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The History of Science: Library Resources and Academic Programs of Teaching and Research in the Middle West

JOSEPH RUBINSTEIN
Special Collection Department,
University of Kansas Libraries, Lawrence

In MEDIEVAL times there existed a doctrine called “the king’s two bodies.” It proposed that the king was one person in his natural body, but a second person as the king, wearer of the consecrated crown and possessor during his life of the eternal kingship of his country; yet these two functions were combined in the one physical, visible body. This afternoon I appear before you as two bodies. In one sense, it is quite obvious. The other, however, traces to the original subject of this meeting, which included teaching programs in the history of science. But no such historian could be persuaded to brave the rigors of our summers, and I therefore stand before you really two bodies, although only one and a half are visible. You will note that the gods have favored us and we have clement weather. Let us hope this is an omen auguring success of this new section.

Now, before getting into some libraries, we must do a little history, correctly to interpret the present state of the collections under inspection.

Interest in the history of science, in and out of academies, multiplies daily. There is a mad crush to possess the great books in the history of science—and even to read them—which is sometimes as childish and naive as the “great books” program, which assumes that contact only with the greatest is the sure and magical way to knowledge. To wisdom, perhaps, but not to knowledge. So we observe a common neglect of lesser books, a familiar story in private collecting, yet found even in libraries, where it is a grim error, for the way to the minds of great men is through the smaller ones they swallow as the ocean monsters feed on tiny fish and plankton. Nevertheless, in the history of science there is some justification for collecting and reading only the most famous and important papers. Epochal works in science, as in all subjects, are preceded by thousands of solid studies which eventually make new insight possible. But once genius has put itself in print, scientists have much less need to refer to the antecedent papers. They are able, if I mistake their methods not, to find the entire history of a problem summed up in the opus maximum, which then interprets a long past to the working future. As Sarton puts it: “Each scientist can so-to-say begin where his predecessors left off.” It
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*
follows that an historian of physics may write a balanced history—albeit not exhaustive—without knowing the entire literature intimately, an undertaking impossible in any other historical study with which I am familiar. A science carries with it its entire history, distilled to useful residues.

Such is not the case with historical or literary studies. There sources must be scrutinized again and again, because new knowledge comes through regrouping facts and old theories—even incorrect ones. Often, the old secondary literature becomes the source of new points of view. Therefore, the competence of an historian depends first on his mastery of the entire range of his subject.

So one understands why collections in the history of science at present are likely to consist chiefly of famous books—the high spots—a predilection which is doing as much violence to correct proportion of scientific collecting as the Grolier list did to literary. A physicist may hardly be charged with lack of proportion if he studies Newton, Galileo, and Boyle and neglects the lesser scientists of the seventeenth century, because in those giants he finds all of seventeenth century physics which is still essential to his work.

In any case it is true that most scientists are productive without need to return to the history of their subject. As to the hackneyed question of whether they would work even more brilliantly if they were soaked in relevant history, if they knew exactly how modern physics got where it is, there is no answer. Prof. Herbert Dingle remarked, in his inaugural lecture: “The history of science is inseparable from science itself. Science is essentially a process, stretching through time, in contrast with the instantaneous or eternal character of traditional philosophy . . . Science may ignore its history, but if so it fails.” Further, he says: “The history of philosophy, in the narrower sense of the word, is the history of philosophy, but the history of science is science. Scientific workers may forget this, and knowing little or nothing of the ground on which their edifice rests, may add to its structure and reach positions of the highest eminence in their profession, but they are not then educated men.” Well, that may be true, but how would one prove it? And by what projection of society’s needs do scientists have to be educated men, any more than statesmen or teachers or librarians? Prof. Dingle’s point may be disputed, but, by pointing to the situation, he enables us to understand how most private and some institutional collections in the history of science reached their present state—they were formed by professors of chemistry and book dealers, not by historians of any kind, nor by librarians. The late George Sarton, who set modern standards in the history of science, took his subject to be as wide as all other subjects combined—the history of civilization itself. He asked of the history of science that its votaries be made patient, sympathetic and kindly men as well as better scientists. He said, “I would like to point out that in spite of the revolutionary nature of science, or rather because of it, if we wish to live good and noble lives, we should never break with the past.” He feared that immersion in technical problems may lead to a feeling that one’s pursuit of measurable
truth is and ought to be divorced from ordinary life. Again, there is no
decisive evidence for or against his fears.

In tracing the history of collecting in the history of science one must
make two distinctions: between collections amassed to illustrate the his-
tory alone on the one hand; and, on the other, similar materials pre-
served in some humanistic libraries. The latter certainly represent genu-
ine interest in science, but were not collected to provide material for the
history or science in the sense we use it at the moment, distinguishing be-
tween the books and journals daily used by the scientists and the histori-
cal literature he rarely draws upon. The scholars of the sixteenth and
seventeenth centuries, whether classical like Scaliger and Bentley or sci-
entific like Copernicus and Boyle, gathered the important treatises com-
ing off the presses and the best editions of the classical authors. (And in
that connection we must remember that, for the contemporaries of Cop-
ernicus and Brahe, classical and medieval authors—the very men whose
incorrect theories they overturned—were nevertheless always present to
the mind.) Seventeenth century scholars and their librarians were not
book collectors quite like ourselves. They collected what they needed
then and there. Now, for the classical scholar or poet this did mean old
editions, for those authors whose opera were not yet published or existed
in editions of varying quality. But for the scientist of the same centuries
the parallel did not exist, since he was creating his books for the first
time, so that for him there was not yet a body of work of no immediate
use and therefore accessible only by historical investigation.

Let us examine the 1589 inventory of the books of Abraham Tilman, a
Cambridge man. The list is part of the inventory of his worldly posses-
sions, which included “twoe globes, one deske, one looking glasse, twoe
cushions, one payer of Sheetes, one shirt and one table napkin, one gown
of Broade cloathe, in good debts and certaine other thinges.” Of some
sixty titles only five or six are scientific: the Louvain scholia on Aristot-
le’s Organon, one work of Cardanus, a Latin edition of Aristotle’s
Physics and one or two others. Tilman’s library was typical, putting aside
such large libraries as the Cramner-Lumley, an accumulation of several
generations. The larger libraries were collected by humanist patrons of
learning or scholars—neither class overly interested in science then.

Richer in scientific books, however, were the English institutional li-
braries of the seventeenth century. Their catalogs exist, commonly di-
vided by subject: medicine, cosmography, geography, classified lists of bo-
tanical works, herbals, treatises on the sphere, voyages, and so on. But
these classified lists do not provide evidence of collecting in science. The
lists are interesting experiments in classifying scientific knowledge, and
they offer quick and reliable guides to contemporary reading interests;
but they represent collections inherited from generations of learned dons
and clerical alumni. Over a long time they would have been serviceable
for the historians of science, had there been any.

Collecting history of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries differs
little from that of the previous two centuries, for the scientific literature
flowing into libraries was nearly all contemporary. Of course, any library one hundred years old or more by 1850 became useful for the history of science just to that extent, but there were few uses for these. Early signs of strong bibliographic interest in the history of science may be traced to some gentlemen well known in other spheres. Samuel Pepys left 3,000 volumes to Magdalen College, including large collections in geography and hydrography, as befitted the president of the Royal Society. John Evelyn had 4,588 books according to his catalogue of 1687, but only about 2,000 are preserved at Christ Church, including chemical and botanical books. John Aubrey, of the famous Brief Lives, had a large library containing—and this is to our interest—old editions of Robert Recorde, John Dee, Digges and Norwood, the mathematicians of the previous century.

A deep mystery attends the library of Robert Boyle. We know he had an extensive one, and we know it was sold on Monday, July 11, 1692; but not a single Boyle book could be traced until about a year ago, when a New York book dealer found the first and only identifiable Boyle book. It made its way swiftly, I need not tell you, to the impatient hands of Prof. John Fulton at Yale. To the extent that portions of such libraries reached Oxford and Cambridge materials for the history of science were accumulating.

By the eighteenth century, science was almost old enough to have a comprehensible history and to be divided into periods—that comprehensible practice which still dominates school histories—and we find great private libraries of natural history reflecting this. Linnaeus, Sir Hans Sloane, and Sir Joseph Banks all had marvelous libraries rich in sources for botany and zoology, which meant, given the sources available in those subjects, libraries historical in good proportion. So, by the beginning of the nineteenth century, when histories of botany and zoology were composed, materials were assembled here and there. It is an American scientist to whom we owe an important scientific library which contained a great many rare and early scientific editions, for Nathaniel Bowditch, of the immortal Practical Navigator, owned the early editions of Sacrobosco, Copernicus, Galileo, Brahe, Kepler, Euclid, Newton, and Boyle. Through the century, one sees gathering interest in older works: the mathematical library of John Thomas Graves, died 1870, contained over 10,000 books and 4,600 pamphlets, mostly historical, as any library of that size in one subject would have to be. And there are the alchemical and chemical libraries of James Young and John Ferguson, both in Glasgow. Some interesting notion of scientific collecting comes from the subtitle of the Ferguson catalog: “a collection of books mainly relating to alchemy, chemistry, witchcraft and gypsies.”

The Royal Society began its library at the beginning of regular meetings in 1660. The Literary and Philosophical Society of Manchester dates its library shortly after founding in 1781. In 1828 the Linnaean Society began its library with the acquisition of Linnaeus’ own library from the widow of Sir James Edward Smith. Incidentally, the story of how Smith,
then a young student, acquired the Linnaeus library in 1784 is a rousing episode, involving secret packings and stealthy removal by night, mysterious sailings before sunrise, and a wild dash over the frozen tundra by the king of Sweden, too late to save the library for his country.

It is significant that these great private accumulations were safely stored in institutional libraries by 1837, when the Reverend William Whewell published The History of the Inductive Sciences, the first book to deal with the history of science on any comprehensive scale, even though its interest is more philosophical than historical. Within thirty years, there were thorough histories of chemistry by Hoenfer and Kopp; and, 1910-1913, Friedrich Danneman published the first satisfactory history of science as a whole.

These late dates show how recent the systematic, critical study of the history of science is, and, it follows, how even more recent are our interests and responsibilities in collecting on a large scale. The first professorship in the history of science dates from 1892, a chair filled by incompetents, says Sarton. Isis was founded in 1912. In the first years of the first world war George Sarton emigrated to the United States where, as research associate of the Carnegie Institution and professor at Harvard, for more than forty years he labored and brought the history of science into the republic of letters as a full citizen.

In an attempt to get an idea of the picture in this part of the world, a quick, informal survey was conducted (by me). The reports which follow were gathered from eighteen university and two independent libraries in the midwest which provided current information on holdings and collecting policies and from a very few published descriptions.* Public libraries were omitted as were smaller colleges which, however, may hold an occasional strong collection. Also omitted were The Chicago Museum of Natural History, which has strong holdings in the zoological sciences, and the Lloyd Library, well known for its holdings in botany, chemistry, and zoology. The schools reporting were Wisconsin, Illinois Institute, Illinois, Michigan, Missouri, Iowa State, Kansas State, Ohio State, Oklahoma, Indiana, Cincinnati, Chicago, Wayne State, Minnesota, Nebraska, Northwestern, Iowa, and Kansas; the private libraries were John Crerar in Chicago and Linda Hall in Kansas City. Tabulation of replies has been precise where possible, but estimates as to the relative strength of collections derive from judgements by the reporting librarians or from personal estimates. Questions were directed toward holdings in all the pure sciences; medicine, pharmacy, and engineering being excluded to keep the report within manageable bounds.

Let us begin with nine selected periodicals fundamental to the history of science. (Where files are almost complete, I treat them as complete for our purpose.) Eighteen of twenty libraries have complete files of the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society and the Comptes Rendus. Eighteen have the American Journal of Science complete. Sixteen

*The author is grateful to the various librarians who produced information on short notice.
boast the *Philosophical Magazine* and fifteen the *Journal des Savants* and *Histoire et Mémoires* of the Academie des Sciences. Thirteen report *Acta Eruditorum* and eleven Magalotti’s Saggi of the Accademia del Cimento. These are rich holdings, from which we may deduce some probabilities without further knowledge. Unquestionably, the *Philosophical Transactions*, *Philosophical Magazine*, and *Journal des Savants* were acquired because they contain much beyond even the wide bounds of Sarton’s scientific world. Equally, the two French series and the *American Journal of Science* are automatic acquisitions in the early collection of any sensible research library. The *Acta Eruditorum* are not quite as broad, and Magalotti is of still more limited interest, yet we find eleven holdings of both, at least two of the latter in all extant editions.

*Oken’s Isis* exists in four sets (plus one at the Chicago Museum of Natural History)—small in proportion to the other holdings. It is quite a scarce journal and occurs in catalogs so infrequently it will not impress itself on any buyers except the fiercely covetous, in contrast to Magalotti, which is common. When we can’t buy what we want, we must buy what we can get—after all, there is a staggering amount of book money to be spent in these twenty libraries.

At least three of the twenty offer other relevant periodical holdings matching the nine reported (*Oken’s Isis* excepted) and four or five others are almost as strong. These three dominant strongholds neatly illustrate three classic ways powerful collections are made. When the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in Boston decided to dispose of its serials in 1946, Dr. Shipman, director of the then newly-born Linda Hall Library here in Kansas City, leaped at the opportunity—a remarkable acquisition including many files back to the eighteenth century. On the other end of the spectrum, we all should profit by studying the patient and persistent collecting of the first director of John Crerar, Clement Walker Andrews. On accession to the post in 1895, he compiled a list of serial desiderata. In 1926, thirty one years later and four years before his death, he was able to purchase the last journal of his original list, thus laying down in Crerar, issue by issue so to speak, the fantastic periodical cellar it now boasts. Of the equally choice *crus* laid down by his successor Dr. Bay I need not speak. The third method is one to which we are not called, but chosen: the late Everette de Golyer, a distinguished geologist and book collector, gave his history of science library to the University of Oklahoma and made it possible to build further on that bedrock.

Immediately behind the large giants are two or three middle-sized giants and three or four ordinary giants. Obviously Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Kansas, and several others are rich in scientific periodicals. Ranking them beyond the large giants is pointless; suffice that, taking the three individually and the others collectively, I doubt if the Midwest would fail to supply the most obscure scientific journal of bygone days, even to the most remote private ornithological magazines held by Michigan and Kansas which, although I am custodian of them, alternately baffle and amuse me, since I cannot tell a jayhawk from a goshawk.
Let us turn now to considering resources by the main branches of science, as they are now fragmented. The twenty reporting libraries report current collecting as follows, divided into strong and modest classes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Modest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry (all branches)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornithology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammalogy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0 (doubtful)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other zoological</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 (doubtful)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, three libraries reported strong collecting in subjects not specified, and three reported modest activity in all. Definitions of relevant material being known to all, suffice it to say that strong collecting in the history of mathematics should include old and new editions of the classical mathematicians, facsimiles of the famous manuscripts, important treatises from the sixteenth century on, a good proportion of the lesser treatises, symbolic logic, autobiographies and biographies of mathematicians, iconographical material, works on philosophy of mathematics, and the important works in collateral subjects such as the treatises on proportion by Dürer and Luca da Pacioli, and, of course, the periodicals. Strong collecting in ornithology should include the best editions of what little ancient ornithology there is, the treatise of Frederick II, *De Arte Venandi cum Avibus*, Turner, Gesner, Belon, and their contemporaries (available generally only in old editions) the pre-Linnaean authors, all the technical literature from 1758 on, the great color-plate books, and the collateral material as in mathematics.

One notes immediately, however, that, because of the varying rate of fragmentation in science, any single subject collection will not answer all the historical questions put to it. Obviously, physics and astronomy demand mathematics. Paleontology demands geology and so forth. It follows, then, that the best place to work may not always be the library with the best collection in that subject if the collection was narrowly defined. A further caution will perhaps not be so obvious. Certain materials which in the past have not been considered as sources for the history of science are nevertheless essential. Thus, an important part of zoological literature is buried in scientific voyages and travels, chiefly of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. A good deal of the history of U. S. natural science is in journals of travels through the expanding frontier, some private and some official expedition reports. Some historians of sci-
ence know this; but acquisitions librarians newly responsible for such collections must go out and learn it.

Although the reporting libraries were neither given a definition of strong collecting nor were asked to justify their assessments, the figures show a minimum of two strong efforts in every scientific class, at least three or four in most, and modest collecting in most subjects almost anywhere. The libraries were then asked to assess total holdings by naming the subjects in which they already held strong collections of historical sources. Those who collect strongly in any particular subject generally already hold the important sources, which means that the best collections have been active for some years (the oldest since 1895) and the other strong ones have been riding an interest in science hard over the last ten years. Two libraries intend to expand in the near future. Altogether a fine showing indeed and good evidence that the area does or will soon hold the full range of relevant material. Now this proposition is true as long as the assessments refer to the subject heartland. But inspection of the outer reaches shows that all is not quite so resplendent. To get at peripheral but essential classes the libraries were asked to identify other “strong collections in which material relevant to the history of science is embedded....” Replies to this question showed almost as much poverty as the others showed riches. Whether the reports reflect haste in answering, or unfamiliarity with holdings, or outrage at defiance of the question—or the truth—I cannot say. But one hardly believes that the same libraries report only five good general collections of scientific voyages and travels, one superb collection of early exploration, one collection of geological travels, one of nineteenth century expeditions, one of commentaries on Aristotle. (One library, nameless here, answered simply yes to the entire question, which means, as my old professor of medieval history used to say, it has all or nothing, and there is no way to know.) Quite discouraging is another class of the same order: catalogs of private museums and cabinets. This was intended to elicit knowledge of books like the Museum Wormianum of 1655. Only one library reported sizable holdings. I choose not to believe that otherwise rich libraries have no such catalogs, so I assume that the ammunition was weak or the targets were elusive. If I must believe the reports, it is the only serious scientific material in short supply, but it can be had in at least one library. There is a collection of such catalogs of old scientific museums not forty miles west of where you sit, and you are all welcome to come out to see it. Books of secrets, so beloved of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, constitute a parallel class. Only one collection was reported, and this in a field which has a classic bibliography to hand.

