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Cataloging in Source: The Experiment from the Viewpoint of the Library of Congress*

C. Sumner Spalding, Chief
Descriptive Cataloging Division
Library of Congress

THE FIRST four months of the Cataloging in Source project were dominated by great activity in contacting publishers to secure their participation in the undertaking. Officers of the Library travelled far and wide during the months of June through September visiting publishers in 38 cities in 21 states and the District of Columbia. The geographical spread was very great, covering states in the North Atlantic, Middle Atlantic, South Atlantic, Middle West, South Central and Pacific Coast regions. Concurrent with these efforts to discuss the project directly with publishers, a supporting series of form letters was sent out to many others that could not be visited. By the end of October 1958, 230 had agreed to send in titles in proof stage for cataloging. These represented firms large and small and firms of many different types: trade book publishers, textbook publishers, children’s book publishers, reprint publishers, religious book publishers, university presses, editorial offices of associations, state document publishers, state and federal agency publication offices, and the federal Government Printing Office. This so-called “promotional” phase was concluded in September when the response clearly assured the receipt of the desired 1,000 titles to be given Cataloging in Source treatment.

In the meantime, the cataloging divisions prepared for action. It was clear that cataloging books under this project would present two types of problems: operational and technical. On the operational front everything had to be keyed to speed. Publishers were provided with special labels marked “Cataloging in Source” for mailing proof to the Descriptive Cataloging Division. Special delivery service was used throughout, and airmail was used whenever warranted by the distance involved. At the other end of the process the cataloging information, in the form of proof

* Paper presented at the joint program meeting of the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division and its Cataloging and Classification Section during the ALA Conference in Washington, June 22, 1959.
copies of the printed card, was returned by the same service. We even compiled a chart of hours at which there would be regular inter-office mail pick-up, LC mail room outgoing delivery, and street mailbox pick-up, so that completed cataloging proof could be taken by messenger to the point at which it would get into the mails the fastest. For publications of Federal agencies and for the National Education Association here in Washington we sent messengers by taxi to pick up publications in proof and to deliver the cataloging proof when completed.

Once proof was received, our schedule called for cataloging, printing of proof copy of the catalog card, and mailing of the same to the publisher within 24 hours (excluding the intervention of weekends or holidays). We had an even tighter schedule for the 100 titles catalogued cooperatively by the Department of Agriculture Library. For these titles we sought to accomplish all of the following steps within the 24-hour period: pick-up of proof from the publishing agency, cataloging at the Department of Agriculture Library, delivery of copy to LC, editing the copy, printing the proof of the card, delivery of the proof to the Department of Agriculture Library, and final delivery of the same to the publishing agency.

Also working with us on this project besides the Department of Agriculture Library were seven other libraries that did cataloging in source and then supplied us with cooperative copy which we edited, printed, and returned. Four university libraries cataloged the publications of their local university presses in this manner (Harvard, Illinois, Maryland, and Wisconsin). A considerably greater number of titles were supplied by three other libraries of the Federal Government (Geological Survey, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Labor).

Despite the tight schedules under which we had to operate, we were unwilling that speed should interfere with cataloging quality, excepting insofar as the very nature of cataloging in source should force such a result. To put it another way, we asked all catalogers at LC to work no faster and no less carefully on Cataloging in Source titles than they would for any titles. What we emphasized was that, once assigned such a title, they should work steadily on it, carry the work through to completion, and then deliver it personally to the next person in the chain of operations. As we shall see later, there were many deficiencies in the end product appearing in the books. These deficiencies, however, were rarely due to haste on the part of the catalogers but were the result of the nature of the Cataloging in Source system. To some extent the system might be improved with time, thus reducing the incidence of error, but some of these deficiencies might turn out to be irreducible.

The speed we sought and to a large degree achieved was accomplished primarily by the whole-hearted cooperation we received from all who worked on these books and secondly by our efforts to streamline procedures as much as possible. Selection, as a separate operation, was eliminated by the delegation of this function by the Selection Officer to the Head of the English Language Section in whose section most of these books were
descriptively cataloged and who therefore had to handle the books, anyway, in order to distribute them to the catalogers. We by-passed our usual searching and preliminary cataloging operations. We obtained the temporary controls we needed by typing very brief entries after descriptive cataloging. The revision stage in the descriptive cataloging process was eliminated by using only senior catalogers, whose work is independent of revision. No manuscript cards left the section, however, without a final review by the section head or her delegate. Throughout the whole process each title was hand-carried from each stage to the next. To enable us to analyze how the system was working, we inserted in each title a "Rush" slip on which each person recorded when he started and when he finished his part of the overall processing.

We gave one person the assignment of general overseer and expediter. She received, inspected, and logged each title as soon as the mails were opened. She assisted as trouble-shooter when procedural problems developed or when bottlenecks threatened. She checked on the final product and, if required, wrote special instructions to the publisher when the cataloging copy was sent to him. She acted as liaison between the three divisions that were involved (Descriptive Cataloging, Subject Cataloging, and Card Division) and gave yeoman assistance to the Director of the Processing Department and the Chief of the Descriptive Cataloging Division in drafting much correspondence with publishers concerning all phases of the operation of the project. Of the many whose efforts made the pilot project a success in respect to meeting schedules, her name must certainly be mentioned: Barbara Andrews, my Administrative Assistant.

The technical problems were many and persistent. We had anticipated most of them, and we designed a cataloging data sheet to minimize them as much as possible. Publishers were asked to send a copy of this sheet along with the proof of their books. It was to be filled in only to the extent that its questions were not answered by the proof itself. Most of its questions covered the detail of imprint and of collation. For example, we knew we would often not receive the plates, tables, and other illustrative matter that would be in the final book, and we therefore asked questions that were designed to elicit the information we would require to make an illustration statement according to the rules. Height after binding is another obvious item that could be provided only by these data sheets. We took special effort to word our questions in terms the publisher could easily respond to; we eschewed catalogers' jargon. As with all questionnaires, however, use revealed faults. As soon as these were apparent, we revised the form, sent out a new supply, and instructed that the old ones be destroyed forthwith. Before we were through, we had reached our fourth version. Many of our revisions were not so much to provide questions we had not thought to ask but rather to find the magical formula for asking a question in such words that practically nobody could misunderstand it!

Such, then, were our operational arrangements for carrying out the project. What happened when the wheels started turning and Cataloging
in Source became a regular part of our daily work? For most of the titles no special problems arose; for quite a number, however, sailing was not altogether smooth. Although page proofs were sought in all cases, we accepted galleys if page proof could not be supplied. Pagination was a potential problem in each of these cases. Sometimes the data sheet would appear to provide the answer; at other times one could not be certain. For example: Is all that front matter really unpaged or did they omit recording it on the data sheet, giving only the main paging? Or did they (as indeed they sometimes did) simply give us the total number of printed pages without reference to page groupings? We learned through sad experience (as you can see by inspecting the entries in some of these books) that the number supplied as that of the last numbered page might turn out to be wrong because they just didn’t bother to number that page in the final printing. Even with page proof the presence of pencilled page numbers on front matter raised the question of whether or not those pages would actually be foliated.

Most acute of the pagination problems was that of the index when there was one. Ordinarily the index had not been printed or was in the process of being printed at the time Cataloging in Source had to be scheduled. In these cases we often had to print the entry without pagination and write detailed instructions to the publishers as to how to supply it in the entry appearing in the book when the index was completed and paged. He was also instructed to report this information back to us so the type being held for the printed cards could be completed and the cards run. One publisher’s work schedule was such that the front matter that was to include the cataloging entry had to be either in press or printed by the time the index pagination was known, thus making Cataloging in Source an impossibility for those of his publications that had indexes.

The lack of proof for the covers sometimes affected cataloging adversely. Our data sheet had a place for supplying additional bibliographic information contained only on the covers and when this was filled in, things generally came out all right. But sometimes this needed information was not supplied and hence a series note might be missed. In one instance we got the primary series recorded but missed a secondary series for lack of information.

Proof was received in all stages of incompleteness. I have already mentioned lack of the index and lack of cover proof. Besides these, title pages often had not been set in type and a typed transcription had to suffice. Preliminary matter was sometimes unavailable. The main text might be received without title page, preliminary matter, or index.

In one instance, as a special test, we agreed with the W. B. Saunders Company, publisher of medical books, to accept title page, preface, table of contents, and only a data sheet with the other information to see if proper subject cataloging and classification could be done under such conditions. This limited test was successful.

The timing of the project was such that we cataloged many books that were scheduled for publication at the end of 1958. Some of these were
actually published in 1959. At the time we catalogued many of them, either the year of publication had become uncertain or else it was later changed from what the proof or the data sheet said at the time we cataloged. Sometimes the publisher corrected the cataloging copy in the book; sometimes he didn’t. In either event he may or may not have thought to notify us so the cards could be corrected.

Likewise there was some incidence of title page changes. The title proper was rarely changed, but it was not uncommon for subtitles and credits for editors, illustrators, etc., to be added, deleted or changed at the last moment. More often than not the cataloging entry appearing in the work was not altered to reflect the change nor were we notified so we could correct our cards.

Our great ally in the face of our cataloging perplexities was the telephone, which we used without restraint whenever we needed to get a point settled. Telephone service was good and it was quick. In spite of this, however, there were a great many cases when the best answers we could get were: “I think it will be thus and so” or “We just don’t know yet.” Perhaps worse than these were firm answers that turned out either to be incorrect or else to reflect a decision that was later changed. In short, there were many cases when the cataloger, in the end, had to make her best guess. We tried to call these matters to the attention of the publisher when we returned the proof, and we held the type for the printed cards for two weeks in anticipation of corrections. Sometimes matters got straightened out; sometimes they didn’t.

The cataloging that gave us the least trouble was that for offset reprint editions where we already had a printed card for the original edition. In these instances the publisher merely furnished a special data sheet showing the details of bibliographical difference between the editions.

The volume of cataloging under this project increased steadily from July, when 25 titles were cataloged, to the peak month of January, when 233 titles were cataloged. The average load during the period November through January was 11 titles per workday. On peak days as many as 18 titles might come in. The thousandth title was cataloged in January, and letters were sent out to the participating publishers informing them that the project would terminate at the end of February. By that time 1,197 books had been cataloged, and 158 publishers had participated.1 Things gradually returned to normal, and we began to evaluate what had happened.

How did we fare on our 24-hour schedule objective? I think we did very well indeed. A good random sample, excluding Department of Agriculture titles, on which I will report in just a minute, indicates that we met this schedule for about 86% of the titles; another 7% ran up to 2 hours late; the remaining 7% took up to two days to complete and mail to the publisher.

The note written by Miss Andrews on the work sheet for one of the titles that was unusually delayed will give you some idea of the situation in the Descriptive Cataloging Division on one of our bad days. I quote:

This didn't get out on time because I needed to
write a note to the publisher about paging.
Mailed those without notes first.
Section Head meeting.
Several more to mail.
Lunch (an hour after usual time)
More proofs to mail.
Mail to open.
Several phone calls.
Man to measure for construction of partition.
Man wanted to know why book he gave us hadn't
been cataloged.
Reader wanted ref. book.
Mrs. X came to talk about CIS.
More proofs received which could be mailed
out without notes.
Finally in desperation I scribbled note
hoping publisher would do what I said
even if he didn't understand why, mailed
letter on way home.

