or under name of institution where held, name of editor or name of conference. We try to use the following rules:

1. Enter under name of sponsoring agency those symposiums, etc., which are sponsored by that one agency only, chiefly for its members.
2. Enter under name of the symposium, etc., those which are sponsored by more than one agency.
Then we make whatever added entries and cross references we think are necessary. Some specific examples from this survey on added entries are:

**LC card** or mimeo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Main entry used</strong></th>
<th><strong>Added entries, as defined. (Reasons given in parentheses)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LC American Institute of Chemical Engineers. Heat transfer, St. Louis.</td>
<td>1. Van Antwerpen, Franklin John, ed. (Listed prominently as editor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC De Witte, Nicholas. Soviet professional manpower.</td>
<td>1. U. S. National Science Foundation. (Publisher and sponsor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC International Conference on Semiconductors, Amsterdam, 1954. Proceedings. but we changed it.</td>
<td>1. Nederlandse Natuurkundige Vereniging. (This was the LC entry. Organized by this society. For the Engineering Library catalog we also made a “see” reference from Netherlands Physical Society.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A technical or engineering library is likely to contain publications other than books and magazines. There may be trade catalogs, patents, pamphlets, company reports, research reports, drawings, microcards, automotive manuals, and a number of other “documents.” How can these be brought under effective bibliographical control? If a library can afford a sufficiently large staff, it would be advantageous to index each item completely, or to devise some more modern “documentation” technique. Our staff is not that large, so we must depend as much as possible on published indexes. For example, we file trade catalogs by name of manufacturer, and depend on various lists of manufacturers by products for the index to names of specific manufacturers. We try to keep as a series any serially numbered publications, such as certain report series, and depend on various published indexes for references to specific numbers. However, if we acquire only occasional and particular numbers in a series, we usually catalog them as separate books, with added entries under the series. Material such as pamphlets, which are not readily indexed and found in published indexes, are given brief indexing or are bibliographically controlled through special index lists.
The only disadvantages in local cataloging we can think of are relatively minor. One is that the single cataloger, with the aid of a typist, must do all of the routines of a catalog department, such as organizing, supervision, training, maintaining supplies, marking, filing, revising. Less time is thus available for straight cataloging. Another minor disadvantage might occur if no one else on the branch library staff is interested in the cataloging. This leaves the cataloger entirely on her own without being able to discuss intricate cataloging problems with someone else who might be familiar with the specific collection.

Some persons will consider the expense of such local cataloging as a disadvantage. But we believe that the extra care taken in providing suitable subject headings, information about bibliographies, extra cards and cross references under societies and other likely entries, and in general making the card catalog a useful and direct key to the library's collection, will pay off again and again in time saved in revealing the resources of the library to the present and future users of our catalog.

REFERENCES

Department Interrelationships:
The Many in One in Action as well as in Reorganization of the ALA*

JOHN MINTO DAWSON
Assistant Director, University of Chicago Library

THE TITLE of this paper seems to imply that in establishing a single division encompassing all of the technical services the ALA has been pioneering some new administrative organizational structure. The truth is, of course, that the ALA, in this respect at least, has not developed some radically new concept, but is following, somewhat tardily, a pattern long since adopted by a great many libraries.

* Paper presented at the Joint Meeting of the Resources and Technical Services Division and the Library Education Division at the ALA Conference in Kansas City, June 25, 1957, under the program caption: Our E Pluribus Unum: After Unification, What Then?
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It seems that until the 1930's few librarians had given much attention to the formal organization of their libraries. While the study of administration in other fields was not altogether new, it was about this time that government was expanding, creating administrative problems on a grand scale and bringing into prominence the work of the experts in the field of public administration. In the introduction to *Current Trends in Library Administration*, a series of papers delivered at the Library Institute of the University of Chicago in 1938, the editor remarked on the great difficulty which the contributors had encountered in attempting to compile reading lists to accompany their papers, and went on to say that "There are no complete or thorough treatises on library administration. . . . This is true not only with reference to administration generally, but also with respect to its various subdivisions."¹ One of the contributors, writing of administrative problems in the technical services, explained the lack of literature on library administration: "Administrative problems are most apparent to those in charge of large libraries and their departments; these officials are too busy with the daily task to generalize and set down their experiences." This same writer suggested that, as administration seemed to be a function of size, "we may expect magnitude and its attendant administrative problems to occupy the library scene increasingly in the future."² A review of library literature since that time indicates that he had access to a crystal ball of unusual clarity.

The emergence of the technical services as a single administrative unit roughly parallels this newly awakened interest in administration. I regret that I do not know the name of the library which first established a technical services division, nor the date of its establishment. In a paper read to the Division of Cataloging and Classification some nine years ago, J. L. Cohen noted that "The trend toward unification of order work and cataloging is a recent one," and he speaks of "its short history of about ten years." Cohen found one library which had had a technical services division from the time it was organized in 1922; only three libraries (two of them public libraries) had established such divisions before 1941. In 1948 he was able to find forty-seven libraries with such divisions.³ It was first suggested that technical services units would be of value only in the very large libraries, but they have been established in libraries of all sizes. Although the concept of the technical services unit found wide acceptance, its spread was not phenomenal, and some libraries dissolved their technical services units soon after organizing them.

Some librarians were outspoken in their passionate aversion to the unification of the technical services while others were equally passionate in its defense, and still others granted its virtues but wondered if a different organizational pattern would not be better still. Some of the advantages cited by the advocates of a technical services division were the reduction of the librarian's span of control, the sequential relationship of acquisitions and cataloging and their natural unity as "technical"
processes, the coordination of the work of these units (either stating or implying the transfer of information from one department to the other, the reduction of files by common use, the transfer of personnel from one department to the others as needed, etc.), a decrease in the cost and an increase in the flow of processing. Some even went so far as to claim that the head of a technical services unit would be sufficiently free from routine tasks that he or she would have time to think constructively about the basic principles and problems of the technical services. At least one opponent of unification suggested strongly that it was doubtful if a processing director could think at all!

Those opposed to a unified technical services challenged most if not all of these rationalia, saw no reason why every advantage claimed for unified divisions could not be achieved under a traditional organization, and wondered what a director of processing could do that a good head cataloger could not do, and that a great deal better. Raynard C. Swank felt that the relationship of cataloging to reference was vastly more logical and intimate than the relationship of cataloging to acquisitions, and presented his views in a challenging article which, to my mind, has never been adequately refuted.4

The Committee on Administration of the Division of Cataloging and Classification of 1952/53 and 1953/54 developed and carried through a study of technical services in forty-eight libraries, nineteen of which had technical service units. I have read their report many times with utmost care and so far as I can see, libraries with technical service units show demonstrable superiority only in the utilization and orientation of personnel. Perhaps the crux of the matter is in the statement “... that although proper organization is vital to libraries, without proper attitudes on the part of the personnel who make up the organization, no procedure, regardless of how important or efficient it seems to be, can succeed.”5 In short, it would seem that there are libraries in which a technical services unit can be and is more effective than separate departments, while in others the converse may be true. Local situations must be considered.

So far I have talked about the technical services without attempting to define them. Maurice Tauber defines the technical services as “Those units of activity which are responsible for the acquiring, recording and organizing, reproducing, preparing for use, and preserving of materials.”6 It is generally agreed that acquisitions and cataloging are parts of the technical services, but in practice there are other activities sometimes assigned to the technical services division, sometimes not. These are book selection, binding, and photographic reproduction. In some instances circulation is included—and in his book, *The Technical Services in Libraries,*7 Tauber includes circulation, interlibrary loans, and shelf work; serials, on the other hand, are sometimes found in public services divisions. Just as authorities and libraries differ as to what is a technical service, so they differ as to the functions assigned to the individual departments. Serials, for example, are, as I have said, sometimes assigned
to the public services departments. When they are in the technical services, they may fall under the acquisitions department, the cataloging department, or they may have achieved departmental status. Selection, now frequently mentioned as a technical service—the ALA notwithstanding—is usually in acquisitions if considered technical, but in some libraries book selection departments have been established. Binding is found in public service departments, in acquisitions, in cataloging, in serials, or in separate departments. I need not go on.

This diversity of organizational structure not only makes it difficult to present a rational discussion of interdepartmental relationships, but makes valid comparative studies of cost or production almost impossible. I admire librarians for the independence of thought which results in this array of organizational patterns and, truth to tell, I would not change them. There are times, however, when a bit more simplicity and uniformity do seem desirable. A colleague recently completed an extensive tour of university libraries and was struck by this variation in organization and by the classification of work as professional in one library and as subprofessional in another. His comment was that they all seem to work, but that he wished we had some accurate standards of comparison by which we could tell which system was really more effective. I think that in this area we have indeed been delinquent and we might do well to consider some objective means for judging the efficiency and effectiveness of the technical services.

Despite this widespread variation in administrative structure, there are relationships between and among the technical services departments and sections which are similar in most libraries. To begin with, the technical services are largely sequential. A book is first selected as a candidate for acquisition, then searched for entry and duplication, then ordered, received, catalogued and classified, perhaps bound or repaired, marked with shelf numbers, and then catalog cards are filed in the catalogs to guide the user to the book, each step following the preceding one. At almost each step in this elementary outline of preparing a book for use the articulation of one department with another can be analyzed, and it can be demonstrated that the work of a department is made easier or more difficult depending on the standards of the department which earlier handled the material.

Let us take searching as an example of the interrelationships of departments. First, the entry must be established at least well enough to see that the book is not already in the collections. To do this the searchers use the catalog and a wide range of bibliographies. If the catalogers have omitted a reference, the searchers may find themselves involved in a long and profitless search to find the entry for an author already represented—perhaps by the very title in question—in the catalog. How very dependent on the catalogers are the searchers! When the book is ordered, the acquisitions department may order Library of Congress cards or at least supply from the coordinated order form a slip that the catalog department can use as a card order. Then when the book reaches
the cataloging department it will be accompanied, in any well ordered library, with some slip or form on which is recorded the findings, both negative and positive, of the searcher. This information should save countless hours of duplicate effort in establishing entry. In at least one library this interdependence has been recognized to the extent that a cataloger has been placed in charge of searching, and the determination of entry is the responsibility of the searching section. If each department thoroughly understands this interdependence and accepts its full responsibility, each may find it possible to increase its productivity and cut its costs. It would be pointless to detail other examples of the interrelationships of the technical service departments. Each of you, I am sure, can cite many such examples in your own library.

The unity of the technical services, it seems to me, is one that transcends mere organizational structure. Whether a library has a technical services division, a bibliography department, or some other form of administration, there is still a close fundamental relationship between the units of the technical services, each of which depends upon the other to attain its full measure of effectiveness. It seems only fitting, therefore, that the members of the ALA who are primarily concerned with these services should have come together in a single division with greater opportunity for membership participation than has ever before existed.

Our predecessors in the Division of Cataloging and Classification, the Serials Round Table, and the several committees have been largely responsible for what progress has been made in those aspects of librarianship that are our concern; working together in the Resources and Technical Services Division, we should contribute even more.
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NOMINATIONS FOR MARGARET MANN CITATION

Nominations for the 1958 recipient of the Margaret Mann Citation for outstanding professional achievement in cataloging and classification should be sent by January 1, 1958 to Miss Pauline A. Seely, Supervisor of Technical Services, Denver Public Library, 1357 Broadway, Denver 3, Colorado.
The National Union Catalog in the Next Decade—Some Unsolved Problems

GEORGE A. SCHWEGMANN, JR.
Chief Union Catalog Division, Library of Congress

The National Union Catalog of the Library of Congress and the regional union catalogs, particularly those in Philadelphia, Cleveland, Denver, Seattle, Atlanta, and Chapel Hill, though differing in size, conform to a basic pattern—they are card catalogs arranged by author or title entry, and the cards comprising them are complete or abbreviated copies of the main entry cards to be found in the catalogs of the various libraries whose holdings they represent. Because of the considerable variation in the quality and character of cataloging practice employed in any group of libraries, these union catalogs are chiefly valuable for locating books—a service that all of them perform most usefully, but with the limitation that as card catalogs, they exist in single copies. This is a serious limitation, which requires one to travel to the union catalog or to depend upon the reference service available with its attending delays and limitations. Another problem common to union catalogs on cards is the fact that they experience continuing and ever increasing requirements of space and personnel to maintain them.

Insofar as the National Union Catalog is concerned, the growth of its space requirements in the Library of Congress (it now nets more than 13 million cards), the need for greater coverage of both titles and additional locations, the desirability of editing to a higher degree of uniformity the entries received from many libraries whose cataloging practices vary, and finally the obvious advantage of making the contents of the National Union Catalog available to other libraries and individuals beyond the narrow means of inquiry by teletype, letter, or personal visit, had by 1950, made the question of publication of the National Union Catalog a steady topic in professional literature and at meetings.

Actually, the feasibility of publishing the whole National Union Catalog was considered as early as 1941, but planning was postponed until the termination of the War. In 1949 Robert B. Downs, who was serving temporarily as a consultant in the Library of Congress, recommended that the National Union Catalog be “completed” by adding to it approximately seven million entries to be copied from ten regional union catalogs and thirty-three important libraries, but no action was taken on this recommendation. However, in 1952 and 1953 the Library of

* Paper read at the Joint Meeting of the Resources and Technical Services Division and the Library Education Division at the ALA Conference in Kansas City, June 25, 1957.
Congress presented to the ALA Board on Resources, at its request, detailed estimates of the cost of “completing,” editing, and publishing the entire National Union Catalog. Also, as a more feasible approach, the matter of publishing a continuing supplement to the National Union Catalog commencing with the imprints of the year 1956 was first considered in 1953. As a result of studies and the favorable responses of subscribers and those attending an open meeting of the Board at Philadelphia in July, 1955, the Library of Congress Catalog-Books: Authors was expanded to include 1956 and later imprints reported by other libraries. Commencing with the July, 1956, issue the title has been changed to The National Union Catalog.

Thus, at the present time the National Union Catalog exists in two parts—one, the heterogeneous mixture of 13 million cards for pre-1956 imprints, including entries for serials, the other being the published National Union Catalog, a Cumulative Author List, which includes, in addition to all currently published Library of Congress cards, all titles for 1956+ monographic imprints contributed by the major regional union catalogs and by several hundred cooperating libraries. In effect there now exists a published supplement to the as yet unpublished main portion of the National Union Catalog.

Cards for pre-1956 imprints are being added to this retrospective portion of the National Union Catalog in the traditional manner, namely, all cards for Latin alphabet materials contributed by the various libraries are filed with a minimum of editorial concern. Cards for Cyrillic, Hebraic, and other non-Roman characters are filed into the separate Hebraic, Cyrillic, Chinese, Japanese, etc., union catalogs that are maintained as adjuncts to the main National Union Catalog. On the other hand, each 1956+ entry for a monographic publication received from libraries other than the Library of Congress, except entries for titles in Cyrillic type and Oriental characters, is edited for integration into the Library of Congress catalogs according to the ALA Cataloging Rules.

For the present, materials printed in the Cyrillic alphabet and in Oriental characters, though published after 1955, are still being added to the special union catalogs in card form for these materials that are maintained in the Library of Congress. Materials published after 1955 in Slavic languages which do not use the Cyrillic alphabet, such as Polish, Czech, etc., are included in The National Union Catalog in book form. Present plans are to include, also, all Cyrillic language items printed after 1955 reported by outside libraries commencing with the January, 1958, issue; but these entries most probably will appear in transliteration. The publication of a Cyrillic Union Catalog for imprints before 1956 is under serious consideration. This Catalog would provide an author and subject and title approach.

The publication of a National Union Catalog of Orientalia presupposes an accepted and uniform system of romanization and cataloging rules for materials in these languages. After four years of steady work on
this problem, the ALA Special Committee on Cataloging Oriental Mat-

erials and the Orientalia Processing Committee of the Library of Con-
gress have succeeded in drafting the necessary cataloging rules and

romanization procedures. Both have been officially adopted and will
be published shortly in the LC Cataloging Service Bulletin.

The control of serials is presently a divided operation and does not
cover the total field. Serials whose commencing date was January 1, 1950,
or later, are basically reported to and the entries are published in New
Serial Titles. About 250 libraries are reporting, a number believed to
be insufficient to yield anything like complete coverage. Catalog entries
for older serials, whenever reported, are filed into the National Union
Catalog on cards. These cards, however, constitute only remotely a con-
tinuation or supplement of the published second edition of the Union
List of Serials and its published two supplements. A numerically more
complete reporting and indication of the exact holdings of the individual
libraries is necessary. It is expected that this control of serials will be
achieved by acceptance of the plan just issued by the Joint Committee
on the Union List of Serials, “A Permanent Program for the Union
List of Serials” (Washington, D. C., Library of Congress, 1957). The
Committee’s report calls for a budget in excess of $1.5 million dollars for
the development of a National Union Catalog of Serials on cards. It is
hoped that the costs will be covered by foundation grants. The card file
would be the basis from which a Union List of Serials and other lists (by
subject, country of origin, regional union lists) could be printed. New
Serial Titles then can be redesigned to report changes of titles, additional
holdings of older serials, and new titles in a cumulative pattern and
thereby form a supplement to the Union List of Serials.

Thus far, I have mentioned only the National Union Catalog con-
trols for monographic book materials and for serials. Also desirable will
be National Union Catalog controls for non-book materials—such as
music, phonorecords and tape recordings, motion pictures and filmstrips,
maps, manuscripts, and prints and photographs. These materials repre-
sent categories less frequently or not at all reported to the National
Union Catalog at this time. Music and maps are reported by some li-
braries and do not offer too much of a problem, although the “conven-
tional title” for music might make editing difficult. There has been no
reporting of manuscripts or prints and photographs to date.

Though the Library of Congress has printed cards for motion pic-
tures, filmstrips, and phonorecords for several years, present conditions
do not allow the servicing of these materials by the Library of Congress.
Single reports of such materials from other libraries have been received;
but the main function of a union catalog, namely, the location of these
materials as a preparatory step towards their use, is not yet possible due
to financial problems. The present printed LC catalogs for these ma-
terials serve mainly for bibliographical and reference purposes. For
obtaining such materials the user must address himself to the manufac-
turers of the motion pictures and phonorecords.
Considerable thought, however, has been given to the development of a National Union Catalog of manuscript collections. The necessary cataloging rules have been approved and published in a preliminary edition. The Library of Congress has made inquiries of the principal repositories of these materials with a view to framing proposals for a cooperative cataloging project which would have as its end a published union catalog of manuscript collections.

Rules for cataloging individual manuscripts and prints and photographs have not yet been completed, nor have plans been made for the National Union Catalog control of either of these types of materials.

In the preceding remarks I have attempted to convey the idea that until about 1950 a union catalog was thought of as being a card catalog designed to locate mainly book materials in various libraries, but that as a result of general demand and the continuing effort of the ALA Board on Resources, the concept of edited and published union catalogs was developed to meet the expanding needs of librarians and individuals for readily available union catalogs of all types of library material.

Here then, are some of the unsolved problems that will be associated with the National Union Catalog concept during the next decade:

I. Publication of the pre-1956 imprint portion of the National Union Catalog.

A great deal of study has already been given to this matter and much more study will be required before a final plan is developed. A re-typing of the cards and an editing of the main entries seem essential before publication. In the editorial process entries for serials could be withdrawn for transfer to the planned National Union Catalog of Serials. It would be possible also to remove other categories of materials suggested by Keyes D. Metcalf and Andrew D. Osborn in their "Proposal for Publishing the National Union Catalog," such as entries for broadsides, maps, music, offprints, paged analyticals, U. S. Government documents, dissertations, etc. It is open to question whether the editing process should be limited to the entries actually represented in the National Union Catalog, or whether a systematic effort should be made to include titles which certain libraries have not yet reported, or to attempt a more complete record of holdings of the titles already recorded, in other words, to "complete" the catalog as suggested by Robert B. Downs. The methods of publication could be by photo-offset, such as the published National Union Catalog, by miniature printing in book form, or by some micro-reproduction technique. Also, as suggested by Charles W. David it would be possible to split the publication according to periods of imprint of the items represented, e.g., 16th century books, 17th century books, etc.

II. A National Union Catalog of Serials and a Published Third Edition of Union List of Serials.

A National Union Catalog of Serials on cards, as inclusive as possible,
should be developed. This would contain the control files for any published union lists and be the source for location information for titles not to be incorporated in printed union lists. The files should be so prepared that alphabetical lists, subject lists, lists by country of origin, and regional union lists can be issued. Serials should be noted as current or dead, for possible refinement of the special lists. Such a union catalog would contain entries for about 500,000 titles and include certain categories of serials such as Government publications, administrative reports, etc., which were omitted from the second edition of the *Union List of Serials*.

From such a National Union Catalog of Serials could be extracted titles of an appropriate nature to be published in a third edition of the *Union List of Serials* and in other lists, such as *A Union List of Newspapers*, and *A Union List of Congresses*.

III. Expansion of Coverage to Include Non-Book Materials.

As I have noted before, the published *National Union Catalog* does not presently include entries for motion pictures, filmstrips, phonorecords, prints and photographs, and manuscripts. The rules for the cataloging of these materials, however, are either already published or will be published within a short time. Decision must be reached as to whether all or some of the categories should be brought under National Union Catalog control, and if so, in what form they should be presented. Should the present *Library of Congress Catalog—Motion Pictures and Filmstrips* and the *Library of Congress Catalog—Music and Phonorecords* be expanded into union catalogs? Should additional catalogs be created for the other types of non-book materials? Should some of these materials, such as music and manuscripts, be integrated in the present *National Union Catalog*?