Inquiries concerning budgeted expenditures for the history of science came to naught. The heaviest collecting was done by libraries without earmarked sums. Another great collection has an elastic income. Only five institutions reported marked funds, but collecting activities of most of them obviously exceeded the marked sums. Most were not able to calculate annual expenditures for the last five years. Of the three reporting an-
annual spending, two had elastic sums from outside sources, and the third was a minor collector. (Crerar and Linda Hall, collecting only science, are outside this test.) It is clear that the existence of an history of science account is no test of a library's holdings or collecting, however accurate such a test may be in linguistics or English or anthropology.

Seventeen libraries have the basic reference tools (Poggendorf, Isis, etc.) one not answering and the other weak. Fourteen report fairly complete collections of the standard monographs of the last twenty years—about what we should expect from libraries of this size as a result of routine faculty ordering without particular interest in the history of science.

Although by no means a sufficient test, a necessary one is the presence of substantial holdings of the great scientists. Here again the results are impressive. Practically at random, we find strong collections as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientist</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gesner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linnaeus</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyle</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copernicus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euler</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galileo</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavoisier</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audubon</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spallanzini</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyell</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luca da Pacioli</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haller</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasteur</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gould</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepler</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eustachius</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glauber</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paracelsus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Drake</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priestley</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ray</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oughtred</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schott</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafinesque</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of course, these represent the minimum. Some collections could have reported scores of names. In certain fields Wisconsin and Michigan contain every name. In almost all fields Crerar has classic resources. The catalog of the first part of the De Golyer library at Oklahoma makes it clear he overlooked very little. But what of the slightly lesser men? Is there a single collection, for instance, of the works of the nineteenth century physicist W. R. Grove? However, here again the interrogation may have missed fire.

With regard to unpublished material there is not much to report. Prof. Clagett has gathered many films of medieval scientific manuscripts, and Crerar has some scattered manuscript material. Kansas has a sizable collection of sketches and drawings of John Gould and some other manuscripts in the Ellis collection, and Wisconsin has Sir Joseph Banks' manuscript Icelandic material in the Thordarson collection. Beyond this nothing was reported. There are certainly letters and other papers of scientific interest here and there, but it was impossible to gather more detailed information in the time available.

One of the most delightful games open to librarians—of undisputed although limited scholarly use—is the search for parts of great libraries of
the past. A number of famous collections now grace midwestern shelves. The Ayer ornithological library is intact at the Chicago Museum of Natural History and available through Zimmet’s fine catalog. Chester H. Thordarson’s marvelous library illustrative of the development of British scientific and technological thought was acquired by Wisconsin in 1946, and a fascinating library it is. It was richly complemented when Wisconsin later acquired the alchemical and chemical library of Denis Dauven, the bibliographer of Lavoisier, which stands as one of the two best such collections in English speaking countries. These enclaves are well known. Much less well known is the Sturtevant collection of pre-Linnaean botanical material at the Missouri Botanical Garden, which was cataloged in print in 1896 and 1903.

John Crerar has an army of well known libraries on its groaning shelves: entomology from the LeBaron collection, the Wiedemann collection of electricity. When Crerar acquired local responsibility for medical sources in Chicago, it acquired the libraries of Baum, Meissner, and Tiedemann. In 1919 Crerar purchased the private collection of Wilhelm Junk, containing over 100,000 books, pamphlets, and separates. In 1898 a good part of the Boncampagni library made its way to Crerar. Early in its history Crerar collected economics and political science. Quite recently, however, it dropped those subjects and Kansas acquired its holdings, including the Gerritsen and Ely libraries. Mr. Andrews bought heavily at auction in his early years and had great success, especially at the Milne-Edwards sale (a famous natural history library). In the third portion, Paris, 1901, Crerar secured 207 lots, losing only seventeen bids. This would not happen again with such books. In 1917 Crerar acquired 407 titles from the Pearse library, then believed to be the finest library of natural history ever offered for sale in the United States. The Levis collection of gastronomy came to it in 1940. Illinois has the large Oppolzer collection of books on logarithms.

My own library possesses two large collections most apposite to each other, but formed by two men of most opposite nature and experience in life. Ralph Ellis, Jr., was the spoiled darling of a rich family, prey to an obscure blood disease, unstable, willful, of vague occupation. But he had a passion for natural history. In a short life cut off by an accident at thirty-seven, he made a superb collection in this subject. His last years were spent at Kansas University which received his library after his death. Quite opposite was the late Thomas Jefferson Fitzpatrick, a minor member of the botany department at the University of Nebraska most of his life. He is the closest American equivalent to Magliabecchi, the famous Florentine “devourer of books” of the eighteenth century. He died a few years ago in his eighties, alleged never to have earned more than $3,000 annually, owner of a huge country house, a barn, and another rented house literally so full of books that there was no room to walk. The stairs were full; the bathtub long since had the pipes removed to hold books safely; porches, attics, and basements were jammed. The only living space left was a small area around the kitchen stove where he and
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his wife, who shared his mania, huddled in the cold winters. Toward the end the book mania became a paper mania, and they saved newspapers and old cardboard. But out of this unholy mess came a vast collection of botany and an equally vast collection of mid-western Americana. The former is at Kansas and the latter at the Kansas City Public Library. Both Ellis and Fitzpatrick have permanent places in the history of American book collecting.

To these collectors of the past we must add three of the present: James Ford Bell, who has established his magnificent library of early exploration and historical cartography at Minnesota; Joseph K. Lilly, who has now given his beautiful collection, of yet unexplored richness although it is known to contain many important books in the history of science, to Indiana; and the late Everette De Golyer, whose unrivaled geological collections are at Oklahoma, surrounded by a prime general scientific collection.

Now, for a moment I shall enter my other body and summarize teaching programs. Crerar and Linda Hall have no official teaching programs. Reports by the schools were not all detailed, so figures are approximate. Thirty-three numbered courses in the history of science were reported, plus one university which reported several and another reporting that each discipline offered a course in its own history. Six reported no courses at all. The eleven which reported the exact numbers do not all have separate departments in the history of science; in most, an historian of science is part of the history department. Wisconsin has had a strong teaching program for many years, and several others not quite so long, but the subject is speedily being introduced throughout the midwest. It was not possible at present to learn the number of faculty exclusively occupied with the history of science, but it is probably not more than ten. The number of historical courses available must be at least double the thirty-three. This would, I think, represent as strong an offering as any other parallel academic section of the country. Although, with the information at hand, it was impossible to find out whether in every case the strong libraries have the strong teaching programs, such is doubtless the case.

You will have long since realized that any kind of research is possible in this section of the country. In three or four practically all subjects may be pursued within one set of library walls. Several others fall below this in minor particulars only. John Crerar will support any project, as will Linda Hall soon enough. Wisconsin and Oklahoma are perhaps as strong in general, the former being further provided with superior resources in chemistry and the latter in geology. Several have fine resources in mathematics. Kansas does nobly by botany. Chemistry and botany may be pursued at the Lloyd library as well. Ornithology is high-flying at four or more. The State University at Iowa City has a fine collection in hydraulics And so on, for any subject.

Rich collections suggest interesting possibilities for cooperation, and the collections reported herein should be fit candidates for cooperative collecting and division of responsibility. Precedent within the area exists
in Chicago, where, as early as 1898, Newberry sold its ornithological books to Crerar. I cannot let this pass without noting that Crerar paid $4,500 for the Audubon elephant folio, several sets of Gould, Selby’s Illustrations of British Ornithology, and “other costly works.” A great bargain it was. In 1906 a discussion among the medical libraries of Chicago resulted in the transfer of Newberry’s medical books to Crerar at the same time that Dr. Nicholas Senn consented to the transfer of his large historical library to Crerar. On the opposite side of the coin John Crerar has in the past transferred its cartographic collection to Chicago and its Oriental collections to the Library of Congress. At present the important Chicago libraries avoid duplication of expensive serials through adequate communication. Other midwestern cases are known of what we may call inferential cooperation. At least one library avoids collecting in certain areas, certain that a library not far away will acquire the material. Sometimes there is an exchange of decision, sometimes not. This form of cooperation works nicely as long as everybody tills his ground faithfully. But, in addition to the working Chicago cooperation, there seem to be two other contiguous areas neatly adaptable to sharing collecting responsibility. Linda Hall and Kansas, forty miles apart, have an informal understanding which works nicely.

Any effective area collecting plan must be preceded by detailed knowledge of holdings, and it might be useful for the twenty libraries to divide themselves into natural subdivisions and publish a check list of holdings, beginning with serials and academy publications, followed by the great collected editions of the important authors. Successful divided collecting responsibility would depend on a free lending policy, which may not yet be general. Newer historical collections might investigate before buying.

It strikes me now, that given the general interest in collecting the history of science and the still small number of historians of science on our faculties, (and this should be true outside the midwest as well) an excellent opportunity exists for librarians to do important and fresh collecting, without subservience to changing faculty interests and without blind fidelity to rigid course requirements or buying guides of the best books. A chance lies open for some acquisitions librarians to train themselves in the literature and bibliography of science and collect against the day their faculties are blessed with historians of science. The relevant bibliographies and histories are already known or may easily be located in Sarton’s Horus, A Guide to the History of Science, 1952. But let me commend to you, with utmost persuasion, the catalogs of the foremost dealers in the history of science. Few men knew more than the late E. P. Goldschmidt or are as learned as H. S. Zeitlinger or Dr. Weil. And there are others whose catalogs are priceless tools, especially with respect to the lesser books I mourned earlier. For the great and expensive books are disappearing, and even the most aristocratic dealers now purvey contemptible midgets. We may profit well from this, for a dealer must gather much information about a forgotten book to make it enticing, and this knowledge is free to all of us, no matter who buys the book.
There is still a further opportunity for librarians in the history of science, one which may confront them in the normal course of duty, on the assumption that an acquisitions librarian is required to collate a hand-printed book after purchase. I mean the chance of making new bibliographical observations in the course of a routine collation. In recent months I have been able to note a half dozen new facts about old scientific books merely as a result of conventional but careful collation. Thus, a hitherto undetected cancel in Rafinesque's *Caratteri* of 1810 was observed, which may alter some zoological dating. Inspection of several editions of Grew's *Museum Regalis Societatis* revealed that all editions are made up of the same sheets, with canceled title pages. Leybourn's *Dialling* of 1682 must now be added to the small number of seventeenth century books known to have been corrected in pen and ink before publication. Comparison of the first two editions of Linnaeus' *Materia Medica* shows the second comprises the same sheets with a cancel title. A copy presented to Mrs. Edgeworth by James Keir of the English translation of Macquer's *Additions* was identified, thus almost certainly establishing Keir as the translator, a fact which was only suspected previously. Since I am a scientific dolt, these observations come from the training belonging to a librarian, not an historian of science. I realize that many acquisitions librarians are not expected to collate their purchases, nor given time to do so. This strikes me as senseless. Books have to be collated; who else ought to collate them? Are only expensive books to be collated? Prices are bound to go higher. If you must have the great works, buy them now, before prices rise to the stratosphere; buy the lesser works now while they are cheap. Will still stronger buying drive the prices up? It will. But there is nothing to do about that except to develop efficient but self-denying cooperative collecting programs. Let us resign ourselves to spending money. But, I beg you, let us learn to keep a decorous silence about our impressive acquisitions. The purveyors of books can read also. Carry a fat roll of greenbacks but please—carry it quietly!
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Some Facets of Acquisitions Work in Selected Military Academic Libraries

ROBERT K. JOHNSON
Chief, Technical Services Division,
Air University Library, Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala.

Introduction

THE field of acquisitions and its attendant problems in military school libraries is a large one. Except for a few introductory and general observations, the present article largely concerns procurement and receiving activities in the libraries of eighteen selected military educational institutions, inasmuch as procurement and receiving are the areas where a comparatively large percentage of the problems of military school libraries are centered.

Acquisition Departments

The importance of library acquisitions work to the proper accomplishment of the purposes and functions of the eighteen military educational institutions which form the basis for this study seems not to be recognized, judging by the stepchild status of this library process in most of them. The libraries in only half of these schools have acquisitions departments. Where one does exist, except for a very few instances, it is in combination with another department, or the work is performed on a part-time basis by a worker from another department, or it is attached to the office of the librarian as a clerical activity under the librarian's general supervision. In the smallest libraries usually no division of labor is possible. Where there are librarians on the staff in addition to the head librarian but not enough staff to spread over all of the facets of the library's work, it is often the acquisitions function which fails to be recognized as an activity sufficiently important to merit the chief attention of at least one staff member.

Acquisitions work is basic to library activities, and this lack of a separate acquisitions activity or the combination of acquisitions work with work of another nature cannot but be detrimental to its effective functioning. In addition, in libraries in which the head librarian acts as the chief acquisitions or selection officer, this added burden—although it

* The author has visited over twenty military educational institutions and their libraries and has prepared reports concerning many aspects of the operations and services of eighteen of them. Seventeen of these reports have been published in the ACRL Microcard Series, nos. 62-77 and 82. For detailed bibliographical listing and abstracts of these numbers see College and Research Libraries, 17:533-4, November, 1956 and 18:343, July 1957. This article is based upon parts of a chapter from the author's doctoral dissertation, Characteristics of Libraries in Selected Military Educational Institutions in the United States (University of Illinois, 1957), which in turn is partially based upon these studies.
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may be valuable to this one person—constitutes a serious interference with
the librarian's administrative and planning responsibilities.

Policy

Only four of these eighteen libraries have a published acquisitions
policy, although there was some indication that a fifth library would
have one by 1956. The published policies are in sufficient detail to be ef-
fective guides for personnel concerned with selection. In the institutions
which have no published policy, a general acquisitions policy seems to be
understood, and the acquisition of library materials is based on these im-
plied policies. In obtaining some types of materials this no doubt is ade-
quate, but the lack of a definite written policy can result in extensive
purchasing in peripheral fields or areas not pertinent to the institutional
missions and in failure to acquire essential materials.

Selection and Tools

In all but two of the libraries, the head librarian is the chief book
selection officer. In the two exceptions this responsibility is delegated
largely to the chief acquisitions librarian. In general, staff, faculty, and
students participate very little in selection, although they are usually free
to do so.

On the whole, the range of helpful and sometimes even essential tools
is considerably smaller in the libraries of these schools than it is in librar-
ies in civilian institutions. The more common and less expensive bibli-
ographical aids and tools used in acquisitions work are in most of the li-
braries, as are the available specialized aids needed in limited or special
areas such as documents and medicine. The larger libraries, with some
exceptions, tend to have the better rounded bibliographical collections,
including foreign publications and more military documents selection
aids.

All of these libraries acquiring documents make heavy use of bibliog-
raphies, acquisitions lists, and other publications, including those issued
by government agencies, contractors, and other military schools and their
libraries.

Security and Security-Classified Publications

Security-classified documents which abound in many of these libraries
require special arrangements for proper safeguards upon receipt and dur-
ing processing, storage, and use. Included in such special arrangements,
in addition to security clearances for personnel working with documents,
safe storage provisions, identification and clearance of patrons, etc., are
provisions for "security areas" where such publications are received, re-
corded, processed, stored, and circulated. In some institutions, such as the
Army War College, the entire library is a security area. In others, such as
the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, the classified documents ac-
tivity is a complete unit separated from the rest of the library, while at
the Air University there are various security areas throughout the library
quarters: the Documents Acquisitions Section, the Documents Cataloging Sections, the Documents Circulation Section, and the Documents vault where security-classified publications are stored and serviced by Circulation personnel.

**Procurement by Purchase**

In military libraries all needed commercial items which are not standard items of supply are obtained through purchasing and contracting activities. In the Navy, Supply Officers handle the details of purchasing from commercial sources as well as being responsible for keeping standard government or military equipment and supply items in stock. In the Army and the Air Force, Quartermaster and Supply Officers respectively are responsible for maintaining stocks of standard items of supply, and Contracting Officers take care of purchasing necessary materials through commercial sources. The commercial (non-governmental) agents include library binders whose services are “purchased” by means of contracts. Thus, in the military, library orders to commercial dealers, jobbers, supply houses, binders, subscription agencies, etc., are routed from the library to the Supply or Contracting activity for implementation.

The libraries of the Air Force Schools have relatively simple systems for handling purchase requests between the libraries and the Contracting Offices. Requisitions in multiple copies are prepared for the signature of the librarian or the acquisitions department chief. After being signed, the requisitions then go to the Contracting Office. At one period in recent years, both the Aeromedical Library at the Air Force School of Aviation Medicine and the Acquisitions Branch of the Air University Library sent out forms for bids for supplying books, periodicals, binding, and other needs of a commercial nature in cooperation with their contracting activities. Under this system the libraries received the bids, examined them, and were permitted to award the contract to the best, most capable bidder judged on the basis of the knowledge and experience of the librarians and the past performance of the bidders. However, this practice was stopped on the grounds that the libraries of these agencies were not authorized to engage in purchasing and contracting activities.

The routing of purchase requisitions in Army schools may be made clear by the operation at one of them. After being approved by the library committee and the library officer, the requests go to the College Secretary, then to the Fiscal Officer, then to Supply and Maintenance, and then to the Contracting Office for ordering. In some schools the Contracting Office re-types the order. For items of publishers not included in the General Services Administration’s Federal Supply Schedule, which designates a government-specified contractor in numerous instances, one Contracting Office further routes the requisitions to the school’s bookstore for the financial benefit of the bookstore. At another school, the library committee and the library officer must sign requests for library purchases, as must the Deputy Commandant. At still another Army school, a total of fourteen copies of various papers constitute the neces-
sary paper work for library orders—nine copies of the list of materials requested and five copies of the official purchase request form.

In general, purchase requests in the libraries of the schools operating under the Army are prepared for the signature of the library committee or the library officer rather than the librarian. The librarian occasionally approves the requests, but not often; and when he does, the purchase request must meet the approval of the school's commanding officer or his designee before going to the Contracting Office.

At one school, because of the slow and cumbersome Army purchasing and bookkeeping procedures, it was necessary to stop purchasing of library materials by mid-April so that all material ordered was either cancelled or received and billed by not later than 30 June, the end of the fiscal year. At one time, all purchase requests from the library for another Army school were forwarded to the Army Quartermaster Property Office in St. Louis, over 400 miles away, for approval and then returned to the school for further processing which added another month in the cycle.

It is obvious that the libraries of these Army institutions are saddled with a purchasing system which is unbelievably complicated and detailed, and burdened with unnecessary limitations, the results of which upon library services the military does not readily comprehend. This routine, exemplified by procedures at any one of a number of these Army schools, is an example of detail glorified to the point where it almost seems that controls have been created solely for the purpose of controlling the controls.