Our record on getting the work out was the object of high praise on the part of many of the publishers who participated in this project. Many expressed pleased surprise that the cataloging got back to them so soon. We were pleased and even a little bit surprised ourselves.

What about the Department of Agriculture Library's cooperative titles that had to pass through so many hands and to undergo so many pick-ups, transports, and deliveries? Miss Shachtman's figures show that the average elapsed time was 26 hours, 2 hours more than one working day.

My hat is off to all who worked so diligently and devotedly on this project: the catalogers, the revisers and section heads, the typists and messengers, the expediters, printers, and all others. There ain't no flies on them!

Were there cases in which Cataloging in Source cannot be made to work? Leaving aside the problem of errors in cataloging details and assuming standard cataloging rules are followed, there are three cases in which it cannot be made to work. In two of these cases it is impossible across the board; in the other it might be possible with some publishers. One across-the-board case is that of books for which the publisher's production schedule is so tight that there simply is no time for this extra step in the process. Among regular trade book publishers there would be a considerable number of publications that are on such a rush basis. The second of these cases is that of the book written pseudonymously or anonymously but cataloged under the author's real name. Authors and pub-
lishers will not stand still for revelation right in the book of what they wish to conceal. They would probably tolerate the real name entry, however, for works of authors that are no longer living.

Not all publishers have objected to the final case but it is fairly clear that there is pretty strong sentiment against the appearance of the author’s dates beside his name in the catalog entry. In some fields of endeavor to be either a little young or a little old may be a black mark against you. One publisher withdrew from the project entirely on this account. Perhaps the most striking case was that of the lady author of a Cataloging in Source book who, having married for the first time at a “later” age, was up-in-arms lest her husband learn the unhappy facts of the case.

Such were the out-and-out failures of cataloging in source. I have at least one small triumph to report. One well-known publisher, whose imprint was New York, Chicago, and San Francisco wrote that our cataloging imprint reading “New York” was unsatisfactory, particularly because the home office and place of first publication is Chicago, the place named second on the title page. We replied explaining the rule for giving only the first named American city and gently suggested that if the city of the home office were either named first or given in larger type, not only would the cataloging difficulty be solved but also imprint citations in books and bibliographies would be more accurate. After due thought the publisher changed his imprint to Chicago, New York, and San Francisco, and we put a feather in our cap.

Probably more disturbing than the limited number of cases in which Cataloging in Source cannot be made to work is the high frequency with which the cataloging printed in the book does not match the finished publication in one detail or another. I have already indicated the reasons why this happened. To a considerable degree discrepancies are inevitable so long as the cataloger catalogs something that is less than complete and still subject to change. It is also probable that under an on-going program the frequency of error could be reduced somewhat through better understanding of cataloging needs on the part of the staff in publishers’ offices and improvement of forms.

Now let us take a close look at how our cataloging labors turned out. The following statistics are based on an analysis of the Cataloging in Source contained in the first 574 books received that had been cataloged under this program.

In 5% of the books the cataloging information had not been included for one reason or another. The remaining figures relate to the 547 that did include the cataloging entry. Fifty-five per cent had an error of some nature or other. Of those that had errors the average number of errors was 1.6. No significant number of errors were due to unauthorized changes in the cataloging entries on the part of publishers. The heading was all right in better than 99% of the cases. The title page transcription had discrepancies in 9% of the cases. The imprint was faulty in 14% of the cases. The pagination erred in 24% of the cases. The illustration state-
ment was imperfect in 7% of the cases and size in 19%. Of all discrepancies, collation errors accounted for by far the most, namely 58%. In 5% of the cases there was an imperfect series note and in 6% an addition or change of other notes was required. All told, the entries were far from reliable in the detail of descriptive cataloging.

In respect to main entries, added entries, and subject entries the results were close to faultless. The disagreement of authors and publishers with subject headings did not materialize to the extent some had predicted. Classification presented no problems. Time pressures, however, resulted in rather less than optimum research in the cases that involved establishment of new subject headings or class numbers.

What about the costs of operating a cataloging program on this basis? Although we have not completed our compilation of work time statistics, we have enough information to be able to make some general statements. First, there is a very considerable overhead cost in a program of this nature. Keeping things running smoothly, surely, and speedily, attending to a great deal of correspondence, and providing necessary clerical and messenger service and effective telephonic and mail communications will make overhead costs a major item of expense. On the other hand, surprisingly enough, there is no evidence that the descriptive cataloging was substantially more expensive than cataloging the publications in their finished form would have been. Department of Agriculture Library experience also confirms ours in this regard. So far as the pilot project was concerned, subject cataloging costs were not substantially higher. It is important to note, however, that in any full-scale program the Subject Cataloging Division would have to be staffed in considerably greater depth so that Cataloging in Source items demanding special expertise could be handled on the necessary rush basis regardless of absences of subject specialists for sick or annual leave. This would be a charge of considerable proportions.

Finally, how did catalogers like cataloging in source? They didn’t. It was a rather frustrating experience. They like to feel that they are doing an important job, doing it carefully and well, and doing it so it will stand up as a permanent record. With Cataloging in Source the uncertainties were so frequent and the results of their work so disappointing that they could not take much pride in it. The rush nature of these titles interrupted regular work which had to be taken up again later. The handling of the proof, either in page or galley form, was awkward as compared with books in codex form. Perhaps most significant, however, is the fact that to catalog in source is to catalog under tension. This was clearly revealed when I put this question to my descriptive catalogers: “When you finished a day in which you had been doing Cataloging in Source, did you feel more tired than you would have otherwise?” The vociferous “Yes” that came back at me was very expressive in its conviction and unanimity.

To sum up, our experience with cataloging 1,197 books in this project would seem to lead to the following general conclusions: 1) it is possible to catalog most books rapidly enough for this operation to mesh in with
publishers' production schedules; 2) some books could never be cataloged sufficiently rapidly if the cataloging were done at the Library of Congress; 3) some other books could be cataloged in source only if rules of entry were changed or if established headings were altered to exclude dates, and 4) the frequency of noncorrespondence of standard descriptive cataloging with the actual book will be critically high.

**Consumer Reaction Survey of Cataloging in Source**

VIRGINIA DREWRY
Library Consultant
State Department of Education
Atlanta, Georgia

"CONSUMER Reaction Survey" was the name given to the part of the Cataloging in Source experiment that was conducted to discover the use that libraries would make of the catalog entry appearing in the publications they acquire, to learn the effects of Cataloging in Source upon their operations and procedures, and to find out if libraries really want Cataloging in Source.

The first step toward the survey was taken by the Librarian of Congress when he asked the ALA Cataloging Policy and Research Committee to serve as an advisory group on the study of consumer reaction. The Committee accepted the invitation, and, after two days of hard work, forwarded recommendations suggesting ways in which such a study might be made, and a listing of possible members of the survey staff for consideration.

There were five people on the Consumer Reaction Survey team when it was developed. In the beginning there was one. Esther Piercy became the director of the survey in September.

She was not alone, however. She had the help and advice of Mr. Cronin, of course, and the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee did not abandon her. In October they all met to discuss the types and sizes

* Paper presented at the joint program meeting of the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division and its Cataloging and Classification Section during the ALA Conference in Washington, June 22, 1959.
of libraries to be covered by the survey, geography, what information was
needed and how to obtain it, and to discuss publicity.

Through publicity Miss Piercy and her advisors hoped to instigate
reaction from those people who could not be visited by members of the
Consumer Reaction Survey team. The Library of Congress Cataloging
Service Bulletin of September had invited librarians to participate in the
experiment of Cataloging in Source by making use of the catalog entry
contained in the books cataloged under the project, and by reporting
their findings to Miss Piercy. Letters did come in. In an attempt to in-
crease this letter-writing and to encourage its applying itself to answers
desired, a publicity release was prepared by Miss Piercy and mailed in
February to American library publications, both national and state. Mem-
bers of the Consumer Reaction Survey team and of the Cataloging Policy
and Research Committee talked about Cataloging in Source at twelve of
the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division Regional Group
meetings. As a result of this publicity, almost two hundred letters have
been received to date about Cataloging in Source. Many of these letters
are extremely thoughtful ones and carefully answer the questions raised in
the publicity releases.

The eventual outcome of the October discussion on the types and sizes
of libraries was visits by the Consumer Reaction survey staff to the mem-
bers of the Association of Research Libraries, twenty-three of the largest
public libraries, a representation of medium and small public libraries, medium
and small college libraries, regional centers, school systems with
centralized processing, separate school libraries, and special libraries.
Among these libraries there was a sampling of those that used H. W. Wil-
trying to have a fair representation of all types, sizes, and locations of li-
braries, Miss Piercy sought and received the help of personnel at the U. S.
Office of Education. The H. W. Wilson Company assisted by lending her
a list of libraries having standing orders for their cards. Book stores were
included in the survey, and Miss Piercy has visited the Alanar Book Pro-
cessing Corporation, the R. R. Bowker Company, and the H. W. Wilson
Company.

The outcome of the discussion on geography at the October meeting
may best be told by introducing the members of the Consumer Reaction
Survey team. The staff met for the first time at the Library of Congress in
January. They were a diverse group, but purposely so.

Esther J. Piercy, Chief of Processing, Enoch Pratt Free Library, Balti-
more, covered the West from Texas to Montana, and from Missouri to
the West Coast.

Eleanor E. Campion, Director of the Philadelphia Union Catalog and
Bibliographic Center, visited libraries in Delaware, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana,
and in Michigan.

Richard O. Pautzsch, Catalog Coordinator of the Brooklyn Public Li-
brary, New York, visited libraries in the New York City area, in New Jer-
sey, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

Virginia Drewry, Library Consultant, Georgia State Department of Education, visited libraries in the Southeast.

These people visited 223 libraries during their tours, but not all of the libraries visited were asked to fill out the questionnaire.

The questionnaire came into being as a result of that October discussion on what information was needed and how to obtain it. It did not come into being easily. It was drafted and redrafted. It was torn up and reconstructed. It was tested on local libraries by members of the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee, criticized and revised. Maurice Tauber and Carlyle Frarey, asked for criticism, revised a large part of one draft to show their suggestions. A much shorter and simpler questionnaire resulted from all of this, but the Consumer Reaction Survey group cut it still further. It was taken to the ALA Midwinter meeting in Chicago. There the most momentous thing to happen to it was a change of name. No longer was it a questionnaire, but “Information To Be Assembled For The Interviewer.” This was not entirely a matter of strategy. The interviewers (the members of the Consumer Reaction team) found that the interview form stood up well in practice and that it was an excellent guide in helping to obtain the information needed. Some of the people interviewed went so far as to say that they were glad to have the questionnaire because it made them take a good look at their procedures and practices.

When the interview form settled down into its final shape, letters were sent to approximately 200 libraries to ask if they would cooperate with the Cataloging in Source project to the extent of granting interviews to the Consumer Reaction Survey people, and of preparing specified information preparatory to the visits. It was only after they consented that they saw the questionnaire. It was mailed to them in advance of the visit by the interviewer so that they might have time to study it, to think about their policies and practices and the effect that Cataloging in Source might have upon them. The personal interview turned out to be wise because in most cases discussion with the interviewer clarified doubtful points, and broadened and deepened the thinking about Cataloging in Source.