Another very special type of material, both monographic and serial, which is ordinarily not cataloged by libraries, and therefore not represented in the National Union Catalog, is the "report" literature. About 50,000 scientific and technical reports are being issued each year. The main issuing bodies are the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, the various Defense Department Agencies, including the ASTIA and the Office of Technical Services. All of these agencies abstract and catalog the reports, some for general use, some for restricted use. The coverage of these reports, amounting to date to more than 250,000, is, so far, not centralized. Should this material be included in a widely published national bibliographical control?

IV. Control of "Essay" Literature.

Materials below the level of the monograph as a bibliographical unit, such as contributions to periodicals and to collective volumes (Festschriften), are not presently under centralized bibliographical control. A number of index publications take care of certain types of periodical
literature, but almost nothing has been done for contributions to book publications in other languages than English. Such a control can hardly be expected to be developed within the short range of ten years. Technical progress in the field of copying processes or in methods of storage of information might change the picture completely and allow controls to become real which today may be considered dreams.

V. Control by Subject.

The Library of Congress Catalog—Books: Subjects published since 1950 and reflecting materials processed by the Library of Congress and a limited number of other libraries since this time and of an imprint date not earlier than 1945 is a first step towards National Union Catalog control by subject. Should this publication be expanded to serve for subject control of all current monographic materials cataloged by American libraries? Should its present form be preserved, or should the bibliographic information contained in it be reduced so that it would serve as an index to The National Union Catalog, a Cumulative Author List? Upon the answer to these questions might depend the decision as to whether libraries could replace the subject cards for current materials in their catalogs by such a publication. Plans are under consideration for the expansion of the present published subject catalog or for the publication of a subject index which either would be additional to the subject catalog or a replacement of it. A subject control for pre-1956 imprint monographic material now recorded in the card National Union Catalog is a practical impossibility.

VI. Problems Relative to Pattern of Publication of the National Union Catalog.

The present National Union Catalog is in an early state of its development, and several major problems already require decision. The pattern of the frequency and cumulation of publication is seemingly satisfactory, but the question of how to handle the listing of additional locations of titles that first appear toward the end of an annual or quinquennial cumulation is one that requires prompt attention. Other questions are: Should imprints older than three years appearing for the first time be shown in monthly issues or should they be held for quarterly or annual cumulations? Should additional locations for a title that has appeared in a quinquennial cumulation be cause for reprinting the title? If so, should it be published in the next annual or the next quinquennial, or should it be held for a still larger cumulation?

What should be the relation of the card catalog of 1956+ imprints to its published counterpart in the National Union Catalog? Should a card supplement be maintained to show added locations of titles already published in a five or ten-year cumulation? Should the imprint date of 1956 continue to be the criterion for including a title in the National Union Catalog, or should this date change as the years advance?

Also important is the question of how many locations of a title should
be shown in any region. The present theory is to limit locations in a region to two, with a maximum of approximately twenty-two. Should different types of material, e.g., American book trade publications, foreign titles, analytics within monographic series, be singled out for different treatment with regard to locations? And finally it might be asked, what should be the functional relationship between the National Union Catalog in book form and the regional union catalogs?
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Dewey 16:
A Preview and Report to the Profession

Benjamin A. Custer
Editor, Dewey Decimal Classification, The Library of Congress

Editor's note: Because the Editors of the two magazines agree with the Editors of the DC that information on Dewey should reach a wide audience, this report is appearing here and also in the November issue of The Wilson Library Bulletin.

Ever since it was announced that a new edition of the Dewey Decimal Classification and Relative Index was in preparation, classifiers and other librarians who considered themselves ill-served, and in some cases betrayed, by the 15th edition, as well as those who were still
using earlier out-of-print editions, have had the liveliest interest and curiosity as to what the 16th edition will be like. It is the purpose of this writer to reassure both the fearful and the hopeful that the new edition will be the easiest to use, and, if the efforts of the Editorial Office and its advisers can make it so, the best, of all those published since 1876.

It is now anticipated that Edition 16 will be off the press and on the market during the final quarter of 1958. No edition has ever been prepared in such a spotlight of publicity; for none has the Editorial Office been endowed with so much helpful and welcome advice; none will have been more thoroughly grounded on the expressed wishes and requirements of its consumers.

There are many reasons for this. In the first place, the 16th edition is being prepared by the Library of Congress, with all its resources and all its sensitiveness to the American and international library scene. As is well known, through the good offices of the American Library Association's former Division of Cataloging and Classification, the Library in 1953 entered into an agreement with the Forest Press, publisher and representative of the owner of the Classification, to prepare this edition during the period 1954-1957. By virtue of its Decimal Classification Section, which assigns DC numbers to titles represented by Library of Congress printed cards for the convenience of subscribers to the card service, the Library is, and for more than a quarter of a century has been, the largest single user of the Decimal Classification; as such, it has an enormous fund of experience to offer in preparation of a new edition, an experience which could not be so readily utilized in the preparation of earlier editions, even though the Editorial Office maintained its quarters in the Library's buildings during the years when the 13th, 14th, and 15th editions were being prepared, simply because no common administrative framework tied together the Decimal Classification Section and the Editorial Office and made it simple and logical for the two offices to work together in tailoring the schedules to the books being acquired by libraries.

In the second place, the Editorial Office has been staffed during the preparation of the 16th edition by persons who are subject experts, or classification experts, or both. Filling the Assistant Editor positions have been experts in science and technology, in sociology and geography, in economics and history. Assisting them in the preparation of schedules for those subjects in which the regular staff lacks specific competence have been consultant editors who were appointed for shorter periods of time to work on astronomy, language and literature, philosophy and religion, the arts, music. The first Associate Editor, Eleanor B. Hungerford, had broad experience in editorial work. The second, Julia C. Pressey, spent the preceding twenty-four and a half years as Head of the Decimal Classification Section; it is probable that her knowledge and experience in the application of the DC are unequalled, and certain that they are unexcelled. The Editor during the first half of the work, David Judson Haykin, was for many years Chief of the Library of Congress's
Subject Cataloging Division, which is responsible, among other things, for the development of the Library of Congress Classification schedules, and he is perhaps the foremost American expert on library classification in theory and practice. He was succeeded, for the second half of the work, by a person with substantial experience in the application of the Decimal, the Library of Congress, and other classification systems.

In the third place, the Editorial Office has worked in cooperation with many unpaid experts both in classification and in specific areas of subject knowledge. In the years since the 15th edition was completed, the governing body under whose direction the Classification is prepared, the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee, now a joint committee of the American Library Association and of the Lake Placid Club Education Foundation, owner of the DC, has been reconstituted and its membership gradually changed, so that the preponderant majority of its members are practicing classifiers past or present, including its chairman, Lucile M. Morsch, Deputy Chief Assistant Librarian of the Library of Congress, whose apprenticeship to her present high position was devoted primarily to cataloging and classification. The Editorial Office and the Editorial Policy Committee have been assisted at all times, both in matters of policy and in criticism of individual schedules, by the Special Advisory Committee on the Decimal Classification, a group made up entirely of currently practicing classifiers under the chairmanship of Janet S. Dickson, appointed by and responsible to the ALA Division of Cataloging and Classification (now the Cataloging and Classification Section of the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division). In addition to these formal groups, the Editorial Office and the Advisory Committee have solicited and received advice on preliminary schedules from scores of advisers, consultants, subject specialists, classification experts, and others, both in the United States and abroad. Some of these friends have volunteered or accepted invitations to examine and criticize all the schedules, some to criticize all the schedules in certain broad areas such as the social sciences or technology, and some to criticize specific highly technical schedules, such as those on paper technology, rubber technology, Judaism, music. Advice and opinion received from these many sources have been reinforced by panel and audience discussion at numerous professional meetings sponsored by national, state, and local groups, by articles in professional periodicals, by questionnaires, and by other devices.

The history of Edition 16 and its relationship to earlier editions is well known, and need not be repeated here. For general background the reader is referred to the comprehensive article by Verner W. Clapp, chairman of the Editorial Policy Committee from 1953 to 1956, to the agreement between the Library of Congress and the Forest Press and the criteria and general procedures for preparation of Edition 16 and to their restatement, all of which have been widely disseminated.

In previewing the 16th edition, which is expected to be completed by March 31, 1958, this article will consider first the three broad areas...
of weakness which were the primary targets of reviewers and critics of the 15th and show how they have been dealt with in the 16th: structure, fullness, relocation.

Let us examine structure. "The familiar skeleton of the scheme," says one critic of the 15th edition, "as displayed in the third summary table, was scrapped. The principle of logical classification which calls for the division of the whole into parts, and the parts into smaller parts, was also thrown aside and replaced by an arrangement which is best described as a tabulation." In Edition 16 the third summary table in most of its geometric simplicity will be reinstated, although it will probably include additional major entries which are "sections" even though based on numbers longer than three digits. It must be kept in mind that the world is somewhat less simple than it was in Melvil Dewey's day, or, at any rate, it is viewed less simply, and one thousand numbers will not hold all the separate compartments of knowledge on which books are written. Nor are the few numbers left unused by earlier editions always located at spots where new topics can readily be slipped into them. Although it was possible to assign 006, never before used, to the new subject of Cybernetics, no such simple solution was available, even in the early days, for the history of Portugal, which was treated as a subdivision of Spain until Edition 10, 1919, which gave 946.9 the dignity of a whole number, so far as that could be achieved by type face and indentation. The third summary continued, however, to show 946 as covering "Spain Portugal." Not until the 16th edition has the DC recognized that 64.9 Forestry is not a true subdivision of 64 Fruit culture, but deserves coordinate treatment. Now, should the third summary in such cases as these show eleven sections in a division—e.g., 940 and 630 respectively—or should it lump Spain-Portugal and Fruit culture-Forestry together? (In actual fact, of course, 940 shows many other additional coordinate topics besides Portugal: Scotland and Ireland share 941; Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary share 943; and so on.)

This look at the third summary provides a simple introduction to the whole tangled issue of structure. Ideally, each division should be broken into parts, each part into sub-parts, each sub-part into sub-sub-parts, and so on until the specificity of existing literature is reached. But to do this while maintaining the relationship of one subject to another would require mountains of relocation of topics from one number to another, and would result in unwieldy numbers. To avoid this, the editors are frequently compelled to bow to the lesser of two evils and set up or perpetuate irregular structure, which appears most commonly in one of two ways: two coordinate topics in numbers one of which is subordinate to another, for example, 946 Spain and 946.9 Portugal; or two topics one of which is subordinate to another in coordinate numbers, for example, 113 Cosmology, subordinate to which is 114 Space, or, more extreme, 712 Landscape gardening, subordinate to which is 715 Vegetation in landscape gardening, subordinate to which is 716 Herbaceous plants in landscape gardening. Big bugs have little bugs upon their backs.
to bite 'em. Let no reader think that irregular structure was invented by the editors of the 15th edition! Of course, the curse of irregularity may be reduced in part by use of indention and type faces, but it is surprising how many classifiers do not notice indention or appreciate its significance.

In the 16th edition the editors have made all reasonable efforts to keep irregular structure to a minimum. In some places they have restored regularity to a schedule which did not have it in the 14th and earlier editions, as, for example, in the case of 669 Museums, which has been returned to its subordinate position under 060 General societies instead of standing out as coordinate with it. There are two major reasons for maintenance of regular structure to the greatest degree compatible with common sense. The first is that it makes the pattern of the classification easier to understand, and makes the life of teacher and student in the library school simpler; the second is that it makes it less troublesome for the small library to cut back schedules for use in classifying small groups of books, and then to expand simply by adding figures to the numbers already assigned to books as the libraries become middle-sized and eventually large. Since the 16th edition is avowedly designed to be used by general libraries of whatever size, this is an important factor indeed.

Another structural shortcoming of the 15th edition was that it sometimes retained specific numbers while omitting the general number above them. A case in point is the dropping of 598 Reptils Birds while retaining 598.1 Reptilia and 598.2 Aves. This step can be defended on the grounds that very few books are written about reptiles and birds, but there are many books about one or the other. Edition 16 will restore 598 in order to show the structure, although authors are still not writing books which will fit into the number, and even small libraries would be ill-advised to throw books on reptiles and books on birds together helter-skelter. The small library's plight is even more serious than this shows, however, since birds are classed in all the subdivisions of 598 from .2 to .9, and .3-.9 are subordinate to .2. If the small library decides to class all works on birds in 598.2 and later finds expansion desirable, it will find it necessary not just to add a digit, but to change a digit, which is much more expensive. However, the editors have found no way to improve upon this irregularity, which dates back all the way to the second edition, 1885.

For a single illustration of both the Spain-Portugal and the Reptiles-Birds problems, the reader is referred to the 14th treatment of 989 Paraguay Uruguay, and the 15th treatment of 989.2 Paraguay and 989.5 Uruguay. So far as the editors are aware, no book has been written on the combined subject of these two dissimilar and noncontiguous countries.

The second broad area of weakness in the 15th edition was degree of fullness. Earlier editions had been expanded unevenly. In Edition 14, 674 Manufacture of lumber and articles made of wood, 675 Manufacture
of leather and fur and articles made of them, 676 Manufacture of paper and articles made of paper, 678 Manufacture of rubber and similar products and articles made of them, 679 Manufacture of celluloid and other, consisted each of one undivided number. But plumped right in the middle of this sequence was 677 Textil manufactures, with no less than 114 subdivisions, while Edition 13 had 400 subdivisions for this same number! As one edition succeeded another, expansions were developed as demands were made and time permitted, until sometimes discretion and common sense called a halt and certain greatly overdeveloped schedules were reduced to more manageable proportions. The extreme development of 020-025 was made at an early date to provide close classification for the collections of the New York State Library School. But before the schedules could be printed, a fire intervened in 1911 and the expansions for 025.3 to 025.9 were lost in the holocaust. Consequently, 025.2 Accession Acquisition has 47 subdivisions; 025.3 Catalog has none.

The 15th or "Standard" edition was planned for libraries of 200,000 volumes or less, and its degree of fullness was inadequate for larger libraries. However, its editors did make an effort to provide schedules which were evenly expanded throughout, to accommodate the books actually likely to be acquired by and shelved in general libraries of the size specified. 674 appeared with 11 subdivisions, 675 with 2, 676 with 7, 677 with 10, 678 with 20, 679 with 2, 025.2 had 2 subdivisions, 025.3 had 5.

The 16th edition, being planned for general libraries, regardless of size, will of course be more fully expanded than the 15th, but not to the extreme degree of some sections of the 14th. In it 674 will have 30 subdivisions; 675, 7; 676, 35; 677, 85; 678, 32; 679, 8. 025.2 will have 7 and 025.3 will retain 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of subdivisions in</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>674</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>677</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025.2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>1121</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>612</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the criteria for Edition 16: "The schedules should be carried out in sufficient detail to make specific provision for topics of interest and importance to libraries. The existence of more than 20
titles under one specific number will raise a presumption in favor of subdivision, and vice versa. ... The detail will vary in different parts of the schedules, according to the amount of material which has been and is likely to be published on the subject, and has been and is likely to be acquired and used by libraries. It is better to give one figure more than most libraries need, rather than one figure less, because it is much easier to cut off one figure than to expand without interfering with future use of official expansions."

The total number of tables entries in the 14th edition is approximately 30,000, and in the 15th 4,600. At the time of writing the present report, when not all preliminary schedules were completed and none adjusted to final form, it was expected that the 16th would contain around 18,000 numbers, exclusive of provisions to "divide like" or to use form divisions.

The third area of weakness in the 15th edition was the number of relocations of topics from one number in the 14th edition to a different number in the new edition. A relocation may be defined as any adjustment in the schedules which results in the shifting of a topic from the number provided for it in an earlier edition to a number which differs in respects other than length. Lengthening or shortening a number is relatively less difficult and expensive than changing a number; and adoption of an expansion or a reduction without immediately (or ever) correcting work previously done does not create the chaos which results from adoption of a changed number without correcting earlier work.

One of the oldest and most honored principles of the DC, enunciated many times by its founder as well as by his successors, is that, with few exceptions, once a topic has been placed in a given number, it shall not later be transferred to another number. In the occasional instance where a number more in harmony with a changed point of view is to be supplied, the abandoned number shall be allowed to fall into disuse and not be employed with a new meaning. Through fourteen editions and many years of growth, expansion, development of more subdivisions, accommodation to new concepts, new technologies, new facts of history, this principle was observed. Most such relocations of topics as were made appeared unannounced, and were accepted without the severe discomfort usually accompanying acute reclassificationitis.

But in the 15th edition this philosophy was overturned, forcing the library which followed along literally to undertake enormous and expensive projects of reclassification. In all, well over one thousand relocations were made, of which about 300 were signalized by notes at the old (but not always at the new) number, e.g., "331.254 It is recommended that Social Insurance be classified in 368.4." Material formerly contained in one number was sometimes reassigned to several different numbers; or perhaps just one topic was removed, while the rest of the subject remained in the old number; sometimes the relocated topics were assigned to previously existing numbers whose meaning was thus broadened, and
sometimes to completely new numbers; some subjects formerly brought together were scattered throughout the whole classification.

However desirable these relocations might be from a theoretic view of knowledge and learning, they were for the most part not justified, in view of their expense, for the purposes of libraries whose pressing need was to place their books on shelves in a workable system and to find them again when needed, to organize new accessions, not to reorganize old ones. Reaction to the relocations was not generally favorable, and yet the need for some modernization could not be denied.

The controversy between the principles, so-called, of “integrity of numbers” and “keeping pace with knowledge” continued to be waged during the course of the editorial work on the 16th edition. So far as topics which had been changed between the 14th and 15th editions were concerned, the editors had no choice but to relocate, either from the one earlier edition or from the other. And even though the criteria as originally stated ruled that the 16th edition should “follow fairly closely the line established through the first 14 editions,” they stated further that the 16th edition should “make use of . . . those changes [in the 15th] which would justify the reclassification they would require.”

As the editors began to develop the earlier preliminary schedules, it seemed to them that, while the 16th edition might not justifiably go all out for relocation like the 15th, yet a great deal of change could be justified on the grounds that the line established through the first 14 editions in some cases was pointed straight toward, and in others had already reached, absurdity. As a consequence, early preliminary schedules showed a great deal of relocation, some of it conforming to the practice of the 15th edition, much brand new. Unavoidably, as noted above, some was from 15th practice back to the 14th. So that relocations might not be made without critics, advisers, and subsequently users becoming aware of them, the Editorial Policy Committee ruled that a comparative table of concordance should be prepared showing all relocations from either the 14th or the 15th to the 16th, and that this table should be made a part of the preliminary schedules as issued and of the 16th edition as printed. Editorial critics, and especially the members of the Advisory Committee, soon became aware that far more relocations were being made than could be readily absorbed by the majority of libraries. To their protests the editors replied that without a certain amount of healthy change and growth the DC would become moribund.

Ultimately, at the instance of the Advisory Committee, the Editorial Policy Committee took a hand and, in December 1955, adopted a restatement of the criteria which, although it did not change their substance, did somewhat alter their emphasis. The word “fairly” was dropped and “closely” italicized, so that there would result “a 16th edition which will follow closely the line established through the first 14 editions. . . .

“Although the classification should to the greatest degree possible keep pace with knowledge, yet, since excessive relocation is to be avoided, the foregoing criteria will have the effect of limiting relocations in the
main to instances where old numbers are absurd, or unworkable, or where there is an insistent demand for a new number. . . .

"In view of the practical considerations involved, and in order to guarantee the integrity of numbers and the continuity with previous editions which the Committee has confirmed as basic principles, the total number of relocated topics in the 16th edition, exclusive of (a) relocations between the 14th and 15th editions, and (b) relocations in preferred (alternative) schedules if any, shall not exceed 500."

The Editorial Office was directed to review and revise according to the restated criteria all preliminary schedules issued prior to the time of the restatement, and to distribute them anew for comment. Although this set the work back by many months, it restored confidence in the DC's continued adherence to the principle of "integrity of numbers."

At the time of writing the present report, it was estimated that the 16th edition will have about 1,800 relocations, of which approximately 540 will be total—that is, the entire number vacated—and 1,260 will be partial—that is, only one or more topics from a given number transferred, with one or more other topics being left in the number. Of the 1,800 about 650 will follow the 15th when the two earlier editions are in disagreement, about 650 will follow the 14th, about 250 will be from the 14th where the 15th makes no provision, or from one subdivision to another of a number which in the 14th is divided but in the 15th not, about 125 will be from the 15th where the 14th makes no provision or is not divided, and about 125 will be from both the 14th and 15th.

Although eighteen hundred relocations seems a large number, careful examination of the literature and of the holdings in the DC Section's shelflist at the Library of Congress shows that only about thirty or forty will represent substantial numbers of titles—more than 30 each—even in the largest libraries; almost all of these are relocations from the 14th edition already initiated by the 15th edition.