In the libraries of only two schools among the Naval institutions studied is the library committee or library officer the final authority for approval of library purchase requests rather than the head librarian. At one of these, the purchase requests go directly to the jobber via a letter-order after the jobber has been designated for a fiscal year by the usual invitation-to-bid procedures and the funds for the particular month obligated by a "stub requisition" sent from the library to the Supply Officer. At another Naval school, after approval by the library officer, the purchase request goes to the Fiscal Officer, then to the College Secretary, then to the Base Supply Depot. In the libraries of these other Naval schools, the pattern generally followed is for the requisitions to go from the librarian to the Supply Officer via a fiscal officer.

The stub requisition system is remarkably simple and efficient, but among the Naval schools its use varies somewhat, and apparently not all libraries of schools supported by the Navy make use of it. The library of one of these institutions estimates an amount for one month's purchases, e.g., up to $600, has its jobber notified via stub requisition through the school Supply Officer, and then proceeds to order against this amount. At another Naval school, if the materials on any one order amount to less than $100, the library can specify the jobber or dealer; otherwise the Base Supply Officer advertises for bids. In any event, in this school the Supply Officer makes up a stub requisition form. At still another Naval institution, up to seven titles may be placed on a stub requisition form. The
items on any stub requisition may be ordered from the dealer, jobber, or publisher of the library's choice provided the total cost does not equal $500; otherwise a more complicated bid-and-contract method using the Naval Purchasing Office some distance from the school must be used.

Recent changes in the Armed Services Procurement Regulation permit Contracting Offices to open "blanket charge accounts" up to the amount of $5,000 per month net cost with any one book supplier. There apparently is no limit to the number of jobbers which may be used by any one Contracting Office, although no single order to any one dealer may exceed $1,000. The library may recommend specific dealers, but the Contracting Office makes the choice. One of the surprising features of this system is that the list prices of books and periodicals as shown in standard bibliographic tools, subject to the usual library discounts, are generally not accepted by the military purchasing authority as being "firm," or list, prices. The Contracting Offices usually send lists off to several jobbers to obtain quotations, not only for in-print books, domestic periodical subscriptions, and large amounts of commercial library supplies, but also for out-of-print domestic books, foreign periodicals, out-of-print foreign titles, etc. This is a practice which still exists in many schools.

Inasmuch as the general purchasing system of the Naval establishment and its local variations on the whole are reasonably efficient and satisfactory to both the schools and their libraries, there seems to be no particularly pressing reason why these activities should change their purchasing methods in favor of the Armed Services Procurement Regulation which permits blanket charge accounts.

Requests for Official Materials

Requests for official military materials of both classified and non-classified nature are generally made up in letter form for the signature of an officer of the school administration. In some military school libraries, the letter order copy is the only record of the order, as at the Air University Library, while in others an order card is made up covering the request. In general, these letter requests are controlled by locally-assigned serial numbers. Records of these publications are maintained which in most instances are similar to periodical and serial record cards. Except for the former Army General School, where the Archives, rather than the school library, was the agency charged with custody and servicing of security publications, documents are the responsibility of a division of the library. However, at the Air Force School of Aviation Medicine, the acquisition and distribution of research documents, including those that are routed to the Aeromedical Library, have been made the function of the Research Secretary. Like certain others of these libraries with classified documents servicing units, this library has no highly-classified publications.

In general, letters concerning classified materials are routed via a modified chain-of-command channel. After being signed by a library or an institutional officer, the request goes directly to an intelligence, secur-
ity, or other cognizant superior agency of the service to which the request-
ing activity belongs. This agency then obtains the desired items and sends them to the school for the library, or directly to the library.

In addition to being able to obtain many single publications on re-
quest, all military school libraries receive certain materials of military origin on distribution. Some of this material is sent automatically by cer-
tain agencies without any requirement for the library or the institution to request them; other types of material are sent regularly after receipt of a request, or regularly for a certain period after which re-justification for receipt must be made.

In some schools, the acquisition of such materials is the responsibility of an agency outside the library, as at the Air Force Institute of Technol-
ogy, where the Adjutant's Office obtains and routes them to the library, or as at the Air Force School of Aviation Medicine, where acquisition of all "documents" material for the school is the responsibility of the Re-
search Secretary.

Non-Available Materials

Libraries in military schools are prevented from obtaining certain materials which would be of considerable value to them in supporting the school curricula. The obstacles are the policies of the bodies such as the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the National Security Council, and other high-level policy groups which issue a variety of publications. Current Army plans are not available, and the published lectures given at the six top-level service schools are not distributed outside their own organizations with the exception of certain lectures sent out by the Industrial College of the Armed Forces.

The official policy of these issuing agencies concerning the availability of their publications for use other than the purpose originally intended does not allow for even the most valid needs of any of the military schools.

Receiving

Problems of paper work concerning the processes of receiving and receipting activities are complicated and troublesome, but not quite as time-consuming as the purchase routines. Accession records, while once a serious problem among Army and Air Force libraries, are not now generally in active use, although a few libraries in these institutions maintain them by choice of either the library or a higher authority.

The receiving routines for library materials are fairly uniform through-
out the libraries of these schools. Most of the libraries receive materials directly from the shipper. However, some exceptions to this may be noted. For example, the Supply Depot serving the Naval War College receives incoming library shipments for record purposes, then transfers them to the Mahan Library for further recording and receipting.

At one time, all purchases of books and periodicals for a certain Army school library were shipped from the jobber to the Army Quartermaster Depot in St. Louis. It was then necessary for the Base Command or the school to make arrangements at the Base for these shipments to be picked
up by truck in St. Louis, a round-trip of 930 miles. This ridiculous situation was corrected some time prior to 1954 by having library orders delivered to the Base Warehouse, 929 miles closer, but still not to the library. It was necessary for the librarian to go to the warehouse daily to pick up shipments of books, periodicals, etc. This too was partially corrected when it became possible to have periodicals and newspapers delivered directly to the library. However, book shipments were still being delivered to the warehouse six months before the school was closed early in 1955, and presumably this system continued up until the closing of the school. At another Army school, receiving reports are signed not only by the librarian, but also by the accountable library officer. In addition, the library officer has ordered that the date received, the source, the price, and voucher number be placed in the books on the first page following the title page.

In general, the receipting processes for these libraries are as complicated or as simple as are the purchasing procedures which they must follow. The writer has not come upon any libraries which are required to produce or work with the legendary “seventeen copies” of paper work commonly ascribed to government activities, but one Army school library processes eight copies of receiving reports, and, as noted earlier, five copies of the purchase request and nine copies of the list of materials to be purchased are required at another of the Army schools. At least nine copies of one of the forms used in recording the receipt of library materials are required at still another Army school.

Accessioning

Aside from the fairly common ephemeral accessions or acquisitions lists, library bulletins, periodicals lists and directories, etc., issued by many of these libraries, little use is made of any type of accession records. Accession records as such are not specifically required of Air Force libraries, but Air Force Regulation 212-1 states that “the addition of library materials will be documented by adequate control records . . .” The same regulation also requires each library to “. . . maintain a shelf-list as the official record of all library materials permanently held in its collection . . .” Receiving reports and other records concerning materials added to the collections serve adequately to meet military accountability requirements in most cases in place of the old-time accession records.

Gift and Exchange

There is very little gift and exchange activity in most of these libraries, and even that is largely spasmodic. Those which have such intercourse usually restrict it, because of military or school regulations or tradition, to other military or military school libraries. In general, only a few of these libraries, chiefly the larger ones, participate in the activities of the United States Book Exchange. The largest and most consistent users among these military school libraries are the library of the Naval Postgraduate School and the Air University Library. The Army War College also uses the Exchange to some extent.
Military institutions generally do not have research or publication programs which compare in size or purpose with those of civilian institutions; in the instances where they do, the resulting publications usually are intended for a closed distribution list. These schools issue almost no publications in the form commonly understood by librarians when the term “book” is mentioned, although some serial publications and reports series are issued by military schools or their libraries. Aside from these serials, the publishing activities they do engage in are generally highly specialized and are largely limited to issuing for their own needs. If an audience for such publications exists outside the publishing institution, it is likely to be quite small. For these reasons, as well as the fact that the stocks of publications of military educational institutions are not normally maintained by their libraries, these libraries are seldom involved in exchange activities.

Gift activity is also circumscribed. Military institutions and their libraries are seldom the recipients of gift collections, parts of libraries, etc., as libraries of civilian institutions often are, and therefore gifts, whether needed or not, seldom accumulate to any extent in the military libraries. Most gifts which are received are usually single volumes or only a few at most, of unneeded or unwanted texts and other books from departing staff, faculty, and students.

One of several notable exceptions to the general lack of exchange activity among these military school libraries is the library of the Naval Postgraduate School. It uses school publications as exchange for needed materials from other institutions, many of them civilian. The Postgraduate School publications which are sent out on exchange by the library include studies issued as the result of research performed in the School’s Engineering School, theses of Engineering School students, and publications in the Naval Postgraduate School’s Technical Report series which are the results of Navy contracts with civilian institutions and research organizations. Free and exchange materials are requested by form letter accompanied by a large stamped and franked envelope.

Disposition

The authority to dispose of unneeded library material is lodged in different officials in different institutions. For instance, at the National War College, after making the necessary papers for record purposes, the librarian or his designees have the authority to dispose of such items; but at the Naval War College, materials from the various libraries may not be disposed of without the permission of the Disposal Board which meets three times yearly. All college materials recommended for disposal are listed by department, accompanied by the recommendations for disposal and the reason therefor. The College Secretary, the Senior Member of the Disposal Board, and the Assistant Secretary for the Libraries, Museum, and Security Division are among the Board members, but no librarian sits on the board. The Board recommends retention or disposal of the materials brought to its attention. At the Naval Postgrad-
uate School there are no restrictions on the disposal of unneeded materials. The decision is up to the librarian, as it is at the Naval Intelligence School.

Concerning disposal of obsolete or unneeded library materials, Air Force Regulations say that “library materials which are determined by the librarian to be obsolete or worn-out through fair wear and tear will be withdrawn from the collection and turned in to the disposal officer . . .” and that “library materials may be transferred to another library . . . .” Military school libraries having custody of classified materials, turn unneeded classified publications over to a security or other documents disposal officer for disposition.

Evaluation of the University Library Collection

HARRY BACH
Head, Acquisition Department,
San Jose State College

THAT the university librarian is concerned about the quality of the book collection under his supervision may as a rule be taken for granted. That this concern is generally translated into action by the adoption and application of a carefully planned policy of book selection based on an objective evaluation of the library collection may as a rule not be taken for granted. In the writer’s study of the “Acquisition Policy in the American Academic Library” only one library out of the fifty-five that reported mentioned that it had made a systematic evaluation of its collection. Stieg was, therefore, right when he remarked that evaluations are usually subjective in nature and based upon the opinions of librarians, faculty members, and, all too rarely, of students.¹

Why Evaluate?

Unless a librarian knows the strength and weakness of the library’s collections, the formulation of an intelligent and realistic acquisition program upon which a statement of the priority of needs can be based will be most difficult. Writes Downs:

“Preliminary to any program of developing research facilities, there should be a study of the collections serving each department. From those data it can be determined what areas within special fields need attention now or at some future time . . . . The primary purpose of the kind of study proposed is to give the librarian and the faculty an over-all view of the strength and weakness of the library’s collections and to help determine what fields are particularly in need of intensive attention.”²

²
Instruments of Evaluation

It would be very helpful if librarians could use a standard measuring device which could be applied and which would indicate immediately and clearly the relative strength of the collection as well as of its various parts. Unfortunately, there is no such measuring device. Librarians interested in appraising their collections have to depend on several evaluating procedures, none of which is entirely satisfactory, to obtain a more or less accurate picture of the status of the collections.

The most common measurement of adequacy in college libraries, according to Lyle is to check the library's holdings against standard lists of recommended books. The limitation of this method, he recognizes, lies in the varying nature of college library book needs. "It is quite obvious," he adds, "that these differ in different institutions, and that in order to ascertain the adequacy of the library of a particular institution the character and nature of the general education program must be taken into account."

If the evaluation of a college library collection is no easy task, the problem becomes even more complex when a university library collection is the focus of attention. Wilson notes that the problem of appraising the nature of a library approximating a million volumes is all but impossible with the instruments of measurement which are presently available and are generally employed in appraising the character of much smaller libraries. He observes that it is one thing to determine whether a given college library can properly support an undergraduate program. It is quite a different matter to determine with equal certainty that a university library can properly support the work of twenty or more departments which offer work leading to the doctorate.

A thorough survey of a university library collection is time-consuming and expensive. In the Chicago self-survey of 1930 some two hundred faculty members participated over a period of several months. The survey involved the critical examination and checking of some four hundred bibliographies and the compilation of a schematic master list of over 92,000 periodical titles. Each department passed upon the journals devoted strictly to its subject, just as in the case of the book lists, while interdepartmental committees or divisional spokesmen adjudged the overlapping titles. The arrears recorded by the survey ran to 1,405,097 volumes, of which 200,424 were serials and 512,000 government documents, leaving 692,773 other books. The cost of acquiring these arrears was estimated to amount to about four million dollars.

That few university libraries can afford to embark upon a large scale project such as the Chicago survey seems very probable. What then have been the instruments employed in recent surveys of university library collections?

An outside specialist, such as veteran surveyor Wilson, generally employs two methods for determining the adequacy of library collections: 1. Faculty opinion; 2. Bibliographic checking.

* 25 *
In order to find out the adequacy of a university library's resources to support existing and proposed programs, Wilson asks the institution's schools and departments to submit statements concerning their needs for library materials. On questionnaires he requests them to indicate (a) The amount of money needed by each department to bring library holdings up to the degree of adequacy required to support the course of study offered by the department, and (b) The amounts that would be required annually to maintain the collections once they are brought up to the desired level.

A slight variation of this approach, as used by McCarthy, is to ascertain the faculty's opinion of the adequacy or inadequacy of the collection of books and periodicals in each subject field for undergraduate and graduate study and to ask for lists of needed materials which are lacking. The advantage cited by McCarthy for this method is that:

"It is precisely this personal opinion that is important, because it may be assumed that the faculty members interviewed were familiar with the Library's holdings as well as with the literature of their subject, and they have the great advantage, which cannot be had from any bibliographical checking, of knowing how the books and periodicals are used by the students and the faculty."6

Wilson, on the other hand, calls the method "practical, though only moderately successful."7 The writer is inclined to agree with Wilson. The method is a quick way for a library to determine whether its resources by and large meet the needs of its clientele. The method is unsatisfactory, however, from the bibliographical point of view of bringing specific weaknesses in the collection to the attention of the library. A faculty member may know that library resources in his field are inadequate here and there, but it is doubtful that the list of desiderata items that might be the outcome of that knowledge would be sufficiently comprehensive to be a substitute for a good bibliography.

A second method which has been employed by surveyors and accrediting agencies for determining the adequacy of a library's resources has been to check the holdings of the library against standard bibliographies. The technique generally consists of an evaluation of three types of library materials: 1. Periodicals; 2. Reference works; 3. Books.

The instruments commonly used to determine periodical strength are:

a. Brown's Table which is a table prepared by C. H. Brown for the Association of Research Libraries showing the holdings of the most-cited scientific periodicals in the fields of mathematics, physics, chemistry, botany, and physiology of 55 research libraries in the United States and Canada. Brown checked these subjects against the holdings of the libraries as listed in the Union List of Serials in Libraries in the United States and Canada, 2nd ed., 1943 and assigned scores based on a scale which allowed 10 points for a complete file, seven for three fourths or more, five for one half to
three fourths, two for one fourth to one half, and one for less than one fourth.

The disadvantage that the use of Brown’s Table has in 1957 is that a library’s holdings would be measured against the 1941 holdings of the libraries listed in the Table. Most of these libraries undoubtedly have in the post-war period substantially increased their buying of journal sets. They would consequently score higher than they did in 1941, and in contrast the holdings of the library being surveyed would be lower if it did not have the benefit of post-war acquisition of journal sets.

b. Ulrich’s Periodical Directory which is a selective list of periodicals in numerous subject fields. A library would naturally check only those subjects in which it had some reason to develop strength. Ulrich’s main disadvantage with respect to its use as an evaluating tool is its limitation to current titles.

Helpful as Brown’s Table and Ulrich’s Periodical Directory may be in the determination of a library’s periodical strength, they are far from being satisfactory instruments. Brown’s Table, it has been seen, is dated and furthermore restricts itself to a mere five subjects. Ulrich, because of its exclusion of defunct titles, fails to show what the body of a library’s periodical collection should be.

In connection with periodicals it should be noted also that none of the surveys read by the writer made any attempt to evaluate serials.4 The explanation for this apathy or ignorance of the problem probably lies in the nonexistence of an easy-to-use list of serials. An unedited, unselective Union List of Serials could not be expected to meet the purpose.

The number of reference titles held by libraries has long been considered an index of the strength of libraries for the support of effective teaching and research. Mudge’s Guide to Reference Books is the commonly used tool in determining the strength of a reference collection. Being a large and authoritative list of reference works in all fields, Mudge can be used as a selection aid for the librarian and as a reference manual for the research worker. It is one of the very few tools which is satisfactory for evaluating purposes. It serves to detect weaknesses in a library’s reference collection and also as a buying guide.

The method usually employed by surveyors in appraising the adequacy of a university library’s book collection is that of checking the resources of the library against standard bibliographies. Because a university library book collection is ancillary to the program of instruction and research of the institution of which it is a part, there are bibliographies that are used in some surveys but not in others. For lack of time surveyors generally do not check more than three or four bibliographies. Their appraisal of a library’s collection is therefore spotty and limited in scope. An exhaustive evaluation of a library collection, if the survey conducted by the University of Idaho may be taken as an example,8 would entail the checking of at least fifteen bibliographies. The survey
of the University of Chicago library, it may be recalled, involved the
critical examination and checking of as many as four hundred bibliog-
rapihes. That university libraries should feel deterred from conducting
self evaluations of their collections is therefore quite easy to understand.

Other instruments of evaluation may in some cases be simpler and
cheaper to use but appear to have less excellence than collection evalu-
ation by the faculty and especially collection evaluation by bibliographi-
cal checking.