The first part of the interview form was designed to provide background information so that answers regarding Cataloging in Source could be evaluated against the type, size, and organization of the library concerned. It included questions about the size of the book collection, number of new titles and new editions cataloged last year, and the approximate percentage of these that were current American imprints. An interesting thing to note here is that the figures on the percentage of current American imprints cataloged range from ten percent to one hundred percent. The acquisitions section of the interview form asked about the percentage of orders placed before and after publication date, the sources of bibliographic information used in acquiring American publications, the responsibility for searching library records prior to ordering materials or
adding gift materials. There was a section on the preparation of catalog cards, and one on cataloging tools. One section asked about the acceptance of current LC cataloging practices, and one asked about cataloging practices for libraries not now using Library of Congress cards or copy.

The last section of the interview form stated three goals for Cataloging in Source: 1) getting new books to readers faster; 2) cutting the present high cost of cataloging; 3) providing greater standardization in the identification of books. It then asked for opinions and conclusions with these goals in mind.

The interviewers were delighted, as they progressed in their tours, to discover the ideas for the use of Cataloging in Source that were stated in this last section. Invariably more ideas came out around conference tables and in discussion groups during the visit of the Consumer Reaction Surveyor.

Often there came the question, “What are they saying about Cataloging in Source in other libraries?” At this time only a summary of the highlights of what they said can be given. The complete report of the survey team will come later as a part of the final report on the Cataloging in Source project.

The ideas that follow came from the librarians who were interviewed, and these ideas are mainly in the realm of imagination in case Cataloging in Source were effected with sufficiently broad coverage.

In book selection procedures, the librarians said that Cataloging in Source with its tracings should, in time, make the sorting, selection, and addition of gift books to the collection much easier and faster. Books sent on approval could be quickly lined up by classification for people to view and the tracings should make for ease in selection. The classification and subject headings might help to serve as annotations and thus cut down time spent in examination of main library copies by branch librarians. The tracings and classification could help in the selection and arrangements of book exhibits for patrons, and could save time in the examination of books to help choose the right books for the particular patron or student. Bookmobile librarians without catalogs should find the subject headings helpful. Cataloging in Source should help to clarify reprints and new editions in trade lists. Some librarians indicated that if there were several texts equally good, the one with C.I.S. would be chosen, and that the American edition with C.I.S. would be purchased rather than the English edition without it.

In acquisitions, searching was the dominant theme. With the standardization of entries resulting from Cataloging in Source, searching should be much faster and more accurate. Unintentional duplications should be avoided. The information passed on to the catalogers should save their time in verification. If anything could be done with second-hand book dealers, that would be heavenly! Automatic receipts could be searched more quickly. Serials could be verified quickly and their processing sped along. Verification of the entry before ordering should increase the effectiveness of multiple carbon order forms. Subject headings and classification numbers should help in making fund charges and in routing books to the
proper agencies. Cataloging in Source should help publishers in filling orders and should make easier the checking of their bills.

In reference and bibliographic work the standardization of the entry again was thought to be the most important thing that Cataloging in Source could do. It could provide uniformity of entry for the preparation of bibliographies, and, because of the uniformity of entry, would make easier the use of bibliographies. The subjects in books with Cataloging in Source should help, too, because they could serve as clues to similar materials. Between the correct entry and the subjects it was thought that many steps to the catalog could be saved.

Catalogers generally agreed that Cataloging in Source should mean speed and time to them. It should simplify searching because of standardization of entry. Searching should be helped, too, by the speed up in processing. Cataloging in Source should save time in searching for LC card numbers and permit more efficient ordering of cards. When the cards arrived they could be matched with the books more easily. Proof cards and catalog cards should come in faster. Cataloging in Source should provide cataloging information for those books for which cards could not be bought. It should provide standard cataloging for libraries that do not buy catalog cards and which sometimes must call for help from other libraries with specialists or expensive tools. Rush books could be classified correctly and not have to be recalled. To go even further, C.I.S. books could be held only long enough for classification and assignment of numbers. Series information in C.I.S. books should be especially helpful, and Cataloging in Source should help to catch changes in LC entries and in subject headings. To the catalogers, Cataloging in Source should mean that more work could be done by non-professionals, and should allow them more time for the difficult things.

There were other areas of the library's work in which Cataloging in Source should make work easier. It should help students to fill out the correct author and title on charging slips. It should help in teaching students and patrons how to use the catalog, and should acquaint them with subject heading terminology. It should help the binding department in making out binding directions, and in choosing author and title for binding titles. It should help in shelf work because anything looking out of place could be quickly checked. The one thing that covered all areas was the belief that Cataloging in Source would mean better service.

In inter-library relationships, it was thought that Cataloging in Source should simplify inter-library loans, and could give uniformity for cooperation of various libraries in the preparation of union catalogs.

In the last section of the interview form, there were questions about machines, tools, and equipment. At that point it was said in some libraries that Cataloging in Source would create the need of a duplicator suited to their particular situations.

The next to the last question asked, "If a new kind of copying machine, inexpensive (under $500.00), portable, dry-process, which reproduced positive copy directly on catalog cards and capable of reducing or enlarg-
ing copy, were available, what would that mean in relation to questions and answers in opinions and conclusions?" It was not surprising to learn that it would eliminate present methods of card reproduction in many libraries, that it would provide a means of duplication that would speed up the cataloging process and cut the time it takes to get cards into the catalog. There were, however, suggestions for its use in acquisitions, in reference and bibliographic work, and in serials work. Some thought that it would encourage regional cataloging.

The last question on the interview form asked, "In summary, do you favor Cataloging in Source?" There was an overwhelming "yes" from the people who were interviewed, and from the letters that have been mailed to Miss Piercy. This overwhelming "yes" tells something about librarians that is no surprise. When it came to the actual application of Cataloging in Source to particular libraries, there was the consideration of its direct benefit to themselves, but nearly always there was the thought of other libraries with other problems, and the librarians wished to back anything that would help to advance library programs anywhere.

With national and international code agreements that would bring about bibliographic standardization in the book world, with Cataloging in Source, with the new kind of copying machine that is becoming well known as the "Cataloger's Camera," librarians are approaching the space age, or heavenly days.

Will all of this mean that catalogers will no longer be needed? Cataloging in Source probably will never be in all U. S. publications, to say nothing of the non-U. S. publications. Almost all libraries will have special collections or interests for which "standard" cataloging will never be adequate. There are the non-book materials. Then, too, there will be changes in entries, in classification, and in subject headings and the C. I. S. book will remain unchanged. Catalogers will be needed, but they can spend more time in providing better service.

The Consumer Reaction Survey team is glad to note that catalogers will be around in the future, for catalogers are librarians, and librarians are wonderful people. Librarians spent hours working with the interview forms, and talking with the interviewers. They wrote letters when there was no force to make them do it. They were kind, thoughtful, courteous, and hospitable to the surveyers. Unexpected incidents threatened to become disasters, but local librarians changed them into delightful adventures. One of our Easterners in the West misjudged distances and scheduled an afternoon interview that was eighty-five miles away from the morning interview. The morning librarians whipped up sandwiches to eat in the car as they madly drove the misguided interviewer to her afternoon librarian. No matter into what new territory they wandered, the members of the team never felt alone or strange because they always knew that warmth and welcome were to be found there with some member of their fraternity.

The Consumer Reaction Survey team wish to thank you all. They have learned much from you which they hope to convert to professional gain.
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Cataloging In Source: The Viewpoint of Publishers*

ROY B. EASTIN, Executive Officer

If the Cataloging In Source project fails of adoption, the responsibility will not rest with the publishers. This statement is based upon answers to a questionnaire sent by the Library of Congress to publishers who cooperated in a trial program and also on opinions expressed by representatives of publishers who met with officials of the Library in New York City.

However, it should not be concluded that Cataloging in Source poses no special problems for publishers, for it definitely does. Several procedural steps are added to the production routine for a book in order to print the facsimile of the Library of Congress catalog card. But most publishers who have cooperated in the trial program (and even those who did not take part) are willing to work out the problems if they can be assured the benefits are sufficient to librarians and private book collectors.

The publishers who are most agreeable to going forward with Cataloging in Source are the ones who cooperated in the trial program. Some apprehension is exhibited by those publishers who did not take part. All are in agreement that Cataloging in Source creates problems and additional work in the printing of a book. However, there is a wide cleavage of opinion among publishers as to how annoying, time consuming, and expensive the additional steps are. Some publishers view the additional work and time as of little consequence and very small cost. Other publishers who did not take part in the trial program fear the additional work will be quite burdensome and time-consuming, with one large publisher expressing the possibility that an additional fulltime employee might have to be placed on the payroll to control and coordinate the Cataloging in Source program.

The Library of Congress issued a questionnaire to those publishers who had cooperated in the pilot program. Comments were solicited on a number of subjects. The mailing arrangements for sending the proof to the Library of Congress and its return with the catalog entry to the pub-

* Paper presented at the joint program meeting of the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division and its Cataloging and Classification Section during the ALA Conference in Washington, June 22, 1959.
lishers met with almost complete satisfaction. The terms “excellent” and “completely satisfactory” were repeated many times in the 77 responses to this question. Where the page proofs did not supply complete bibliographical information, a data sheet was used to supply missing information. The data sheets were found to be entirely satisfactory by many of the publishers, and some went out of their way to praise the design and arrangement of the sheet. Some publishers did point out that filling in the data sheet was an extra operation which had to be assigned to some clerk and constituted extra work. Two publishers stated that it was not always clear how much additional information was necessary to supplement material included in the page proofs.

The question of interruptions to the editorial and production scheduling and the effects of such interruptions on printing and publication scheduling elicited varied responses. The majority of publishers indicated that they had experienced little delay in processing. Some of the companies that run on tight production schedules stated that there were delays although a few said there was more anxiety than actual delay. The problem was solved by some organizations by sending a duplicate proof to the Library of Congress at the same time the author’s proof was sent. Other companies indicated that they obtained the information by telephone or omitted the Library of Congress catalog card if time became a factor.

While a number of publishers felt that the inclusion of the catalog card spoiled the appearance of the page, 54 of the 76 responses indicated no problems had been encountered insofar as design was concerned.

Estimates of extra costs incurred ranged from negligible to $25. Fifty-two of the 81 publishers answering this question reported either no additional charge or a negligible charge. Of the other replies, an average cost appears to be about $5.00 a book.

Generally the publishers cooperating in this project were pleased with the results. Some hoped that it would become a permanent service of the Library of Congress, especially if benefits were realized by libraries. Publishers printing books by offset experienced greater difficulties than those who printed by letterpress. Other comments made were the criticism of including the author’s birth date, the use of the author’s real name when he wanted a pseudonym used, and the possibility that error would increase as more extensive use was made of this system.