The schedules for 546 Inorganic chemistry and 547 Organic chemistry presented a special situation. Concepts in these fields have changed so completely since the schedules were first developed, that it was out of the question to interpolate modern concepts through expansion of the existing schedules. Under these circumstances, the Editorial Policy Committee directed the editors to prepare two separate schedules for each, one expansion based on the 14th, to be called the "Obsolescent Schedule," the other, the "Preferred Schedule," being a complete recasting from the ground up, re-using old numbers with new meanings as required. Those libraries which use the obsolescent schedule will be informed that it will be dropped in the 17th edition, and thus they will have the approximately seven years which are expected to intervene between the two editions to reclassify their books, unless they wish to hold to what will then be an obsolete schedule.

Relatively few alternative provisions will be provided for a given topic, and, in all cases where they are, the editors' preference will be clearly stated. This in itself created many cases of relocation in practice,
though not called such, because the 14th was prodigal with such provisions, and it was necessary, for the 16th, to choose one and relocate from the other. However, wherever the 14th shows editorial preference, and the 16th chooses the preferred number, abandonment of the other number is not officially considered a relocation even though it certainly is one for those libraries which in the past made a decision in favor of the number not preferred by the editors.

As we have already noted, the Editorial Policy Committee decided that comparative tables should be included in the 16th edition as a convenience to those libraries which find it necessary to continue to use all or parts of an earlier edition, and to assure continuity between editions. In October 1956, the Committee decided that relocations should be shown in the schedules themselves, both at the old number and at the new one, and also in the index. In the examples which follow, the dagger denotes 14th edition practice; the asterisk, 15th; the square brackets around a number, that it is no longer to be used for the topic indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>574.873</td>
<td>Protoplas [formerly also †*576.2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[†*576.2]</td>
<td>Protoplasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>794.7</td>
<td>Indoor ball games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Including billiards, pool [both formerly *796.3]; table tennis [formerly *796.34]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796.3</td>
<td>Ball games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class billiards, pool [both formerly *796.3] in 794.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>796.34</td>
<td>Racket games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Class table tennis [formerly *796.34] in 794.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Index:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billiards</td>
<td>formerly 794.7 *796.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ping-pong</td>
<td>formerly 794.7 *796.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>formerly 794.7 *796.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protoplasm</td>
<td>formerly 574.873 †*576.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table tennis</td>
<td>formerly 794.7 *796.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In April 1957 the Editorial Policy Committee decided to eliminate comparative tables with the proviso that if, after publication of the 16th edition and a trial period with its use, there is a demand for such tables, they will then be prepared and issued separately.

These two decisions were based in large part upon consideration of the need to serve each of the following groups without prejudice to the others: (a) libraries using Edition 14 in whole or in part which decide to reclassify to the 16th; (b) libraries using Edition 14 in whole or in part which decide not to reclassify; (c) libraries using Edition 15 in whole or in part which decide to reclassify, or (d) not to reclassify; (e) new libraries; (f) teachers and students requiring a text.

In such ways as these have the people responsible for the 16th edition tried to profit from the mistakes of the 15th. Let us now survey briefly some of the forthcoming work's other features:

To begin with, it will be liberally annotated. Every page will carry a substantial body of definitions, scope notes, lists of topics to be included under various numbers, instructions, references.

Definitions are provided wherever terms are not commonly known and are difficult to find in standard reference works, and also where they are ambiguous or have more than one accepted dictionary definition.

Notes of scope and inclusion, while extensive, will naturally be fewer and shorter than in the 15th edition, where major reductions from the 14th made mandatory the enumeration of topics covered in the 14th by subdivisions. For example:

### 14th edition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>523.3</th>
<th>Moon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Constants: size, mass
- Distance and parallax
- Heat and light
- Phases
- Orbit and motions
- Features of surface: mountains, plains, etc.
- Atmosphere
- Physical condition
- Spectrum
- Eclipses
- Charts, photographs, etc.

### 15th edition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>523.3</th>
<th>Moon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Includes motion, surface features (atmosphere, craters), size, heat, light, eclipses, physical condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moon
Constants and dimensions of moon
Including size, mass, distance, parallax
Phases of moon
Including sources of lunar heat, light and radiation
Orbit and motions of moon
Including sidereal month, perigee and apogee, librations
Selenography
Science of physical features of moon
Theories of lunar atmosphere
Lunar climatology
Including lunar temperature
Lunar spectography
Lunar eclipses
Charts and photographs of moon
Including lunar observations and tables

Instruction notes, clearly phrased in the imperative, perform a variety of functions. Among others, they provide for irregular use of form divisions, e.g., Use 220.01-220.02, 220.04-220.09 for form divisions. They show where numbers may be divided like other numbers, usually with an example, e.g., 221 Old Testament Divide like 220, e.g., commentaries on Old Testament 221.7. They indicate relocations, as shown above, e.g., Class table tennis [formerly *796.34] in 794.7.

Cross references lead the classifier to related topics, and serve further to differentiate meanings which definitions and scope notes may not have made completely clear. Blanket references are always supplied with examples.

Libraries as educational force
Role of libraries in education of children and adults thru planned, purposeful reading
For adult education, see 374; adult reader service, 025.54; service to children, 027.62; college and university libraries, 027.7; school libraries, 027.8

The following two examples show typical, though unusually extensive, annotation of various types:

Apologetics
Exposition of Christian doctrines refuting alleged errors in other systems
Including polemics, methods of apologetics

- 176 -
Use 239.001-239.009 for form divisions

For exposition of Christian doctrine, see 230; controversies over a specific Christian doctrine, the doctrine, e.g., divinity of Christ 232.8; polemic writings by adherents of one Christian denomination against another, the denomination attackt, e.g., Protestant polemics against Roman Catholic Church 282

National bibliographies and catalogs

Bibliographies of works published in a specific place: country, city, publishing house

Including publishers' catalogs, lists and indexes of government publications, histories of publications in a place covering writing in all subjects as well as in belles-lettres

Divide like 940–999, e.g., bibliographies of books published in Belgium 015.493

For bibliographies of works about a specific place, see 016, e.g., works about Belgium 016.9493; of works published in a specific place on a specific subject, the subject, e.g., works published in Belgium on mathematics 016.51; general library and sales catalogs, 017–019; literary histories of a place covering belles-lettres only or primarily, the 800's

It is obvious that, although the 16th edition will contain only 18,000 numbers as compared with the 14th's 30,000, the schedules will be longer. Since, as we shall see later, the index entries are greater in number, the 16th will be the larger by close to one thousand pages, and will have to extend to two volumes.

Another device for the assistance of the classifier is explicit instructions in many subject areas as to where to class comprehensive works, when different aspects of a subject class in different places. For example:

646 Clothing and personal appearance

Including comprehensive works on clothing

For costume, see 391; apparel manufacture, 687; manufacture of leather and fur garments, 685.2; of footwear, 685.3; of gloves and mittens, 685.4
As might be expected, modern terminology is used; and provision is made for modern concepts and topics on which literature is beginning, or may be expected to begin, to appear. The classifier will find provision for effect of radiation on genes, Ghana, automation, eye banks, nuclear engineering, the United Church of Christ, pilot plants.

Extended systematic classification is in some places supplemented, or replaced as an alternative, by alphabetic arrangement. For example, counties and cities in a given state of the United States may be arranged systematically, as in earlier editions—and those states not previously developed, such as Texas, will be developed in the 16th edition—or they may be arranged in the simpler alphabetic design used so successfully by the Library of Congress Classification. Similarly, the hundreds of botanical families under dicotyledons may be arranged systematically, although nearly every writer on taxonomy has his own system, or alphabetically by their scientific names.

In addition to the first, second, third summaries, summaries will be included at the beginning of all schedules which are long and complicated.

The index will be "relative," and relatively exhaustive. It will contain some 25,000 more entries than the 65,000 in the 14th index. It will include all terms appearing in the schedules; and in addition currently used (including British) synonyms; parts of topics, provided there is literature on them; names of outstanding persons and organizations associated with subjects; aspects of subjects; both scientific and common names.

One of the notable features of the DC prior to edition 15 was its "simpler" spelling, interesting to the student but exasperating to the busy classifier, and never wholly consistent. The 14th conventionalized the spelling of some schedules, and of the entire index, where Melvil Dewey's orthography was a special hazard; but it was not until the 15th that conventional spelling was used throughout. As in so many other respects, in this also the 16th edition returns part way to the practice of the 14th. As a mark of respect to the founder of the DC, and in recognition of his long and deep interest in spelling reform, a few simplifications are consistently used, none of which, the reader may be assured, will give the classifier any trouble. The simpler spelling of the twelve words adopted for use by the NEA in 1898 is observed: catalog, decalog, demagog, pedagog, prolog, program, tho, altho, thoro, thorofare, thru, throughout. Many of these spellings are more familiar, to Americans if not to Britons, than their longer analogues. (Why isn't that word on the NEA list?) In past tenses and past participles of verbs, "ed" is simplified to "t" and spelling modified as required when so "pronounst," provided no possibility of misinterpretation is admitted. The 16th says "clast," "publisht," "attackt," but not "produst," "bast," "prestrest concrete." All other spellings are based on Webster's unabridged dictionary and other standard reference tools. As a memorial to Dr. Dewey, his introduction to the DC is included in his spelling.
The introduction and auxiliary matter will contain much material which should be helpful to the classifier, including full description of many matters touched upon in this article.

Finally, plans are under consideration which will give the users of the DC the same kind of current service which is available to users of the LC Classification. It is projected that the 16th edition will be kept up to date and interpreted, in the light of books actually published and classified at the Library of Congress for inclusion of DC numbers on LC cards, by a periodic publication which will be available to DC users. In this way, additions, expansions, relocations can be distributed and incorporated into the practice of libraries on a gradual basis, instead of coming to them all at once in a 17th edition. This most important feature, together with the published 16th edition as described here, should in truth bring the DC back into the tradition of the first fourteen editions; and should make it again, as it was years ago, one of the librarian's best friends.
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DEWEY AWARD TO WYLLIS WRIGHT

The Melvil Dewey Medal was awarded at the Kansas City Conference to Wyllis E. Wright, Librarian of Williams College, "for creative professional achievement of a high order."

Mr. Wright, described in the citation as "a librarian's librarian," has served, among his many activities, as President of ACRL, DCC, and CNLA; Chairman of the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials, the DCC Board on Cataloging Policy and Research, and the Catalog Code Revision Committee; and as Editor of the Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook, and of the American Library Annual.
Bibliographic Control of Audio-Visual Materials: Report of a Special Committee

Prepared by FRANCES HAMMAN
Catalog Librarian III, University of Michigan Library, Ann Arbor

Introduction

At the Philadelphia Conference in 1955 the Executive Board of the Division of Cataloging and Classification authorized the establishment of a Special Committee on the Bibliographic Control of Audio-Visual Materials to survey needs and existing practices in this field and to make recommendations for future action.*

The Committee, after some study, decided that the best method of accomplishing its assignment was to prepare a questionnaire to be sent to libraries with audio-visual collections. Ideas for the questionnaire were contributed by members of the Committee and were discussed at a Committee meeting at the 1956 Mid-Winter Conference. At this meeting the following decisions were made concerning the questionnaire: (1) It would be limited to motion picture films, filmstrips, and phonorecords. (2) It would be sent only to those libraries which had had audio-visual collections for some time and hence had had an opportunity to consider and work out problems of cataloging and classification. (3) It should investigate what cataloging and classification procedure was employed, and why it was used. (4) It should include a request for sample catalog cards and local manuals of procedure. In formulating the questionnaire the Committee decided to use Library of Congress descriptive rules for films and phonorecords as a basis for the terminology, on the grounds that these were the best known and most easily accessible standards available.

A tentative draft of the questionnaire, drawn up prior to the Miami Beach Conference in 1956, was sent to members of the DCC Executive Board and to members of the Audio-Visual Board and Audio-Visual Round Table for criticism and suggestions. The many useful and valuable comments submitted were discussed at a Committee meeting at Miami Beach. In the fall of 1956 a final draft of the questionnaire was approved by all Committee members and mailed to the libraries.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire in its final form was designed to provide the following information:

(1) the various types of audio-visual material owned by the libraries queried;

* Members of the Committee: Shirley Ellis, Frances Hamman, Helen B. Stevens, R. G. Swank, and Eunice Keen, Chairman.
(2) the department responsible for cataloging audio-visual materials;
(3) how many libraries use LC printed cards, colored cards, or make their own cards;
(4) what cataloging rules are used;
(5) what items on the cards are considered most essential;
(6) whether audio-visual materials are classified and, if so, according to what system;
(7) whether subject headings are used and, if so, what standard lists are followed;
(8) in what catalogs the audio-visual cards are placed, that is, public catalog only, audio-visual catalog only, or both;
(9) whether both patrons and staff have access to the audio-visual card catalog;
(10) the extent to which printed catalogs for audio-visual materials are provided;
(11) whether librarians feel that LC rules and cards can be the basis for standardization in this field as they have been for books, with reasons for the answers; and
(12) whether there is a need for an audio-visual manual of procedure.

In addition, librarians were asked to make comments or suggestions on audio-visual cataloging procedures and problems and to send sample cards and local manuals of procedure where available. An exhibit of these materials was arranged for the Kansas City Conference by Eunice Keen.

Each member of the Committee tabulated a portion of the questionnaires, and the Chairman of the Committee compiled the final tabulations. At a Committee meeting at the 1957 Mid-Winter Conference the tabulations were reviewed, and an outline was drawn up for the Committee's final report.

Selection of Libraries

The mailing list for the questionnaire was prepared by Shirley Ellis of the Visual Materials Center of the Chicago Public Library. Three hundred questionnaires were sent to libraries with phonorecord collections; one hundred to each of three types of libraries: public, college and university, and school. Two hundred and three film libraries were sent the questionnaire; forty-six in public libraries, sixty-six in college and university libraries, and ninety-one in school libraries.

The libraries were selected in accordance with the Committee's decision to send the questionnaire to relatively large, established institutions which had had the most experience with films and phonorecords. Public libraries with film collections listed in the American Library Association's Public Library Film Statistics, 1955, indicating date of establishment as 1951 or before and having a collection of at least 300 titles, were chosen. College and university library film collections were selected from the hundred largest institutions, as listed in the Office of Education Education Directory, 1951-52, Pt. 3, Higher Education, hav
ing film libraries established at least since 1951, according to Seerley Reid's *A Directory of 16 mm. Film Libraries*, and a survey of the general catalogs of these schools for 1951-52. School libraries were chosen from those listed in Reid's *Directory* as having at least 376 film titles.

Since a selective list of the largest and longest established music libraries in the country was not available, the size of cities and of colleges and universities seemed the most practicable criterion for compiling the list for phonorecord collections. Accordingly, the public libraries and school libraries in the 100 largest cities in the United States and the libraries of the 100 largest universities and colleges were selected.

**Responses to Questionnaire**

Replies were received from about sixty per cent of the libraries contacted. Responses were about equally divided among the three types of institutions: sixty-four college and university libraries; seventy-four public libraries; and sixty-three school libraries. The college and university figures include four replies from university extension departments or audio-visual centers which exist independently of the library. One special library is included in the public library statistics. The school library figures include those for fourteen county school materials centers, three board of education materials centers, and five state departments of education. Nineteen institutions returned the questionnaires unchecked, apparently feeling that they had no information to contribute, but some of these expressed an interest in the results of the questionnaire.

The division among libraries according to types of material is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coll. &amp; Univ.</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motion picture films</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filmstrips</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonorecords</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Where the Cataloging is Done**

In regard to the department or agency responsible for the cataloging, forty-five film libraries said that films were cataloged in the catalog department; thirty-three said they were done in the film or audio-visual department. Three school libraries indicated that cataloging was done in an instructional materials center. Other answers included: circulation department, administrative office, general reference unit, art and music department, literature and language division, adult education department. Twenty-three indicated that the cataloging was done in some place other than the catalog department, but did not specify the place. It would seem that more films are cataloged outside the library's catalog department than by the department.

Seventy-five phonorecord librarians said that their records were cata-
loged in the catalog department. Forty-seven named the audio-visual department or music library. In eleven cases these materials were cataloged by the music librarian. One library indicated that music records were cataloged in the music department and non-music in the catalog department. Other answers included: the fine arts department, special services librarian, administrative assistant, materials center, listening room, pamphlet and ephemeral department. In summary, phonorecord collections seem more likely to be cataloged by the catalog department.

Type of Cards Used

Thirty-seven film libraries, or about twenty-seven per cent, use Library of Congress printed cards. Only about thirteen per cent use colored cards. Most of the libraries typed, printed, dittoed, mimeographed, or otherwise reproduced their own cards using information from the Educational Film Guide and the Film Strip Guide. Other cards used were the Educational Film Library Association cards and Coronet Film Company cards.

Thirty record libraries, or about seventeen per cent, use Library of Congress printed cards. Twelve per cent use colored cards. A number of other libraries use LC cards when available but found they had to make their own cards for many titles. In summary, the majority of libraries make their own cards, although, as will appear later in the report, many of them would like to make more use of LC cards.

Cataloging Rules

Thirty-two film libraries use Library of Congress descriptive rules, fourteen an adaptation of LC rules. Sixty-one record libraries use LC rules, and thirty-seven said they use an adaptation of LC and Music Library Association rules. Library of Congress rules, or an adaptation of them, appeared to be employed by thirty-three per cent of the film libraries and about fifty-six per cent of the record libraries.

Essential Items on Catalog Card

In order to gauge the libraries' estimates of the relative importance of items of information to be included in cataloging, the items the Library of Congress uses on its catalog cards were listed, and the libraries were asked to indicate those which they omitted in preparing their own cards. Items most frequently omitted (forty or more replies) in film cataloging were: date of release, features requiring special equipment for projection, notes about other versions, related materials, source material, and added entries. Other items less frequently omitted (twenty to thirty-nine replies) were: releasing agent, date of production, number of frames, size (although some indicated separate catalogs for 16 mm. and 35 mm. films), type of audience, indication of study guide, and change of title. One must conclude that the items considered by these libraries as most essential to their needs were: title, length (running time), color or black and white, statement of physical medium, producer, sound or silent, series note, and contents note.
The same procedure was used in obtaining information on cataloging phonorecords. Those items most frequently omitted (seventy to one hundred and three replies) were: date of release, source of title if not on record, edition of original work, details concerning performance, and duration note. Other items frequently omitted (forty to sixty-nine replies) were adapter, translator, librettist, statement of physical medium, abridgments, composer-title added entries, and added entry for author of text. Items omitted by some libraries (twenty to thirty-nine replies) were arranger, number of parts of sides, number of cylinders, reels, spools, and rolls, series note, “with” note, separate entries for different editions, speeds, varying sequence, varying media, etc., and added entries for performers and series. There may have been some misinterpretation of this question since seven indicated omission of composer, and fifteen indicated omission of transcribed title. However, it would seem from these tabulations that the most essential items in cataloging phonorecords were: composer or author, title (either conventional or transcribed or both), serial identification, trade name of publisher, number of albums, number of sides, size, speed, names of performers, medium, contents note, and added entries for title. One library indicated in answering this question that it omitted composer analytics for collections if the composer was not studied in the music program in the schools, but that it included title analytics for almost all collections.

Classification or Location Symbols

In answer to the question concerning classification, fifty-seven libraries stated that they classified films, five using the Library of Congress system and thirty-one using the Dewey system. A number used modifications of either LC or Dewey. Other classification systems specified included grade level by subject and units taught, subject matter, and size. Forty-eight libraries said they did not classify films but used systematic arrangements or location symbols. Most of these seemed to be variations of the accession or serial numbering system although some used alphabetical systems. Film libraries, then, seemed about equally divided between those who classified and those who did not, with a slight edge toward classification. The majority of those who classified films used the Dewey classification system.

Sixty-four libraries said they classified records, twenty-nine using Dewey, five using LC, and the others using a modified Dewey or LC or their own systems.

Seventy-seven libraries did not classify records but used their own arrangement or location symbol. Some of these systems were specified as manufacturer’s number, accession number, serial number, letter code, groupings by size and speed subarranged alphabetically, alphabetical arrangement by composer or title, alphabetical listing by size, location symbols for type of composition, Cutter number from composer subarranged in order of receipt, and various combinations of letter and number systems. Most libraries seemed to have systems which distinguished single records from albums.
Again among the record libraries there was fairly even division between those who classified and those who did not, with a slight edge toward the location symbol. Again Dewey was the most popular classification system.

Subject Headings

One hundred and eight libraries used subject headings for films, thirty-four using the LC list or modifications of it, and eighteen using Sears. Others used headings from the *Educational Film Guide*, *Reader's Guide*, curriculum or course of study, and the *Filmstrip Guide*. Some libraries simply specified a local system or a combination of several lists according to needs.

One hundred and forty-three libraries used subject headings for phonorecords, over half, eighty-seven, using the LC list or modifications of it, and nineteen using the Sears list or modifications of it. Among others mentioned were curriculum or course of study headings, Music Library Association headings or modifications of them, and musical forms.

The majority of both film and record libraries use subject headings. The LC subject heading list is the most widely used, although not as many film libraries as record libraries use it.

Location of Catalogs

Only sixteen film libraries said they placed catalog cards in the public catalog, while sixty-seven indicated they had a catalog in the film or audio-visual department only. School libraries tended to have catalogs in all teaching departments or all schools. Some libraries had film catalogs in the reference department or at the public information desk. One library indicated that subject cards appeared in appropriate departmental catalogs.