The method of appraising the adequacy of a library's collection by
comparing its holdings and rate of growth with those of other institutions
permits a library to know whether it ranks above or below other libraries
in the region or country, but it fails to disclose the library's specific strong
and weak fields. Since the main purpose of an evaluation is to make it
possible for a library to determine its needs, comparison with other institu-
tions can hardly be considered as a satisfactory measure of the adequacy
of a library's collection; nor can its size, for that matter. Quantity is hardly
synonymous with quality.

The suggestion has been made that significant deductions about the
book collection can be drawn from the extent to which students and
faculty members are successful in finding in the universities the materials
which they need in the pursuit of educational and research activities. According to Lyle the "ratio of successes to failures in efforts to get books
is certainly a valid index of adequacy." In the writer's opinion it might
be a valid index of adequacy under ideal conditions. But in what uni-
versity library can those ideal conditions be found? In what university
library could the librarian establish the procedures that would permit
him to ascertain from the faculty and the student body whether or not
their needs for library materials have been met and if they have not been
met, which titles the library did not have? Which university library would
want to conduct such a study over a long period of time? It should also be
pointed out that the implication of this method is that a library collection
does not necessarily have to be either good or bad and that if there is such
a thing as a qualitatively average collection that average collection might
very well satisfy the library's clientele. The fact that a library collection
meets the needs of students and faculty does not make it a good collection,
a collection that should not or cannot be improved.

Concluding Remarks

It has been maintained in this paper that none of the evaluating tools
presently used by librarians in measuring the adequacy of their collec-
tions meet all their needs. The tools are either too costly in time and,
therefore, money, or they do not measure, or at least measure imperfectly,
what they are expected to measure. It might be well, therefore, for li-
brarians to concentrate on bettering their present evaluating tools or con-
structing new instruments.

The writer believes that librarians might do well to experiment with
the application of sampling techniques to the evaluation of library col-
collections. In polls, for instance, small samples of people, representing what is called the universe, are selected to measure public opinion. In librarianship likewise, small samples of books in a given field, could perhaps be selected to measure the adequacy of the library's entire holdings in that field. If a bibliography, for example, listed 1000 titles under U. S. Civil War History, the problem would be to select 100 titles, or some such figure, from the 1000 that would be representative of the whole. Should a checking of the 1000 titles reveal that a library lacked 10\%, or 100 titles, then the checking of the sample of 100 titles, if it is a good sample, would also reveal that the library lacked 10\%, or 10 titles. The writer is fully aware of the limitations of this technique. In the first place, it could probably be only applied to large collections; and secondly, it would fail to show which specific titles a library did or did not have. It would show, however, at no great expense in time and money to the library in which fields the library was strong and in which fields it was weak. The sampling technique would, therefore, be a strainer; it would point out to the librarian the strong and weak spots in the collection. The librarian could then proceed from there and check bibliographies covering the weak fields for specific titles to buy.

The sampling technique would not represent the optimum but at least it would be an improvement over the imperfect evaluating instruments that are in use at present.
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THE St. Louis Public Library, as a preliminary step to solving its own serial problems, decided to inquire of other public libraries in the United States as to what they were doing in regard to their serial problems. Hence in September, 1954, a questionnaire was sent to public libraries in cities having more than 300,000 population. In addition, twelve other cities were selected for various reasons, and questionnaires were sent to them. In January, 1955, a follow up was sent to those libraries which had not replied by that time. Of the forty-eight questionnaires sent, forty-four or ninety-one percent were returned.

Of those libraries replying, two did not answer the questionnaire; San Antonio because “our Library is relatively small and we feel that we are unable to help solve your serial problems by the practical experience of this Library in serials procedures”; Syracuse because “we are planning reorganization of our serial procedures and can give little information about our policies at this time.”

The standard questions concerning serials were asked: housing, records, etc. Also included were questions inspired by some particular problems here at the St. Louis Public Library. The questions on the whole were intended to be general yet specific, and after reading some of the returns it would appear that they were just that. However, any attempt to discover the answers to all the aspects of serials in only two pages of questions must necessarily be informal.

Of the forty-two libraries answering the questionnaire, only four had separate serials departments. However, seven others had separately-administered serials units which were small divisions of larger departments. In each instance these were under one of the technical processes departments. In those libraries not having separate, or separately-administered serials units, the organizational unit responsible for serials in the most cases (nine) was some unit of the technical processing division. Next came the Reference Department with five. Other units responsible accounted for three more instances. In fourteen other libraries the task of dealing with serials was so scattered that it could not be determined which department had the chief responsibilities.

In view of the shortage of trained librarians and the current trend toward using clerical help in all possible instances, an effort was made to determine, if possible, the composition of staffs working with serials.
However, the varying inclusion of those staff members handling serials (due to the previously mentioned fact that only a small number of libraries have separate serial units) coupled with conflict in terminology of classification and pay plans, prevents any adequate comparison of the composition of staffs handling serials. From returns it does seem safe to conclude, though, that so far as total staff is concerned, those libraries with complete serial units were able to do the job with smaller staffs.

To house their serial records twenty-one libraries (or approximately half of those reporting) indicated that they used some type of visible method, nine reported that they used catalog drawers exclusively, while ten reported using a combination of the two. One library, Philadelphia, was currently considering the question of purchase of new equipment, while Atlanta reported that it was in the planning phase of changing from catalog cases to Acme visible records.

Among those libraries using visible housing for their records, Remington Rand's Kardex outpolled Acme two to one. One library (Akron, Ohio) reported using the Victor visible system, and two (Seattle and Cincinnati) as using Cardineers.

When a library used the visible checking method, the size of the catalog card used in most cases (twenty) was 4x6 inch. Seven institutions used 5x8 inch cards, while only two used the 3x5 inch card for their visible records. On the other hand, in those libraries using catalog drawers to house their records, all but one used the universal 3x5 inch card. The information on the checking card varied enormously, but most libraries included some records of binding, location, and payment, in addition to their checking records. Color was the factor most used to distinguish types of material, although a surprisingly large number of libraries reported using the time-consuming method of separate alphabets.

Fourteen institutions reported having a Central Serial Records Center. The departmental location of these centers varied, but almost all were the responsibility of the serials unit. An additional four libraries had actual plans for establishing Central Serial Records Centers, while four others were definitely considering the possibility of such a move. One institution reported the establishment of a Central Serial Records as "desirable, but we have no plans at this time."

The unit responsible for binding was variously mentioned as being the Reference Department, the serials unit, the Order Department, etc., with no clear cut pattern discernible. Concerning the question of binding, twelve libraries reported binding before cataloging, fifteen after cataloging, while the others reported their practice as varying according to the material.

In most cases the amount of serials cataloging in terms of the number of catalogers was difficult to define. This was especially true in those libraries having subject subdivisions. There was a great deal of variance regarding the indication of serials holdings on the catalog cards. Those libraries with Central Serial Records Centers used the records in those centers for their holdings information. Everyone reported making an ef-
fort to obtain lacks before binding. Seven libraries do not recatalog for change of title; while eight others do not for certain types of material.

In shelving of unbound and bound serials, the trend was to shelve them together. This was especially true of periodicals.

One reason for establishing a separate serials unit and the resulting Central Serial Records Center is the fact that the record of the entire holdings of a library can be expressed (only once) in this records center, thus saving the tremendous labor of adding information to catalog cards and maintaining duplicate files. One of the main difficulties in locating such a unit is that the center must be easily available to the staff and to the public alike. During normal working hours a multiplicity of telephone connections can do the trick. Normally, however, technical processing departments (where it seems units should be located) are closed in the evenings and on weekends, and said records are inaccessible. Seattle, with its reported use of two Cardineers, has come up with one solution to this knotty problem. In the daytime these mobile units are in the Order Department, in the evening it is a simple matter to roll the two units (with their 10,000 records) to the Periodical Room where the person in charge can readily answer any questions.

From the maze of facts and figures gathered in the course of the survey it would seem that the following conclusions concerning serials in the larger public libraries are not invalid:

(1) While there does not seem to be a trend to the establishing of an entirely separate Serials Department in large public libraries, it does seem that the work of dealing with serials is being consolidated in one unit, said unit usually being located in a technical processing department.

(2) Those libraries that have consolidated their serials work are able to handle the work with a smaller staff.

(3) The majority of serials records are housed visibly on 4x6 inch cards. There seems a possibility, however, that records housed in catalog cases may be making a comeback—but in a larger size than 3x5 inch.

(4) A number of representative institutions have already established Central Serial Records Centers, while a surprisingly large number are considering establishing such centers. This is encouraging, because I believe that it is only through the establishing of such Central Serial Records Centers that a library can completely whip its time, cost, and personnel problems as they relate to serials.

(5) Ingenuity and new devices can be used to solve serials problems, i.e., "Seattle's use of the Cardineer" to house their records.

This fathomless, flourishing, frightening field of serials is one that presents many knotty problems. Through cooperative exchange of ideas and the use of our native intelligence these problems can be solved.
Classification at Dorking: The International Study Conference on Classification for Information Retrieval

Jesse H. Shera, Dean, School of Library Science, Western Reserve University

The Background

The International Study Conference on Classification for Information Retrieval had its origin in the conference on scientific information sponsored in 1948 by the Royal Society of London. This now famous conference created a panel on subject classification in science, and by the close of the year 1950, this panel reported that its discussions had "served to show that the problem of classification is far more complex than was imagined at the outset." Therefore, its secretary, Professor J. D. Bernal, proposed that the problem be studied further by an informal group of interested librarians, and, in February 1952, after a considerable period of deliberation, the Classification Research Group, the major sponsors of the Dorking Conference, was formed.¹

The objective of this new group, which developed largely through the leadership of B. C. Vickery and A. J. Wells, was "to review the basic principles of bibliographic classification and information retrieval, unhampere by allegiance to any particular scheme."² Because the group has endeavored to reach unanimous agreement in the presentation of its views, progress has been relatively slow. Up to the time of the Dorking Conference, however, two publications had resulted from its deliberations. The first was a brief outline of the problem which appeared in the Library Association Record for June 1953, (55: 187-188). The second was a much longer memorandum which appeared under the title "The Need for a Faceted Classification as a Basis for All Methods of Information Retrieval," published in May 1955 by the UNESCO International Advisory Committee for Documentation and Technology in Pure and Applied Science.³

The Group began its work with a consideration of basic principles, but in recent months it has turned its attention to specific subject fields, and in so doing has, in the opinions of the members, stimulated and clarified subsequent generalization. The fields considered were: library science, "enterprise activities," office management, insurance, social science, and soil science.

In November, 1956, the group began the publication of a mimeographed bulletin, of which three issues have appeared to date, the intent of which is to provide an instrument for the dissemination of information concerning the work of the group and the results of its deliberations. The pages of the Bulletin are freely available to contributors who are not...
themselves members of the organization. Thus it was hoped that the group and its activities could constitute an international forum for all who are concerned with, or are interested in, bibliographic classification.

Though the group, which met at frequent intervals in London, was probably weighted in favor of the Ranganathan principle of faceted classification, it addressed itself to a wide variety of problems including scheduling, notation, chain indexing, coordinate systems, structure, semantics, and, to a limited degree, even mechanization. The successful efforts of the group, and the enthusiastic support which it aroused, revealed the general need for greater attention to the problems of classification as an instrument of bibliographic organization.

The Conference

Because of the progress which the British group had made, the International Federation for Documentation requested of its British affiliate, ASLIB, that an international study conference on classification be organized. Accordingly ASLIB, with the cooperation of the School of Librarianship and Archives of the University of London and the Classification Group, announced such a conference to be held May 13-17, 1957. The organizing committee was composed of: D. J. Campbell, Assistant Director of ASLIB; J. E. L. Farradane, Scientific Information Officer, Tate and Lyle Research Laboratories; D. J. Foskett, Librarian and Information Officer, Metal Box Co., Ltd.: Barbara Kyle, research staff, Social Science Documentation; Mary Piggott, Lecturer, School of Librarianship and Archives, University of London; B. C. Vickery, Librarian, Akers Research Laboratories, Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd.; and Leslie Wilson, director of ASLIB. Inasmuch as the announced objective of the conference was “to study the modern ideas of classification and their application to information retrieval,” the organizing committee turned to the members of the Classification Group for the identification of the main problems which would provide the skeleton for the program. In addition, a limited number of volunteer papers, or presentations, relevant to the program theme were accepted.

To expedite the exchange of ideas, promote free discussion, and make possible a maximum of personal contact, participation in the conference was limited to some forty invited experts and the meetings were held in a “retreat” where competition from the distractions of city life would be all but eliminated. The choice of Beatrice Webb House was a particularly happy one. This quietly elegant estate, situated near Dorking, in Surrey, about thirty miles south-west of London, is maintained as a memorial to Beatrice Webb, and is used for residential conferences and schools. Nestled in one of the most beautiful sections of the rolling English countryside, the village of Holmbury St. Mary, a mile distant, is its nearest urban neighbor. The beauty of Leith Hill and its environs was indeed a welcome invitation to one of the few surviving Americans who enjoys walking to share this enthusiasm with his British colleagues. There could have been no better way to deliberate on the problems of classification.
The invited experts included representatives from France, Germany, India, Italy, the Netherlands, UNESCO, the United Kingdom, the United States, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Hungary, and Norway, though those from the last four were unfortunately unable to be present. The roster presented an appearance something akin to a *who's who* in bibliographic classification:

**France:**
- Jean Bouillut, Laboratoire de Psychologie Sociale, Paris.

**Germany:**
- C. Braband, A. E. G. Frankfurt/Main.
- Martin Scheele, Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

**India:**
- S. R. Ranganathan.

**Italy**
- G. Bricarelli, Instituto Siderurgico 'Finsider.'

**Netherlands:**
- G. Groeneveld, Koninklijke/Shell Laboratorium, Amsterdam.

**UNESCO:**

**United Kingdom:**
- Miss Jean Binns, English Electric Co., Ltd. Whetstone, Nr. Leicester.
- Miss D. Caldwell, Thornton Research Center, Chester.
- D. J. Campbell, ASLIB, London.
- C. W. Cleverdon, College of Aeronautics, Cranfield.
- R. A. Fairthorne, Royal Aircraft Establishment, Farnborough.
- J. E. L. Farradane, Tate and Lyle, Ltd., Keston.
- Miss Barbara Kyle, Social Sciences Documentation, London.
- J. Mills, School of Librarianship, North Western Polytechnic, London.
- Miss Mary Piggott, University of London School of Librarianship and Archives.
- R. S. Schultz, Kodak Ltd., Harrow.
- B. C. Vickery, Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd., Welwyn, Herts.
- Leslie Wilson, ASLIB., London.
- R. C. Wright, Royal Aircraft Establishment, Farnborough.
Regrettably, Jacques Samain of Filmorex in Paris, K. Thalberg of the University of Oslo, and Norman T. Ball of the National Science Foundation, Washington, were unable, because of last-minute developments, to be present. We are, however, pleased to record that W. C. Berwick Sayers, the dean of classification theory in the United Kingdom, and, indeed, throughout the world, was present for the opening session of the conference.5

Most of the major papers were distributed to the participants well in advance of the conference, so that formal presentations might be held to a minimum and discussion could proceed with maximum efficiency. The proceedings of the conference will be published by ASLIB, and, indeed, may be in the hands of readers by the time this essay appears, so it is here desirable to record only the most important features of the program.

The conference opened on the afternoon of Monday, May 13th, with a welcoming address by Barbara Kyle, on behalf of the sponsoring organizations, FID, ASLIB, the University of London School of Librarianship and Archives, and the Classification Group; and B. C. Vickery, speaking for the organizing committee, explained the general plan of the conference. The main paper of the session, Library Classification as a Discipline, was presented by S. R. Ranganathan. The discussion which followed centered about the effect of social conditions upon classification, the scope of classification, the distinction between classification and "codification," and the "idea plane" and the "notational plane." The afternoon session was made particularly memorable by the introduction of Mr. W. C. Berwick Sayers who spoke with feeling on the rising importance of classification, and paid well-deserved tribute to the achievements of his brilliant pupil—S. R. Ranganathan. Unfortunately it was not possible for Mr. Sayers to remain for the entire conference, as his wisdom and wealth of experience would have greatly enriched the deliberations. The evening session, for which Dr. Mayer was the chairman, was devoted to the presentation of the paper, Pattern, Structure, and Conceptualization in Classification for Information Retrieval, by J. H. Shera. The discussion revealed the rather sharp conflict between those who believed classification to be "objective" thus making possible a "universal" scheme of classification, and those who considered it "subjective," thus denying the possibility of "universality."

Mr. Langridge presided over the session on Tuesday morning, at which Mr. Mills introduced his paper on The Classification of a Subject
Field. The discussion was focussed upon the problems of faceted classification, specifically the facets to be used in a particular field; the sequence of facets; and the arrangement of facets in a schedule. At the afternoon session (Mr. Wells, chairman) B. C. Vickery spoke on Relations Between Subject Fields—Problems of Constructing a General Classification. This resulted in a continuation of the discussion of facets begun in the morning session, emphasizing particularly the recurrence of the same, or similar, facets in more than one part of a general classification scheme, and the choice of basic classes. The multiple location of facets, the factors to be considered in the choice of basic classes, and the coalescence of subjects to form new fields, also received considerable attention. Late in the afternoon, at the request of some of the participants, Mr. Ranganathan presented a demonstration of the procedure in faceted analysis. The evening session, under the leadership of Mr. Vickery, was devoted to less formal presentations: Eugene Garfield spoke on citation indexes as used by the legal profession, showing the possibilities of applying this technique to scientific literature, and explaining the operations of Documation, Inc. Also, Helen Brownson spoke on current research in the United States on increasing the effectiveness of scientific information, with particular reference to the projects being sponsored by the National Science Foundation in this field, and Julian Smith introduced his paper on Language and Classification. Again discussion tended to center about the problems of special versus general classifications.