Of the 69 responses, 50 indicated they would be willing to cooperate if the program were continued on a permanent basis, particularly if it would be helpful to libraries. While no publisher refused outright to cooperate, several replied with reservations. One company had dropped out of the experiment because the use of the author’s birth date had caused embarrassment; another stated that the project was a nuisance, a delay, and an expense; another stated the hope that it wouldn’t become a permanent program but if it did the publisher would support it; and another publisher indicated opposition to having the system become a requirement for all books published or of having it become so universally established that everyone would expect it on all publications.
The experience of Government publishing agencies closely followed the experience of the private publishers. One agency which cataloged 100 items reported no serious difficulties; and since messenger service was utilized, there were no delays even on certain "rush" publications. There was some feeling that the design of the facsimile catalog card detracts from the appearance of the publication and that for some "tight" publications there may be no space available. There was also objection to the use of the author's birth date in the catalog entry. Extra costs were reported to be negligible.

In December 1958 the Librarian of Congress appointed a committee of publishers' representatives to advise the Library of Congress on design and production problems in connection with Cataloging in Source. The members of this committee met with representatives of the Library with the understanding that they were not being asked to commit their firms in any way and that they would not be responsible for committing the publishing industry. Their advice and counsel was sought as experts on the problems involved.

Since New York City is such a large publishing center, some representatives suggested the establishment of a cataloging service in New York. Library of Congress representatives expressed the belief that it would not be possible to perform the actual cataloging in New York under the terms of a uniform system.

Other problems explored were the absence of proofs for many publications which are printed by offset-lithography. The offset process is growing gradually in the book publishing field, and for those publications it was suggested that the cataloging might be done from the title page, table of contents, and an abstract or synopsis of the contents. Many publishers prepare such an abstract to use in their sales promotion program. Another special problem is found when a book is printed abroad and flat press sheets are delivered to this country to be folded, gathered, and bound. Since all of the printing has been completed abroad, it would be difficult to imprint the facsimile catalog card.

One of the publishers' representatives stated that his company is not only interested in publishing worthwhile books for the edification of its readers but also in making a modest profit. The Cataloging in Source project would have much more appeal if it would result in increased sales. Library of Congress representatives said that if Cataloging in Source is adopted on a general basis, there would undoubtedly be a substantial saving to libraries. However, they were unable to estimate how much of this saving might be reflected in additional book purchases.

Some of the publishers' representatives evidenced a belief that if several publishers started including facsimile catalog cards in their publications, the other publishers would almost be forced to follow suit as a defensive competitive measure. One publisher who issues editions in special durable bindings for the library profession felt that the Cataloging in Source entry represented a valuable adjunct service for these special editions.
A number of the publishers’ representatives took the position that the project would be much easier if some compromise could be made in the information supplied for cataloging. For example, instead of submitting an entire set of page proofs, the publisher might submit only title page, table of contents, and a summary of the book. This would have to be supplemented by a data sheet to provide the total number of pages and any other missing bibliographical information.

Proof of the acceptance of this program by the publishers can be best summarized by a statement by one of the Library of Congress representatives—that if the Cataloging in Source trial project had not been terminated, the publishers by this time would have submitted an additional 3 or 4 thousand titles for cataloging.

In trying to work out a broad project such as Cataloging in Source, which has been a dream for perhaps a hundred years, there are many problems to be solved and a substantial job of coordination. All available evidence points to the conclusion that most publishers are willing to do their part to make this undertaking a success.
WHO IN 1904 would have thought that a casual statement in that year by Philip Lee Phillips would have such an unpropitious influence on map cataloging practice in American libraries? Phillips wrote, "The cataloging of maps and atlases differs very little from the cataloging of ordinary books." Although his philosophy of map cataloging as expressed in this statement did not become a part of ALA's Catalog Rules, Author and Title Entry when it was published four years later, the ideas of the long-time (1897-1924) Chief of the Maps Division in the Library of Congress were to effect an unbelievable and unfortunate influence on map cataloging in the United States.

Most challenges of Phillips' ideas about map cataloging such as those of Boggs and Lewis in 1932 and again in 1945 seemed to be of little concern to catalogers and reference librarians in general libraries. The librarian of the special map library and of the separate map collection in the general library saw the obvious fallacy in the assumption that maps and books were not unsimilar and thus could be cataloged using the same rules. He recognized what Boggs and Lewis had written as a more logical approach, in most instances, to the solution of map processing problems. Practice in specialized map libraries in the United States indicated recognition of essential differences existing between maps and books as had practice in major British map collections.

Not until 1947, after the LC Rules for Descriptive Cataloging were published, was there any organized opposition to the, by then, generally-accepted entry for maps by author. Shortly after the LC rules appeared, there was appointed in the Geography and Map Group of the Washington, D.C., Chapter of the Special Libraries Association a Committee to study map cataloging. Their Preliminary Report issued in 1948 and their Final Report of 1953 summarized the best thinking of a hard working committee and suggested a scheme for the cataloging of maps and related materials which merits further attention.

A review of early conceptions of map cataloging and a presentation of the recent Special Libraries Association report on map cataloging seem
appropriate at a time when the ALA is undertaking a new edition of its catalog code.

The Past

One of the very early considerations of map cataloging was that made by Charles Cutter in 1876 when he advised, "... the cartographer is the author of maps ..."6 Similar advice was given in Linderfelt's *Eclectic Card Catalog Rules*7 published by Cutter in 1890 and in Cutter's third edition of 1891.8 In none of these editions was much advice offered on the details of map cataloging. It was intended, instead, that book rules should apply to any and all situations.

Earlier practice of map description in printed library book catalogs also favored arrangement by author. In eleven instances reported by Bates, entry for maps was by author, by area in two catalogs, by title in two, and by no consistent entry in still another.9 On the other hand, in the earliest of separate American printed map catalogs, that of Harvard, 1891, the arrangement is by geographical area and alphabetical by title within area as was entry in the later and most comprehensive of all printed map catalogs, that of the British Museum in 1885.

Phillips first contributed his famous essay on map cataloging to the fourth edition of Cutter's rules. His assertion: "The cataloging of maps and atlases differs very little from the cataloging of ordinary books" must have startled those who were familiar with published statements of this prolific bibliographer. Less than five years earlier he had written, "... the name of the maker of a map as a rule is of small consequence to the student. What he most wants are the subject and date. In rare cases only is a map asked for by the maker's name; therefore, in cataloging the most importance should be given, first, to the subject, next to the date, and last to the author."10 Extracts from this article on map care appeared in the *Library Journal*11 a few months later and repeated the affirmation of the prime importance of subject, i.e., area, and date to the map user and the relative unimportance of author.

It was during the following year that Phillips' *List of Maps of America*12 arranged by geographical area, by chronological order within area, and in alphabetical order by title within each year was published. The change in Phillips' approach to map cataloging must have occurred sometime early in 1901 as the *Report of the Librarian of Congress for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1901* reported a map catalog by author and subject was in progress.

The notes prepared by Phillips for inclusion in Cutter's rules were expanded and issued in a twenty page booklet in 191513 and in a revised edition in 1921.14 Both editions contained that infamous statement which prompted Walter Ristow much later to comment, "This statement seems to have made a deep impression upon libraries, and its effects, unfortunately, are still evident today."15

During the same period, rules formulated for the "Catalogue of Maps" in the British Museum advised, for the first time in 1900, "The main-
entry of every atlas, map, chart, plan or view is to be placed under the generally accepted name of the geographical or topographical area which the work delineates, and is to be of sufficient fullness to serve its identification." There was little change in the thinking of librarians in that institution, for again in 1936 entry under area was reaffirmed and "Supplementary entries . . . where possible, under the name of every author, draughtsman, engraver, surveyor, or compiler" was ruled. Not all British librarians were in agreement with the British Museum rules for map entry. Those proposed in 1881 by the Library Association, advocated by Cutter, and reprinted in 1948 and 1953 by the Association stated, as has been noted, that author was the important consideration for maps as well as books.

History of an ALA map cataloging code began in 1908 as the report of the Cooperation Committee, 1883, did not consider maps. Full text of rule 6 in the 1908 ALA code advises: "Cartographers (Map Makers) Enter maps under the cartographer. If the name of the cartographer is not found, enter under the publisher . . . . "

But what was next to be issued by the ALA? "For the catalog of maps the subject (area mapped) is more important than author, and for most libraries the latter may well be dispensed with in the case of most maps, or reduced to a cross-reference." This complete reversal of the recommended map cataloging rules appeared in an ALA sponsored booklet in 1917.

Advice on map cataloging given in the pamphlet seems to have been of little significance as an influence on cataloging rules although reference to the pamphlet did merit inclusion as a footnote in the preliminary American second edition of the *ALA Catalog Rules Author and Title Entries* in 1941. The footnote suggested that "Small libraries may find that an entry under subject (i.e., area mapped) is all that is necessary . . . and special collections may prefer a main entry under area, a scheme for which is worked out in the Boggs and Lewis Manual." The second edition, however, advocated entry under the person or corporate body (cartographer, publisher, government bureau, society or institution) responsible for the map or atlas. Additionally, counsel on treatment of titles, imprint, collation, scale, insets, and added entries was provided.

The next suggestion of Library of Congress practice and procedure in map cataloging was given in 1947 when the preliminary edition of its descriptive cataloging rules appeared. As these rules accepted "the application to maps of descriptive cataloging rules for books . . . . " so did the edition of 1949 which was also adopted by the ALA. The second edition of the ALA rules for entry repeated for the most part the statement appearing eight years earlier in the preliminary edition. All of which seems inconsistent, for the experience not only of the Library of Congress during the war years but that of new and fast-growing collections in Washington and elsewhere throughout the country generally supported the contention of map librarians that maps and books are different and to assume similarity is not wise.
The ALA rule of 1949, and one under which most collections not organized as separate units are probably being cataloged, requires entry for maps and atlases under the name of the person or corporate body responsible for the content of the map or for the production of the atlas, as cartographer, editor, publisher, government bureau, society, or institution. For maps, "Preference should be given to (1) the person or corporate body stated in the title to be responsible; (2) cartographer; (3) engraver, if known to be a map maker; (4) publisher; (5) copyright claimant. If responsibility cannot be determined, enter under title."

The Challenge

The first concrete challenge to Phillips' credo (if the 1917 ALA booklet is ignored) appeared in 1930, but seemed to have little effect as its distribution was obviously limited. The challenge was presented in a short pamphlet in which Lieutenant Colonel J. P. Terrell. Chief of the Geographic Branch in the War Department, described the Williams System of map classification and the cataloging scheme used in the General Staff map collection. Subject, i.e., area, was the first item on the catalog card.

S. W. Boggs, geographer, and Dorothy C. Lewis, map librarian, in the Department of State, prepared in 1932 a manual which not only reaffirmed Sir Herbert Fordham's statement of 1921, "... a map lies in character between a book and a picture, and combines the features of both. The classification and the bibliographical description of maps are thus difficult, and require a good deal of attention," but went even further and provided advice, in detail, on how to provide for these differences. Boggs and Lewis were firm in their belief that differences between maps and books were so numerous and of such a character as to necessitate the development of a cataloging technique differing sharply with established book cataloging practice.

Since in maps the principal emphasis is neither on subject nor author, but on the geographic area shown, area may be considered as the most obvious and significant characteristic by which to classify and arrange them. The lack of a recognized title page, (unless it is to be one or both sides of the sheet); the importance of date, portraying a situation at a particular time; the usual lack of a personal author (possibly as high as 90 per cent of maps currently being published are issued by government agencies); the physical form of the map; and the need to record many items about a map which do not occur in books tend to support the stand of Boggs and Lewis.