Of the phonorecord libraries, twenty-two put cards in the public catalog while ninety put cards only in the phonorecord or audio-visual department catalog. Several libraries indicated that there were separate record catalogs adjacent to the public card catalog. One library indicated that cards for non-music records were placed in the public catalog and cards for music records only in the phonorecord department. Again, at least one catalog was located in the reference department.

Access to Catalogs

In general, most film catalogs were for the use of the staff only. Seventy-nine libraries reported this, while thirty-seven reported that patrons had access to the catalog.

In phonorecord libraries the catalogs are more available to the public. Eighty-two libraries allowed the public access to catalogs, while ninety-one had catalogs for staff use only.

In summary, catalog cards for most audio-visual materials are kept in special catalogs in the department handling these materials, and many of the catalogs, especially in film libraries, are for staff use only.
Printed Catalogs

Film libraries are likely to have printed catalogs of their materials, as shown by the fact that 107 reported having them. Among record libraries the converse is true with fifty-six libraries having printed catalogs and 108 not having them.

Library of Congress Rules as a Basis of Standardization

Although not all libraries are using Library of Congress cards or rules, the majority (eighty-eight) seemed to feel that they could be the basis of standardization for cataloging audio-visual materials. Some of the reasons given were: a saving in time and costs, uniformity, the coordination of film and book records, familiarity of the staff and public with LC terminology, and the difficulty of locating information elsewhere. However, those who made a negative response (twenty-eight) had some very definite reasons for their answers. They cited the great lag in publication of cards, insufficient subject headings, insufficient content information, too much detail, and lack of flexibility. Several felt the LC system was too complex for a small collection.

Among record librarians the vote for LC as a basis for standardization was even greater, one hundred to ten, although at present many obviously use adaptations of LC. Some of the reasons given for the affirmative answers were: good basic information adequate for present needs; aid to libraries in starting record collections; the efficiency of centralized cataloging; uniformity; coordination with book materials; familiarity of public and staff with LC cards; the advantage of Library of Congress access to extensive sources of information; and the flexibility of LC cards. Those who voted against LC again emphasized the lag in publication, felt that LC cards were not adapted to the needs of school and public libraries, and that LC cards were too detailed and inflexible.

Manual of Procedure

When asked whether a manual of procedure was needed in addition to cataloging rules, one hundred and fourteen librarians said yes, fifty-seven said no. Among the reasons given for having a manual of procedure were: standardization of rules and methods of procedure with a consequent saving in time and money; orientation of new personnel and assistance in coping with the turnover in untrained help; provision of a teaching and reference aid; aid to those starting a new collection and to small libraries; usefulness in clarifying classification policies and processing procedures. One library stated that many exceptions were not covered by the rules, and that circumstances in most libraries prevented complete adherence to rules formulated years after the collections had been established.

Among those who did not think a manual of procedure necessary, the majority seemed to feel that procedures should be determined by individual institutions to fit their own needs, and that local situations varied too much for a standardized manual to be of much value. One
library pointed out that Rufsvold's *Audio-Visual School Library Service* was excellent for technical procedures.

**Suggestions and Comments**

One of the most interesting parts of the questionnaire was the final question asking for suggestions or recommendations. Some of the comments only enlarged upon points already made, such as the lag in publication of LC cards and the fact that many titles are not available on LC cards. But there were a number of comments on subject headings. Some felt that there should be a standardized list of subject headings not as detailed as the LC list for books but subdivided for type of borrower; others wanted a selected list of subject headings, a supplement to Sears, or more subject analytics. One library asked if subject headings for children's recordings could be devised since they need to furnish a different approach from those of the adult collection. Another library which was ordering LC cards to set up a card catalog did not feel that they could afford to put subject cards for each film in the public catalog, but were planning to put a general information card at the end of subjects represented in the film collection saying "Also 16 mm. films on the subject; see catalog in Film Dept."

Other suggestions were for a comprehensive bibliography on organization, an analysis of cataloging methods by various libraries, and information on marking films and records. One library stated that they were interested in other libraries' systems of marking receipt of new materials (accession list, shelf list, or other record), information included on charge-out cards, and statistics on size of collections.

One library thought it would be helpful if the producer put the information needed for cataloging on the label on the film container. Several felt that printed catalogs were all that were necessary for films. There was a query as to whether the Wilson Company would consider printing cards for materials listed in *Educational Film Guide* and *Filmstrip Guide*. (The Wilson Company has reported to the Chairman of this Committee that they do not feel they can print cards at the present time because the cost would be too great.)

One record library suggested that the libraries cataloging according to LC rules contribute their cards to a central depository which would make the cards available to all libraries. An interesting development toward centralized film cataloging was reported in the Library of Congress *Information Bulletin* for March 11, 1957. Announcement was made of two UNESCO publications: (1) *International Rules for the Cataloging of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Films and Filmstrips* (2) *Manual for Evaluators of Films and Filmstrips*. The *International Rules* are based on British Film Institute and LC practice. Four kinds of catalog cards are anticipated: (1) a descriptive catalog card, (2) an evaluation card, (3) an international availability card, and (4) a national availability card. It was stated that UNESCO hoped that each country producing films will establish a national card production center to arrange for the evaluation and cataloging of films.
There was expressed the desire for colored cards to distinguish audiovisual materials in the catalogs. However, it must be pointed out that colored cards need a chart or guide to distinguish type of material. Some libraries solved this problem by having separate catalogs.

One librarian felt that more research was needed on the way the patron approaches audio-visual materials and that it would be useful if some libraries with large collections could do some experimental studies on this topic.

Simplification seemed to be the most often expressed need among record librarians. Several people mentioned that the life of a record is fairly short, and that therefore detailed cataloging is a waste of time and money in a heavily used collection. One large public library stated that while they were still cataloging records for their central collection, they were no longer cataloging them for branch libraries, but were allowing each branch to do indexing or whatever they found most useful in their smaller collections. This cataloger also hoped that there could be found a quicker and cheaper method of cataloging records that would still satisfy reference needs. The need for standardization and simplification was mentioned in connection with author and title cross references, authority file procedure, methods and extent of analysis, problems of withdrawal, and conventional title.

Conclusions and Recommendations

In conclusion the Committee would make the following comments and recommendations:

(1) Every effort should be made to achieve standardization of the essential elements in cataloging audio-visual materials. Attention should be given to flexible rules which could be used by a small library, and which could be easily expanded as the collection grows. However, two considerations should be kept in mind in simplification of rules: (a) all collections will grow, and recataloging is expensive, therefore an expandable system should be sought by any library starting a film or record collection; (b) films and records are not as easily consulted as are books and are more easily damaged by handling. Therefore, the information necessary for the catalog user to make a decision as to which film or record will meet his needs must appear on the catalog card.

(2) Since a number of libraries expressed willingness to use LC cards were more titles available and published more promptly and since the use of LC cards would give a basis for standardization, it is hoped that LC will be able in the future to meet these requests.

(3) The question as to whether the present subject heading lists are adequate for audio-visual cataloging or whether special lists should be drawn up probably needs further study by subject specialists. Certainly some thought should be given to the problem of subjects for recordings for children since these recordings need a different approach than those for adults.
The Committee would recommend that a standardized manual of procedure for the handling of audio-visual materials be prepared. The manual should include (a) a simplified but easily expandable system for small collections, (b) directions for cataloging with adequate examples and sample cards, and (c) suggestions for marking and for the physical handling of these materials.

The Committee would suggest that in view of the attention at present being given to studies of catalog use, some consideration be given to research on the approach of audio-visual catalog users to this material.

At the Kansas City meeting of the Cataloging and Classification Section of the Resources and Technical Services Division, ALA, the above recommendations were approved with one change: that work toward a section-sponsored manual would proceed if investigation showed no similar one being planned or prepared elsewhere.

Aids for Use in Cataloging and Classifying Audio-Visual Materials

Editor's note: This supplementary list represents the work of too many people to list, but the initial work and final preparation was done by Eunice Keen, Librarian of the Lakeland, Florida, High School Library.

The basic general cataloging tools listed in the July, 1955, issue of the Journal of Cataloging and Classification are also necessary for audio-visual materials, and, in addition, the special aids listed below prove very helpful and many may be classed as "musts."

**GENERAL**

  - Maps and Atlases—Section 8, p. 67-73.
  - Microfilm—Section 10:4, p. 99-100.
  - Music—Section 9, p. 75-95.
  - Also its Supplement 1949-1951, 1952.


(Its Music Library Manual, no. 3)
L. C. Rules as adapted for use at the University of California. Includes
35 pages of sample catalog cards.

e. [Music Library Association
Code for Cataloging Music and Phonorecords; prepared by a joint com-
mittee of the Music Library Association and the American Library Asso-
ciation, Division of Cataloging and Classification. Rev. ed.]
Completed and approved by both associations but not yet published.

FILMS (Basic tools)

Arranged in 2 parts. Pt. 1. Title and subject index in one alphabet.
Pt. 2. Classified subject index, by Dewey Classification. Gives LC catalog
card number when printed cards are available. Gives brief summary of
each film, with running time, number of reels if more than one, sound
or silent, black and white or color, and size.

b. Educational Film Library Association.
Ceased publication in sheet form in 1947, and is now published as
3 x 5 inch cards for each film described. The cards include subject area,
evaluation, synopsis, uses, age level, technical quality, comment, and
rating on each film. The cards give LC card number when printed cards
are available.

Service, 1941-date.
Alphabetic arrangement, by subject and title. Does not give LC card
number, but other information is similar to that in the Educational Film
Guide.

Issued every 3 or 4 years since 1927, with supplements. Gives summary of
film, date of release, etc.

FILMS (Additional tools)

a. U. S. Copyright Office.
Motion Pictures 1912-1939. Catalog of Copyright Entries, Cumulative
Series.
Motion pictures registered for copyright 1912-1939.

b. U. S. Copyright Office.
Motion Pictures 1940-1949. Catalog of Copyright Entries, Cumulative
Series.
Motion pictures registered for copyright 1940-1949.

c. U. S. Copyright Office.
Motion Pictures and Filmstrips. Catalog of Copyright Entries, Third
Series. Issued semiannually since 1947.
Describes all currently copyrighted motion pictures and filmstrips.
FILMS (Other possible aids)

   Includes data on possible use of films.


   Issued annually.
   Includes producing companies for both 35 and 16 mm. films, a biographical
   index, and current releases.

d. *Cine-annuario*. Rome, Fratelli Palombi, 1948-
   Best source for Italian names and companies.

e. Cornwell-Clyne, Adrian.

f. Educational Film Library Association.
   *Film Review Digest*, 1953-
   Periodic issues in leaflet form presenting excerpts from various reviews
   of films.

g. *Educational Screen and Audio-Visual Guide*. Issued monthly beginning
   with September issue, 1956.
   Articles, reviews, etc., related mostly to classroom films.

   Articles, reviews, etc., related mostly to classroom films.

i. Film Council of America.
   Separate sheets accompanied by subject indexes.

   Emphasis on the theatrical industry, but contains lists of organizations
   and companies related to 16 mm. and television fields.


l. *International Motion Picture Almanac*. N. Y., Quigley Publications. Issued
   annually.
   Who’s who (mostly U. S.) foreign and United States companies and titles.
   Emphasis on theatrical, but contains information on non-theatrical and
   television companies also.

   British companies and societies, who’s what in the industry, list of titles.
   etc. Emphasis on theatrical, but contains information on documentary
   producers also.

n. McDonald, Gerald D.
   *Educational Motion Pictures*. Chicago, American Library Association,
   1942.
   The importance of film as library material.
o. Writer's Program.

_The Film Index: The Film as Art._ N. Y., Museum of Modern Art, and H. W. Wilson co., 1941.

Bibliography by titles and actors. Index to reviews and articles.


Mostly theatrical. Contains briefer sections on television, radio and 16 mm. films.

**FILMSTRIPS (Basic tools)**


Alphabetic list by subject and title, brief annotation, giving number of frames, running time, whether black and white or color, and sound or silent.


Alphabetic list by title and subject, also classified list by Dewey Classification. Gives LC catalog card number when printed cards are available. Gives brief summary of each filmstrip, number of frames, running time, black and white or color, and sound or silent.

**MAPS AND ATLAS (Basic tools)**


b. Boggs, S. W., and Lewis, Mrs. D. C.


c. Brown, L. A.

_**Notes on the Care and Cataloging of Old Maps.**_ Windham, Conn., Hawthorn House, 1941. p. 28-81.


Entry by ADS (area, date, subject) heading for maps is recommended. (Published also in _Bulletin_ no. 15, October 1953)

e. Thiele, Walter.

_Official Map Publications; a Historical Sketch, and a Bibliographical Handbook of Current Maps and Mapping Services in the United States, Canada, Latin America, France, Great Britain, Germany, and Certain Other Countries._ Chicago, American Library Association, 1938. 356 p. (Planographed)

"Cataloging and Classification of Maps": p. 282-311.

f. U. S. Aeronautical Chart and Information Center, St. Louis.


MAPS AND ATLAS (Additional tools)


MAPS AND ATLAS (Other possible aids)


c. British Museum. Department of Printed Books, Map Room.  
*Catalogue of the Printed Maps, Plans, and Charts in the British Museum.*  
London, 1885. 2 v.  
This work with the supplemental lists of accessions is one of the most comprehensive map catalogs ever published.

*Catalog of Copyright Entries, Part 6: Maps and Atlases.*  
1947 to date.  
Divided into four sections: Current registrations (by author); Index of areas and subjects; Renewal registrations; and Publisher's directory. Useful for date information and names of less well known cartographic firms.

e. U. S. Library of Congress, Map Division.  
*Bibliography of Cartography.*  
Washington, 1895-  
A cardfile containing about 55,000 entries in July, 1956. Includes material on exploration, map making, interpretation, reading, use and preservation, biographical data. Selected from current literature.


g. U. S. Library of Congress, Map Division.  
Lists 5,324 atlases dating from the Middle Ages through 1919. Includes chronological lists of atlases, author lists and indexes. Has extensive biographical notes. Many atlases in this work are not represented in the Library of Congress catalogs of printed cards. A supplementary volume listing world atlases from 1920 to October, 1955, is scheduled for publication in 1957.

Lists 15,000 to 20,000 titles, arranged alphabetically by area including separate maps, and maps in atlases and books.

i. U. S. Library of Congress, Map Division.  
Volume 2 is a union list of United States atlases and includes atlases in other U. S. libraries.

**MUSIC AND PHONORECORDS (Basic tools)**

a. Affelder, Paul.  
*How to Build a Record Library.* N. Y., Dutton, 1947.  
Several hundred compositions listed with brief discussion of each. May be used as an aid in identifying composers, titles, etc.
   Alphabetic arrangement by composers. Useful reference tool for composers in the United States.

c. Apel, Willi.
   Reliable reference book with information on types of music, musical form, notation, etc. Includes bibliographies.

   In one volume, this is one of the best and most reliable of its kind.


   One volume, divided into two sections: music printed before 1800; music printed since 1800.

g. Clough, F. F., and Cuming, G. J.
   Arranged alphabetically by composer, then by type of composition. Lists all records issued from 1925-June 1951. Valuable for old recordings.

   Randolph, Wisc., Educator's Progress Service, 1955- to date.
   Alphabetically arranged, by subject and title. Gives synopsis and length of time of each.

i. Eitner, Robert.
   *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Quellen-Lexikon der Musikern und Musikgelehrten der Christlichen Zeitrechnung bis zur Mitte des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*. N. Y., Musurgia [1946?-1947]
   In ten volumes, arranged alphabetically by composers. Invaluable for names, dates and complete works of composers to 1850.

j. Gramaphone Shop, Inc., N. Y.

k. Grove, Sir George.
   A most valuable tool for identifying composers, compositions, terms, etc.

l. Hall, David.
   (Revision of Hall's *The Record Book*, International Edition: Guide to the World of the Phonograph.)
Arranged alphabetically by composers, then by type of composition, if composer has many works, as for orchestra, concertos, etc. Gives full name and dates of composer.

A complete catalog of long playing records and tape recordings, arranged alphabetically by composer (with his dates) Also includes section of songs, arias, etc., listed by performing artist; section of folk music; popular music; theatre, films, speech, and children's records.

n. Myers, Kurtz, comp.
Includes valuable information identifying titles recorded.

o. Pratt, Waldo Selden.
Valuable in locating full names and dates of composers and musicians with a listing of their works. (Good if unable to afford Grove's *Dictionary of Music and Musicians*)

p. Thompson, Oscar.
Alphabetic arrangement with listing of important composers, dates of composition or first performance or publication, if possible.

Good for identifying composers, and for other information about operas and recordings of them.

*Catalog of Copyright Entries. Part 5 A, Published Music.*
Washington, Copyright Office, Library of Congress, 1947-
Includes helpful name and date information for composers, both American and foreign. Since 1955, includes conventional titles in Library of Congress style.

s. Wier, A. E., ed.
Valuable aid for identifying some of the less well-known composers and performers.

t. Wier, A. E.
*Thesaurus of the Arts; Drama, Music, Radio, Painting, Screen, Television, Literature, Sculpture, Architecture, Ballet.*
Very good reference aid for brief information about composers, compositions, etc.

MUSIC AND PHONORECORDS (Other possible aids)

Record Catalogs as-
a. *Columbia Record Catalog.* N. Y., Columbia Records, Inc., 1949-
Arranged alphabetically by title with complete information, also listed under composer, artist, album set, type of composition (as sonata, sym-
phony, concerto, etc.) or under a particular heading (as accordion music, ballet, music, drama, etc.) Very valuable in identifying a composition.

Biographical Dictionaries of Musicians as-

b. Ewen, David.
Includes biographical sketches and a list of works of each, by types. Helpful in identifying a composer and his work.

OTHER AIDS FOR CATALOGING SPECIAL MATERIALS

Since 1953, the Library of Congress has printed catalog cards for many of the audio-visual materials added to its collections. Copies of these printed entries are included in the several printed catalogs which the Library publishes as indicated below.
Maps and atlases. Published as a separate part of the printed catalog, 1953-1955. Entries for 1956+ are included in the author and subject catalogs for books.
Motion pictures and filmstrips. Published as a separate section of the printed catalog since 1953. Quarterly issues and annual cumulation. (1953, annual issue only)
Music and phonorecords. Published as a separate section of the printed catalog since 1953. Semiannual issue and annual cumulation.

Multilithed 3 x 5 cards for currently copyrighted maps, music, motion pictures and filmstrips may be ordered from the Register of Copyrights on a subscription basis. Weekly distribution.

AUDIO-VISUAL MANUALS

Keen, Eunice.
Rufsvold, Margaret.

ORIENTAL CATALOGING

The Committee on Descriptive Cataloging of the Cataloging and Classification Section has approved a large body of recommendations made by the ALA-DDCC Special Committee on Cataloging Oriental Materials. These recommendations include a number of new rules to be inserted in the A.L.A. Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries and in the Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress; there is also a Manual of Romanization, Word Division, etc. to assist in the application of the rules. The rules and manual will constitute one complete issue of Cataloging Service.

This has been a long-term project to which the members of the Special Committee on Cataloging Oriental Materials and the Orientalia Processing Committee of the Library of Congress have given hours of time and endless effort; the results will benefit all libraries with collections of Orientalia.—Marian Sanner, Chairman, Committee on Descriptive Cataloging.
The Administrator Looks at Technical Processing

NORMAN L. KILPATRICK
Director of Libraries,
Florida State University, Tallahassee

BEFORE the meeting I was talking with several catalogers and was interested and somewhat amused to have them remark that they were hardened to administrators complaining about the work of technical processes. Since I was once a head cataloger, I appreciated what they meant and was very sympathetic to their attitude. In the last few years a great deal has been written by administrators about the work of the catalog department. Much of it has been critical, but most of it has been sincere. Although faculty members and graduate students may return from Europe or the Far East with glowing accounts of how they unearthed valuable material under the eaves of an old cathedral or in private collections, they are still impatient when materials acquired by the library are delayed in being listed in the catalog and shelved in their proper sequence. In every university and research library the technical processes division is of great concern to the administrator. Unless the work of ordering, cataloging, and classifying is proceeding smoothly, the work that is carried on in the public services division is handicapped.

One of the problems that faces the administrator is to determine the point of balance between technical services and public services. The law of diminishing returns operates as relentlessly in library business as in any other. Savings made in cataloging frequently result in increased costs in the public services departments and, therefore, do not represent real savings. The philosophy that well-trained reference assistants can substitute indexes and bibliographies for the card catalog is not sound in most subject fields. This is particularly true in the fields of humanities and social sciences where studies show that gaps and inconsistencies in the indexes make it futile for the reference librarian to depend on these as his only tools. The diversity and complexity of materials acquired by university and research libraries makes it difficult to establish procedures that do not have exceptions. Because books are as individualistic as their authors and because in a university library it is desirable to give consideration to the teaching program in the arrangement of library materials, complete standardization is not always practical.

Aware of the problems, and of his own inadequacies to solve them, the administrator frequently sounds critical when he is merely trying to assure himself that the procedures under discussion are the most efficient.

*Paper presented at a meeting of the Catalogers' Round Table of the Florida Library Association in St. Petersburg, March 29, 1957.*
What does the administrator expect of the professional staff who work in technical processes?