The Wednesday morning session (chaired by Dr. Groeneveld) featured Mr. Coats’ paper on Notation in Classification, which emphasized the desirable attributes and possible functions of notation. The discussion was devoted mainly to the problem of desirable attributes, and was notable for R. A. Fairthorne’s exposition of the contribution which information theory could make to the theory of notation. Late Wednesday afternoon Mr. Mills gave a demonstration of chain indexing before an informal “seminar.” Mr. Fairthorne presided at the evening session for which Norman Ball’s Conference Lecture had been scheduled. In Mr. Ball’s absence the paper was read by William A. Wildhack, who followed the presentation with an informal discussion of his own on the Peek-a-Boo system as used in the Department of Basic Instrumentation at the Bureau of Standards. The Conference Lecture, which was intended as a kind of “keynote” speech for the sessions, was basically an exposition of the importance of classification to all branches of scientific thought and a plea for greater attention to classification as a basic instrument for bibliographic organization. The session concluded with a presentation by M. Cordonnier, Classification Terminologique et Diffusion “Selecto” par les Centres Specialisés, in which he argued that subdivision of the universe of knowledge into three main classes, each of these into three subclasses, and so on until elementary “notions” were reached, would result in a system in which complex concepts could result from combinations of two or more such elements. Such a system could generate a standardized terminology and thus contribute to universal classification. With ref-
ference to Cordonnier's "Selecto" system, Fairthorne later pointed out that "aspect cards" had been used in medical diagnosis, to which Vickery added that this was practiced in Sumer nearly three thousand years ago, as evident from the survival of clay tablets, each referring to a single symptom and listing the diseases in which it was present—the "Units" of the ancient medicine men.

On Thursday morning J. E. L. Farradane (Eugene Garfield presiding) presented his paper on Classification and Mechanical Selection, in which he emphasized the relationship between the human mind and the machine and the importance of understanding the operations of the brain in constructing classifications. He rejected the traditional method of constructing classifications through the breaking down of assumed main classes, and urged that since human experience developed inductively, classes must be built up from elementary ideas. Inasmuch as a whole is more than the simple aggregate of its parts, it is necessary to include relational concepts among elementary ideas to bind the parts into a coherent and meaningful whole. The discussion was disappointing and never really came to grips with the speaker's central thesis. Any discussion of mechanical systems per se remained relatively general, and regrettably, the program did not allow for even one detailed presentation of a machine system.

The Thursday afternoon session, for which Mr. Foskett was the chairman, was devoted to ratifying the resolutions and recommendations of the conference as drafted by the organizing committee, in consultation with other conference participants, and presented by M. de Grolier. The Conference Conclusions and Recommendations are presented elsewhere in this report; here it is sufficient to say that the task of agreement was relatively easy, and that these twelve points, as they eventually emerged from the ratification session, represent relatively little compromise. This, in itself, is something of an achievement for a group so diverse in its attitudes toward and experience with classification.

The final session of the conference, Thursday evening, was devoted entirely to entertainment and relaxation. Bill Wildhack was made master of ceremonies—to "get revenge" for what Fairthorne "had done" to him on Wednesday evening, and Fairthorne himself delighted the assembly with an amazing demonstration of paper tearing and other forms of topological phenomena at which he is a real master. Reluctantly the conferees dispersed immediately after breakfast on Friday morning. The four days had passed all too quickly!

Such "free time" as was available was consumed by a variety of informal discussions, conferences, and "seminars," many of which, stimulated by much good drink, went on into the night. In England, even in mid-May, an open fire can be welcome, and the fireplace was a natural focus for much of this impromptu discourse. Wednesday afternoon, which was one of those late spring days when the English countryside surpasses even its customary glory, the conference recessed from its labors. Though we use the work "recessed" we strongly suspect that in the good
fellowship that characterized the little clusters of documentalists, as they forayed out into the surrounding woods, could be found the greatest single achievement of the conference. Trudging together along the highways, over rocky slopes, beneath spreading branches, and stopping for tea at a village pub, these are the experiences that engender understanding and give real meaning to a conference. These are the true values beside which all graphic records of proceedings, all volumes of official documentation, all published papers must pale. Yet, these must forever be the unexpressed intangibles of a travel requisition or an application for a grant-in-aid. This is mainly why one goes to professional meetings—what more important reason could there be—but it must never be admitted to a budget officer, or allowed to come under the watchful eye of an auditor.

Conclusions and Recommendations

At its final working session the conference voted approval of the following conclusions and recommendations, which, as stated in a preamble, were made "without prejudice to the requirements of the other uses of classification," and are submitted "from the point of view of information retrieval."

1. The scope of classification

Traditional classification has been concerned with the construction of hierarchies of terms—chains of classes and co-ordinated arrays. Modern information retrieval techniques also necessitate the combination of terms to express complex subjects. This conference takes the term 'classification' to include the problems raised by both these forms of relation. Some members use the term 'codification' for this field of study.

2. Schemes of classification

There is general agreement that the most helpful form of classification scheme for information retrieval is one which groups terms into well-defined categories, which can be used independently to form compounds, and within which the terms can be arranged in hierarchies where this conforms to the recognized structure of relations between them.

3. The need for research

There is no single agreed technique for the construction of such schemes. Facet analysis, relational analysis, codifying analysis, semantic analyses, synthetic terminology, linguistic analysis, and other relevant techniques should be further studied. There is a need for continued and organized research into the theory of classification.

4. The use of classification schemes

Classification schemes constructed on the above lines may be applied in all forms of literature search and information retrieval, ranging from manually manipulated, visually scanned card catalogues on the one hand, to the most highly developed machine systems on the other. Schemes can be adapted, by suitable coding, to very different retrieval systems. Close co-operation between those working on different retrieval systems is therefore valuable.

5. Differences between systems

Different retrieval systems using the same classification scheme differ only in the mechanisms by which search is effected, but this may lead to very
marked differences in efficiency. More tests as to the efficiency of various systems at various levels of contents analysis are needed.

6. The construction and application of schemes

In constructing schemes of classification and in applying them to a retrieval system the fullest consideration must be given to providing alternative approaches for different users. In particular, freedom to vary the manner of combining categories and to vary the arrangement of terms in a category in different contexts, must be provided, although a preferred arrangement may be desirable for some international purposes. The schemes must correspond as closely as possible to the needs of users and must be readily adaptable to the changing relationships of subjects in the literature.

7. Notation for such visually scanned systems as the card catalogue

For such visually scanned systems as the card catalogue, notation serves to arrange subjects in a sequence which is helpful to the users. It must therefore offer maximum hospitality, i.e., it must allow the interpolation of all new subjects in a helpful place, no matter what these subjects are or where they occur.

Secondly, notation for such systems must be acceptable to users. Some qualities which may be needed to ensure this are: simplicity, brevity, (spatial, graphic and/or phonetic), and pronounceability. Tests are needed on the relative importance of these qualities in different circumstances and the symbolism which best embodies them.

In order to allocate notation economically, statistical studies will be of value. The possibility of using, within each category, purely ordinal notation which does not reflect the hierarchy of subordinate and co-ordinate classes, appears to be of value and needs further study. The suggestion from workers in the field of information theory, that their mathematical approach could help in the design of notations, should be explored.

8. Machine systems

The conference is generally agreed that a great deal more information is needed about the use of machines in information retrieval. Guidance is required as to what types of retrieval system are best adapted to various searching situations in different documentation services. Can a single code for a machine system serve all three functions of placing documents, selecting documents relevant to a given subject, and analysing the information content of the same documents? What are the relative advantages and disadvantages for various types of mechanical selection, of the different types of code which may be available—e.g. (1) random coding, (2) “alphabetical” coding derived from a natural language, (3) systematic coding which expresses hierarchical structure where this is considered necessary? What is the value of special types of symbolism, such as self-demarcating code words or super-imposed coding in different situations? We suggest that attention be given to devising and using methods of answering such questions.

9. Research projects

Among the research projects which it would be desirable to conduct in the near future, the following may be cited:

1) elaboration of schedules of classification for the more general categories usable in many different fields of knowledge (logical, morphological, spatial, of properties, values, and materials, etc.);
2) clarification of the problem of relations between subjects, and of the nature of connecting symbols necessary for expressing them;
3) study of the different methods for coping with the increasing overlapping between areas of knowledge;
4) establishment of a unified systematic terminology in the field of classification theory itself.

10. A general scheme of classification

The need for a general encyclopedic or universal scheme of classification, based upon the principles enumerated above, is felt by a number of the conference. It is needed in general libraries and bibliographies, and in special libraries which have interests in many fields. It can aid the construction of special schemes. Reciprocally, it might best be built up by the integration of special schemes. If a new general scheme is to be made, its component parts must be constructed according to a common pattern.

11. The development of classification schemes

To aid the development of new schemes of classification, whether special or general, according to such a pattern, more detailed guides for their construction, based on the most recent advances of classification theory, are needed. In the construction of schedules for particular subject fields, the closest co-operation is required between those expert in classification technique and those expert in the subject. It is highly desirable that this should be done at international level.

12. The furtherance of research

In order to further all the aims already discussed, the closest contact must be developed between all who are working in classification theory and in allied fields. The following methods of achieving this suggest themselves:

a) Maintenance of personal contact between conference members, and making contact with other workers on classification and information retrieval, particularly those in countries not represented at the conference.

b) Maintaining and extending contact with workers in allied fields.

c) Exchange of draft schedules.

d) Setting up research groups in various population centres, as recommended by F.I.D.

e) Setting up "clearing houses" for papers and schedules in different countries.

f) Organising further conferences on classification and information retrieval in other countries.

g) Publishing papers in the journals of other countries than the authors' countries.

h) Co-ordination and systematization of the terminologies of subjects.

i) Contact with broadly based organizations which can support research.

j) Persuading schools of librarianship and documentation to pay more attention to modern developments in the field.

Evaluation

There is still insufficient perspective on the work of the conference to make possible a valid identification of its tangible results or assess the impact of its recommendations. As has been previously mentioned, the proceedings will soon be available in published form and hence will become a permanent part of the literature. This focusing of attention upon the importance of classification to the total problem of information retrieval was most urgently needed, particularly in the United States.
where the value of classification has never been fully realized. Both British and Continental librarians and documentalists are puzzled by the apparent neglect of classification on this side of the Atlantic, and this writer found himself quite incapable of explaining the criticism which his defense of classification has brought forth. If the conference does no more than arouse a serious interest in classification in the United States it will have made a contribution of lasting importance, and there is already some indication that this may be true. Through the leadership of Mrs. Phillis A. Richmond of the University of Rochester (N.Y.) Library, and with the assistance of others at Eastman Kodak and Western Reserve University, plans are being formulated for a classification society in America which will be similar to the Classification Group in London. Geographical dispersion greatly increases the magnitude of the problem—there are times when the English should rejoice in the limitations of their island—but if interest in classification is genuine the barrier of distance should not prove insurmountable. Certainly this incipient interest should not be allowed to languish as did the earlier Committee on the Organization of Information of the ADI, and it may well be that the robustness of the movement in England and on the Continent, as well as in Latin America, will promote developments here.

At least one tangible result of the conference seems to have emerged. The National Science Foundation has awarded a $10,000 grant to ASLIB for research into the comparative efficiency of various indexing and information retrieval systems. The two-year research program will be conducted at the College of Aeronautics, Cranfield, England, under the direction of Cyril W. Cleverdon, the librarian of the college. Mr. Cleverdon writes us that it is his intention to index 20,000 documents, in the subject field of aeronautics, by four different systems. Strict control will be kept over all phases of the work in ways that will make possible comparisons of the relative efficiency of each system under varying conditions of use. The four systems to be thus tested are: The Universal Decimal Classification, "a faceted classification that is being prepared by members of the Classification Research Group, a subject catalog, and a coordinate system of a nature which has not yet been precisely determined." The alphabetical subject catalog, he adds, will probably be based on that prepared a few years ago by the Special Libraries Association, but will be expanded and brought up-to-date. With reference to the coordinate system he says, "We have in mind something along the lines of Uniterm, but I am drawing on the experience of a number of users who have made adaptations of various kinds."

In our opinion, the conference was somewhat over-balanced in favor of the Ranganathanian theories of bibliographic classification. At least we felt this, even though we ourselves have long admired and respected the work of the great Indian philosopher. Conversely, the role of classification in mechanized literature searching was rather seriously neglected. Prejudice against mechanization was as evident at Dorking as disrespect for classification is prevalent here, but to accuse Americans of being
"gadget-happy" is no more realistic than to condemn Europeans for being "classification crazy." Viewed in retrospect, however, these relatively minor flaws are conspicuous mainly because of the high degree of excellence achieved by the program.

To summarize, in an editorial in the October 1957 issue of American Documentation, we attempted to epitomize what for us was the deeper meaning of the Dorking conference, and, because we believe we can say it no better, we hope we will be pardoned if we repeat ourselves here:

We have long admired the quiet unobtrusiveness of English hospitality and nowhere could it have been better displayed than at Beatrice Webb House, sedately elegant in the Surrey Countryside. It was one of those rare occasions when intellectual stimulation, companionship, and environment blended into as nearly a perfect whole as one is likely to find in this far from perfect world, and it is difficult for us to speak of it with restraint . . .

We are convinced that the Classification Group has made an important professional contribution in reaffirming the central position of classification in bibliographic organization, and we sincerely hope that the seeds which they have so effectively planted will bear rich fruit. We hope, too, not only that the precedent established at Dorking will be continued in the future, but also that American documentalists will follow the lead of their British cousins . . .

We cannot close this discussion, however, without expressing particular admiration for the ability of the group to dissent without being disagreeable . . . In the final analysis this may prove to be the great contribution of the conference. If international diplomacy could but be carried out in such an atmosphere of sympathetic understanding, this war-weary world would no longer live in dread of rising armaments and terror of The Bomb."

But whatever may be one's emotional reaction to the deliberation at Dorking, certainly the group set forth a commendably ambitious program, and if it is to be realized all of us must, as Bill Wildhack was quick to point out, observe the admonition of the Webbs and their fellow Fabians: "Pray Devoutly—Hammer Stoutly."
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INDEX OF TECHNICAL ARTICLES

A new indexing service has been announced. The Index of Technical Articles (published by Iota Services Ltd., 98 Farrington St., London) is a monthly index of articles published in British technical journals. The coverage includes scientific, industrial, technical and trade materials; and the arrangement is by subject, employing a modified version of UDC.
UPON reading and studying Mr. Lubetzky's masterly and revolutionary report concerning the rules of entry, the first question that came to mind was how and in what form could the principles presented by the author influence cataloging practices in Spanish America, and especially in Cuba. In the last few years our country has been increasingly influenced by the ALA rules; they are studied in our library schools and practiced in many of our libraries. It is, therefore, undeniable that any changes in practice or orientation of these rules will have great repercussions here.

In Mr. Lubetzky's report there were a number of precisely-defined sections, some of which were undoubtedly more controversial than others. For example, we did not believe that anyone would be opposed to re-arranging the rules in a more logical pattern, establishing rules according to general principles rather than for particular cases, or re-arranging separate rules that have identical purposes and identical treatments, etc. In these instances the author revealed great mental clarity and acute reasoning; surely every person who has ever struggled to learn or teach the vast accumulation of rules in the existing code agreed with the proposed modifications.

There are two sections of the cataloging code which affect us most directly as Spanish language librarians. These deal with the form of the individual author's name and with corporate authorship. However, before considering these sections we want to emphasize the need for a revision which will contribute to worldwide uniformity of cataloging practice, eliminating the principal obstacles to it, in particular eliminating the diversity and multiplicity of the rules of corporate entry and the distinction between societies and institutions.

It is doubtful that simplification of the existing labyrinth of rules, and the formulation of a set of general principles applicable to different instances, will be important factors in bringing about this worldwide uniformity. It is more likely that other trends, such as a return to the title page as the primary source of information concerning the form of the author's name, are closer to the actual practice of many European librarians. The interest shown by the ALA in learning the opinions of non-North American librarians on Mr. Lubetzky's report was another indication of the international emphasis of the proposed revision. Of course, this proposed rule was not to be confused with the idea of a single, inter-
national form of author entry (be it the form of name on the title page, or the form best known) as opposed to the vernacular (for proper names, titles of nobility, etc.) or to the Latin (for saints, popes, classic authors) or others, forms justified only in libraries of an international character or with a cosmopolitan public.

Although Mr. Lubetzky's report did not make specific reference to this, a systematic revision of the rules governing the form of the author's name ought to consider the peculiarities of Spanish surnames and the difficulties they present to the cataloger. One of the problems which actually causes much lost time, in cataloging as well as in searching in the catalog, is the establishing of the author's next-to-last name (maternal surname). Another problem is the multiplicity of proper names used by some Spanish authors. According to Lubetzky's recommendations, the form adopted should be that chosen by the author, that is, the form by which he is best known and under which he is searched most often. In the case of an author who uses only one surname, his maternal surname need not be established; the same would apply (except in cases of doubtful identity) to proper names (not surnames) additional to those ordinarily used by an author. These proposed rules would have, for example, prevented the name of a young Cuban writer who is known to the world as Surama Ferrer (a name impossible to confuse) from appearing on the LC card as (absurdly) Ferrer Deulofeu Augustina Surama de las Mercedes. [Translator's note: This is not typical of current LC practice]

We also expected that the proposed revision of the rules of entry would eliminate another vexing problem, that of the use of the conjunction "y" between surnames. There is no doubt that it is widely used and that it sometimes serves to differentiate between the maternal surname and the second part of a compound name. In actual practice, however, it represents nothing more than an added difficulty in alphabetical arrangement, and hence another obstacle to rapid use of the catalog by the reader. For example, it widely separates the surnames Garcia Fernandez and Garcia y Fernandez, although very often the user does not know whether or not the author for whom he is searching uses the conjunction.

At the very least we expected that the revision of the rules would take into account the difference between our multiple surnames (formed by paternal and maternal surnames) and genuine compound surnames, in order to avoid added confusion and difficulty.

If the rules are rearranged and simplified according to rules of logic, it is possible that the problem of surnames with prefixes in which the entry is determined by the nationality of the person will also be solved. All catalogers would appreciate a simplification of rule 99B [2d ed., pages 84-86] or at least a convincing explanation of the discrepancies.

The fundamental problem, however, on which Mr. Lubetzky's report focused, and the cause of major discussions and disagreements, was the form of entry for corporate authors.

In referring to the history of the development of author entry cataloging in United States libraries, Lubetzky came to the conclusion that the
actual difference in the form used for entering societies and institutions is derived from the original distinction between corporate authors with a definite or specific name (or having a particular attribute) and those having a non-distinctive or generic name. It happens that the majority of the institutions are in the second group.