Although the 1932 manual was available only in mimeographed edition, there seems to have been general knowledge of its existence. It is listed regularly in bibliographies and referred to in published articles, and on one occasion Mr. Boggs addressed an ALA Conference meeting. Thus it seems logical that the ALA Division of Cataloging and Classification should have invited Boggs and Lewis to prepare a revised edition of their manual. It also seems logical that the Division was aware of the early position taken by Mr. Boggs and Mrs. Lewis regarding the differ-
ences between maps and books. When presented for publication the manuscript was rejected because "... in the opinion of the Committee [it did] not conform to established cataloging practices particularly with respect to the rules of entry." The ALA, in the meantime, published Thiele's *Official Map Publications* which reported briefly on map cataloging practices in several large collections and concluded "that book cataloging technique is, on the whole, applicable to maps."  

What was so different about Boggs and Lewis' revised manual which was then published in 1945 by the Special Libraries Association? The manual offered help for the first time to the map cataloger on most cataloging problems. It specified that designation of main entry should be left to the map user. A unit card with map title on the first line was indicated. Further suggested was that the first card to be made for each map should be one for the area shown on the map, followed by the subject emphasized, then by the date of the situation portrayed. Other information to be transcribed would include author, edition, place, publisher, date, scale, collation, projection, series, and other explanatory notes as needed. Additional entries for subject could be provided for maps of a peculiar subject nature. Added entries could be made for any person or institution responsible in a significant way for the content of the map. Title, series, form, scale, or projection entries are suggested if the clientele of a particular library are likely to expect or use these approaches.

**The Practice**

"No Best Method to Catalog Maps" was used in 1950 as the title of an article describing the status of map cataloging and classification. There is no preferred map classification scheme in the large collections; the Library of Congress, Army Map Service, American Geographical Society, the library which includes the former State Department and Office of Strategic Services collections, Aeronautical Chart and Information Center, all use a different scheme. There is, however, more agreement on map cataloging rules than the title of Miss Anderson's article would suggest. In four of the five libraries (the Library of Congress is the exception) entry by geographical area is the practice. An examination of current practice in these and other large collections can be helpful.

In the U.S. Army Map Service map library, established in 1942 from the old General Staff collection and where nearly every minutia is available to the catalog user through the use of punch-cards coded by machine, the principal arrangement in the Card File is by area. The arrangement of cards in a systematic geographical order provides features of a classified catalog. Other approaches to map use are provided through files for Urban Areas, Scale, Special Service Negative Number, Series or Special Number, and in an Authority Call Number Reference File.

Although the map collection of the American Geographical Society in New York is nearly as old as the Society, founded in 1851, a classification for maps was worked out as recently as 1944. A map catalog has been maintained for a much longer time. "Cards are made for maps in sheets,
single or in sets; for maps in books; for maps in periodicals; for atlases; for gazetteers; for glossaries; for indexes to maps . . . ; for catalogues; and for other texts or articles concerning maps." The unit card for maps begins with area-date at the left margin on the top line, title and author on a second line, scale or size on a third line, imprint information on the next two lines followed by various descriptive and explanatory notes. Call number is written in the extreme upper right hand corner. The main card is the unit card filed by area. Additional cards are filed by subject and by author, such information being added at the top of a unit card.

During World War II a map library was organized in the newly established Office of Strategic Services. Practices employed in that library are now being used in the map library formed when the OSS and State Department collections were merged. The entry on the check card used in map cataloging by the OSS provided on the first line boxes for area, subject, scale, and call number. Wilson reporting on his wartime experience with OSS indicated that the most important items in map cataloging are area, subject, scale, date, type of map, author-publisher, edition, and projection. Although he does not state that this order is an indication of relative importance, it could be assumed.

The familiar check card record for maps is used at the U. S. Aeronautical Chart and Information Center. Area, subject, scale, and call number are recorded on the first line; title, date, edition, and the Army Map Service number on line two; language and security classification on the third line; authority is relegated to line four. Names of subjects commonly shown on maps occupy parallel columns at the lower part of the card.

A different yet practical approach in the National Archives arranges maps by record groups (government publishing authority) rather than by geographical area. Inventories, special lists, and catalogs annotate groups of maps rather than single items in many instances. Such an approach has few possibilities for use in most map libraries but might be adapted for use with groups of newspaper maps, battlefield maps, and in manuscript collections.

In university libraries, too, map librarians have tended to favor area instead of author for the map entry. Ottilia Anderson has effectively described the classified catalog, with cards arranged with area and subject on the top line, in use at the University of California. This catalog is the main and complete one for maps. A supplementary alphabetical index of geographical places and including authority entry cards is made, especially for government agencies. Separate map catalogs, as maintained at California, are favored by most writers on map cataloging and in actual library practice. Greater flexibility to provide for specialized needs of the map user is then more likely possible. California files an information card under the word "Maps" in the public catalog calling attention to the special collection and catalog of maps in the Map Room. In some libraries with separate map catalogs or where little or no map cataloging has been accomplished, information cards, including the name of the area followed
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by the word maps, are filed in the library's public catalog to call attention
to the separate map facility.82

Although maps in the University of Illinois Library are cataloged
using the 1949 ALA-LC rules, there is little satisfaction with them. They
are inadequate for many needs and fail to recognize conspicuous facts of
map use. Since 1944 the inadequacy of the rules has been met in part by
making area followed by date the first added entry for each map. Classi-
fication has served as the principal aid in locating maps buried deep in the
files. The Library of Congress “G” classification for maps is used and
highly favored, for it provides notations for area, subject, date or scale,
and authority. Only 55 per cent of the total collection is represented by
cards in the dictionary catalog, but all maps are classified and described
in the shelf list by cards relating call number, author, title, and, in most
instances, place of publication, date, and scale. Information cards refer-
ing the catalog user to the shelf list for the more complete record of map
holdings for a particular area are filed in the catalog for continents, coun-
tries, states, large cities, and other prominent areas. If a choice has to be
made, classification of a collection should be accomplished before cata-
loging. However, systematic arrangement in the files is not enough; aid
in the location of maps through some kind of a map catalog is almost
essential.

British library specialists with maps generally are in agreement with
the predominant thinking of their American colleagues. Royal Geographi-
cal Society practice reported by the Map Curator reveals that the title of
a map, if it is an accurate one, is considered of more value to the map
user than other items; therefore stands before the author in the catalog
entry.83 Entry by geographical area is the rule in most other collections
as was reported earlier for the British Museum. Parsons in the Manual
prepared for use in the Directorate of Military Survey of the British War
Office described in detail the preparation of a master card with designa-
tion of area provided for first of all.84 It is also interesting to note that a
standard British volume on cataloging recognizes that entry under the
subject heading (area) “is obviously of far greater value to people likely
to use such a catalogue than entry under the cartographer, especially
where the scope of the catalogue covers anything than a very restricted
area.”85

The Difference

Most of the map cataloging codes and practices reviewed recognize the
differences existing between maps and books, differences making the need
for separate rules seem logical. What are some of these recognized differ-
ences?

1. The principal difference is the primary identification of maps with
area rather than with authority or author, generally agreed to be among
the first items of importance in identification of a book. Nearly all maps
are published by corporate organizations; most are issued by government
agencies, others are published by companies and by scientific, business,
and automobile associations. Few maps, unlike books, are the responsibility of a personal author. Only for the early map, one published before 1800 or one issued before the invention of lithography in 1798, or one predating the invention of wax engraving in 1841, or one published before the domination of map publishing by the government agency, would there be general agreement on the use of author for entry. 

Map users usually present their requests for a map of a particular area: a map of Chicago, of the Sudan, of Cuyahoga County. Such a request might be further specified as to subject: a railroad map of Chicago, an agricultural regions map of the Sudan, a landform map of Cuyahoga County. Date, too, may be an important consideration. Experience of most map librarians is that the patron has not identified the Kalmbach Publishing Company with the railroad map of Chicago, or the Survey Department of the Sudan as publisher of the agricultural map, or the young geographer, James A. Bier, as the cartographer responsible for the landforms map of Cuyahoga County.

Thus it is emphasized that the map user usually will make his request by area, that he has little knowledge of who publishes such maps, and in the long run, is little concerned with authorship of a map so long as one which meets his needs is quickly located and withdrawn from the files for his use. As Boggs and Lewis point out, “The main entry heading should be one which is useful in the actual information it provides, in addition to making a convenient entry.”

2. The special subject information graphically presented on a map is perhaps of next significance to the user. Subject content of a book is acknowledged to be of importance and is recorded through the use of appropriate subject headings. Some special kind of record for subject on a map, other than a subject heading, is needed when the subject is specific and competes with area for the user’s interest.

3. Date for maps is of unusual significance. There is need to know and record both the situation date and the publication date. Most users recognize the unreliability of an undated map. Copyright laws, unfortunately, do not require that date be included in the copyright statement. When no date is given, the map cataloger must assume responsibility for establishing a reasonably accurate date.

4. One feature peculiar to a map and for which there is no counterpart in a book is scale. To know that there exists a definite and sustained relationship between the area being mapped and the representation shown on the map is helpful. Any catalog record for a map should include a statement of scale.

5. Size is probably of more importance when a map, rather than a book, is being considered. The use of maps for display, for exhibits, for use in lectures, for use as an outline or base map, and for incorporation into another publication is aided by an indication of size. Description in inches, rather than in centimeters, especially for large maps, also sounds reasonable.

6. Map titles perhaps even more than book titles are vague, incom-
plete, and misleading. Principal features shown on a map can best be described when information about area, date, and subject are used to supplement and clarify a vague title.

7. Projection is another feature peculiar to maps and one to be noted in any discussion of basic differences between them and books.

8. Color, the presence or lack of it on a map, may well cause a patron to reject it for use. If a catalog record, regardless of its form, is to save time for the user, to save work for the librarian, and to save wear and tear on the maps by eliminating unnecessary withdrawal from the files, such information should be recorded.

9. The physical characteristics of a map may limit its usefulness or enhance its value. Photostatic copies, blue line prints, blue prints, and other types of reproductions have limitations which need to be identified in the catalog record.

Boggs and Lewis point out other differences which complicate matters when maps and books are considered to be alike: absence of a tangible title page for a map; general subject emphasis (as geologic data) superseded by the importance of geographic area; usability of maps in unfamiliar languages; presentation of information on maps in geographical and graphic form only; and finally the preponderance of problems associated with the filing of maps.

The Preliminary Report

At a time when some librarians felt that agreement was about to be reached on cataloging rules for entry and description, map librarians in the Washington, D. C., Geography and Map Group of the Special Libraries Association expressed dissatisfaction with the Library of Congress Rules for Descriptive Cataloging. This was in April 1948, and a Committee to take organized issue with LC rules and practice was appointed.

Members of the original Committee were Mrs. Jane Brewer Jones, Mary Murphy, Mrs. Dorothy C. Lewis, Joseph C. Rogers, and Muriel H. Parry, Chairman. The Committee in a Preliminary Report submitted in October 1958, expressed the belief that constructive comment on individual rules for map cataloging was not possible because of dissatisfaction with some of the basic principles which were assumed. The Committee held that not author, but area either alone or qualified by date, subject, scale, or other factors was the most appropriate entry for use in map cataloging.