First, he expects complete co-operation from the departments within the division. This can be achieved only when the routines of each department are well understood by the staff of the other departments and when not only the procedures, but the reasons for establishing the procedures, are understood.

Second, he expects them to realize that their work affects all other departments. It is important that the staff of the public services divisions be kept informed about order, cataloging and binding routines and policies. It is equally important that the staff of technical processes know how the public services departments function and the problems with which they are confronted.

Third, he expects constant and serious effort, particularly by the heads of departments, to eliminate duplication of work. An administrator would be unwise to insist that the catalog department accept all entries as established by the order department, but he does expect that the two department heads will work out procedures that will eliminate repeating routines that need to be done once and only once. Not only should the technical services staff guard against duplication of work within the division, but they should be on the alert for duplicate record keeping in other divisions. For example, a central serials checking record can serve all divisions of a university library even though the serials are divided by subject and serviced from several divisions. Planning and co-operation are necessary to accomplish this, but it eliminates duplicate work thereby cutting costs and simplifying the procedures.

Fourth, and in some ways the most important, the administrator expects the librarians working in technical processes to have as complete an understanding of the educational objectives of the university as do those working in public services. In a university library, and particularly an open stack library, some consideration should be given to the curriculum when determining the classification of materials that permit a choice of classification.

Recently at Florida State University Library several problems arose which illustrate the necessity of giving consideration to the curriculum and to the fact that the library is designed with open stacks. I shall cite two of these problems as examples.

In planning the arrangement of materials in the new library it was decided to set up a Documents Division because it seemed more efficient to have U. S., United Nations, Foreign, and State documents by form rather than by subject. In order to be consistent, it was necessary to define in exact terms the materials to be processed as documents. A major problem arose when we came to the materials published by state universities, particularly the monographic series such as California University's Publication in History. Technically they were documents, but to the student they were merely subject monographs. The Heads of the Technical Processes and Public Services Divisions discussed this and
similar problems in detail. It was decided that university studies would be treated as subject material, not as documents.

Another more specific problem was one that concerned the classification of a series dealing with geophysics. The Library of Congress had classified it in a geography number, and our catalogers accepted the LC classification. At Florida State University we have a very strong collection of meteorology. The meteorologists objected to the location of the material in Geography. When the material was re-examined, it was obvious that the major use of it would be by the meteorologists, and the classification was changed. This was an instance when the cataloger needed an understanding of the university's curriculum to do the best possible job.

The problems cited above exemplify one other quality that the administrator expects to find in his technical processes staff, namely, the ability to discuss problems objectively without feeling on the defensive.

In a recent article in the Journal of Cataloging and Classification, Dean Shera of the School of Library Science of Western Reserve, said, "Cataloging instruction too long has begun with the 'how' rather than the 'why.'" In making this statement, the Dean was criticizing the teaching of techniques in cataloging before the teaching of theory. His criticism carries weight because ultimately the administrator wants his technical processes staff to know why they do what they do.

A professional staff member who is no more than a good technician is decidedly limited. The administrator has a right to expect his technical processes librarians to exhibit qualities of interest, perception, and inquisitiveness that distinguish the professional from the clerical and non-professional assistant. Much of the "how" of library work is learned by experience, but the "why" is an attitude that differentiates the true professional.

Having expounded on the qualities which the administrator expects to find in his technical processes staff, let me close by stating that the administrator has responsibilities also. He cannot expect a co-operative, well-informed, and alert staff unless he provides opportunities for the necessary contacts. This means opportunities for formal and informal discussion between the various members of the staff and between staff and members of the university faculty. The best way to do this? That is a "how" question and emphasis in this talk is on "why."

LC CATALOG REPRINTED

According to the Publishers' Weekly, the Pageant Book Company (59 Fourth Avenue, New York 3, N. Y.) is planning a facsimile reproduction of the Catalog of Books Represented by Library of Congress Printed Cards, Issued to July 31, 1912 and are seeking subscriptions.

The proposed reprint should be ready in late Spring of 1958 and would sell for $1,000-$1,500 depending on the number of subscriptions which are received by December 31, 1957. Should the response be insufficient, the Company reserves the right to cancel all orders.
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The Administrator Looks at Technical Processing: School Libraries

C. Taylor Whittier
Assistant Superintendent for Instruction,
Pinellas County Public Schools, Clearwater, Florida

One thing we are concerned about, as administrators, is the environment in which our people work and the environment into which our patrons must come for service. We should try to improve working conditions so librarians become more effective as individuals. A librarian is, first and foremost, a human being who must communicate with other human beings. The library, to me, is one of the keys to our entire program of education. It is a tireless teacher with infinite patience. In whatever library field we are engaged, we all have the same general responsibility, namely, that of improving the citizens of our country. Any process we follow, and any practice continued, must be reviewed and justified in terms of the goals established for the library.

Technical processing, it seems to me, is a means to an end, never justification for itself. This is particularly true of the person who is engaged in technical processing, who must view the work as a contribution to those who will use the library. Such a person reduces time, distance, and financial blocks to learning. It seems important that we get the books on the shelves, and available to our users, as soon after the publication date as possible. We can become bogged down with processing to the point that books are too slow getting through the red tape. The business of cataloging needs to be simplified in order to carry it out quickly. We need to streamline all steps eliminating some, however venerable with age. Many engaged in this work are not critical enough of what is done. Let each of us ask ourselves the question, “Is the method by which I now do the things I do best in the light of today’s needs, or has today’s processing developed as it has by accident?” In short, who should be practitioners of the art of critical thinking if not the librarians? One needs to be flexible in viewpoint and routine. Librarians are working with ideas for the future. It is good sometimes to review the importance of each step followed in processing. From a practical point of view, it seems to me that some steps can be eliminated. You may well say that is the voice of the novice. However, I can report that in questioning one librarian about a certain step carefully followed these many years in the preparing of books for use, that no reason was forthcoming other than that her predecessor had instructed her to follow that step. No one was found who knew why. In a school library where all types of work

*Resume of a paper presented at the Catalogers’ Round Table of the Florida Library Association, St. Petersburg, March 29, 1957.*
are done by one librarian, it is necessary to simplify processing as much as possible. Catalogs and files must be organized in order to eliminate duplication. We must think, "Is this record necessary?" "Why are we doing what we do?" "Does it have a definite and necessary purpose?" "Could it be reduced in complexity?" "Can it be eliminated?" Let's not be afraid to face the new day with one less step to be followed. With a great variety of man's recorded ideas available, the librarian becomes an expeditor who creates a desire for, and satisfies the needs of, others who seek material contained in the library.

As an administrator, I am concerned with getting the maximum cataloging with the minimum personnel, which means each individual must spend as little time as possible doing this work. No library collection is of any merit unless it is accessible to the users. Yet all books do not need to be treated as if they were destined for the Library of Congress. We don't really need to use subject headings which few people would recognize. Nor do we need to provide for every conceivable eventuality which might develop. Let's put ourselves in the shoes of the fellow who is going to need help, and then let's really do something about streamlining.

In the schools, the catalog should be adapted both to the faculty and to the educational level of the students served. With the shortage of librarians and other personnel, we must streamline our processing and cataloging so as not to use the time of trained librarians who would better be used in direct pupil contacts. Be practical in everything we do. I think cataloging makes its contribution by making it simpler, clearer, and easier for people to obtain the information which they seek. If a library can cause more people to seek information, it is effective. We want librarians to develop skills in the job of cataloging and classifying to make that possible. My job as an administrator is to provide personnel to make that a possibility; but with all the other services needed, it must be on a minimum basis.

One of the purposes of an administrator is to bring about understanding between himself and other trained personnel. Maybe we are all too sensitive about training and attitudes. There are many processes which can be carried on by machines more effectively, more rapidly, and more simply. One of the points which has always bothered me is that our librarians tell me they must catalog their books in order to be familiar with the collection. I can't help but feel you can know your collection without cataloging. We could do a much more efficient job of both processing and public service if we used a centralized system of cataloging instead of each librarian doing his own.

The librarian works with the teachers as well as the students. It is possible to introduce time-saving measures that will be accurate and attain the same goals as the traditional processes. While I am a strong believer in helping children learn to care for books, I believe it comes with their use. We may not need to keep records to the point that all angles are covered. Some books are going to be lost. Tradition plays a strong part in cataloging books; it is a strength as well as a weakness.
Catalogers need to help the administrator realize the needs of the library so that the library, as the heart of the educational program, can become increasingly vital. Remember that appearance is of vital concern. We can reduce juvenile delinquency by more effective library service; we can reduce adult delinquency and finally senile delinquency by continued library use. The goal of both the school and public librarian is the same in these times.

We should make processing a servant to us. Less staff can accomplish the same goal. I think we have got to have help along the line from the cataloging field. You must help, not only as an individual in your own library, but as a part of a larger service area. We can spread the service and effectiveness of both libraries and librarians over a wider area by eliminating unnecessary steps.

I am not trying to imply this is not a joint responsibility—I think it is. I would like to suggest that catalogers must be sure that the administrators who are not technically trained in the library field are properly educated by you in what needs to be done. The library must be a wonderful place in which to serve and be served.

The Administrator Looks at Technical Processing: The Public Library

WILLIAM S. FRIEZE
Director, Tampa Public Library, Tampa, Fla.

I was very glad to accept your invitation to speak on "The Administrator Looks at Processing." It is one subject I like to talk about, and this is the first time I have ever felt that I would enjoy speaking. I have been looking at processing for some time; five years as a cataloger and ten years as an administrator. And I think I look at technical processing more sympathetically than do some administrators. But it is easier to look at processing than it is to talk about it; and sometimes we can only look at it—rather helplessly. And sometimes the catalogers would be much happier if we only looked and stopped there.

There has been a good bit written on the administrator and processing. In 1941 Andrew D. Osborn looked at cataloging and saw "A Crisis in Cataloging." In this paper he classified cataloging practice into four theories: the legalistic, the perfectionist, the bibliographic, and the pragmatic. His conclusion was that only the pragmatic could continue to be practiced with economy. I think many, if not most, of the catalogers tend to follow the legalistic, perfectionist, and bibliographic theories. In other words, they want to do the best, most thorough job they can. They

want to do it once and for all so that anyone can get all he wants from
the catalog.

But the administrator must be practical and must think of the cost,
even though we are just as anxious as the cataloger to have the perfect
catalog. I am surprised at how much my attitude could change when I
stopped cataloging and started considering the entire library. Of course
the catalog department is still my favorite—and sometimes the catalogers
wish it otherwise.

I don't need to go into the reasons for our looking always at the cost
and looking for economies. Libraries do not have the same economic
necessity to be efficient as private enterprise does. Our inefficiency is not
nearly so disastrous as that in a business. A library may be bankrupt, but
few go out of business. Our directors seldom question the efficiency of
the operation of the library. They may question expenditures but not
how well the job is being done. We do not show a profit or loss, and our
product can't be priced in the market.

Our economic necessity is in doing a job we feel should be done with
a shortage of professional help, with noncompetitive and unattractive
salaries, and with a constant turnover of nonprofessional help. I don't
suppose a library was ever meant to compete with Cupid and the stork.

The subject of this meeting is "The Administrator Looks at Technical
Processes." I thought that I would let you look at the administrator
looking at technical processes. I have tried to list the questions which
are on my mind when I look at the processes. I won't talk about classi-
fication and descriptive cataloging. I think the administrator had best
leave the classifier and cataloger pretty much alone.

You can't put your

finger on what they are doing anyway. But in the handling of the books
and preparing the cards we can see change for the better. So I will give
you some of my questions. They are not original, and the solutions may
not be the best, and the picture you get may not be of a normal ad-
ministrator.

The first question, of course, is WHAT DO WE WANT TO DO? In general
that is to get the books to the shelves and cards in the catalog as quickly
and easily as possible and at the least expense.

The second is DOES IT HAVE TO BE DONE? We had been embossing our
ownership seal three places in each book. Once was enough. So we saved
opening the book in the two places where it did not have to be done.

HAS IT ALREADY BEEN DONE? You can enter your holdings of bound
periodicals and microfilm copies of periodicals in the catalog. But we had
the holdings listed in our periodical file when they were received as single
issues. So with a one line entry in the periodical file, as to the fact that
this volume had been bound or received on microfilm, this listing of
bound holdings had already been done. Our periodical entries in the
catalog are reference entries to the periodical file and never have to be
changed.

CAN WE CONSOLIDATE INFORMATION? Again, with periodicals, all infor-
mation on periodicals—volume, issue, date, date of receipt, binding,
complete holdings, location and order information—is kept together in one file, handled by one person; and if one wants any information about a magazine, there is only one place to look. But I have come to the conclusion that, although this system works and has a lot of advantages, if we keep our order file separate from the main periodical file, we can handle it much better.

Can we do several things at one time? We use cards and pockets in each book and we have several copies of each title. We type one stencil and duplicate the cards and pockets from this one stencil. In this case we almost do several things at one time. We do several in the time it would take to do one. And then we use the same stencil with a line cover plate to print the title on the necessary catalog cards, and if we are using printed cards which do not have the classification or call number, we use the same stencil with another cover plate to put the call number on all catalog cards. Now we are thinking of saving the stencil and filing it in classified order and then running a cumulative booklist of recent additions. With this latter I am going to have to go back to the question does it have to be done. I had it worked out so that we could catalog a book completely without once putting a card or pocket in the typewriter, but I decided I was following a perfectionist theory a little too far.

Can one operation help in a subsequent operation? We order printed cards for some books when we order the book. If we mark the order card when the cards are ordered, on receipt the books can go directly to the appropriate shelf to be processed. They do not have to be sorted against the card order file.

Can we change the sequence of operations? I think most libraries accession their books about the first or second operation. I had never heard or thought of any other time to do it. I know some don’t accession at all, but with us it is necessary since we use the accession numbers to designate duplicate copies. Now we accession as the last step before final revision. We use a numbering machine and stamp the accession number in the book and on the card and pocket, which are already pasted in the book. Thus we save having to put the card or bookpocket into the typewriter and practically eliminate the chance of getting the wrong card or pocket in the book. Since all copies of the book are the same until accessioned and given a branch designation, we do not have to be careful to keep the book or cards in any special order.

Can we use another method? Going back to embossing the seal in the book three times, two of those times were not necessary; but if we use a rubber stamp on the top edge of the book, we don’t have to open the book at all and this is much faster than the embossing seal—also it is harder to obliterate and can’t be torn out.

Another change in method was in “sourcing.” We used to enter the agent, date, and price in each book with the branch designation. Then each book had to be handled to get the accession number, source information, and branch designation on the shelflist. Now we use a slip indicating by check marks the branches with a notation of the source and
price. This slip goes with one copy of the title until the books are accessioned. At that time the accession number is stamped against the appropriate branch check at the same time the volume is accessioned, and this slip goes back to have the information entered on the shelflist. The cataloger has to handle only one copy of the book. The slip also indicates how many cards and pockets and how many catalog cards have to be made.

**CAN MACHINERY DO IT BETTER?** There is some machine that can do any repetitive operation more economically than a person. Here we have to decide what we want done and what machine can do it best and what else it can do.

**DOES THE LOAD OF WORK JUSTIFY THE COST OF THE MACHINE?** I admit that here is the real job of the administrator, to determine the cost of an operation and figure the saving by the installation of a machine or the change in method. Except in some cases I have not been able to get cost figures which would satisfy me. I have usually begged the question and gotten the machine. After all, it is easier to get the machine in the budget than it is increases in salary or added staff members. A fairly expensive machine costs only the salary of two of my lowest paid assistants and will last ten or more years with a nominal upkeep. They break once in a while, but they don't marry and have babies.

Then I question the details—is the furniture and equipment arranged in the best order to facilitate or speed up the operations? Does one operation lead directly to the next, or do we have to move the books back and forth too much? Is the furniture best for the operation and does it fit the operator? Are the chairs adjusted correctly? Is the assistant in an awkward or tiring position? And finally is the assistant making unnecessary movements? I guess I should have stopped before I got down to that point; but I have noticed that just a little change in position or arrangement of work sometimes will save a lot of waste motion, will be less tiring and will speed the operation.

I have also found it very helpful to look at the operations of other libraries. (I got the idea of accessioning last from Miami Public.) And I like to investigate methods and equipment used in other businesses. Except for the charging machines, I think there are very few machines made specifically for library use. Pasting machines, duplicating machines, and book marking presses are all adaptations of machines designed for other uses. Although there had been some experiments in using addressing equipment in cataloging, my machine was sold to me for use in registration and was adaptable to cataloging. Keysort is another business system that is very adaptable to library processes.

Most of the things which I mentioned may have been of little importance, but theoretically, at least, they saved time, or speeded up the process, or, just as important, saved some work.

Now you have looked at an administrator looking at processing and from this you may better understand why the catalogers like the catalog department as far from the librarian's office as possible.
Partial Library Automation with the Flexowriter Automatic Writing Machine

GEORGE R. LUCKETT
Professor and Director of Libraries, U. S. Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, Calif.

THERE is little likelihood of libraries ever reaching a stage of full "automation." Imagine, if you will, the patron pressing a series of buttons on the public catalog and being served with the selected books, ready-charged, like so many candy bars; or voicing a reference question to a coding assistant who obtains the answer from a high-speed electronic computer. But even though there are limits, particularly in the reader services division, beyond which mechanization is neither possible nor desirable at this time, there are certain "automation" processes applicable to the technical services divisions that are both desirable and possible.

Without detailing these, it is well to mention several obvious and, to some extent, well-known mechanical applications. The use of punched cards, magnetic tape, and other memory devices for the storage and retrieval of research information has received much publicity in recent years. The use of duplicating devices such as mimeograph, multilith, ditto, and, more recently, xerox, has improved many operations in libraries which prior to their use required many hours of personal labor. It is not the purpose of this article to outline the many devices that can be applied to library processes, but rather to delineate the experience of one library in one application that might prove beneficial to others.

For years, administrators have been looking forward to the day of the automatic typewriter which would type more rapidly than most typists and with less error than is humanly possible. Until recently such devices were either not yet invented or were so costly that only a very wealthy library could even consider their purchase. Now, fortunately, such a device is being manufactured and at a cost within the financial ability of most libraries to own. The machine, known commercially as the Flexowriter Automatic Writing Machine, is both applicable to many library processes and is priced at less than the cost of the salary of one beginning typist for one year.

Our introduction to the Flexowriter was through the Department of Mathematics and Mechanics of our School which uses several of these machines in connection with its Digital Computer. The suggestion of

*Opinions expressed in this article are the author's and do not constitute a recommendation by the Naval Postgraduate School or by the Navy Department.
library application was made to me by the Library's secretary, Mrs. David Plant, who saw in its operation possibilities for the furtherance of our program. Our Library had experimented with many methods of catalog card duplication, but, because of the limited number of copies of the unit card required, the well-known duplication methods were wasteful and costly. Manual typing resulted in less waste, but staff costs remained high because of the necessary proofreading in addition to the ordinary typing charges.

Through the courtesy of Mr. Reginald Rumwell, West Coast Manager for Commercial Controls Corporation, a Flexowriter was loaned to our Library for several weeks during which time test runs were made and compared with normal typing costs. What we learned in those weeks made the procurement of a Flexowriter number one on our equipment priority list.

The following is a brief report of those test runs supplemented by nearly two years of experience with our own machine. They will show that an identical amount of work is produced in forty per cent of the time required for manual typing. This, of course, does not take into consideration the added savings made possible by other applications.

For those who are not familiar with the Flexowriter a brief explanation is in order. Basically it is an electric typewriter to which has been added a device to punch coded symbols into a paper tape and a device which reads these symbols and activates the typewriter to reproduce the data originally encoded. The paper tape is \( \frac{3}{8} \) wide and will "hold" ten coded symbols per inch of length. The code is based on a six-position punch which makes "clean" holes ranging from one hole in any of the six positions to a code of six holes and including the various two, three, four and five-hole combinations. When a typewriter key is stuck resulting in a printed letter, a change to upper or lower case, a carriage return, back-space, tabulation, ribbon color change, etc., etc., a code representing that action is punched into the tape. It should be obvious that all typing actions must be performed using the keyboard—no manual positioning of the carriage or paper is permissible since the machine will "read" only the keyboard action. Any manual movements will not be recorded and the "reading" operation will skip these manual operations. A few minutes of practice for a typist skilled in the use of an electric typewriter or about an hour for one experienced only on manual machines is all that is required to produce highly acceptable work. Additional practice, of course, brings more ease in handling and skill in recognizing shortcuts in operation.

In one of our applications, the Flexowriter operator is furnished with a simple catalog work-sheet from which she types the first catalog, or main entry, card. As this card is typed, the Flexowriter punches the symbols on the paper tape described above. Proof-reading of this main card is done as it is typed, or immediately thereafter, by the operator. The coded tape is then "saved" until all books in the unit have been similarly prepared. Reproduction of the catalog cards is then begun and for this operation
two methods are followed depending on the preference of the operator. In the first method, the tapes are cemented into loops and are inserted into the Flexowriter, which repeats without error the typing of the added entry cards. Since interspersed manual typing is a feature of the Flexewriter, subject and added entry headings are first typed on the card. The remainder of the card is then completed automatically with the mere depression of a single key marked "Read." The absence of error and the high-speed of more than 100 words per minute mean top-level efficiency of the operation. The second method involves the arranging of the books into alphabetical sequence by author in groups of eight. In this method a coded tape "eight cards long" is prepared. When the tape is inserted, a catalog strip of eight cards, prepunched and scored, is typed without interference. Headings are added afterwards and the cards separated into regular sized units. While the first method permits completion of one book at a time and is, from this point of view, simpler, it requires cementing the tapes and insertion of the individual cards. The second method eliminates tape cementing and individual insertion of cards but it adds to the operation the later typing of headings, separation of the strips into unit cards and the skipping of portions of the tape representing those sets in which card number requirements are less than others in the same series of eight.