Mr. Lubetzky's excellent reasoning with regard to distinctive (having particular attributes) individualistic, or specific names of corporate authors is applicable primarily to the English language. As for us, we can affirm without hesitancy that the vast majority of the names of our societies and institutions, even though distinctive per se, begin with a generic word: asociación, universidad, instituto, colegio, biblioteca, sociedad, etc., etc. The only exceptions are those societies which, due to snobbery or some other reason, have adopted anglicized names: Miramar Yacht Club, Havana Business University, Merici Academy.

All of the names which in English begin with distinctive words, such as proper names or geographic adjectives, in Spanish have, for grammatical reasons, the distinctive part of the name at the end; Universidad Marta Abreu, Museo Poey, Colegio Baldor, Sociedad Cubana de Ingenieros, Club Atenas, and so many more as to make this account endless. At the present time the primary reason for the difference in entry of societies and institutions does not apply to Spanish names. There remains, of course, the official reason stated in the rules, that institutions are more closely connected with place because of their building, equipment, etc., but it appears to us an "a posteriori" explanation or rationalization, designed to provide a more logical base for the distinction between the two types of corporate authors.

It is a source of satisfaction to Spanish American librarians that one of the first people to state the necessity for revising the rules concerning corporate authors and the lack of a logical base for the distinction between societies and institutions was the Argentinean, J. Federico Fino. He did so first at the Assembly of American Librarians, in Washington in 1947, and a short time later in his pamphlet, Encabezamientos de entes colectivos.

Fino's proposal, that of entering all corporate authors except the departments of state, province, municipality, etc., under the first word that is not an article, has been endorsed by the Instrucciones para la redacción del catálogo alfabético de autores y obras anónimas issued by the Junta Técnica de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos de Espana. This publication goes even farther, entering government publications under the first word of the official name of the government agency.

Even though we do not agree with this last policy, we believe that the elimination of the difference between societies and institutions and the entry of both under the first word of the official name that is not an article will serve to simplify greatly the existing chaos in the rules of corporate authorship. Thus, the reader who looks for publications of the Universidad de la Habana under the "U" and not under the "H", those of the Biblioteca Nacional under the "B" and not under Habana, and
the Metropolitan Museum of New York under the "M" and not under the name of the city, will be served.

The main objection to this idea is the accumulation of many cards under a few generic words: association, institute, library, university, and others. This accumulation would not be any worse or more difficult to organize than that now produced under the names of the cities. Indeed, under cities alphabetizing is even more complex because of the addition of official publications of the municipalities and their dependencies and subject cards for works dealing with various aspects of the city.

Another objection noted by Lubetzky in his report was that the English or North American reader tends to search for corporate authors under the name of the locality with which the corporate body is identified. This may be true in the English language which places identifying characteristics before the common name, even changing at times the legal and official title of the institution (for example, saying Illinois, University, even though the official name is University of Illinois); but it is never true in our countries, where the construction of the language itself always places the generic noun before the qualifying or determining characteristic.

To summarize, the elimination of the difference in dealing with societies and institutions, entering both under their legal name, or the name by which they are best known, conforms to the practice of the Hispanic reader. It is a great struggle for him to adapt to the inversion of terms necessary for finding an institution under the name of its location, when in his own language he finds the place name at the end. There might be exceptions, as the report seems to suggest, for those institutions with extremely nondistinctive generic names, which could be entered under place. We do not believe that it will be necessary to apply the exceptions to the names of Spanish institutions, even though the majority of them may begin, as we have already stated, with nondistinctive words.

A study of Mr. Lubetzky's report, at its end, invited an optimistic outlook. We Cuban librarians look forward to the emergence of a well reasoned and carefully planned project of rule reform that will govern author and title entries.

INDEX TO RELIGIOUS PERIODICAL LITERATURE

The American Theological Library Association is proceeding with plans to revive the Index to Religious Periodical Literature on a current basis beginning with the year 1957. This project is being assisted by a grant from the Seabury-Western Theological Seminary. Dr. Lucy W. Markley will serve as Editor with headquarters at Seabury-Western Theological Seminary. Dr. Markley has held various theological library positions and has also served as an indexer on the International Index. Present plans call for indexing approximately 50 periodicals (chiefly English, but including several foreign language titles) in the field of religious literature. Present plans presume an annual volume with a cumulation at the end of a three-year period. Further information may be secured from the Editor at Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois.
In this age of streamlining, why not also streamline cataloging? Especially does this seem necessary in the light of current staff shortages, which are most acute in cataloging. Perhaps some of the lack of interest in this particular library activity may be due to the survival of the old idea that cataloging is a dull, routine job, with even a bit of the dust of ages clinging to it. We feel sure that this is no longer true in many libraries; particularly is this not true in the Atlanta Public Library, whose Catalog department has received a complete face-lifting since 1949. We present this brief résumé because we feel that it has been an interesting reorganization and might help others faced with such a problem, and because we hope to interest prospective catalogers with an account of the operation of an up-to-date department.

Until 1949 the department procedure had been along traditional lines somewhat as follows: book ordering, while centrally administered, was done agency by agency, and all new titles were bought and cataloged for the main library first, branches ordering later. The department staff consisted of the Head Cataloger, five professional catalogers, and two clerical assistants. Of the five professional assistants only the First Assistant did anything resembling professional work. Although two professional assistants were assigned to children's books, their work was really clerical in nature: typing headings on Library of Congress cards; typing entire sets of cards if Library of Congress cards were not available; or just adding copies to the shelf-list. The classification and subject headings had been previously assigned by the First Assistant, who also revised this work. One professional assistant cataloged branch books, which were really only added copies. Titles new to the main library were cataloged by another professional assistant but only after the Head Cataloger had assigned classification and subject headings.

The Head Cataloger also classified and assigned subject headings for all new adult books and revised all adult cataloging. The First Assistant, in addition to classifying and assigning subject headings for all children's books, did all the adult main library added non-fiction, assisted the Head when necessary, ordered Library of Congress cards, and kept the department statistics. The two clerical assistants typed duplicate cards of those typed by the professional catalogers, to be used in various duplicate files.

The library maintained three catalogs, all dictionary in form. The official catalog was a union catalog of the system, housed in the Reference department. The Head Cataloger revised filing in this catalog, a clerical
assistant filing over the rod. There was also an open-shelf catalog of the main library adult circulation collection, housed in the Circulation department. The assistant who cataloged new-to-main-library titles filed directly into this catalog. The third catalog was the catalog of the main library juvenile collection, housed in the Children's department and filed by the staff of that department.

Statistics were kept in great detail. Withdrawal records were broken down into five or more categories; entering them meant that the shelf-list card was removed from the file, inserted in the typewriter, and marked by category. Do-not-replace shelf-list records were made, catalog cards pulled, and a file kept of obsolete shelf-list cards, all work done by professional catalogers.

The department staff gave time to the Reference, Circulation, Periodical and Children's departments amounting to about three hours per day per person. In addition each professional assistant, except the Head and First Assistant, was scheduled from two to four weeks of branch work during the vacation period. There were other small routines, such as typing a weekly list of new titles, usually assigned to a professional assistant. As might be expected, the Department had a large quantity of arrears both in books not cataloged and in withdrawal records, and there was little or no time for recataloging, reclassification, or special projects. There were 14 branch libraries and a bookmobile; in 1949, 98,434 books were added, 21,000 withdrawn; and as of December 31, 1949, there were 348,958 books in the system.

In the fall of 1949 changes began to take place. Among the first was in the ordering of books. All adult books, both main and branch, now arrive at the same time on a consolidated order. This enables us to develop our "multiple copy" procedure, which is the use of one "master copy" in cataloging routine. The use of Library of Congress cards was discontinued, the Department getting only Library of Congress proofsheets. A Multilith and a Varitype machine were added, and the unit card is now used for all purposes including analytics. Variations in type and spacing greatly improve the looks and readability of the card.

Changes were made gradually in the work of the department staff so that in 1957 each professional cataloger now performs professional duties. She catalogs and assigns classification and subject headings to material in one or more subject fields for which she is qualified by interest and background. She revises the work of another cataloger as well as that of various clerical assistants. Her subject assignment remains the same, but her revision assignment changes at intervals, to insure a broader point of view.

A master copy of each new title with the consolidated order card, a blue multilith card later filed in the catalog until the catalog card replaces it, and all cards and pockets for the entire number of copies ordered come to the proper cataloger. The consolidated order card has listed on its face all agencies in the system, and those ordering copies are indicated by checks and the number of copies ordered. All accession numbers are stamped on the back of this card. The cataloger types a copy slip, and this
is just what the name implies, exact copy for the unit catalog card. In addition it has on its face: an alphabetical notation over the tracing for the use of the typist later; the date of cataloging; cataloger's signature and number of cards to be run. All information which is not to appear on the unit card is typed in red or written in pencil. On both the back of the copy slip and the back of the order card the cataloger indicates beside the proper accession number the agency to which each copy goes. Any special notes for the typist or reviser, such as extra cards needed for special files, or stamping to show special location, are typed in red on the back of the copy slip. To the blue card, which is a duplicate of the part of the order card containing author's name, title, imprint and annotation, the cataloger adds the classification and date and makes any necessary correction in the author's name. The book, with the order card, copy slip, blue card, and cards and pockets, then goes to another cataloger for revision.

Is this more efficient than our 1949 procedure? Assume that main library and each branch get one copy of a new title. Today, one cataloger types one copy slip and in so doing accomplishes what in 1949 would have required two catalogers to handle fourteen separate copies fourteen separate times, type fourteen sets of cards at fourteen different times, and make fourteen separate card-by-card revisions. Furthermore, it has removed the revision load from the Head Cataloger and divided it among four catalogers, thus allowing the Head time for more urgent duties.

The book is revised, counted; the copy slip is sent to the varitypist; the blue card to the filing assistant for filing under author in the official catalog next morning; and the book, with order card clipped in the back, and cards and pockets in it, to the cards and pockets desk. The cards and pockets desk is merely one end of a long specially-built table, along which the books move for successive stages in their mechanical processing. Here the typist types all cards and pockets as well as labels for use under the mylar jacket. Then the additional copies are moved by truck from the shelves where they were put after accessioning to the cards and pockets desk. Here they are marked, using the master copy and the order card as a guide. The marking is revised by a clerical assistant, the order cards are sent to the Order department, and the books move on to the next stage in processing.

Consider the saving in time and energy. Instead of a succession of copies drifting through at different times and requiring individual handling, only one copy is handled between accessioning and pasting. No shifting from truck to truck, wasting motion and energy and monopolizing trucks. No marking by hand, instead typed labels are used for all books with jackets. Two sizes of labels are used depending on the width of the spine of the book.

New editions, which once were recorded by a time-consuming system of dashed-on entry and stamps now each receive new cards, picking up the old editions in a note. We pull the older cards as we file the new ones; thus the latest edition is always the prominent entry on the card. Also
this means a neater card because constant erasures and retyping make a rather dirty card; and it relegates into general routine one more activity that a professional cataloger would otherwise have to perform.

Children's books, formerly cataloged by two professional catalogers under the supervision of the First Assistant, are handled much more easily by one cataloger and a clerical assistant. Single copies of new children's titles are sent to the main library on approval, selected, and then cataloged by a cataloger as only part of her subject assignment. She proceeds much as for adult titles, with this difference: after the copy slip is made and ready to go to the varitypist, she checks it with the order file for the number of branch copies ordered and has cards for both main and branch run at the same time. Because of this, the bulk of children's books are added copies, yet can be processed under the multiple copy procedure as all branch copies come on a consolidated order. When they come, a clerical assistant adds them, they are revised, the books routed to pasting and the waiting catalog cards, banded to a slip containing the necessary information for typing the card sets, are sent to the typist.

There are of course some titles, chiefly adult, which main library alone gets. The procedure is the same as that noted in the preceding, except that when there are only one or two copies, they both come to the cataloger.

As for the multilithing, we varitype from the copy slip on a small mat which we print with non-reproducing blue ink lines on mat paper to our own measurements. After mats are proofread against the copy slip by a professional assistant, they go to the multilith room, and the copy slips are filed in alphabetical order in a drawer. After the cards are run, they too are kept in drawers but in no particular order. When the typist is ready to type headings, she pulls the copy slips to match the cards she has. She types the entries indicated on the copy slip by following the alphabetical notation made by the cataloger over the tracing on the copy slip and using a sample set of cards to which this notation refers. When this is done, the cards are left banded to the copy slip and again put in a drawer. A professional cataloger revises them, separating them into various categories by the use of a set of guide cards. From there they are distributed to various branches or filed, as the case requires. The final destination of the cancelled copy slips is the General Information desk where they are used to make a subject list of new titles added to the library.

From one copy slip, typed by one cataloger, a mat is typed requiring one proofreading by a cataloger; result—any number of cards for any number of copies of the same title. Can there be any greater contrast with our former method of typing card by card, which in turn required revision card by card? This job formerly took two typists. Now, in addition to typing headings on cards, the clerical assistants in the Department do other things, such as marking withdrawal records off the official shelf-list, pulling catalog cards, typing cards and pockets, sorting Library of Congress galleys, entering added fiction copies on the shelf-list; and other routine jobs.
Withdrawal records as well as statistics have been simplified. Instead of the five or more categories, there is now only the one ‘Withdrawn’. This is designated by a blue line drawn through the accession number on the shelf-list card without removing the card from the shelf-list drawer. If the copy is reinstated for any reason, Re (for reinstated) plus the last two digits of the year date is typed after the entry on the shelf-list. Book cards are still sent monthly to the Department by main library departments and the branches for the shelf-list records to be made, and a statistical record is made for the main library at that time. Branch statistics formerly were sent in monthly with the cards, and the Department kept them by the month. With five or more categories for both the adult and juvenile collections for fourteen branches and main library, this system piled up a multiplicity of small white statistics slips each month. Now the branches themselves keep them under the one designation ‘Withdrawn’ and send them in as a consolidated statistical report once a year. The marking of the shelf-list for withdrawal records, Do-not-replace shelf-list records, and the withdrawal of catalog cards is now done by clerical assistants with professional supervision. No file of obsolete shelf-lists is kept.

As all the public service departments except the Fine Arts department are on the first floor, the library maintains one centrally-located, official catalog which is a union catalog of the entire system. The cards are filed over the rod by a clerical assistant, and filing is revised by a cataloger. In addition, there is a catalog of the main library children’s collection which is filed by a member of that department. The Fine Arts department, on the second floor of the library, has four small catalogs, one each for books, records, prints, and films. The book and record catalogs are filed by a cataloger directly into the file.

In addition to Catalog department duties, all members of the Department give some time to public service in the main library; none is given to the branches. This probably would average not more than one hour per day per person. Personal abilities and interests are considered in determining where in the library this service will be given. The Department staff members like this very much and feel that it helps them to understand what the public wants in a catalog.

The Department has no arrears nor has it had any for some years. In addition to keeping the current work moving, many other things have been done. The entire Fine Arts record collection has been recataloged; new branches added; a card file of cataloging rules and department procedure has been made; manuals for various routines have been formulated; the official name and subject files checked with the official catalog; several small collections transferred from one agency to another; catalog cards for items in the U. S. government depository collections pulled from the catalog—to mention a few.

We are always on the alert to find more efficient ways of handling our procedure, such as the reproducing of cards and pockets. We would like a mechanical method that would be quicker and have a smaller element of error than our present method of typing, but we have found none that
adequately fulfills our needs. We try always to adapt the physical arrangement of the work area, and to use book trucks and shelves to keep the work flowing in the most efficient way.

There are now in the system seventeen branches and a bookmobile. In 1956, 43,889 books were added, 21,932 withdrawn; 2,531 phonograph records were added; and as of December 31, 1956, the library had 492,007 books and 4,639 phonograph records in the system. The staff of the Department at present is four and one-half professional assistants, including the Head Cataloger, and three clerical assistants. That is one and one-half professional assistants fewer than the 1949 staff and one clerical assistant more than the 1949 staff. However, we carry the work of the Department more efficiently and much more easily and not only keep the current work moving, but have expanded our activities considerably. So streamlining cataloging is a practice we can urge with the enthusiasm of successful experience.

The Classified Catalog

WE HAVE received some correspondence concerning Andrew Osborn's review of *The Classified Catalog*, by Jesse H. Shera and Margaret E. Egan which appeared in the Spring 1957 issue of this magazine. Although not widely used in this country, the classified catalog obviously has some vehement defenders. Unfortunately, we do not have enough space to permit a full airing of opinion on the subject; however, it seems only fair to publish the following comments on Dr. Osborn's review.

From L. E. Palmieri, Librarian, Chicago Teachers College, North Campus:

Without declaring myself in the classified-dictionary dispute, I should like to make comment on what I believe are errors in the Osborn review. First let us turn to that section of the review entitled “Not an American Form.” We read, “This review would evade its responsibility if it did not emphasize the fact that the classified catalog has been and should (italics mine) remain a thing apart from the main stream of American library economy.” Now, although the classified catalog has been apart from the main stream of American library economy, I find it difficult to give an interpretation to “should” in this sentence. Discounting, as irrelevant, a moral interpretation, he would seem to mean at least that in terms of the broad criteria of efficiency of retrieval in a subject approach and of ease in coming to know the given library's holdings in a chosen subject field, that the classified catalog has no place, being clearly the inferior. Such, however, is a summary conclusion presented without citing evidence. The claim is especially surprising when we discover that Osborn charges Shera and Egan with failing to hide *their* own preference when they compare the two types of catalogs.
While on this matter, we continue to read,

The authors are reading more into the picture than is right and proper when they maintain that “There has been a renewal of interest in the classified catalog and a new burgeoning of enthusiasm for experimentation with new approaches to classification itself.” (p. ix) Quite definitely the classified catalog does not belong in a general library in this country; in the one case in which it may be found, namely Boston University, I advised strongly against its inception and would advise against its continuance.

First, supposing the very sequence of sentences to be taken as indicative of argument, if not attempted proof, then Osborn would gainsay the authors’ claim that there is a new interest in the classified catalog and in classification by reiterating that the classified catalog does not belong in this country. Restricting himself to a general library makes the claim of Osborn no less irrelevant.