A further basic conclusion, that maps and books are fundamentally different rather than alike, guided the Committee in its consideration of physical differences between maps and books, differences in use, and special problems which maps, unlike books, create in housing, arrangement, and preservation. They recognized that physical differences alone, however, would not justify separate cataloging treatment. The Report concluded "... that rules for the cataloging of maps cannot satisfactorily follow traditional book cataloging, but must be independently organized, preferably, in a self-contained document." It concluded by recommending
that the Library of Congress restudy map entries giving serious consideration to the use of area for that purpose.

The Final Report

Work of the Committee was continued; in 1951 it became a standing committee of the SLA Geography and Map Division, and Kathleen Irish Hickey replaced Mrs. Lewis on the Committee. What this Committee recommended deserves careful review and consideration.

In 1951 maps were no longer the unwanted library step-child that they were in 1941 when the modern ALA rules were first published. Maps were far on the way toward becoming an important research tool in large academic and public libraries as well as in governmental and special geographical collections. Progress during the previous decade had been the result of several activities. The map depository program of the U. S. Army Map Service, expanded publishing activity of governmental and commercial map producers, increased university instruction in cartography, and, of course, the new popular interest in maps as a result of World War II brought many thousands of maps into libraries of all sizes. Administrators, reference and acquisition librarians, and catalogers had become acutely aware of the problems associated with maps in libraries.

In specialized map libraries, too, the situation was similar. The need for a classified arrangement to insure proper control and to provide adequate reference service was realized. Classification schemes used for books were not adequate for maps; when they were used, the differences between books and maps became obvious to the frustrated librarian. To meet these differences special map classification schemes were devised.

These same differences, too, concerned librarians who attempted to catalog maps using rules which recognized little if any difference between maps and books. As map collections became more numerous and the number of map librarians in charge of these collections increased, opposition to existing and widely adopted map cataloging codes also increased.

The members of the Committee on Map Cataloging had a number of years of varied experience with maps; they felt that a fuller insight and appreciation of the problems facing the map reference librarian was needed. A questionnaire inquiring into the physical aspects of the map collection and of card catalogs and into the nature of map requests was prepared and distributed to 956 libraries thought likely to have some sort of a collection. Questionnaires were returned by 64 per cent of the libraries solicited. It is likely that of the libraries not responding many had map collections too small to present unique problems of interest to the Committee.

It was found that 68 per cent of the reporting libraries had cataloged some or all of their maps; half of the libraries maintained separate map catalogs; 34 per cent of the collections were housed as separate units while 46 per cent, primarily the smaller ones, were housed as part of the library's reference collection. Of particular significance to the Committee, though, was the indication by 72 per cent of the libraries that patrons most often
requested maps by area alone or qualified by date or subject, that they were seldom requested by author or title.

On the premise that the map catalog should be geared to the needs of the map user and the ability of a library to service these needs, and supporting their earlier declaration of disagreement with the assumption that maps are like books and hence can be cataloged satisfactorily using traditional book cataloging rules, the Committee went to work.

Serviceability—“the card should proclaim itself immediately as an entry for a map and should at once give the searcher a mental picture of the map”; economy—“the rules by which maps should be cataloged should be stated simply, and should be easy to apply”; and flexibility—“the card should be capable of expansion from a brief entry for small collections to a comprehensive entry for larger and more specialized collections,” were the three objectives which provided guidance to the Committee.

The card catalog serves three basic functions: inventory, location, and organization: “inventory of the collection by means of which a searcher locates a desired item or by which there is selected from among several items the one or several likely to supply the information desired” or bringing to attention related items which otherwise would not be known to the searcher. As the Committee report emphasized, the card catalog serves a fourth important function: that of protection. Wear and tear on maps will be lessened by utilization of the card catalog.

Some large collections of maps function, albeit with difficulty, without a card catalog. Some large collections still are relatively unclassified. Even though the geographical arrangement possible for maps makes a catalog less a necessity than with books, there are a considerable number of collections grown beyond the point which marks the minimum requirements for a catalog.

Classification for the map collection is even more important than is cataloging. Control through use of a special map classification such as Library of Congress or Boggs and Lewis which provide notations for several features might well form the basis for a classified catalog. Most map libraries admit to uncataloged backlogs, so it might seem reasonable to let a classification number and an accompanying shelf list card filed by this number provide an approach to control when time and staff are limited. Catalog records, though, provide the control necessary to give more than a minimum service to the map user. Every library with a map collection must strive for more than such a minimum.

An ADS heading would be the main entry for maps according to the Final Report of the SLA Committee on Map Cataloging. Elements of this new heading are Area, Date, Subject, plus Scale and Size. It would also serve as the first line of the unit card. The Committee felt, and this is a point worthy of further consideration, that the ADS heading alone would provide a simple, economical, and adequate guide to many small map collections, for it provides significant description in a concise form.

It should be noted again that replies to the library questionnaire revealed the elements of chief concern to maps users in libraries to be area,
subject, and date, in that order. For several reasons the Committee felt it desirable to alter this order slightly in the recommended heading. Area, as noted earlier, has been the most consistent entry for map cataloging in the principal map collections. Area is suggested as the first item in the ADS heading. A direct heading describing the area shown on the map is assumed, thus Urbana, Ill., not Illinois. Urbana.

Advantages of a sub-arrangement by date were apparent to the Committee; therefore the choice of date (presumed to be date of situation portrayed on the map as opposed to publication date if they differ) as the second element in the heading was an easy choice. Map users are often interested in a map of an area as of a particular date and one showing general geographical detail without concern for more specific subject information. The Area-Date order provides an arrangement satisfying this need as well as describing in one place all separate maps available for a given area. Such advantages have been apparent at the University of Illinois where for over fourteen years area followed by date has been used as the first added entry in all map cataloging.

Subject as the third element in the proposed heading allows a prominent position to another item of interest. Many maps have no subject; that is, they show several subjects so are considered general maps. In such instances subject added entries would not be required, but it is assumed that they will be provided when the several subjects are significant.

Buffum has suggested that a more useful arrangement in the heading would be Area-Subject-Date, as it would be "uneconomical of the readers' time to look through all area cards for his particular subject, or else abandon the area approach and go to the subject file." This second step, though, is likely to be necessary and desirable to bring together references to maps showing such special subjects as population distribution or geology or land use. Special subject maps regardless of the area they describe are sometimes of special interest to illustrate a cartographic technique, for use in a comparison of legends, or as an example of a method of presentation.

A chronological arrangement for all maps of an area is not possible in the Area-Subject-Date heading, and an arrangement by date seems essential. General geographical and boundary data are available on most maps even though some special subject may be emphasized. Another example of importance of date is the practice in the Map and Geography Library of the University of Illinois where atlases have been cataloged using conventional LC headings. All subject cards with the heading, ATLAS, are arranged by date rather than by author. Immediate reference to atlas maps of a particular date is available through the book card catalog.

One library which has adopted the ADS heading, and several introduced to it in Map Workshops held in 1952 and 1955 at the University of Illinois have elected to catalog maps using ADS, and have preferred to omit the date in the heading except in the case of "old" maps. But it seems to this writer that the date of the map is too important to omit from the catalog record regardless of the map's age.
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The two final items in the ADS heading, scale and size, were considered by the Committee of sufficient importance to the user in his selection of maps to be included in the heading and to be used as secondary filing devices in large collections. Scale would always be given in the form of a representative fraction as 1:50,000 or 1:1,000,000. Measurement of size in inches is also suggested; and giving height, then width, is here further suggested.

The second part of the catalog card would include a transcription of authority, title, edition, and the elements of imprint: place of publication, publisher if different than authority, and date of publication.

Present Library of Congress practice with respect to notes is generally considered to be adequate, although greater guidance with notes is provided by Boggs and Lewis in their manual. The Committee did suggest that collation information, other than scale and size which are now a part of the ADS heading, be included as the first note.

Tracings would be provided for subject entries when applicable, for series and for titles under certain circumstances, for authorities in some instances, and for any additional areas other than the one used in the original heading. This added entry for an additional area would be presented in the form of an ADS heading.

The following examples illustrate the ADS heading and other points made in the Committee's Final Report:

---

**Classification Number**

**UNITED STATES. 1957. PHYSICAL. 1:5,000,000.**

24 x 38 in.


Colored

Relief shown by hysometric tints.

1. PHYSICAL. I. American Geographical Society.

---

**Classification Number**

**BURMA. 1955. TOPOGRAPHY. 1:250,000.**

18 x 25 in. each.


col. maps.

Series U542.

Transverse Mercator projection.

Relief shown by contours or form lines, shading, and spot elevations.

1. TOPOGRAPHY. I. U. S. Army Map Service. II.

Series.
WYOMING. 1956. IRRIGATION. ca.1:850,000. 25 x 28 in.
Colored
1. IRRIGATION. 2. POWER. I. Wyoming Natural Resource Board.

SHOSHONE NATIONAL FOREST, WYOMING. 1952.
FORESTS. ca.1:255,000. 28 x 46 in.
2 maps on sheet.
Black and white.
Polyconic projection.
1. FORESTS. 1. U.S. Forest Service.
(Authority added entry is not really necessary for this map.)

ILLINOIS. 1956. PHYSICAL. 1:1,000,000. 26 x 15 in.
Black and white.
Relief shown by landform technique and spot elevations.
Inset: Physiographic divisions of Illinois.

LITCHFIELD, ILL. 1957. ca.1:16,000. 9 x 11 in.
Black and White.
(No additional entries are necessary for this map.)

ILLINOIS. 1945. TRANSPORTATION. 1:250,000.
23 x 33 in. each.
9 col. sheets.
Lambert conformal projection.
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Catalogers are well aware that establishing consistent author entries occupies an unreasonable percentage of the time required to catalog a book or map; the “no conflict” principle often has not been enough. The transcription of author should be a routine thing. General standardization is, of course, desirable, but a liberal use of “see also” references to variant name forms of organizations and individuals known or suspected to be the same should be included in the catalog.

One critic has agreed that the chief source of economy in cataloging using the ADS heading results by eliminating the bugaboo of establishing authorities. The ADS heading eliminates the need for spending useless amounts of time to establish author entries. It is not supposed that all libraries would provide an added entry for authority. In fact their value to most users is questionable, for users often are unable to suggest or recall responsibility for map publication. As the author is of minor importance to the map user, it does not seem necessary to give it a prominent position on the card.

Already mentioned have been certain objections to parts of the Final Report. All seems capable of easy resolution. While the Committee suggests that the word “map” precede the call number, another proposal is that the word “Map” be included in the ADS heading similar to “Phonorecord” and “Film Strip” as used in some library catalogs.

Many librarians without experience in preparing a catalog record for maps are unaware that a very high percentage of maps (perhaps as high as 75 or 80 per cent) are issued in sets or series. Many more maps are revised with a regular or indefinite frequency. Large scale topographic and geologic map series intended eventually to provide coverage for an entire area fall into the first category; hydrographic charts, state road maps, and city maps issued from time to time in revised editions are included in the second category. Maps in the first group will be represented by a single set of catalog cards. In some libraries an analytic card for each sheet in the series is prepared and filed as an inventory record, or an accession sheet is used to record this information. The second group of maps, revisions of the same map issued at intervals, would be processed using a date or number serial checking card in addition to a set of cards using the ADS heading.