The Flexowriter, like any electric or manual typewriter, can be equipped with a Standard Register edge-feeding platen, permitting the use of continuous strips of catalog cards. This additional equipment is inexpensive and will pay for itself in the time saved in hand-feeding the catalog cards. A further modification used by some libraries saves even more time. This is the use of checked tracings and guide cards for each subject heading, thereby eliminating the manual typing of subject headings. Since this procedure involves a major catalog policy revision, further discussion of it is not a part of this paper.

The saving in time and cost made possible by the Flexowriter does not cease with the completion of catalog cards. In this Library a bulletin of acquisitions is necessary to keep our faculty, staff, and students aware of materials added to the Library. In this operation, the Flexowriter again saves time and effort. The tapes are saved until the end of the week at which time the margin and tab sets of the Flexowriter are changed (a half-minute operation) and a multilith duplicimat master prepared by inserting the tapes in alphabetical order thereby automatically typing our bulletin master for duplication.

The time required for processing our catalog cards and bulletin by manual typing was forty man-hours. Using the Flexowriter, we now produce more attractive, error-proof cards and bulletin in similar quantity in sixteen man-hours. We have also found that this machine has many other applications in addition to those of catalog card duplication and bulletin master preparation.

There are times when form letters must be individually typed. These times are when a "duplicated" form letter would be inappropriate and yet
basically all the letters in the category are identical or nearly so. Tapes for these letters can be prepared at the time of the first typing and through the use of the ingenious “stop code,” individual data may be inserted at any portion of the letter making it indeed “personal” but limiting the manual typing to date, address, salutation, and the minor amount of individual data. This application has been used by this Library in letters requesting copyright holders’ permission to reproduce material, “beg” letters when the publications desired are not normally available without charge, and by offices of this School for commendatory letters, letters to parents of enlisted personnel, etc.

Certain other features of the Flexowriter are worthy of mention. For example, errors can be “corrected” without erasure. In this operation the first copy is prepared on scrap, discardable practice cards or p-slips. When an error is discovered, the incorrect coded symbols can be eliminated by moving the tape backward to the beginning of the error and depressing the “code delete” key until the entire error is deleted from the tape, retyping the correct data over the incorrect and continuing on to the end of the card. The scrap card is then discarded and a new catalog card run through the machine. In “reading” the tape, the Flexowriter passes over without action any codes so “deleted.” Another example is the ability to make a new tape from an old one. Tapes will normally run in excess of one-hundred times before wearing out. When wear begins to be apparent, the depression of a single key will automatically punch a new tape as the old one is run through.

That there are other applications is not doubted, and each library will discover and use them as facility and understanding develop. An example might be mentioned which was recently brought to my attention by a staff member. “Why not,” he suggests, “punch a tape for the Library’s periodical holdings showing each title, the extent of the run, whether bound or not, and location. When changes occur, such as acquisition of earlier volumes, addition of new titles, changes in binding decisions or location, a new section of tape for the change can be punched and cemented into the main tape, replacing the incorrect portion which is removed and discarded. Since new periodical holdings lists are required for distribution to our faculty and staff each year, they can be run automatically on multilith duplicimat masters for duplication and distributed whenever they are required.” Needless to say, we will adopt this suggestion if trial proves its worth.

The question paramount in the administrator’s mind, at this point, is undoubtedly: “How much money is involved?” This is an important factor since the original cost is between $2,000 and $2,500. But this is less than the annual salary of a typist and, therefore, the machine with its 60% time saving, will pay for itself in considerably less than two years.

Our Library has been using the Flexowriter for two years and even with the many applications so far “discovered” realizes that we have really just begun.
IN RESPONSE to the profound professional concern expressed by many American librarians for a new cataloging code, the Graduate Library School, University of Chicago, held its twenty-first Conference in June, 1956, devoted to the subject, "Toward a Better Cataloging Code." This, the third Conference on cataloging or a related area, focused its attention upon significant issues of timely interest. Cosponsorship with the American Library Association, or one of its Divisions, is evidently not the policy of GLS Conferences, and it is likely their independent nature serves a distinctive function. However, in June 1952, Columbia University, School of Library Service cosponsored with the Division of Cataloging and Classification the Institute on Subject Analysis, directed by Maurice F. Tauber, which was followed by the DCC Symposium on Subject Headings at the annual meeting of ALA in New York. This fortuitous circumstance provided an unusual opportunity for co-operative planning and concentration of interest.

The ten speakers for the Chicago Conference, with their variety of talents and leadership, created a stimulating atmosphere. All the speakers shared the common experience of current or previous practicing cataloging concern; some fill top administrative posts in academic or research libraries now. Since one speaker only represented a public library when the Conference was held, it must be mentioned that several others have enjoyed earlier such association. Mrs. Ruth French Strout, assistant professor, Graduate Library School, University of Chicago, director of the Conference and able editor of the papers, was the only woman on the program. It was indeed a happy occasion to welcome Arthur Hugh Chaplin, deputy keeper, Department of Printed Books, British Museum, to share his ideas with the American librarians on "Toward a Better Cataloging Code."

The spirit of the Conference, despite the wilting humidity, and the unusually large attendance (148 listed registrants) from every region of the United States and from Canada reflected the timeliness of the Con-
ference. There are two factors which make any conference more meaningful than its printed papers, the impact of provocative discussion by the audience and the opportunity for smaller unofficial group discussions. Questions and debate from the floor indicated intense interest and knowledgable criticism. Unfortunately, the Conference, concentrated into two and one-half days, permitted too little time for “bull session” type of assimilation. The reviewer, in reading the papers, notices that some appear longer and more polished than their original presentation. The recurrence of similar ideas is more evident. Perhaps to keep each session within proper limits, some speakers, recognizing over-lapping material, may have made omissions, a reasonable procedure.

For the papers, which appeared in the Library Quarterly, October 1956, and also bound in a separate volume, 1957, Mrs. Strout provides a discerning “Introduction” which clearly summarizes the considerations involved in the creation of a better cataloging code and reveals with acute perception the objectives of the Conference. To chart a new course for a more effective instrument, the Conference papers treat of ideas and proposals rather than of specifics. It was not intended to be a congress to promulgate rules for a code but to be an assembly to consider conditions, issues, and concepts.

The history and characteristics of catalogs and codes and the development of traditional concepts of entry are reviewed, as are European practices which influenced Jewett and Cutter, who set American practice. Divergent principles of codes patterned on the German tradition are compared with those patterned after the Anglo-American.

Involved in accumulated criticisms of cataloging practice are such complex issues as the functional limitations of cataloging rules and the values inherent in pragmatic approaches to them; as the interrelationships of subject entries with author-title entries; as what shall the role of the catalog be as a means of access to all library materials; and as what shall the readers’ role be in code revision. Areas for further investigation are suggested, either in the form of systematized research studies, or as productive observations from day-to-day experience. Distinctive public library cataloging practices are contrasted with their opposite numbers in academic and research libraries. For realistic evaluation of cost factors, cataloging must be fitted into its proper frame of reference, the total bibliographic services of librarianship.

Need is demonstrated, in philosophical terms, for a new code, which would recognize for all types of human communication a common element or primary attribute, and which would permit appropriation of the “natural entry” rather than the conventional book-centered approach. Forceful opposition to this theory of “natural choice of headings” is voiced in favor of a code logically constructed and clearly based upon formulated principles of entry. The progress report on the principles and objectives, which the Catalog Code Revision Committee has developed from the consensus of both the Studies of Descriptive Cataloging made at the Library of Congress and the Lubetzky Report, indicates the
trends of revision. Despite structural and linguistic obstacles, co-operation toward an international code may be possible through a planned program for the interchange of ideas, the will to compromise, and the development of codes on a regional basis.

A brief analysis of the papers follows. It is hoped, however, that quotations lifted out of context for the purpose of flavor and interest, will not cause erroneous impressions.

The first and properly the longest paper, Mrs. Strout's "The Development of the Catalog and Cataloging Codes," appropriately sets the historical perspective for the Conference, and constitutes not only a concise introduction to the firmly rooted traditions of cataloging but also to the profession of librarianship. She has culled from a variety of sources and synthesized into readable form the origins of bibliographic concepts prior to the Christian era; has evaluated the pervasive cataloging ideas of each succeeding period or century; and has traced the evolution of the standard of entry (main or otherwise), which has so occupied the makers of modern catalogs.

Among the recognized names in the evaluation we find Callimachus, "one of the scholars of Alexandria"; Crates, "scholar from Pergamum"; Johann Tritheim, "German bibliographer and librarian"; Konrad Gesner of Zurich, "bibliographer and naturalist"; Florian Trefler, "Benedictine monk"; Andrew Maunsell, "English bookseller"; Sir Thomas Bodley, "English diplomat, retired from foreign service"; Gabriel Naudé, Frederic Rostgaard, Sir Anthony Panizzi, Charles C. Jewett, Charles A. Cutter, and others, whose callings and interests contributed to the development of entries and arrangements of bibliographies and catalogs.

We wonder, however, at the omission of Sir Thomas Hyde, Librarian of the Bodleian. His preface to the Bodleian Catalogue, 1674, sets forth "our first code of rules," which influenced practice in other British libraries and anticipated Sir Anthony Panizzi's 91 Rules for the British Museum Catalogue.

Mrs. Strout's survey recounts, within the compass of limited space, the human drama involved in the search for "the concept of entry, the idea that significance attaches to the entry word because it in itself constitutes a means of approach to books and information . . . a relatively recent notion . . . the ancient oriental tradition of title, the Western tradition of author . . . the modern notion that something should be done about subject . . . the principle of added entry—the idea that there might be more than one way of finding a book in a catalog . . . ."

In pointing up the transition from inventory to finding list, the emergence of cataloging codes, the impact of the controversy between the classified versus the alphabetic catalog, and the appearance of the dictionary catalog, this admirable overview serves the function of reviewing traditional concepts and usages and of encouraging evaluation of present concepts. One becomes impressed afresh at the paucity of insight with which each century developed its organization of recorded knowledge. Mrs. Strout queries: Will our efforts reflected in a new codification
of principles and rules and in the catalogs prepared during the latter half of the twentieth century reveal us as unseeing and unimaginative?

The summary, which provides a clear background to consider the other papers of the Conference, concludes as follows:

Examined from the perspective of history, codes have not been a statement of the usage of their day but rather the very means through which progress has come. If it is true that codes become unintentional pioneers, the forerunners of future practices, then the responsibility which is upon us is heavy indeed.

Since widespread dissatisfaction with American codes and apprehension over existing catalogs prompted the Division of Cataloging and Classification to appoint a Catalog Code Revision Committee, the Conference provided, through Paul S. Dunkin’s paper, “Criticism of Current Cataloging Practice,” an opportunity to weigh the evidences of dissatisfaction and to evaluate his interpretation of current criticism against the soundingboard of the theories set forth in 1941 by Osborn in “The Crisis of Cataloging.” Dunkin describes the influences of the forebears—Cutter’s Rules, the Anglo-American code of 1908, and the preliminary American second edition of 1941—upon our currently accepted ALA author-title code of 1949. He also demonstrates the effect of the Library of Congress Studies of Descriptive Cataloging upon the resulting code, Rules for Descriptive Cataloging, 1949, and its Supplement, calling the codes “the Forty-Niners—twins by fiat of ALA . . . children of Cutter’s rules by different mothers, L.C. and ALA . . . .” In his analysis Dunkin emphasizes basic principles, whether stated or implied, highlighting the conflict between the two functions of descriptive cataloging (inherent also in subject entry) simply, as “The first looks at the book as an individual; the second looks at the book as part of a group.”

With variations upon this theme, the author adroitly organizes his findings (attacks and otherwise) and his ideas around these four topics: 1) basic principles, 2) simplifications, 3) study of the user, and 4) crisis within the crisis. He asks: “Which function shall we have? Or shall we have both? . . . Also, what about a code for subject headings? . . . Can we afford anything less than a completely integrated code for all kinds of entry? . . . Can a Declaration of Independence mean anything at all if it does not lead to a Constitution, and can a Constitution mean anything if it does not lead to a Congress which keeps on making laws and to a Supreme Court which keeps on interpreting laws? . . . [questioning pleas for the study of the user] But do we really mean it? . . . Do we really have a crisis?”

Penetrating questions such as these stimulate the librarian to face the implications, to face the facts, and to decide whether we think we want. Broad coverage of the literature to substantiate his arguments is evident from the footnotes.

The Lubetzky Report appears prominently in the paper (as well as references to it in a number of the others). Of this publication, which has been termed a “revolution” or a “reformation,” Dunkin says, “Rather
it is a 'renaissance'—a return to the basic principles drawn up by the giants in what Cutter called the 'golden age of cataloging' and an insistence that nothing—not even Cutter's much-loved 'convenience of the public'—be allowed to water them down."

Dunkin introduces the controversial issue, that of the prerogatives of the reader in catalog code revision. Cutter, who recognized the public's habits as "deeply rooted," and therefore unwise to ignore, influenced the codification of later rules based on "convenience of the public." For years pleas for reader-use studies have led to little implementation or accomplishment. But the author, under any conditions, questions whether valid information can be supplied by the reader in the formulation of cataloging principles. Both Lubetzky and Dunkin agree in their skepticism of the validity of results to be obtained from reader-oriented studies of the catalog.

The balance on the debit side constitutes a lively issue in three papers. Dunkin intimates that cost factors as well as statistics may be used to substantiate whatever one wishes, or they may reveal little. His illustration taken from the Library of Congress is climaxed with the question, "What are the statistics on all these new costs, and how far do they offset increased production per cataloger?" "Ranganathan has put his finger on a key factor in catalog-code revision, the cost of reworking older entries," states Osborn. Notwithstanding, the Code Revision Committee's statement of objectives and principles in Wright's paper includes this point: "In preparing the revision, the amount of recataloging which may be involved in changes in rules should not be considered if the change is otherwise desirable."

In the paper devoted to this subject, "Cataloging Cost Factors," the author, Raynard C. Swank, makes clear his intention to discuss all aspects of cataloging rather than limitation to problems of author entry. "Cataloging is a great tradition," he acknowledges; then, in logical and convincing fashion sets cataloging within his favorite bibliographic frame of reference, where many librarians agree it properly belongs. "Within the vast complex of bibliography," Swank skillfully interprets his theory or system of filters. In the sifting process the functions of cataloging are considered an integral part of "the cost of bibliographical services in general."

Against this background we find six cost factors or variables characterized: 1) extent to which bibliography is designed to satisfy the varied and specialized needs of the reader; 2) degree of bibliographic coverage of the world's books and completeness of control which can be expected; 3) degree of co-ordination among various instruments that comprise the greater bibliographic system; 4) degree to which bibliographies and catalogs are produced centrally or cooperatively; 5) form in which instruments are cast, card or cumulative book form, etcetera (a point stressed by Osborn); 6) efficiency of process by which bibliography or catalog is compiled; the quality of personnel, experience, etcetera. Swank's cognizance of the increasing responsibilities demanded by the multi-dimen-
sional, in contradistinction to linear, concepts of knowledge and the informational requirements of current scholarship, emphasizes an enlarged and challenging perspective. Within the broad circumference of bibliographic control and services the author demonstrates his awareness of the implications for a better catalog code. He points to data contained in cost studies, but he says, “none of the studies has attempted to relate costs to values or results,” and points out, factor by factor, significant signs for the future. Swank believes “case studies of the experience of readers in using the entire range of a library’s bibliographical service ... related to analyses of the costs ...” would be worthwhile.

“The Need for a New United States Code,” Richard S. Angell’s paper, is a philosophical presentation in which he offers propositions from which he derives the following: the requirements, the elements, and the patterns of description; and from these propositions, the criteria for a new descriptive code. Conceiving “the role of the cataloging code as a social instrument,” he logically develops his idea of “effective access to the disseminable records of human communication through systematic descriptive lists.”

We look at our familiar friends in new focus: the manuscript, the book, the sound recording, the motion picture, the painting, or the map, all manifestations of human communication with individual characteristics which may require distinctive consideration and treatment. Angell in his search for a common element or a primary attribute applicable “to the description of records of all media,” concludes that, since no single common element can be found, there exists a “natural entry,” which choice “can be reduced to a set of principles.” Upon this conclusion he pleads the need for a new code freed from book-centered conventions with potential to encompass records in all media. Angell’s list of qualities submitted as criteria by which he appraises the present United States code seems particularly worthwhile to mention: “clarity of function, comprehensiveness of scope, soundness of theory, generality of principle, logic of organization, precision of style.” He pleads for clearer distinctions between descriptive and subject elements, as do Dunkin and Henkle.

Angell’s theory of “natural entry” like Osborn’s comment that “firmer ground can be reached by the adoption of practical and natural entries in place of conventional forms” indicate pragmatic attitudes. Lubetzky opposes the theory of “natural choice of headings,” “non-author headings,” or “form headings” as headings which “contract chaos” and lead to a “return to the Alphabetical Catalog, where every book was treated as a separate item ...” Can these opposing theories be reconciled? Do the objectives and principles accepted by the Catalog Code Revision Committee provide a program for mediation?

Wyllis E. Wright summarizes the successive steps which led to the appointment by the ALA Division of Cataloging and Classification of a Steering Committee and of a Catalog Code Revision Committee to supervise the compilation of a new code. “A Report of Progress on Catalog
Code Revision in the United States" indicates the direction of the progresstoward a better cataloging code." In addition to citing Osborn's Crisis, in which the pragmatic approach expressed had direct influence upon the successful revision of rules for descriptive cataloging compiled at the Library of Congress, Wright also refers to the comparable influence of Lubetzky's Critique upon rethinking of conditions which affect rules for author and title entry.

A four-point statement of "general considerations" based on ideas expressed by Lubetzky and Osborn and widely circulated for discussion has resulted in not entirely unified support by administrative, cataloging, and reference librarians. A modified statement develops two objectives: 1) "As a minimum requirement, a library catalog must serve as an efficient finding list ..., other uses ..., are subordinate to this one ..." and 2) "Economies in construction ..., be emphasized up to the point ..., they would result in a clear and demonstrable loss in the effectiveness with which the catalog serves its various purposes ...." Wright discusses the dispute between catalogers and reference workers over "the position of the catalog as a reference tool," stressing that, although each rule "should prove its reason for existence before it is accepted," provisions will be made for alternative practices to serve requirements of diverse library installations. His referral to Sidney Jackson's unfinished study of catalog patron's use, reiterates this issue and expresses the hope for information which may be pertinent to catalog code revision needs. Inclusion of the Code Revision Committee's nine-point statement of objectives and principles, agreed upon during the ALA meeting in Miami following the Conference, offers an opportunity for librarians to evaluate these within the context of this volume. This opportunity involves the responsibility for the profession, while these propositions remain in a tentative state, to influence the direction in which the preparation of a new code is progressing!

The two papers, "Cataloging and Cataloging Codes in Other Countries Today," by Andrew D. Osborn and "A Universal Cataloging Code," by A. Hugh Chaplin, may be considered as complementary. Osborn's penetrating analyses of and contrasts between "The Germanic Tradition" and "Great Britain and the Anglo-American Tradition" seek "a middle ground on which the traditions can meet and merge," while Chaplin asks the question, "Is it desirable, and if so, is it realistic, to attempt to extend the benefits of uniformity to all the catalogs of the world by framing an international code?"

Influences and applications of these two great traditions, which involve, for example, different theories on the arrangement of titles, grammatical versus mechanical; on the treatment of anonymity; and on corporate authorship, have been cogently presented by Osborn, whose quotations and footnotes lend added interest to the paper. Osborn advocates study of corporate entry not in isolation but within the entire framework of "cataloging aims." Though differing in their individual proposals for resolution or solution of the complex problem of corporate
entry, Osborn, Chaplin and others all recognize it to be an obstacle in international co-operation.

Chaplin emphasizes the “gap between local and universal codes” to be both structural and linguistic. Although cognizant of the values to be gained from “community of use of library catalogs of national libraries,” Chaplin faces realistically the serious obstacles to be encountered and logically questions the results to be achieved. In his thoughtful survey of the sporadic and often feeble attempts toward international cooperation he indicates that reasonable progress may be made. International discussion and study of general principles governing catalogs, their efficiency, kinds and structure; which principles may prove to be independent of script, language, or perhaps tradition, can be a first step. Investigations and reconciliations of the inner structure must be made before there can be hope for agreement on outer form, he states. The second obstacle, linguistic differences, would require various kinds of compromise, depending on the structure of the catalog, but “an attempt could be made to reach agreement on a universal standard . . . for treatment of names . . . but first . . . to be worked out within each separate region.” With these possibilities in mind, Chaplin discusses imitators of the rival traditions among European codes, the followers of the Prussian tradition and the followers of the codes fashioned upon the Anglo-American patterns. He indicates the features of unit cataloging or unit entry, which, outlined principally from Ahlstedt, has been suggested as a possible basis for “international unification of cataloging practices.” He also refers to “the first deliberate attempt . . . to formulate in the postwar period principles for the construction of an international code,” Ranganathan’s theories embodied in both his publications, Classified Catalogue Code and Headings and Canons: Comparative Study of Five Catalogue Codes. From the latter work Osborn has quoted and referred in a telling manner not only to illustrate Ranganathan’s “Method of Osmosis” but also to fortify his own statement, “Be it noted that the whole history of cataloging consists of one generation redoing the work of another. Our own day is no exception.”