Now for specific objections which Osborn raises to buttress the view that the classified catalog is inferior. He would have it that we judge the two catalog types, in the U. S. at least, on “maximum of self-service on the part of the reader,” and that any catalog is a barrier, but (1) that the classified catalog with its index is a double barrier, and, (2) that save in such fields as those served by the Engineering Societies Library where the interest is likely to be well defined and very specific, the scholar’s subject interest is usually not specific. In short reply may I say that it does not follow that because a catalog is a felt nuisance that an index and a catalog would be a greater felt nuisance. If we find it to be a fact that patrons do not like one sort of catalog, we would have to discover as an independent fact that they did not like both an index and another sort of catalog. And we could only discover this by a study, a study which to be clearly relevant makes use of reports of persons confronted with a dictionary catalog and persons confronted with a classified catalog and its index. We might find that the character of the latter produces less frustration. I only suggest the possibility; Osborn seems already convinced, but the other way.

In reply to objection 2 above, I point out that though we might admit that greater specificity is obtained in the classified catalog, this supposed fact does not bar efficient use by persons whose interest is not, by scholarly standards, specifically defined. It is far from obvious that the dictionary catalog bears a distinct advantage for the person who would cut across disciplines, especially if the dictionary catalog makes real use of the principle of specific entry, thus forcing interdisciplinary scholars to follow a maze of “see” and “see also” references. It is for Osborn to make his case at this point.

It goes without saying that my criticism of the review should not be taken as blanket defense of The Classified Catalog, nor of the type of catalog which that book is about. But I did find Osborn writing as though from certain self-evident generalizations, and I find these very generalizations to be doubtful if not clearly false.
From the authors (Shera and Egan):

... Inasmuch as a number of people have indicated to us a highly critical attitude toward Osborn's review, we have decided that it might be wise to reverse our earlier decision not to reply to Osborn. This letter, therefore, which may be published if you so desire, will set forth the reasons for our original decision and the main points which have been raised in our discussions with other people concerning the review.

When we first read Osborn's review it occurred to us that he had violated the first principle of book reviewing in ignoring the author's stated purposes and, in fact, the mandate under which we undertook the preparation of the volume. Osborn seemed to have written notes about a book which he would like to have seen written, or perhaps would like to have written himself, rather than explicit comments upon the book which we wrote. For this reason, it seemed futile to us to answer Osborn's criticisms in detail.

As was indicated in Henkle's preface, we were not writing a general book on the history and development of the classified catalog but were rather attempting to impart the intellectual skills necessary for effective planning and performance in the field of classification and cataloging, with special application to the classified catalog. We might further point out that our mandate, under contract, did not give us the freedom to choose between the classified and the dictionary catalog, but we did attempt to point out the characteristics of each, and the circumstances under which each would be most appropriate.

Osborn's assumption that we reached the conclusion that a classified catalog is preferable under all circumstances is certainly not justified. We believe that the form of the catalog is a matter to be decided in the light of particular needs, whereas Osborn seems to be thinking entirely within the traditional framework of attempting to standardize practice throughout the country.

Palmieri seems to be most incensed over the passages relating to the use, or lack of use, of the classified catalog in a general library. As a matter of fact, this passage in Osborn's review is completely irrelevant inasmuch as we have never recommended a classified catalog for the small general library. As to Boston University's selection of the classified catalog, we consider that a matter for administrative decision at Boston University. This may prove to be a most interesting experiment with the use of the classified catalog in a general library but it is still too early to reach a final decision. Osborn's own disapproval of the classified catalog at Boston University rests between him and the administration of that library and is not relevant in any way to the book which we prepared.

Again, Palmieri quite properly points out that Osborn has advanced nothing but his own opinion concerning the merits of the classified catalog and the dictionary catalog and that we did detail the advantages and disadvantages of each type...
Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee: Annual Reports, 1956* and 1957

August 1955—July 1956

This is the first report of the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee since its reconstitution as a joint committee of the Lake Placid Club Education Foundation and of the American Library Association (which has designated its Division of Cataloging and Classification to act on its behalf in all matters relating to the Committee). The work of the Committee during the year August 1955—July 1956 can be presented under the following heads:

1. Reconstitution of the Committee.

Prior to 1957 the Committee had existed as a committee of trustees of the Lake Placid Club Education Foundation. In 1957, as the result of recommendations made by an American Library Association special Committee on Cooperation with the Lake Placid Club Education Foundation, it was reconstituted as the Decimal Classification Committee, reporting to the Foundation, but with the chairman (Dr. Milton J. Ferguson) and three others of the seven members appointed on the nomination of the Executive Board of ALA.

Following the publication of the DC Edition 15, at the suggestion of Dr. Godfrey Dewey, the ALA Division of Cataloging and Classification established its Special Advisory Committee on the Decimal Classification. This was staffed in the Fall of 1952, and shortly thereafter Dr. Dewey secured authorization from the Foundation to permit the chairman of the Special Advisory Committee to sit ex officio with the Decimal Classification Committee, and this was renamed, for purposes of distinction and clarification, the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee.

A still further step in the development of the Committee took place when, on September 8, 1953, the Executive Committee of the Foundation voted to permit the Committee to elect its own chairman, and to be guided in future appointments to the Committee by the recommendations of the Executive Board of the DCC to an extent that would give DCC not less than four of the eight members of the Committee.

On June 20, 1955 the Executive Secretary of ALA wrote to the President of Forest Press, Inc., suggesting that the Committee be reconstituted.
as a joint committee of ALA and the Foundation, reporting to both organizations, with a membership whose nominations would be equally divided between the two organizations but whose appointment would be approved by both. DCC would represent ALA in making such nominations, but, in recognition of the importance of DC to the library world at large, would not necessarily limit its nominations to its own members.

As a result, the Trustees of the Foundation on September 5, 1955 and the Executive Board of ALA at its meeting of November 11-12, 1955, approved the reconstitution of the Committee as a joint Committee, reporting equally to ALA, the Foundation, and “the library profession generally.” The Committee is to have nine members; six are appointive, one being designated each year for a six-year term with nominations alternating between the ALA (odd years) and the Foundation (even years); and three being continuing members, representing Forest Press, Inc., the DCC Special Advisory Committee on the DC (as long as there is such a committee), and the Library of Congress (as long as LC maintains its concern with DC). ALA has delegated its nominating authority to DCC and has designated that division to act for the Association in all matters relating to the work of the Joint Committee.

The membership of the Committee as thus reconstituted is as follows:

Appointive members:  Term ending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harriet D. MacPherson</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard O. Pautzsch</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont Rider</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn M. Hensel</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bertha Frick</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Borden</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Appointed to fill the unexpired term of Dr. Dewey, who is now a continuing member.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lela de Otte Surrey</td>
<td>1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Appointed to fill the unexpired term of Lela de Otte Surrey, resigned effective October 6, 1955.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continuing members:

- Verner W. Clapp, Library of Congress
- Godfrey Dewey, Forest Press, Inc.
- Janet S. Dickson, DCC Special Advisory Committee on the DC.

At the 38th meeting, December 6-7, 1955 (which was the first meeting of the Committee after its reconstitution), the chairman submitted his resignation and called for a new election. Mr. Clapp was elected, without term. The Committee at that time agreed that the terms of office of appointive members should run to the last day of the last calendar year for which they are appointed, or until their successors are elected and qualify. The Committee also agreed to consider at its next meeting rules for its procedure, including terms of office for its officers.
Mr. Deo Colburn has continued to serve as the Secretary of the Committee, and expenses of the Committee's meetings have been defrayed by Forest Press, Inc.

On December 15, 1955 the Chairman circulated a report entitled "Reconstitution of the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee; Note by the Chairman" (5p., multilithed), and this was published in Library Journal 81:155-158, Jan. 15, 1956 (though under the misleading title "DCC Editorial Policy Committee"), and later republished in the Journal of Cataloging and Classification 12:89-91, April 1956.

2. Meetings.

The Committee held its 37th and 38th meetings during the period—on October 6-7, 1955 and December 6-7, 1955, both times at the Library of Congress. Except for Miss Borden’s absence at the 38th meeting, attendance at both meetings was complete. At both meetings the Committee was assisted by the presence of the Editor and other members of the Editorial Office, and of Mr. John W. Cronin, Director, Processing Department, Library of Congress. Miss Julia C. Pressey and Miss Elvakrogh of the DC Section, Subject Cataloging Division, Library of Congress, attended the 37th meeting.


The business of the Committee has been concerned especially with the following:

a. Review of papers issued by the Editorial Office. The Editorial Office attempts to keep the Committee fully and currently informed of its work. It sends directly to each member, among other papers, its Monthly Report, the Critical Analyses prepared for each of the schedules by the Decimal Classification Section of the Subject Cataloging Division of the Library of Congress, and the Preliminary Schedules for Edition 16. Members of the Committee are encouraged to submit advice and comment directly to the Editor on any and all matters reflected in these papers, or to bring to the attention of the Chairman any policy questions meriting discussion.

b. Decisions on editorial policy. Matters on which decisions have been taken include the following:
   - Restatements of the criteria for Edition 16, including new specifications for fullness, specific limitations on amount of permissible relocation, and specifications for determining priorities among proposed relocations.
   - Adoption of alternative schedules for 546 and 547.
   - Form and location of comparative tables.

Matters which are still under consideration include the following: the question of an alternative schedule for 582-9; extent of relocation of the 900's; organization of 974-979's; format; and location of books on materials of construction and structural elements.

A statement of "Criteria and General Procedures for Decimal Classification, Edition 16" was adopted at a joint meeting of the Committee with the Executive Board of DCC, the directors of Forest Press, Inc., and representatives of the Library of Congress, at its 34th meeting, November 13, 1953. This statement (published in Cataloging Service 32:4-6, February 1954, and in the Journal of Cataloging and Classification 10:92-98, April 1954) formed the basis upon which the editorial work, assumed by the Library of Congress on January 4, 1954, was to proceed.

By the end of 1954 the Editorial Office had issued enough Preliminary Schedules for Edition 16 so that the character of the work had become apparent. It was obvious that the number of relocations from previous editions was considerable, and this was the principal subject of discussions of the DC at meetings sponsored by the DCC Special Advisory Committee at the ALA Midwinter Meeting, 1955. At its 36th Meeting, January 27-28, 1955, the Committee attempted to prevent excessive relocation by requiring comparative tables which would show, for each Preliminary Schedule issued, all topics relocated from previous editions, and it has been decided that such comparative tables will be reproduced in Edition 16, providing a convenient concordance between Editions 14, 15 and 16.

The comparative tables issued as a result of this decision with Preliminary Schedules in the ensuing months demonstrated the extent of relocation proposed for Edition 16, and this was the subject of a workshop sponsored by the DCC Special Advisory Committee at the ALA Annual Conference in Philadelphia in July, 1955 (the papers for which were distributed to the members of the Committee in August 1955 and were later published in the Journal of Cataloging and Classification 12:23-46, January 1956).

The amount of relocation proposed for Edition 16 was thus giving concern both to the Committee and to the DCC Special Advisory Committee on the DC, but the Editor, in a paper presented to the Committee at its meeting (later published in revised form in College and Research Libraries 16:370-374, October 1955) defended change as necessary to preserve the utility of the DC.

At its 37th Meeting, October 6-7, 1955, the Committee had in hand a report indicating, on the basis of the comparative tables to that date, that relocations in Edition 16 might rise to a total far exceeding the number (approximately 1000) in Edition 15. The Committee attempted to find a formula for limiting this number, but compromised by suggesting to the Editorial Office that it categorize suggested relocations in a series of priorities in order to facilitate a selection of the most important. At the same time it amended the Criteria so as to make it clear that Edition 16 was intended for libraries of whatever size (Edition 15 had been aimed at libraries of 200,000 volumes and less), and it provided a criterion for "fullness" of schedules.

By the Committee's 38th Meeting, December 6-7, 1955, it was apparent that a quantitative specification was required for the number of permissi-
ble relocations in Edition 16. The Committee, consequently, adopted a "Restatement" of the Criteria (drafted by John W. Cronin of the Library of Congress) which among other things (a) requires that Edition 16 shall follow "closely" (instead of "fairly closely") the line established through the first 14 editions; (b) provides criteria for evaluating proposed relocations; and (c) limits the permissible relocations in Edition 16 to a total of 500, exclusive of relocations between Editions 14 and 15 and relocations in preferred (alternative) schedules. This "Restatement" was published in Cataloging Service 32:1-6, December 1955, and in the Journal of Cataloging and Classification 12:91-97, April 1956.


In January 1956 the Editorial Office commenced the reissue, incorporating the decisions of the "Restatement," of Preliminary Schedules previously issued. By July 31, 1956, Preliminary Schedules for some twenty sections or portions of sections have been issued. Meanwhile, to assist in the understanding of these Preliminary Schedules, arrangements have been made to distribute to members of the Committee (as well as to the members of the DCC Special Advisory Committee on the DC) Comments on the Preliminary Schedules prepared by the DC Section, Subject Cataloging Division, Library of Congress, under the direction of Miss Julia C. Pressey. Commencing in January 1956, these have kept pace with the issue of the Preliminary Schedules (Revised Criteria).

The adoption of the "Restatement," necessitating a revision of the Preliminary Schedules issued up to that time, required a corresponding revision of the Editorial Office's work-schedule. A revised work-schedule was issued in January 1956, and was again revised on June 1, 1956, in each case contemplating the completion of the Preliminary Schedules by December 1, 1956, leaving the entire calendar year 1957 to the work of final revision of schedules, compilation of index, tables and ancillary matter, so as to be able to meet the December 31, 1957 deadline for submission of printer's copy.

6. Replacement of Editor.

Following the adoption of the "Restatement," Mr. Haykin indicated his desire to be relieved of what had been contemplated as a half-time assignment but which had in fact (as indicated in last year's report) become whole-time, in order to return to his regular duties as the Library of Congress' Specialist in Subject Cataloging and Classification. Accordingly, on July 19, 1956, the Library announced that Mr. Benjamin A. Custer, at present Director of Processing at the Detroit Public Library, will succeed Mr. Haykin on September 4, 1956. Mr. Haykin will continue, however, to be available for advice and consultation in connection with the preparation of Edition 16.

The Associate Editor, Mrs. Eleanor B. Hungerford, who had been a member of the Editorial Office staff since 1947, and who served as Director of the Office from 1950 to 1954, resigned effective July 31, 1956 for
reasons of health. In her the Office loses not only very valuable experience in the problems of DC, but specifically the only member of the staff who participated in the preparation of Edition 15 and in the events linking that edition with the present work on Edition 16.

7. Spanish Edition of DC.

This was published on December 5, 1955. The Committee was represented at the reception at the Pan American Union on that date at which the publication was signalized, and has, through individual members, made suggestions from time to time for promoting its distribution, but has not otherwise been involved further than as previously reported. The Committee has taken satisfaction, however, in the fact that the Melvil Dewey Medal of the American Library Association was awarded, for the year 1956, to Miss Nora Albanell MacColl, the translator of the work.


The arrangement under which Edition 16 is being prepared is a cooperative one: Forest Press, Inc. provides on a budgeted basis such funds as are available to it for the purpose, while the Library of Congress contributes space, general administrative direction and certain other costs.
—Verner W. Clapp, Chairman.

August 1, 1956

**********

August 1956—June 1957

This is the second report of the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee since its reconstitution as a joint committee of the Lake Placid Education Foundation and the American Library Association.

The most important event of the Committee’s year was the resignation of its stimulating and beloved chairman, Verner W. Clapp, which followed his retirement from the Library of Congress, where he held the position of Chief Assistant Librarian, to become President of the newly created foundation, the Council on Library Resources, Inc. Since 1951, Mr. Clapp had been a member of the Lake Placid Club Education Foundation’s Decimal Classification Committee which preceded the DCEPC as an advisory committee appointed by and responsible to the Foundation alone. He was the first elected chairman of that committee, assuming this responsibility in November 1953. When the committee was reconstituted as a joint committee in 1955, Mr. Clapp was elected its first chairman.

Mr. Clapp’s interest in the Decimal Classification was demonstrated not only in the fact that he was influential in working out the arrangements for the Library of Congress to assume responsibility for editing the sixteenth edition, but even more clearly by his personal research and writing in regard to the classification and its progenitor, Melvil Dewey. Immediately after his election in 1955, Mr. Clapp prepared a statement on the “Reconstitution of the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy
The Librarian of Congress appointed Miss Lucile M. Morsch to replace Mr. Clapp as the LC representative on the committee and at the October meeting she was elected interim chairman. There were no other changes on the committee; Dr. Harriet D. MacPherson whose term expired in 1956 was reappointed upon the nomination of the Lake Placid Club Education Foundation.

The business of the committee during this year was done primarily in two meetings, in October and April. These were the second and third meetings of the Joint Committee.

Meeting, October 1956. At the first of these, held on Oct. 18-19 in the Library of Congress under the chairmanship of Mr. Clapp, the Committee adopted a set of Regulations for the Conduct of Committee Business. These regulations cover the sponsorship, function, membership, reporting, officers, elections, meetings (providing for a meeting in October and such other meetings as may be necessary), quorums, proxies, financing, relations with the editorial office, reports, etc. They provide that terms of members shall be for six years, terminating on September 30 of the last year, and that the reporting year of the Committee shall commence on July 1. (This explains why this report covers only August through June.)

Resolutions showing appreciation of the services of David J. Haykin and Mrs. Eleanor Hungerford who had resigned from the positions of editor and assistant editor, respectively, were adopted, and the Committee heard reports from their successors, Benjamin A. Custer and Julia C. Pressey, on the status of work on Edition 16 and the program through 1958. It was anticipated that the editorial work on this edition could be completed in December 1957 making it possible to publish Edition 16 in 1958. Before the end of the meeting, however, it was agreed that the time for editorial work should be extended three months; publication would still follow in 1958.
Consideration was given to the adherence in preliminary schedules distributed during the year to the criteria for Edition 16 as restated by the Committee in December 1955, to problems of fullness and size of Edition 16 (including the amount of "front matter" to be included, the inclusion or omission of comparative tables showing the relation of numbers in Edition 16 to those in Editions 14 and 15, the fullness of the index, etc.), the use of consultants in the revision of schedules, and the desirability of providing alternative schedules in certain classes. The Committee was informed about the financial arrangements between the Forest Press and the Library of Congress although the Committee has no responsibility in this area.