The Future

Various problems introduced by the Committee but not considered by them to be within their provence merit further study. These and others are suggested for consideration:

a. Establishment of a uniform practice for the determination of area names.
b. Preparation of a special list of subject headings to include terms commonly used to describe maps.
c. Review of map classification schemes currently in use and consideration of the Library of Congress or Boggs and Lewis or other classifications for use in a classified catalog.
d. Study to determine whether atlases should be cataloged as maps or books as there is general recognition that they have certain characteristics of each.
e. A joint ALA-SLA-LC committee to make a considered study of published map cataloging codes and of the Final Report of the Committee on Map Cataloging, giving recognition to maps as separate documents requiring their own cataloging rules, and preparation of a map cataloging code, preferably a separate document, which will provide help both to the map user and to the map librarian.

Recognition of differences between maps and books and the need for separate rules for the cataloging of maps is long overdue. Serious consideration of the Final Report of the SLA Committee on Map Cataloging and a quick retreat from the Phillips' postulation of 1904 is urged.

REFERENCES


OTHER REFERENCES

Cataloging of Pictures

Rules for Pictures, Designs, and Other Two-Dimensional Representations have been approved by the Library of Congress and the CCS Descriptive Cataloging Committee for the American Library Association. They were developed by LC's Committee on Rules for Cataloging Prints and Photographs, established in January 1952 to prepare a draft for these materials as part of the Library's program to provide coverage for all library materials in its Rules for Descriptive Cataloging. A preliminary draft was distributed in 1954 to 75 libraries, museums, art publishers, and individuals and the resulting criticisms carefully studied. Necessary modification and expansion of the A.L.A. Cataloging Rules for Author and

Title Entries 19E and 32D have been included.

To quote from the Introduction:

These rules for pictorial works are designed to provide for the preparation of catalog entries which may be integrated with entries for other materials. They are applicable to prints, paintings, drawings (including architectural drawings), photographs, transparencies and slides, etc., but not to sculpture, objets d'art, or other three-dimensional works. Rules for motion pictures and filmstrips have been issued separately.

It should be emphasized that these rules are not designed to be applied to pictures which may be more economically and efficiently serviced in files with self-indexing subject arrangement. There is, however, a need to provide access to certain individual works and specific collections by approaches other than subject, such as author (i.e. artist, engraver, etc.) and title, which are normally provided for other materials. These rules are intended to provide for the cataloging of such individual pictures and collections.

In accordance with the needs, size, and specialization of a particular library, some of the descriptive details may be either simplified or elaborated and the number of added entries increased or decreased. For example, museums may need more exact description of some of the more unusual media, and notes relating to condition, source, or to size and location of the original work.

The Library of Congress is publishing a preliminary edition in the same format as the rules for phonorecords. It will be available without charge on request to the Card Division.—Audrey Smith, Chairman; Descriptive Cataloging Committee.
Andrew Delbridge Osborn

Wyllis E. Wright, Librarian
Williams College
Williamstown, Massachusetts

The Margaret Mann Citation in Cataloging and Classification is awarded in 1959 to Andrew D. Osborn for his varied and extensive contributions to cataloging. As a penetrating analyst of cataloging rules and practice, a thoughtful author of comprehensive works, a careful translator, a helpful consultant to various libraries, an alert promoter of simplifications, a successful teacher and an effective supervisor, he has demonstrated the type of leadership that has led to progress in the field of cataloging.

When Andrew D. Osborn arrived, like a new Phileas Fogg, to receive the Margaret Mann Citation for 1959, it was certain that the Award Committee had done well to summon him from half around the world. Few indeed are the people who have had as deep an influence on the thinking of their own generation of catalogers as he. After he had
spoken, others were found in agreement with his ideas, but it was his voice which ended one long tradition in cataloging and set our principles and practices in a new direction.

Born in Tasmania, he received the degrees of Bachelor and Master of Arts from the University of Melbourne and was a senior cataloger in the Commonwealth Parliament Library when he came to this country in 1927. He was immediately secured by the New York Public Library where, working alternately in the Preparation Division and at the Information Desk, he both made and used one of the world's great catalogs. In 1934 he obtained his Ph.D. from Columbia with a thesis on The Philosophy of Edmund Husserl. In 1936 he earned a Master of Science in Library Science degree from Michigan and was for a year the first Director of the School of Library Science at the University of Southern California. The following year he returned to Michigan as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Library Science. When Keyes D. Metcalf became Director of the Harvard University Libraries, he called Osborn to become Assistant Librarian in Charge of Cataloging, where he served until he left a year ago to return to Australia as Librarian of Sydney University.

Dr. Osborn's energy and interest have always kept him busy in activities beyond his routine assignments. He has taken part in many surveys, of which those of the Library of Congress (1940), the Army Medical Library (1943), the University of Illinois Library School (1943), and the University of Pennsylvania Library (1948) were the most important. He has taught at Columbia and Simmons in addition to USC and Michigan. In 1938 he published the English translation of The Prussian Instructions and in 1955 Serial Publications, Their Place and Treatment in Libraries. In 1950 he was borrowed by Carl Milam to assist in the organization of the United Nations Library and later served as Interim Chief there. He has been the American representative on the Working Group on Cataloging Principles of the International Federation of Library Associations, ALA representative to discuss coordination of cataloging practices with the German Library Association, international liaison member of the Cataloging Code Revision Committee, and a tireless worker for an international conference on cataloging. For three years he served as chairman of the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials, and he made the preliminary studies for the Council on Library Resources of "Cataloging in Source." He was President of the Division of Cataloging and Classification in 1940/41.

The choice of Michigan as the school in which to seek his library science degree was based on Mr. Osborn's admiration for the work of Margaret Mann. Her common-sense approach to the problems of cataloging and the practical nature of the instruction which she gave corresponded to like qualities in his own nature. The two years which he spent at Ann Arbor encouraged a firm friendship and led him to devote many hours to assisting her, anonymously, in the revision of her Introduction to Cataloging and the Classification of Books. His speech of acceptance of the Citation at Washington was a warm tribute to her.
The appearance of *The Crisis in Cataloging* in 1941 marked a great divide in the history of cataloging theory in this country. Ever since the publication of the Anglo-American code of 1908, the more influential catalogers of the country had been elaborating rules of entry to cover each particular possibility of variation in material and ever more and more detailed and complex rules of description. The results of this process were exhibited in the Preliminary Second Edition of the *A. L. A. Catalog Rules*. Osborn's attack on perfectionism and legalism and his advocacy of a pragmatic approach in cataloging was an immediate counterblast. Greeted at first with hostility on the part of the majority or at least of the more vocal members of the profession, his point of view won enough acceptance to delay final approval of the new code. Slowly he gained more adherents. The descriptive rules were removed from the code, reconsidered with considerable care, and greatly simplified before being issued by the Library of Congress as its *Rules for Descriptive Cataloging*. The applause which greeted this publication led the ALA Board on Cataloging Policy and Research to urge a similar reconsideration of the rules for author and title entry, a reconsideration which is still under way in the current drafts of a new code. It was Dr. Osborn who called a halt to the old era and rallied the forces to bring in the new.

But he has not devoted all of his time to professional activities. As a young man he earned a reputation in Australia as a cricketer and has kept up his interest in athletics. He is a strong opponent on the tennis court (and also at the bridge table). During the years at the New York Public Library he was an enthusiastic participant in the men's hikes and the organizer of many a week-end football game. Unless he has reverted to cricket in the months since he returned to Australia, he is still a very warm baseball fan.

"Andy" Osborn has been guide, philosopher, and friend for many younger librarians both through his teaching and through his work at New York and Harvard. He imparts to those around him his own feeling of the excitement and intellectual challenge to be found in library work. His ready grin is an index of the warm friendliness of his nature. He will not accept loose thinking or slipshod work even from those that he likes, but his approval of a job well done is a sufficient reward for the work which he demands. A host of friends rejoice that this year's Margaret Mann Citation went to Andrew D. Osborn.

**INSTITUTE ON CATALOG CODE REVISION**

**MONTREAL, JUNE 12-17, 1960**

The Cataloging and Classification Section and McGill University will sponsor a second Institute on Catalog Code Revision at McGill during the week preceding the joint annual conference of the American and Canadian Library Associations. Details concerning room and meal arrangements and registration and costs will be announced as soon as they are available.
A WORKSHOP on order records and methods was sponsored by the University of Southern California School of Library Science on April 14, 1959. Short papers on pertinent topics followed by panel and group discussions were the order of the day with the emphasis on the practical and the readily applicable. The following papers, somewhat abridged, were among those presented. They are offered here to provoke further thought on the basic problems they examine. Our thanks go to Dean Martha Boaz of the School for making them available.

Besides the authors of these papers, others who participated as discussion leaders and panelists were June Biemann, Los Angeles City Schools; Helen Harvey, Pasadena Public Library; Edwin Coman, University of California at Riverside; Elsie Truesdale, Los Angeles Public Library; and Elizabeth Reining, Pomona Unified School District.—H.M.W.

A SURVEY OF ORDER FORMS
Ethel H. Swanger, Orange Public Library

In attempting to gather basic information pertaining to the various forms used in placing book orders, the author sent letters of inquiry to sixteen neighboring libraries. This survey then, includes seventeen libraries. Each was asked to send a sample of its order form, and, if multi-copy forms were used, to indicate how they were routed. The librarians were also asked to indicate the extent of bibliographic searching that was done before the order was placed.

An effort was made to see that libraries with book collections of all sizes were represented in this survey; the smallest reporting has a stock of 31,000 volumes; the largest has 367,000.

Of the seventeen libraries, nine use some form of multiple order slips, varying from three to six copies, without re-typing the titles on an order sheet. Of the sample multiple forms received, some are locally printed and some are Gaylord forms. Two contain no printing at all; in these cases the library types all the necessary information. It is interesting to note that five of these libraries have book collections of less than 50,000 volumes.

In these nine libraries, the routing of the slips is as follows: all nine send the original copy to the dealer; eight send one copy to the Library of Congress for LC cards; five file one copy in the public catalog until the catalog cards are filed (two others file a copy with the Reader's Adviser and at the Information desk, respectively); and eight report that one copy travels with the book while it is being processed. Two other libraries, both with much larger collections than those in the above group,
use multiple order slips for their order and processing routines, but send an order sheet to the dealers.

Six of the seventeen libraries use no type of multiple slips, but rely on order sheets entirely. Again, it is interesting to note that this group includes five large libraries (81,000 to 293,000 volumes) and also the smallest of the seventeen. Of these six, three use printed order forms, one uses letterhead, and two report "sheets." Five of the six libraries use a printed card (Library Bureau, Demco, or Gaylord) for their order file, and in most cases this card travels with the book through the processing stages.

In reply to the question regarding the extent of bibliographic searching done before ordering, practically all of the seventeen libraries stated that they keep this to a minimum. In most cases, the information supplied to the vendor is taken from current book reviewing media. When special titles, added copies, or replacements are ordered, search is made in such tools as Books in Print, CBI, etc. Only one library, a small one, reported that a complete search is made for every title.