Osborn, pointing up tentative moves toward reconciliation between British Museum practice and that of the British National Bibliography, in Great Britain, also emphasizes the period of change in Germany, in which workable simplifications are being sought and an inclination toward compromises with the Anglo-American tradition is becoming apparent. Moreover, aware of the limited but obvious trend toward printed book catalogs in the advancing twentieth century, Osborn recommends taking this important condition into account when constructing a new code.

Through such international organizations as IFLA, with its group for international co-ordination of cataloging principles of which Chaplin is executive secretary and Osborn the American representative, appears one avenue for diffusion of ideas in an international spirit of compromise. Scholarship is no longer limited to national boundaries.
Without revealing their entire view of conditions, suggestions for alleviation, or reports of progress, suffice it to say, that Chaplin and Osborn both face squarely the reassessment of conventional cataloging and seem to be prepared to abandon traditions which might impede the “groping toward universal valid cataloging principles.” All librarians who are actively concerned with the future of the catalog code will welcome these papers and, it is hoped, will encourage prompt endeavor, for as the editor pleads in the “Introduction,” “Unless the new code takes into consideration the practices of other countries and thus starts laying the groundwork for an international code, it will betray the trust of its international leadership.”

“The Crisis,” in which Herman H. Henkle reviews changes which have occurred since the appearance of The Crisis, questions whether “the philosophy of precedent still motivates present cataloging,” a fact which might be determined by the extent of decisions written in margins of catalogers’ copies of RDC. He expresses, however, the “hope that the pragmatic approach to cataloging is a guiding philosophy of current cataloging practice.” Problem areas which he considers significant include “fundamental re-examination of . . . underlying principles” for author-title rules, the complications of subject cataloging and its potential integration with bibliography, the effectiveness of catalogs for the reader, and administrative features, particularly “developing standards of production.”

Henkle suggests that cataloging literature based upon opinion and individual experience be supplemented by “systematically organized investigations of the problems,” whether they be “research” by students and faculties of library schools or by practicing librarians toward the objective of “ultimate solution to the problems and questions which confront us.” He also pleads for the critical attitude which the librarian on the job may exercise.

Benjamin H. Custer continues “Some Unanswered Questions” with emphasis upon “The Public Library,” the subtitle of his paper. He deals primarily with public library conditions, unlike those of academic or essentially research institutions, which seem to require distinctive considerations. The four differences embrace 1) “heterogeneity of . . . clientele” with its diverse needs; 2) “inability to conduct investigations in catalog use . . . due to lack of captive audience”; 3) “constant pressure on the catalogers to make everything available for use as soon . . . as received,” hence little backlog of uncataloged materials; and 4) public library branches, which often require elaborate central records. Interpreting these conditions in terms of catalog entries (common versus authoritative names), filing rules, and related problems, Custer emphasizes public library policies which, if they occasionally disregard specific catalog code principles or rules and introduce practical simplifications, have nevertheless proved successful. Although he quotes Margaret C. Brown’s comments on the inconsistencies of user approach to the catalog, he does not seem committed to abandoning “controlled studies of catalog use.”
Within the focus of the general objective of a better cataloging code Seymour Lubetzky, in his paper "Some Observations on Revision of the Cataloging Code" puts his finger on four crucial points in dramatic fashion. In his first point Lubetzky forcefully defends the "spirit" of the Rules for Descriptive Cataloging (1949)—functional in content and design. The second stresses the fact that a code of rules for author and title entry encompasses many complexities inherent in the identity of authors, in the vagaries of names, in the interrelationships of works, etcetera. Lubetzky's third point constitutes a vigorous appraisal and refutation of the theory embodied in the principle of "natural choice of heading." His "fourth point relates to the role of the reader in the proposed revision.

... But are we not readers ourselves? Do we not know what are the reader's library needs and his approach to the catalog? ... Do we wish to discover and provide for all his approaches? What precisely do we expect to learn from such 'reader-centered' studies? In question and answer style Lubetzky reveals his conclusion that, "The solution of this problem is the calling of the cataloger." He sees in a functional code constructed upon rational principles the opportunity for a "more unified and better cataloging code."

One omission appears in the program planning, that of an entire paper which delineates the public service librarian's role in catalog code revision. However, Wright's paper reports briefly on the reception by librarians of the "general considerations" which were widely distributed prior to active work on code revision. Henry J. Dubester's recently published article, "The Catalog—A Finding List?" serves to fill the gap and merits attention as a supplement to the volume under review.

An anonymous writer, quoted by Henkle, expressed skepticism concerning its outcome when the Conference was announced in the Northwestern Library News: "If the Conference has not accomplished anything else, it has at least taught us this much: We now know that we don't know enough to know what we must know if we are to draw valid conclusions concerning the problems under discussion. ... What we now need is synthesis."

Appraisal of the papers must be within the program objectives: to meet in Conference while code revision progress remains fluid, to synthesize concepts, conditions, and factors which have caused dissatisfaction with earlier traditions of cataloging, to evaluate the issues which face those who are committed to formulate a new code, and to realize the responsibilities of international co-operation. The Conference accomplished its aims notably with respect to synthesis, for the papers as a whole provide a careful synthesis of the issues. The question which arises...
in the reviewer's mind is not so much what we don't know but rather what we shall do with what we do know! Most of the papers reveal little startling new information. Some of them project creative ideas and propose realistic solutions, however opposed in theory they may be. They pose questions for decisions. The anonymous writer, mentioned previously, may think these questions prove his point. The reviewer does not agree. Valid answers can be found, if the profession will make bold experimentation in the spirit of the Conference papers.

The theme of the Conference embraced greater values than an adequate national code. Osborn foresees possible rapprochement of American-British and German traditions. Prospects for a larger horizon of co-operation are evident, with the invitation of Chaplin to present a paper. Would the program have been further strengthened if a Continental librarian had also been invited to share his point of view with us and to understand ours? Will we, again, in a localized climate develop a new code, or shall we accept the responsibilities of international co-operation and leadership? The Conference appeared to give tacit approval of the Catalog Code Revision Committee's position that "The other library associations should be informed of all steps in code revision; particular efforts should be made to secure agreement with the [British] Library Association." This statement seems to the reviewer to reveal an attitude of condescension. Steps toward international co-operation may be deliberate and progress slow, but can we afford to ignore the proposals for an international code which Chaplin suggests?

One last question: Will there be, as a consequence of the Conference papers, any basic change in the program for the new catalog code?
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EXAMINATIONS FOR FEDERAL LIBRARY SERVICE

The United States Civil Service Commission has announced a new examination for high-level Librarian positions in the Federal Service. The entrance salaries are $8,990 to $11,610 a year. The positions are located in Washington, D. C., and the nearby area. Some positions in foreign countries may also be filled.

To qualify, applicants must have had successful and progressively responsible experience in professional library work, or a combination of appropriate education and experience.
RTSD At Kansas City

ORCENA MAHONEY
Executive Secretary

The Annual Conference of the American Library Association at Kansas City last June provided an opportunity for the new Resources and Technical Services Division to demonstrate its wide scope and variety of interests. Meetings of the Division, its sections and committees were scheduled throughout the week with such regularity that it was impossible for one person even to attend all of the open meetings.

The Division’s program meeting, held jointly with the Library Education Division, was on Tuesday afternoon, June 25. RTSD President Edwin B. Colburn presented the Chairman of the Program Committee, Sarah K. Vann, who introduced the theme, “Our E. Pluribus Unum: After Unification, What Then?” The three speakers covered areas of concern in administration and organization as well as continuing projects of importance to the membership. John M. Dawson discussed “Departmental Interrelationships,” in which he pointed out that the formation of RTSD reflects the development of such organizational structures within the profession itself. George M. Schwegmann, Jr., discussed the program as it has developed in plans for the publication of a National Union Catalog in his topic, “Projects Encompassed by Our Divisional Scope.” Martha Boaz reviewed the discussions in library schools concerning ALA organization. Her topic: “Are Library Schools Educating for Divisional Responsibilities?”

At the Resources and Technical Services Division membership meeting on Monday morning, June 24, Edwin B. Colburn, Chairman of the Organizing Committee and newly elected President, opened the meeting by outlining the history of the formation of the Division in the reorganization, explaining in particular, changes since the Midwinter meeting: The creation of the Copying Methods Section and transfer to the Division of the former ALA committees on Bookbinding, Documents, and Resources.

Since it had not been possible to print the text of the constitution which had been tentatively approved at Midwinter, and hence not possible to act upon it, it was voted to extend for one year the interim organization with the newly elected officers as the governing body.

Affiliation with the Division of the Regional Groups which had been established by the former Division of Cataloging and Classification was approved and a provision for the possible establishment of informal discussion groups within the Division was accepted by the membership.

Following a report by Paul Howard, Chairman of the Bookbinding Committee, Mr. Colburn introduced the other newly elected officers: F. Bernice Field, Vice President (President-elect); Edith Scott, Chairman,
Council of Regional Groups; C. Sumner Spalding and Robert W. Wadsworth, Executive Board members-at-large.

Two of the Division committees held open meetings: The Bookbinding Committee, with Paul Howard as Chairman, met for the discussion of "Minimum Specifications for Bindings for Lesser Used Materials for Libraries" and for other aspects of the Committee's program. This meeting emphasized the need for establishing a communications program related to library binding with some sort of clearing house for this purpose.

The newly created Library Cooperation Committee under the chairmanship of Ralph Esterquest sponsored a meeting with Verner Clapp, President of the Council on Library Resources, Inc., making an address on "Building Resources through Inter-Library Cooperation." Mr. Clapp pointed out that one of the reasons cooperation among libraries has not reached ideal levels was the difficulty of budgeting for plans that did not given promise of immediate, tangible returns. He urged that research libraries give increasing attention to building resources collectively and cooperatively if they are to meet the needs of modern society.

Closed meetings of the Division included three Executive Board meetings, two on Sunday, June 23, and one on Friday, June 28. At the Sunday meetings the Board decided upon matters to be presented at the membership meeting. It was voted to recommend that action on a constitution be deferred with the temporary organization being extended for another year, and that the membership approve the provision for informal discussion groups in the Division. Other Executive Board action included approval in principle of the report of the Subcommittee on Binding Lesser Used Materials and approval (subject to the approval of the ALA Committee on Organization) of the request of the Bookbinding Committee to establish two subcommittees, one on the physical book and one on paper-backed books. The Board recommended, however, that the parent Committee change its name to encompass this wider scope. A report of a special committee outlining the duties of the Division's Executive Secretary was approved with a recommendation that the Executive Secretary prepare a manual of procedure for the use of officers and committee chairmen. The Catalog Code Revision Committee was granted Board approval to pursue plans to seek foundation money with which to hold a conference of representatives of various countries for the purpose of planning an international conference on cataloging rules. It was voted to establish a special committee to study the terminology in the technical services and resources area of library work. Plans for the San Francisco Conference, the budget, and other procedural matters were discussed.

Several Division committees held closed meetings. The Regional Processing Committee met to discuss the best means of gathering information on existing regional processing centers, the kinds of information needed for future centers, and means of making this material available. The Bookbinding Committee met to complete the "Minimum Specifications for Binding Lesser Used Materials for Libraries" in order to receive approval by the Division's Executive Board and the ALA Council. A
compromise was reached with LBI enabling the ALA to approve the proposed "Commercial Standards for Library Binding." The compromise provides that "For the purpose of this standard only, binding according to these specifications shall be referred to as library binding; and nothing in this standard shall be construed to exclude other types of binding, whether superior or inferior." The Committee agreed to seek expansion of its functions to include physical aspects of bookmaking as well as bookbinding. In furtherance of this program the establishment of two additional subcommittees was approved. A subcommittee on the physical book is to be composed of three librarians, three publishers, and a library binder. Its functions will be to explore the problems of preserving library materials as affected by physical aspects of bookmaking such as paper, margins, binding, etc. It will seek to define and to clarify problems and eventually work toward their solution. A comparable subcommittee, similarly constituted, was approved for investigation of problems connected with paper-back books.

The four sections of the Division were active in their particular areas of responsibility meeting both in open and closed sessions. The Acquisitions Section had a combined program and membership meeting on Monday afternoon, June 24, with Edwin E. Williams, Section Chairman, presiding. Joseph Rubinstein, head of the Department of Special Collections, University of Kansas Libraries, read a paper on "The History of Science Library Resources and Academic Programs of Teaching and Research in the Middle West." The members who remained after the program for the brief business meeting were asked to approve the constitution which had been presented at the Midwinter Meeting. Although no copies of the revised document had been distributed, the membership approved, with no dissenting vote, the constitution and bylaws as drawn up by the Committee on Constitution and Bylaws under the chairmanship of Alton Keller.

The Cataloging and Classification Section program meeting was held on Wednesday, June 26. It was called by at least one of the audience, "the most stimulating meeting at this Conference or any other for a long time." "Centralized Cataloging for a School System: a Committee Faces Problems" was the topic so successfully handled by the role-playing panel. The exchange of questions among panel members was taken up by an enthusiastic audience at the conclusion of the panel participation as they asked practical questions and received tangible answers.

The membership meeting of the Cataloging and Classification Section with Margaret W. Ayrault presiding, was held on Tuesday evening, June 25. David Judson Haykin of the Library of Congress was awarded the Margaret Mann Citation "for nationally distinguished leadership in the systematic development of Subject Cataloging and Classification." The award was presented by Norman Kilpatrick, Chairman of the Committee on the Award of the Margaret Mann Citation. The Chairman of the Code revision Committee, Wyllis E. Wright, reported that Andrew Osborn attended the Verein Deutcher Bibliothekare as the representa-
tive of ALA and the Code Revision Committee and that the Committee had prepared a statement to go to the Council on Library Resources, Inc., requesting funds for the establishment of a Planning Group to arrange for an international conference on cataloging rules to be held in 1959.

Henrietta Howell, Chairman of the Council of Regional Groups, reported the transfer of affiliation of the groups to the RTSD, commenting that the Council had seen 35 years of service and now numbered 29 groups. The reports and changes in status of all committees of the former Division of Cataloging and Classification were read. A final report of the Special Committee on Bibliographic Control of Audio-Visual Materials was given by its Chairman, Eunice Keen. Since the project assigned to this Special Committee is now completed, it was recommended and accepted that the Committee be dissolved.

Miss Ayraud reviewed her term as President of the former DCC and Chairman of the new RTSD Cataloging and Classification Section. Maud Maseley, the incoming Chairman outlined the work now before the Section; and Gertrude L. Oellrich, the newly elected Vice-Chairman was introduced.

At the meeting of the Copying Methods Section, conducted by James E. Skipper in the absence of William R. Hawken, Chairman, the report of the Elections Committee was read and officers for the 1957/58 term were announced. The report of the Organizing Committee was approved unanimously. It was reported that David Weber had accepted the appointment as editorial representative of the Copying Methods Section on the Editorial Board of Library Resources and Technical Services, and that a 1957/58 Nominating Committee had been appointed. The following resolutions were passed:

"That the Copying Methods Section establish a committee to study and report on the available copying methods, describing the purpose of each of these methods and evaluating what they can accomplish, and that the reporting be done through the journal of RTSD and at program meetings at Midwinter and Annual Conferences."

"Resolved, that the Copying Methods Section of RTSD go on record as favoring its continuance as a section of RTSD, to have responsibility primarily for the copying methods and techniques involved in the Division's activities and necessarily with the appropriate equipment therefor."

The Serials Section held its meeting on Thursday morning, June 27, under the chairmanship of Jane Ganfield. Proceedings got under way with a presentation of the Section's new officers: Philip McLean, Chairman; Dorothy Comins, Vice-Chairman; James Barry, Secretary. The membership then voted to adopt a set of bylaws in lieu of a section constitution. The main part of the program included a report by Wyllis Wright on progress toward a union catalog of serials which would also be the basis of another printed union list, to appear eight to ten years hence.
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Mr. Wright's report was followed by a proposal by Harry Dewey that each serial title be assigned a number—preferably its LC card order number—as a means of obviating multiple printings of an alphabetical list of serials and thus simplifying the compilation of revised editions of union lists. Mr. Dewey's proposal stimulated an interesting discussion.

The program closed with a statement of objectives of the joint Committee on Long Term Periodical Subscriptions by its Chairman, William Kurth. It is his hope that the Committee's work will increase the number of periodicals offering savings for two and three year renewals and that it will be able to publish data to prove the economies of multiple year renewal so that more libraries can persuade their fiscal officers of its virtues over the bid system and enlist their assistance in taking advantage of it.

On the lighter side, the RTSD sponsored two social occasions. The first was a reception for members on Tuesday afternoon, June 25, in the President Hotel Ballroom, affording ample space and opportunity for people to visit and meet the Division officers. Approximately two hundred members attended. The other social event was the Council of Regional Groups luncheon which was held on Tuesday, June 25, in the Continental Hotel. This annual luncheon gives representatives of the Regional Groups an opportunity to meet each other and to meet the officers of the Division.

Report of the Executive Secretary

As THE Resources and Technical Services Division Executive Secretary since Midwinter, I am reporting to you on activities since that time. The office was without a permanent secretary until the first of May and it seemed as if a great deal of my time was given over to explaining to temporary typists our seemingly complicated organization and why we needed so many carbons for each letter. At this time I would like to introduce Mrs. Genevieve Leher, who became my secretary the first of May. You may be sure life in the office has become much easier and more pleasant since her arrival.

One of the things you would probably like to know about is the membership, but because we are a new division, processing the records takes time, and as some people are slow in paying their dues, our count at the end of May was 3225. However, the Press mailed out 3840 copies of the first issue of Library Resources & Technical Services and we mailed about 400 more to new members and subscribers. We now have approximately 165 paid subscriptions and 50 or more complimentary, exchange, and sample copies were distributed, which would indicate a membership of over 4000.

As you know, the Resources and Technical Services Division actually came into existence at the membership meeting held at Midwinter. The
Organizing Committee and section presiding officers became the executive committee and we proceeded to carry on the work of the Division and its sections. Elections of officers for 1957/58 was a major task. The various nominating committees cooperated admirably by getting slates of candidates to us in time to have ballots printed and mailed out. Our RTSD and section ballots were delivered to my office to be separated for the Elections Committee which, by diligent effort, succeeded in doing the counting in one day, not only for the Division but for all sections. Then, of course, it was the responsibility of our office to notify all candidates of the outcome of the elections.

The reorganization brought a change in fiscal policy. Money is no longer allocated to divisions on a membership basis. ALA General Funds provide for the staff and operational expenses. Allocations for programs must be approved by the Program Evaluation and Budget Committee and it is the Executive Secretary's duty to assemble the divisional requests for the budget prepared by the ALA Comptroller.

Even though we are a new Division and much of my time and that of the Division officers has been given to organization, the sections have been operating bodies with ongoing programs. The Division also assumed the responsibility for several former ALA boards and committees with active programs. This has been tremendously interesting for me in spite of the increased correspondence and work involved. The new organization required appointment of members to committees and we were able to assist in this activity. To illustrate the variety of other projects in which we have had active part I'll mention a few. The Code Revision Committee's sending a representative to the German Library Association meeting in Luebeck; the Bookbinding Committee's work on a Standard for Lesser Used Materials, and the sponsorship of the American Standards Association Section Committee on Photographic Reproduction of Documents, PH5. Further information about these and other activities will be given in the various committee reports, some in this meeting and others in the section membership meetings.

Beginning with January 1 of this year the status of the executive secretaries changed with that of the divisions. We come under the direct responsibility of the ALA Executive Secretary who in turn is responsible to the division boards to which we are assigned for our performance. As before, we continue to have headquarters responsibilities toward ALA projects such as the Library Services Act, National Library Week, etc., as well as representing the American Library Association and giving talks at state and regional meetings. This Spring it was my privilege to attend the Alabama Library Association meeting in Tuscaloosa, a Regional Catalogers' meeting in Nashville, a Michigan Library Association Catalog, College, and Reference Section meeting in Kalamazoo, and the Symposium for Systems of Information Retrieval in Cleveland.

As you can imagine we have all been feeling our way in this new venture and have no doubt made some mistakes. I am sure, however, that we are making progress and that the road ahead should be easier. We
have a fine slate of officers and committee members for the coming year. With most of the organization behind us we should be able to concentrate on the many and varied programs now undertaken and be ready to assume new and broader activities for the benefit of the profession.

In closing I do want to thank all of the people it has been my privilege to work with for their fine cooperation and assistance—Orcena Mahoney.

Policy and Research Committee, Cataloging and Classification Section

THE POLICY and Research Committee of the Cataloging and Classification Section of the Resources and Technical Services Division held its regular Spring meeting at the Department of Agriculture Library in Washington, D. C., on April 26, 1957, at 10 a.m. The meeting was attended by: Members of the Board: Katharine Ball, Margaret C. Brown, Bella E. Shachtman, Maurice F. Tauber and John W. Cronin, Chairman; and Guests: Margaret W. Ayrault and Sidney L. Jackson.