In considering the comparative tables mentioned above, the Committee agreed, unanimously, that the text of the schedules should include obsolete numbers from Editions 14 and 15, regardless of whether the comparative tables were included or omitted, because only the explanations in the text could show clearly what had happened when subjects were relocated. The possibilities of publishing the comparative tables in a separate pamphlet and of dropping them completely were discussed and left for later decision after the Special Advisory Committee on the Decimal Classification had had an opportunity to study the matter. (The Special Advisory Committee, Janet Dickson, chairman, is the committee established by the American Library Association at the request of Forest Press, to bring to the attention of the Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee consumer opinion from librarians representing more types of libraries and geographic spread than can be represented on the DCEPC. The chairman of the Special Advisory Committee is ex-officio a member of the DCEPC. In the ALA, responsibility for this activity has been assigned to the Cataloging and Classification Section of the Resources and Technical Services Division.)

Meeting, April 1957. The second meeting of the year was held on April 26 at the Library of Congress to reconsider the decision made at the previous meeting that the schedules in Edition 16 should represent a comparative text by including the numbers from Editions 14 and 15 which had been relocated in Edition 16. The reconsideration had been requested by the Chairman of the Special Advisory Committee on the Decimal Classification after further study of preliminary schedules by the members of that committee. Whether comparative tables would suffice to explain the relocations and the schedules themselves could be simplified by omitting the obsolete numbers was the question under consideration. After full discussion and the study of numerous exhibits which had been prepared by the Editorial Office, it was voted to sustain the earlier decision. It had been demonstrated that the full information could be included in the schedules without confusion to the user who had not been using one of the earlier editions and that thus giving the information would require fewer additions to be inserted by those who wished to continue to use numbers from previous editions. It would also explain, in the
simplest manner, the meaning of obsolete numbers appearing on cards printed by the Library of Congress prior to the publication of Edition 16.

Further consideration of the comparative tables, their probable use and necessary complexity, led the Committee to agree that they should not be included in Edition 16. This decision was made without prejudice to possible reconsideration of their compilation after Edition 16 is published if the need at that time seems to warrant publication.

Samples of proposed formats were submitted to the Committee for advice although it was agreed that the final decision on this matter is the privilege and responsibility of Forest Press.

The DCEPC was indebted again this year to the extensive work that was contributed by the Special Advisory Committee and particularly to that of its chairman.—Lucile M. Morsch, Chairman.

July 31, 1957

Basic Cataloging Tools: Medical and Dental Supplement

This selective list, to be used in conjunction with the list of Basic General Cataloging Tools (Journal of Cataloging and Classification, 11:153-155) was compiled by Winifred A. Johnson, Head of the Cataloging Section of the National Library of Medicine, with some suggestions and advice from catalogers at her own library; also at the University of Maryland Library of Medicine, Dentistry and Pharmacy; the University of Wisconsin Medical School Library; the Yale Medical Library; and the University of Michigan Library.

Group A. Primary Tools

1. Classification Schemes


2. Subject Heading Lists

Quarterly Cumulative Index Medicus. Subject Headings and Cross References. 2d ed. Chicago, American Medical Association, 1940. 431p.

Group B. Interpretative Aids


Group C. Subsidiary Tools

Current List of Medical Literature. Washington, National Library of Medicine, 1941—to date.
Cyclopedia of Medicine, Surgery, Specialties. George M. Piersol, ed. 3d ed. Philadelphia, Davis, 1950—to date. 14v. and Index.
Excerpta Medica, the International Medical Abstracting Service. Amsterdam. 1947—to date.
Index to Dental Literature in the English Language. 1839—to date. Chicago, 1921—to date.


Quarterly Cumulative Index Medicus. Chicago, American Medical Association, 1916—to date.


——— *An Introduction to the History of Dentistry*. St. Louis, Mosby, 1948. 2v.

Group D. Background Materials


Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials: A Report on its Program

In January, 1957, the Rockefeller Foundation made a grant to the Library of Congress to permit the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials to develop a permanent program for serial control. The Committee recognized that it must take steps to provide comprehensive and up-to-date union list records to supersede the earlier non-comprehensive, non-current publications and that the program must be permanent and self-sustaining so that the work will not have to be repeated each time a new edition is projected, as it has in the past.

The Joint Committee was fortunate in securing Wyllis Wright, Librarian of Williams College and former Chairman of the Joint Committee, to study the problem and make recommendations. Mr. Wright spent three months at the Library of Congress and presented a very comprehensive and well-organized report to the Joint Committee, which was discussed thoroughly at a two-day meeting at the Library of Congress in May.

At that time the Committee agreed on the following program, for which it is now seeking foundation support:

1. A Union Catalog of Serials, as inclusive as possible, should be established at the Library of Congress. It should give as complete and exact
bibliographical information as is available and should be set up in such a way that alphabetical lists, subject lists, lists by country of origin, and regional union lists can be issued as desired.

2. Third and later editions of the Union List of Serials should be issued, which would be as inclusive as New Serial Titles. The basic listing would be supplemented by special volumes to provide for types of material which require special arrangement, e.g., newspapers.

3. Approximately the same number of libraries as were in the second edition will be invited to participate.

4. The method of reporting holdings will be varied, probably including a checking edition, report forms, microfilm, or any combination of these.

5. Cooperating libraries should be subsidized at an agreed-on rate for the titles they report, and they will be expected to continue to report serial holdings to the Union Catalog of Serials.

6. These reports will be published in New Serial Titles, which will become a continuing supplement to the Union List of Serials.

7. A special subsidy will be sought for reprinting the second edition of the Union List of Serials, with information from the two supplements included, to serve until the third edition appears eight to ten years hence.

8. Revised editions of the Union List should be issued about every twenty-five years, with five-year supplements to keep the information up-to-date.

9. During the preparation of the third edition an intensive drive should be made to consolidate incomplete files by exchange of material among libraries. A special subsidy will be sought for this purpose.

10. The Joint Committee will incorporate itself.

The total amount which is being sought from foundations for this inclusive program is $2,679,222. This seems a large amount, but the Committee feels that it must plan for a complete listing of all serials of any importance and that it is better to ask libraries to check their records only once for everything rather than to check several times for different types of serials. Mr. Wright estimated that the Union Catalog of Serials will probably contain more than 500,000 titles. Not all of these will be included in the printed Union List, but the records will be available in the Union Catalog of Serials at the Library of Congress.

The report, entitled A Permanent Program for the Union List of Serials, has been reproduced and mailed to all libraries subscribing to or reporting to New Serial Titles and to a number of other libraries and librarians. The Committee hopes it will be widely read and discussed.—F. Bernice Field, ALA Representative, Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials
HENRIETTA HOWELL, former chairman of the Council of Regional Groups of the Division of Cataloging and Classification, died on November 1, 1957 after an illness of seven weeks. At the time of her death she was head of the Catalog Department of the University of Cincinnati Library.

Miss Howell was born in Mount Sterling, Kentucky on March 31, 1907. She graduated from the University of Kentucky in 1929, taking a B.S. in Library Science in 1930 and an M.A. in 1937, both at the University of Illinois. Her professional career began as assistant cataloger at the University of Tennessee in 1930. In 1935 she returned to the University of Illinois for graduate work and after receiving her M.A. in 1937, became head cataloger at the Florida State University Library. From 1943 to 1946 she served as senior cataloger and reviser in the Library of Congress. From 1946 until the time of her death she was in charge of the catalog Department at the University of Cincinnati Library.

In her work at the University of Cincinnati she saw to completion the reclassification and recataloging of the entire library of nearly 700,000 volumes from Dewey to L.C. She was a teacher and leader to her staff who respected her careful decisions and reasoned explanations of classification and subject heading policy. The devotion of her entire staff resulted from this enlightened leadership and from her friendship for each one of them.

Miss Howell was a member of the American Library Association, the Cataloging and Classification Section of the Resources and Technical Services Division, the Ohio Regional Catalogers Group, and Beta Phi Mu. In 1952 she was president of the Ohio Valley Regional Catalogers Group and was chairman of the DCC Council of Regional Groups from 1954 to 1957. She was an advisory editor of the Journal of Cataloging & Classification and Library Resources & Technical Services.

Miss Howell made a definite contribution to the profession as chairman of the DCC Council of Regional Groups. During her term of office two new regional groups were added to the Council, and many friends were won for ALA by her leadership. Her department in the Journal of Cataloging & Classification which reported news of the regional groups was read with enthusiasm.

Her quiet and unobtrusive personality was dominated by a firm and principled character that was admired by all who knew her. She was respected for her thorough and constructive professional knowledge. Her friends said Henrietta Howell exemplified the best ideals of her native state of Kentucky and of her profession. All of those who knew her realize the great loss to the profession in her untimely death.—Mrs. Orcena Mahoney, Executive Secretary, RTSD.
This report of regional group activities is the first to be prepared by your new chairman of the Council of Regional Groups. The four reports in this summary show the continuing need for recruits to librarianship, one of the many experiments in cataloging organization (frequently due to the shortage of trained catalogers), and the constant need for alertness to catalog use and the consequent need for change.

The New York Regional Catalog Group held its spring dinner meeting on April 12, 1957, with one hundred twenty-eight members and guests present. Emily C. Nixon (New York University), President, introduced the two speakers of the evening: Sidney L. Jackson, Director of the Catalog Use Study, who gave a report on the study; and Oliver T. Field, Head of the Catalog Department, Air University Library, Maxwell Air Force Base. Mr. Field discussed "Problems of Catalog Change."

Newly elected officers introduced were: Gertrude Moakley (New York Public Library), President; C. Donald Cook (Columbia), Vice-President and President-Elect; Laura Cummings (Columbia), Secretary-Treasurer.

On May 11, 1957, the New York Regional Group joined the New York Library Club for a tour of the United States Military Academy. The already large group was augmented by "multitudes of children" assembled for the same purpose. James Hilliard, Associate Librarian of the Academy, was in charge of the librarians' tour of the Library and Museum.

Two groups met on May 18, 1957, in California and Ohio. The Northern California Regional Group of Catalogers met in Santa Clara, with Alice Charlton (Stanford), Chairman, presiding. Joseph Ryus (University of California, Berkeley) was elected as the new Chairman, and Ursula Grunwald, Secretary-Treasurer. John H. Merryman, Librarian and Associate Professor of Law at Stanford University, spoke on "A Classification for the Law Library." Mr. Merryman pointed out the present difficulties of staff and patrons in locating materials in law libraries, the inadequacies of universal classification systems for law, the lack of standardization resulting from homemade classification schemes, and the possibility that L.C.'s long-delayed Class K may not be practical for law libraries. The solution adopted at Stanford is an arrangement by form and by jurisdiction; the remaining material for which subject classification is desirable will be broadly subdivided by form, abandoning book and author numbers. The shelf list, with short numbers, will be adapted to a retrieval method.

The Northern Ohio Catalogers met in Canton on May 18, 1957, Marjorie Borne (Cleveland Public Library), Chairman. The program topic, "Recruiting for the Library Profession," was presented from three viewpoints. Peggy Fahringer, a student in the School of Library Science at Western Reserve University, emphasized the necessity for librarians to be enthusiastic about their profession and to be able to communicate the importance of the library's role in community life. Alice E. Wright, Librarian, West Hill Branch, Akron Public Library, described the Akron plan for awarding a scholarship for children's library training, and urged more financial assistance for prospective librarians. The Director of the Placement Bureau, Kent State University, Paul K. Howells, suggested that the high school counselors be enlisted in the cause of recruiting for librarianship and that library recruiting officers participate in both high school and college Career Day programs. Officers elected for 1957/58 were: Marian L.
Parker (Lucas County Library), Chairman; Dorothy Loomis (Board of Education, Cleveland Heights), Vice-Chairman; Jean Rieley (Western Reserve), Secretary; and Eva Grills (Oberlin), Treasurer.

The spring meeting of the Boston Regional Group of Catalogers was held at Brandeis University on May 20, 1957, Edward X. Casey (Boston Public Library), Chairman, presiding. Dorothy P. Ladd (Chenery Library, Boston University) was elected chairman for 1957/58. Other officers elected were Barbara A. Gates (Brookline Public Library), Vice-Chairman, and Katherine C. Dwyre, Secretary-Treasurer. After a brief discussion of A.L.A. reorganization, the Group voted to continue its affiliation with the Council of Regional Groups and to keep its name unchanged but to invite non-catalogers to join. Louis Schreiber, Director of Administrative Services at Brandeis University, gave a stimulating talk concerning the organization of the cataloging at Brandeis. Because of the problems involved in organizing a book collection for immediate use, several unorthodox methods were tried. Two of the most effective were circulating books before cataloging and developing an assembly line method for the cataloging process thereby utilizing efficiently the student assistants available.

Group officers are reminded that if we are to have adequate coverage in LRTS of your activities, full accounts of your meetings should be sent to the Chairman of the Council of Regional Groups within one month after the meeting. — Edith Scott, Chairman, Council of Regional Groups (University of Oklahoma Library)

REVIEWS


Although this work is called the third edition of a publication which first appeared in 1940, it has been so completely revised and reorganized that it is practically new. The author's theme is "that purposefully directed experimental 'research' and efficiently exploited 'records' are interdependent necessities for progress and that they form a cycle" and he points out to the research worker and engineer the importance of records and shows them what they are and how to use them.

The book is a combination guide to methods of literature searching in technology, and introduction to scientific and technical research and development methodology. Although it has been written with the practicing engineer in mind, it should be equally of value to others. The first part of the volume, which deals with "The Nature and Methods of Technical Science," "The Progression from Science into Technology," and "The Substance of Technical Science" would appear to be particularly suitable for orientation to those outside the field of science and technology. For instance, these three chapters would serve as excellent readings to give to library school students who had a limited background of science when taking up the study of its literature. Interspersed with the substantive material within these chapters are many references to texts and articles for further background reading. Although many citations are to British titles, there is a good representation of American publications.

A second section discusses in three chapters the contributions of scientific and technical organizations in Great Britain, in other countries, and internationally through the United Na-
tions, especially UNESCO with which Dr. Holmstrom is now connected, various international scientific unions and conferences. This section will be particularly useful in American libraries for its details concerning British organizations. The coverage for American activities is much abbreviated in comparison.

In the last three chapters Dr. Holmstrom discusses the "records," first considering how information is recorded, disseminated and published; secondly how it is identified and located by means of indexes, abstracts, and reviews; and finally, how libraries and information centers operate and how their services can be used intelligently. These chapters review in a concentrated way many of the operations now commonly called "documentation," beginning with methods of scientific note-taking, and ending with the possibilities in mechanical and electronic devices for locating informational data. In no case is the material detailed enough to serve as a complete guide to any one library or documentation operation, but it is very suggestive and, supplemented by other readings—many of which are cited either in his text or in his bibliography—should help the inquirer in understanding many procedures.

The author has eliminated (or greatly shortened) some of the practical material which was in the second edition—particularly his consideration of various filing and indexing methods—because they are discussed at length in his recent Facts, Files and Action in Business and Public Affairs which he refers to in his present text frequently as "FFA." He also has devised a sort of bibliographic " shorthand" in referring to titles in his bibliography and to other parts of the book, thus eliminating elaborate footnotes. His bibliography is extensive and reasonably up-to-date. A few minor errors in citation of name, date, or edition were noted.

This is a thought-provoking book, and one to be read or studied carefully. It is so packed with information that it cannot be used for quick consultation. It will probably not be consulted very profitably by an engineer wanting a hurried introduction to sources of information, but a more leisurely and thorough study of the volume should be quite rewarding.—Helen M. Focke, Professor of Library Science, Western Reserve University.


The purpose of this little book is to aid the librarian of the "small" library in processing its catalog cards and books, and in getting reading materials into the hands of its borrowers. It excludes the professional aspects of cataloging and classification and begins at the point of making the cards. The preface states that it is designed primarily for the library that "does not necessarily have a professional librarian or even a full time person in charge of its book collection." Nonprofessional and part-time librarians are most often found in small public or school libraries, and it is probably for these two types of libraries that a procedures manual will be found most useful. The preface points out that "a choice has been given regarding the degree of complication or simplification which the individual library might prefer"; but comparatively few alternative procedures have been indicated. For example, with the single exception of the fullness of the author's name, the chapter on preparing typed catalog cards is a categorical list of items to be included. From the standpoint of the untrained librarian specific directions are probably preferable; but, in such a case, it becomes important to indicate the type of library for which the procedures are recommended, since
the cataloging needs of the small general library are different from those of a special library of the same size.

Some vagueness about the type of library for which the manual is intended is probably due to the circumstances under which it came to be prepared. It had its origin in a cataloging project undertaken by the Miami Regional Catalogers for the Jewish Home for the Aged, and its first intention was to serve as a guide to this institution in maintaining its catalog and its library. After a second call for cataloging service had come, this time from a special library of physics, the Group decided to publish the manual in a sufficient number of copies for wider distribution.*

Approximately half of the book is devoted to cataloging procedures; but the processing of books, circulation routines, and the vertical file, are given brief treatment. The text begins with the listing of eleven steps of the complete routine, presumably in the order in which they would be taken in a library. It was noticed that accessioning was omitted from this list, although there is a later chapter on the accession record.

The procedures of ordering and adapting Library of Congress printed cards are treated in some detail but no reference is made to those of the H. W. Wilson Company, especially designed for the small general library. In the directions for ordering LC cards it would have been helpful to explain the economy of using card order numbers and to mention a few useful book sources for these numbers. The sample order slip is misleading since it includes both the LC card number and the full bibliographical information needed when the number is not available. Since reference is made to the Library of Congress Handbook for Card Distribution for the arrangement of order slips, a similar reference might easily have taken the place of the numerous examples of adapted LC printed cards.

The chapter on circulation routines is evidently from the point of view of the public library since registration of borrowers is included. Self charging is the only book charging system described.

The manual concludes with two bibliographies—one entitled "Aids to Cataloging and Classification" and the other, simply "Bibliography." Since four of the items in the first list are duplicated in the second, the two might easily have been combined in a general bibliography of aids. Through some oversight, the ALA Rules for Filing Catalog Cards, referred to in the chapter on filing rules, does not appear in either bibliography.

Bringing together in one place detailed instructions for a complete job of processing is a boon to the small library. This book, with the imprint of the Miami Public Library, presents a neat, attractive appearance, and is of handy size to use as a desk book.—Miss Clyde E. Pettus, Associate Professor, Emory University Division of Librarianship.

Editors Recommend:

This comprehensive article is an excellent source of information for the 'uninitiated' because it classifies copying methods according to the five technical processes in current use. The nature of the process is explained in non-technical language, and trade names of equipment on the market are given.