The first item on the agenda was a report on the progress of the study on the use of the card catalog. Although Dr. Mostecky was unable to meet with the Committee, Dr. Jackson reported that Dr. Mostecky expected to devote the month of June to the writing of the report, that the text would be cut where the tables could adequately present the findings, that parts of the report would be rearranged and that the final draft was scheduled to be completed about the first of July.

On April 10, 1957, the Chairman of the Policy and Research Committee had presented to the Executive Board of the Cataloging and Classification Section the proposal that a grant be sought from the Council on Library Resources, Inc., that would make possible the completion of the study on the use of the catalog. The Executive Board of the Cataloging and Classification Section has approved the request. Present ALA procedure requires that such requests have the approval of the RTSD and ALA Executive Boards. The Committee discussed the advisability of recommending that the Executive Board of the Section present the request to ALA, but since the present schedule calls for completion of the catalog use study before the end of the Summer it was thought advisable to try to find enough money within the present budget of the Section to cover the absolutely essential expenditures in connection with the preparation of the final copy of this report.

The next order of business was a report on the Symposium on Systems for Information Retrieval held in Cleveland April 15 to 17, 1957, and
sponsored by Western Reserve University School of Library Science and its Center for Documentation and Research. The symposium offered the opportunity for participants to see demonstrations of equipment and to hear reports on the application of Uniterm and other familiar retrieval systems to particular situations. Little consideration was given to the cost of such systems in terms of manpower to prepare the information for storage in the machines or in terms of the cost of the equipment itself. Nor were the methods described evaluated in terms of orthodox methods. A good proportion of the 900 who attended the meeting were college, university, public, and special librarians. Papers prepared for this symposium will be published.

In connection with the discussion of new and projected equipment, Mr. Cronin described an electro-static printing machine built and designed by IBM that can reproduce 600 labels a minute and might be adapted for card reproduction and used to reproduce author and subject sections of the catalog as needed.

Miss Ayrault suggested a project which she thought the Committee might be interested in investigating. Since many libraries have had considerable experience with Xerography as a means of preparing copy for card reproduction, it was suggested that a new appraisal of Xerography for library use might now be in order. There is no recent report available. The question was also posed as to how, short of direct copying by manual means, catalog copy in the printed National Union Catalog could be satisfactorily used for multilith masters.

In answer to a request made by Mrs. Mahoney regarding the budget to be submitted to the Resources and Technical Services Division for 1957-1958, the Committee voted to request $500 for travel expenses to cover the two meetings, Spring and Fall, which are held in addition to those scheduled at the Annual and Midwinter meetings of ALA. The possibility of limiting meetings to two a year was discussed, but the consensus was that the nature of the Committee's assignment was such that it could not fulfill its major function satisfactorily through correspondence.

The Chairman reported that no progress had been made with the studies to be undertaken by the Library of Congress and the National Medical Library regarding the use of book catalogs as substitutes for card catalogs. The project is still considered of value and will likely be undertaken at a later date.

Miss Ayrault proposed that the Committee submit to the Executive Board of the Cataloging and Classification Section a recommendation regarding the question of revision of ALA Rules for Filing Catalog Cards, published in 1942. The ALA Editorial Committee is of the opinion that such a revision is necessary and has invited RTSD to appoint a committee, either as a subcommittee to the Editorial Committee or as a committee of the Division, to study the kind of revision needed and to prepare such a revision. The Committee was also asked to consider whether revision of the Code would affect such a project. The Committee was of the opinion that filing revision, if needed, should not wait upon the completion of
code revision and recommended appointing a committee to study the nature and extent of the dissatisfaction with the present ALA Rules and the demand for revision. In the opinion of the Committee the present rules offer sufficient alternatives to permit easy adaptation to the requirements of any specific library's needs.

Mr. Cronin, reviewing the progress of catalog code revision, reported that Mr. Lubetsky's draft of the chapter on Anonymous Works had been mailed to advisors and that the next chapter scheduled for completion would treat of corporate entries. Dr. Andrew Osborn and Mr. Wyllis Wright have expressed an interest in having American librarians meet with librarians abroad with the view to establishing a corporate entry policy which would be satisfactory to all concerned.

Miss Ayrault reported that ALA had been invited to send a delegate to a meeting of German librarians scheduled for June of this year and that ALA is currently seeking support from the State Department to send a representative to this meeting. The hope was also expressed that perhaps a foundation grant could be obtained to finance an international conference on cataloging rules under UNESCO sponsorship or a meeting between interested British and American librarians on the general subject of code revision. Dr. Tauber brought to the Committee's attention a conference to be held in Dorking, Surrey, England, on May 13-17 of this year, to which British librarians have invited representatives of various other countries for the purpose of discussing information retrieval methods. The number of participants will be limited to 40.

Mr. Cronin announced that the Dewey Decimal Classification, 16th edition, would likely be published about October 1, 1958. Dr. Osborn raised with Miss Janet Dickson the possibility of an international conference on the Dewey Decimal Classification. It has also been suggested by some that research into the uses of the Dewey Decimal Classification would be helpful as a guide to the preparation of the 17th edition. It was pointed out, however, that if the principle of integrity of numbers is to be adhered to in the 17th edition and the present statement of criteria is acceptable to the profession, there may be little information obtainable through a research project which could be expected to affect future revisions.

Mr. Cronin also announced that the 6th edition of Subject Headings Used in Dictionary Catalogs of the Library of Congress would be off the press in late summer or early fall.

The Committee heard a report from Mr. Cronin on his proposal for a National Subject Index to the National Union Catalog, to take the place of the present Library of Congress Catalog—Books: Subjects, this index to begin with entries from the 1956 issue of the National Union Catalog and to cumulate every five years. Sample pages were distributed to the Committee for comment on the general idea, as well as the layout of the pages.

Miss Ayrault reported that the Association of Research Libraries is interested in studying the administrative aspects of cooperative cataloging...
and has requested that the Executive Board of the Cataloging and Classification Section submit suggested names of individuals to serve as representatives of the Section to work with ARL in this area.

As the last item on the afternoon's agenda, Miss Ayrault reported to the Committee that rules of entry for Japanese and Chinese material has been approved by the committee on Descriptive Cataloging. Included in the rules was the decision to express the entry in transliterated rather than translated form. In view of this decision, the Committee on Descriptive Cataloging suggested that a manual on corporate entries be prepared for general libraries with Western language catalogs. However, such a manual has not yet been prepared, and some think it unnecessary. The Committee was asked to indicate whether in their opinion the rules of entry as developed at this time should be issued as provisional rules with an alternate rule for those libraries which wish to retain the transliterated form for corporate bodies. In the case of an individual library, the preference for translated as opposed to transliterated form of entry will depend in large part on whether the Oriental material is to be interfiled in a catalog of Western material or whether it is to be filed in a separate supplementary catalog. The Committee recommended that the rules of entry be issued in the form of a provisional edition.

June 24, 1957, Kansas City

On Monday, June 24, 1957, during the Annual Conference of the American Library Association, the Policy and Research Committee of the Cataloging and Classification Section of RTSD met in the Hotel Continental in Kansas City. The meeting was attended by: Members of the Board: Margaret C. Brown, Bella E. Shachtman, Maurice F. Tauber and John W. Cronin, Chairman; and Guests: Gertrude L. Oellrich, Jennette Hitchcock and David J. Haykin.

The Chairman reported that due to recent hospitalization, Dr. Vaclav Mostecky was unable to attend the Kansas City Conference. Dr. Mostecky had, however, reported on his progress to date with the editing of the Catalog Use Study. He indicated that, in his opinion, the significant results should be highlighted while other less valid conclusions should be de-emphasized in the final report. The Committee was unanimous in their expression of appreciation to Dr. Sidney Jackson for assuming the directorship of a study which presented unusually formidable problems both in the gathering and assembling of the raw data and in the organizing and presenting of the findings. The Committee also commended Dr. Jackson for sustaining his interest throughout the grueling period of tabulation and in the final editing stage. The draft resulting from the cooperative effort of Dr. Mostecky and Dr. Jackson is expected to be completed and ready for distribution to the Advisory Committee within six weeks. The $200 remaining of the original sums allocated for the study will be sufficient to cover the cost of reproducing this draft, and the work will be done at the Catholic University of America.
Discussion followed regarding the advisability or feasibility of the Committee’s suggesting a number of problem areas in which foundation money could profitably be spent for research. Mention was made of the $100,000 which the Council on Library Resources awarded to Rutgers University to enable its Graduate School of Library Service to conduct a two-year project, “Targets for Research in Library Work” under the direction of Ralph R. Shaw. This study will attempt to outline the fields of librarianship wherein we have considerable information and those wherein we lack information and need research. The two chief factors which have retarded library research would appear to be (1) dearth of personnel trained to do research and (2) lack of time on the part of those so trained to undertake research on a full-time basis. One indication of this is the inability, because of administrative and/or other responsibilities, of most individuals holding the doctorate degree in librarianship to continue with research after meeting the requirements for their degree. It was pointed out that the Council on Library Resources may now make it possible for those individuals who are willing to dedicate themselves to the study of certain problems to do so without financial sacrifice. It was agreed that Dr. Tauber would present a list of the six or seven most worthwhile projects in the general field of cataloging and classification which the Committee might want to recommend to the proper foundations for financial support.

Mention was made of an article written by Rutherford D. Rogers entitled “Shelving Books by Size” which appeared in the ALA Bulletin for June, 1957. A question was raised as to the possibility that some librarians might interpret this report as implying that systematic classification is no longer necessary in all types of libraries. This would be an unfortunate interpretation at a time when the trend in academic libraries is toward open shelves and consequently greater reliance on classification.

At several recent meetings of the Committee on Policy and Research, the subject of the future development of book catalogs has been mentioned. There appears to be a growing interest in the book catalog as evidenced by the literature as well as by the publication of book catalogs themselves by such institutions as the Library of Congress and the New York State Library. However, studies of their use are needed, particularly their use in relation to the use of the card catalog. It was agreed that this was a topic which might be included among others as a possible area requiring research and meriting foundation support.

Progress on code revision was reported, and it was announced that the chapter which treats of corporate entries should be completed in September or October and would thereafter be distributed to the Advisory Committee for comment. The members of the Committee on Policy and Research were urged to cooperate by submitting comment and criticism to Mr. Seymour Lubetzky.

It was reported that the German Library Association had invited the American Library Association to send a representative to Lubeck to report on American progress on code revision at a meeting of the Ger-
Librarian Association held June 11-15, 1957. The Council on Library Resources provided funds with which Andrew D. Osborn was enabled to accept the German invitation. At this meeting Dr. Osborn had an opportunity to discuss the possibility of an international library meeting on cataloging problems.

Mr. Cronin reported that the sixth edition of *Subject Headings Used in Dictionary Catalogs of the Library of Congress* would go to press the end of July and would cover all revisions down through the end of 1955. There is a strong likelihood that the next edition may have to be published in two volumes.

It was reported at the Committee meeting on April 26 that the Association of Research Libraries was establishing a committee to study the administrative aspects of cooperative cataloging and had requested that the Executive Board of the Cataloging and Classification Section appoint a representative of the Section to work with ARL. Susan M. Haskins of Harvard will be the representative of the Cataloging and Classification Section on this committee. A meeting of the committee was scheduled during the week of the ALA Conference.

Mr. Cronin reported that he had requested that money be placed in the budget to cover travel expenses for members of the Policy Committee for two of the four meetings a year. He said that his statement had been supported by a similar statement from the Section's Chairman, Margaret Ayraut.

It was mentioned that Velva Jeanne Osborn's study, "Early Developments in Storage Library Processing," (dealing with the Midwest Inter-Library Center) has been published in the University of Illinois *Occasional Papers* (No. 47) January 1957. The published report is a somewhat shortened version of the original work and omits Miss Osborn's supplement which contained the raw data.

Mr. Haykin reported to the Committee on the progress he had made to date with the subject heading code and outlined the various methods he had used to obtain reactions of some librarians. Solicitation of comments by mail had not been encouraging, although some libraries have made, and are making, substantial contributions. Questions which proved particularly troublesome were presented to the staff of the Library of Congress, and other questions were resolved by a thorough study of certain parts of the Library of Congress catalog itself. It is Mr. Haykin's conclusion from the suggestions received that the final code must include rules of formulation as well as of application. Special problems in various subject fields will be included by Mr. Haykin, but he does not plan to devote a specific part of the code to instructions on how each kind of special library can adapt headings in a general list to its own purposes. By Fall the basic statement of principles will have been formulated for criticism by those librarians who are interested. Some rules have already been written. The entire code is expected to be completed by the end of 1958. It is Mr. Haykin's view that this statement of rules should lead to more uniform application of subject headings, but, as he points out,
the code can not be expected to take the place of knowledge of the substance of a book.

It was with regret that the Committee noted that Dr. Tauber's term of office on the Committee ended with the close of this meeting. For him this marks the end of six years of monumental service to the Committee, continuing from the time of the establishment of the Board on Cataloging Policy and Research in the Spring of 1951 down to the present time. Dr. Tauber was the Board's first Chairman and has been responsible more than has any other individual member for the contribution which the Board on Cataloging Policy and Research, now the Committee on Cataloging Policy and Research, has made to the work of the Cataloging and Classification Section. A welcome was extended to the new member of the Committee, Jennette Hitchcock, of Yale University.

Officers were elected to serve for 1957-1958: Chairman, Bella E. Shachtman; Vice-Chairman, Margaret C. Brown; Secretary, Katharine Ball.

The Committee acknowledged the assistance of Margaret Ayrault, Chairman of the Cataloging and Classification Section, during her term of office. Gertrude Oellrich was invited to attend the Committee meetings of the coming year as a representative of the Executive Board. It is hoped that the Committee can plan one joint meeting with the entire Executive Board during each year, preferably at Midwinter. The next meeting of the Committee will be held during the first week in November in Philadelphia.—Margaret C. Brown, Reporter

REGIONAL GROUPS

The Chicago Regional Group of Catalogers and Classifiers held its spring meeting May 6. Mrs. Mahoney, Executive Secretary of RTSD, explained reorganization as it affected regional groups. The Group, which had already decided in favor of expansion, voted to change its name to the Chicago Regional Group of the Resources and Technical Services Division. The meeting ended with a trip to the Library of the Chicago Historical Society.

The Florida Catalogers' Roundtable met in St. Petersburg March 29. After the business meeting which included reports from the Miami and Midwinter conferences, the program section was devoted to the theme "The Administrator Looks at Technical Processing" with these participants: William Frieze, Librarian, Tampa Public Library; Norman L. Kilpatrick, Librarian, Florida State University; C. T. Whittier, Director of Instruction, Pinellas County.

The Los Angeles Regional Group of Catalogers held its spring meeting May 4. Marie Warner read Mary Louise Seely's report of the Midwinter meetings of the RTSD and the reorganization activities. The program part of the meeting was devoted to the reading of papers by branch librarians on the UCLA campus on the topic "Adapting the Catalog to the Client." The following papers were read: "Local Cataloging for the Engineering Library"—Johanna Tallman; "Ideas and Devices for Cataloging a Law Collection"—Jerry Dye; "Reference Librarian Looks at the Medical Catalog"—Robert Lewis.

The Miami Regional Catalogers ended their year with a dinner meeting May 14. The Group decided not
to expand its scope of activities but to remain a catalogers' group. It was decided that the project for next year would be to work on subject headings in connection with the proposed Haykin code.

The MICHIGAN REGIONAL GROUP OF CATALOGERS held its spring meeting in conjunction with the College and Reference Sections of the Michigan Library Association at Western Michigan University, May 15. The program was devoted to a panel discussion of "Co-operative Cataloging—a Further Consideration (with Special Emphasis on Existing Systems)" Mary Jo Trolinger, Wayne County Library, discussed the co-operative cataloging experiment inaugurated six months ago when the Library acquired a Xerox multilith machine and found that, with little extra cost to themselves, they could furnish their cards to any interested libraries within the county. Ellen Butterfield, Dearborn Public Library, gave the viewpoint of a participating library. Leo T. Dinnan, Oak Park, spoke for the new library with no previously established cataloging procedures. Robert D. Franklin, Toledo Public Library, outlined a system by which Toledo purchases and catalogs books for the Rossford Public Library, which is outside the county limits. He does not favor expansion of this plan because the Catalog Department is already overloaded and understaffed. Fannie Noonan, Michigan State Library, discussed several possible schemes by which the State Library might do cataloging for libraries in the state on a cost basis.

The second meeting of the NASHVILLE CATALOGERS for the 1956-57 season was held May 2. Orcena Mahoney was the guest speaker. She talked on the reorganization of ALA with special emphasis on the Division, its committees and work.

The CATALOGERS' SECTION of the NEW JERSEY LIBRARY ASSOCIATION held its spring meeting May 3 in Asbury Park. Charles Moritz, Graduate Library School, Rutgers University, spoke on "Some Literary Forgers: Their Works and Ways." The winter meeting was held in Jersey City, January 16. Edwin B. Colburn Chairman of the Organizing Committee of RTSD, spoke on "The DCC—Present and Future." Mr. Colburn, a former Executive Secretary of DCC, outlined some of the important activities which have been inaugurated and carried on by DCC and discussed the new Division.

The OHIO VALLEY REGIONAL GROUP OF CATALOGERS met April 26-27 in Cincinnati with the Public Library as host and Eleanor Shrimpton as program chairman. The theme of the meeting was "The Ohio River Valley, Its Importance and Development—New Days Ahead for a Valley and a Profession." Nellie M. Coats, Indiana State Library, gave the keynote speech: "Past—Present—Future." In a witty and brief manner she sketched the changes in our library catalogs from pre-H. W. Wilson days to the coming days of the Peek-a-Boo retrieval system. David J. Haykin, Library of Congress, presented an outline of his proposed code for subject headings, after which he exposed himself to a period of "Facing the Catalogers," asking for questions and suggestions from the floor, which resulted in a lively discussion. This was followed by a business meeting which included a report by Rachel Road on the Midwinter luncheon of the Council of Regional Groups, where the implications of reorganization were discussed. The Group voted to expand its scope of interests to include all phases of the new RTSD. President Sparks appointed a committee to review the by-laws in relation to this change. At the dinner meeting, C. W. Stoll, Sinclair Refining Company, Louisville, continued the Ohio River theme with his talk, "Mark Twain Started Something," in which he car-
ried the river theme from the old and colorful pioneer days to the industrial present. Saturday morning's breakfast meeting emphasized the new Inland Rivers Library of the Public Library with an informal talk by Dorothy Powers, Curator. Two Ohio River films were shown, and the meeting ended gaily with door prizes.

The Catalogers' Section of the Oklahoma Library Association held its annual meeting in Oklahoma City March 22. Following the business meeting, a program was presented on "Centralized Cataloging for Multi-County Libraries in Oklahoma." Lucy Ann Babcock, Oklahoma State Library, presented the state plan which was followed by a panel discussion by Hollis Haney, Pawhuska Public Library; Jean Harrington, Enid Public Library; William Morris, Ardmore Public Library; Mortimer Schwartz, board member, Norman Public Library. A summary and some interesting comments were given by Maurice Tauber, Professor of Library Service, Columbia University.

The annual dinner meeting of the Philadelphia Regional Catalogers' Group was held May 22. Audrey Smith reported the results of her investigation of the Group's feeling toward expanding to include the areas encompassed by the new RTSD. The result was approval of expansion. Charles Shaw, Librarian of Swarthmore College, read a paper on "Special Collections in the College Library," presenting the college librarian as a bookman.

The Texas Regional Group of Catalogers and Classifiers held its business meeting at Southern Methodist University, March 27. New officers were elected, and reports on the Miami and Midwinter meetings were given.

The Twin City Catalogers Round Table met May 16. The program consisted of brief, informal descriptions of catalog card duplication methods used in several libraries of the area and their relative advantages.

The Catalog Section of the Wisconsin Library Association met in Madison, October 2, 1956. Oreana Mahoney discussed mutual exchange between individual catalogers, regional groups, and the Division, expressing the conviction that through such exchange problems are exposed and eventually solved by mutual effort. The program ended with a panel discussion of the methods used in libraries to make available materials other than books. Participating were: Ferne Congdon, Mead Public Library, Sheboygan; Louise Wernecke, Manitowoc Public Library; Jack Baltes, Technical Library, Globe-Union, Inc.

This is my last report as Chairman of the Council of Regional Groups, and, therefore, the last report of regional catalog groups as such. These have been pleasant years working so closely with the membership at the local level. Regional groups, created, established, and encouraged by the Cataloging and Classification Section (under whatever name it was bearing at the moment) have well proved their worth both to the individual and the organization. A glance at reports of regional group activities in any issue of the JCC or LRTS will suffice to show upon what a broad base of membership participation are the ideals and activities of the Section built. It is with some reluctance that we leave the fold of the Cataloging and Classification Section to assume our responsibilities in the larger Division. But it is also with a feeling of confidence that regional groups can bring to the Resources and Technical Services Division a strength and a tradition of membership participation unique in ALA organization. At the same time, the enlarged scope of activities will bring renewed strength and new interests to the Groups.—Henrietta Howell, Chairman, Council of Regional Groups.
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