OUR ORDER FORMS
George T. Smisor, University of California, Riverside

Perhaps the reason I have been asked to give this report on our order forms is because we at UCR have one of the most multiple of multiple order forms in use. We didn't design it to see just how many carbon papers we could put in a form or to see how many copies an IBM electric typewriter could make. The form was designed to fit the needs of our local set-up. In fact, the first criterion in planning a multiple order form is to design it for a particular program in specific circumstances. Since all libraries differ in their ordering and accounting procedures, no one type of multiple order form would serve for all of them.

I should like to explain to you, as briefly as possible, how and why our order form, consisting of an original and eight copies, fits into our system. First of all, however, I will go back a step to the beginning of our procedure. We begin with an order card, as most libraries do, on which is written the author and title of the work wanted with other available bibliographic data. In our case this order card is usually filled out either carelessly or completely by a member of our academic staff. Sometimes the card is legible, but sometimes the checkers can scarcely make it out. This is the card that is used for checking in the bibliographies and in our files for possible duplication. After it is checked and a dealer assigned, it is typed on the multiple order form.

Our multiple order form contains blanks in the left-hand column for order number, date of order, dealer, volumes wanted, number of copies wanted, guide line (which is the department in the university to which material is to be charged), and person recommending the purchase. After the book is received, we use the lines for date received, cost (which is exact cost, including sales tax), and the date of bill. In the upper right-hand corner is a blank for the Library of Congress Card number. The rest of the form is blank, and this is a tremendous advantage to us, for it means that
we have room enough on the blank to give all the bibliographic data with price, whether it is lengthy or short, in the proper bibliographic order. We use a gothic type, and the last name of the author and the main title of the book go in capitals and the rest in caps and small caps.

This multiple order form is used for all orders placed, which include books, continuations, periodical subscriptions, microfilm, phonograph records, and music scores.

The first or original sheet of our order form is about a 29-lb. white ledger paper and is our permanent record. The other eight forms are on various colors of 12-lb. bond. The first carbon on light buff paper is the dealer's copy, and on the back of it are printed the conditions of purchase and shipping directions. The pink form which follows is for the controller's office. Then comes a green form which is filed in the order department according to the order number. The next three forms are for the cataloging department. A canary one is used to order Library of Congress cards. The blue one is for a catalog department file and will contain a stamped date indicating when the LC cards were ordered. The canary and blue forms are given to the Catalog Department when the order is placed. The cherry form is placed in the received book and is used by the catalogers as a temporary shelf-list card. Then follows a salmon form which is used for department accounting and is retained in the order department, filed by department and then by professor's name. The last form, goldenrod, is attached to that copy of the invoice retained in the order department files. Whenever a book is received on purchase, we make use of all nine forms. Only in the case of books received by gift or from exchange do we discard some of these forms.

After the form is typed, all nine copies are separated and sent to their respective files or departments. The original, the cherry form, and the last form are stapled to the order card, and the set is filed in orders outstanding. When the book arrives, these forms are separated. The order card is stamped with the statement: "Received in Acquisitions" and dated, and then mailed to the professor requesting the book. The cherry form slip goes with the book to cataloging. The original of the multiple order form is filled in and filed in the order department's permanent record file of received titles. Thus it is our principal checking file, since it contains all books received, except government documents, serials and series. This original form contains all pertinent information concerning the order and its receipt.

The last form is attached to the invoice. When we receive a book, we write in the margin of the leaf following the title page certain information, such as the date received, order number, dealer, price, professor's name. We often find this information very important later, so much so that we have no intention of eliminating it.

We have other forms which we use regularly. One of the most useful is a mimeographed one which we send to dealers, asking them to indicate and hold second-hand catalog items which we wish to buy. Because of the cost of our multiple order form and the work involved in placing an or-
der, we nearly always find out first from the dealer what items he still has available before we place a definite order. We send this form in duplicate, so that the dealer need only check the items and return one form to us. We have a mimeographed form for general and miscellaneous inquiries concerning an order and its shipment and invoices. Seventeen different items can be indicated on it. Both of these mimeographed forms are made to use with window envelopes.

We have a number of other forms as do all order departments. My policy on forms has been to wait until the need was evident and then design the form to fit this need.

ORDERING BOOKS FOR LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOLS
Gladys McDowell, Los Angeles City Schools

The procedure for buying a book for the Los Angeles City School Library is an involved process. The school orders a book in one of two ways: on an order card or on a check list of recommended books called a combined order. These orders are sent to the Library Section, where central ordering and cataloging takes place. The orders are thrown together in one file according to publisher. At this time the Supervisor checks each order to be sure of suitability for the maturity level of the students in the school and to be sure it is in accordance with Board of Education policy. This has been taken care of on combined orders, since the check list is a compilation of books reviewed by librarians and teachers in the Los Angeles Schools. Orders on the check list are transferred to a combined order card, and bibliographical data for all orders is checked for accuracy.

The Los Angeles City Schools buy all printed materials under a system of contracts and bids. This is in accordance with the Education Code of the State of California, although recently an optional clause was added permitting the local governing board to make a choice. To date the Los Angeles City Schools still purchase with contracts and bids.

Contracts are established in July for the fiscal year. Jobbers and publishers bid on these contracts, and one jobber has currently as few as eleven publishers and another as many as eighty-seven. A dealer receives the contract because he has offered the lowest bid, or, to state it in reverse, the largest discounts with additional cash discounts for payment within twenty to forty-five days. There are twenty-seven contracts this year. All other publishers are then handled by separate bids.

To return to the order cards arranged by publisher, these are then arranged by contract. Requisitions are typed on a special requisition form which will be reproduced in from twelve to twenty copies at the Business Division, depending on whether the requisition is for contract or bid items. On the requisition for contract items the following information is included: vendor, his address, fund used (high school, elementary or junior college), requisition number, date, authors, titles, prices less twenty percent, and terms of payment. If it is a bid item, the information given is: requisition number, fund used, price, publisher, and publisher's address.
The Business Division places the order with the designated contracting firm. A copy of the requisition is returned to the Order Department with the purchase order number added.

Order cards are filed in an outstanding file according to card order numbers as indicated on the annual calendar to schools. Each card is stamped with requisition number for additional identification in case of damaged and defective or incorrect deliveries.

RECEIVING AND FINANCIAL RECORDS
Catherine MacQuarrie, Los Angeles County Library

Our major problems in these fields are: To shorten the length of time between the selection of the title and the receipt of the book, partial deliveries which result in added work in both ordering and cataloging, and keeping current our financial records under the book funds. There has been very little written about these subjects; in fact, the whole subject of acquisitions is sadly neglected in library literature. Evidently, the librarians concerned with these procedures are either too busy to write or are not interested in getting their ideas into print. Receiving and financial record-keeping are fields in which mechanization of procedures and the application of business methods have many possibilities, but little has been done by libraries to take advantage of new methods.

Library procedures for the receipt of books and the related financial records vary according to the size of the library, the number of accounts kept, and the financial arrangements the library has with its governing body. In the County Library, we have made some short cuts and have discussed the use of various machines. For example, we have stopped collating books, as most manufacturing errors are caught as the books are processed. We do the minimum of checking of the books against the invoice. We have started using a machine—the Burroughs Sensimatic machine—to keep our book fund accounts. However, these few shortcuts are just a drop in the bucket in the overall procedure of getting the books to the borrowers as quickly and as economically as possible. In my search of library literature the only reference of any importance that I could find within the last few years was an article prepared by Wilmer H. Baatz and Eugene H. Maurer of the Milwaukee Public Library on "Machines at Work" (Library Journal, August, 1953). The Milwaukee Public Library Acquisitions Division uses a five-part order form, from which IBM tabulating cards are prepared. These enable the easy production of such valuable monthly lists as: a cumulative total of money paid out to dealers, itemized by dealer; orders still outstanding, including estimated discounts; lists of totals remaining in each book fund; an alphabetical list for each fund showing the titles paid for; and orders outstanding sorted by dealer. At the end of the year a list is prepared giving a complete record of all books and serial receipts and all outstanding orders for each fund.

Recently I attended an open house given by the International Business Machines Corporation. There was one machine in particular which looked as though it would have possibilities for order work and bill pay-
ment. It is called the IBM 632 Electronic Typing Calculator and punch card machine. It prepares tabulating cards and invoices at the same time. The salesman showed us how the retail store uses the machine for grocery ordering. A machine that can itemize and keep records of all the thousands of items and grades of canned goods in a grocery store can surely be adapted to book ordering where there are fewer items or titles and far fewer grades or editions.

Such business methods can be applied to books as well as groceries. Then the many files and cross files now kept in order departments could be eliminated and machines used. Usually, as soon as a business takes the time to settle down and decide just which records they need and what information they want from their records, business consultants or IBM system programmers can review the project and see if machines can do the job better and more quickly than it is being done now. Can book ordering be systematized so that machines can be used? Can record keeping in order departments be reduced to tabulating cards so that lists such as those prepared by Milwaukee can be made without the endless typing that now goes on in order work? Can invoices, bill payments and the clearing of records be reduced to machine process? Can order librarians and vendors solve their mutual problems if they consult more? If so, perhaps ordering can be kept current, files and receipts be kept current, and books delivered to those who order them while they are still in demand, without having such large order staffs.

Are order librarians willing to do a little soul-searching as to whether the ordering of books really is a unique process once the title, quantity, edition, and price discount are determined?

FOLLOW-UP ON ORDERS
Ruth A. Diveley, Occidental College

According to the Oxford English dictionary, follow up is "To prosecute with energy (an affair already in progress); to reinforce by further vigorous action or fresh support." In addition to the urgency that arises from wanting particular titles to satisfy the needs of our patrons, many of us have the practical necessity of saving our funds for the purpose for which they were appropriated, inasmuch as there are legal safeguards which require that a budget allowance may not be exceeded and that bills may not be carried over into another fiscal year. Even though we may have screened out any foreseeable trouble in our order procedure and most of our books have arrived in a reasonable time, from ten to twenty percent may be delayed, and we need to know why. Sometimes, the answer may be readily available by telephone or a quick trip in person, but most of our answers will have to come in writing. At Occidental, our routine calls for claiming all domestic books after a delay of ninety days and foreign books, after six months.

Working out some practicable means of communication among the buyer, the dealer, and the publisher is most desirable. The multiple order form serves us well. Two copies go to the dealer, one for his records
and one for return to us, either as a report or in the book. This report is especially helpful to the smaller organizations, who have limitations of time and staff. Most large organizations prefer to use their well-established forms for reports. Let us assume that a title has been reported as temporarily out of stock, but two months have gone by and still no further report nor shipment. Then is when we use another ply of our multiple form, which is appropriately imprinted on the back. A gasco signal is attached to our basic order record, and the date of the claim is stamped on it as well as on the claim itself. For those who use punched order forms or sheet orders, a photographic reproduction of the original order becomes an effective claim.

So far, this is an impersonal correspondence, I realize. However, it does have the essentials of good business letters, in that the receiver has at hand all essential points to be considered. The number and date of the original order and the title, exactly as it appeared in the original order, are there, so that the complaint can be correlated with what has gone before, or may supersede it should the original be mislaid. If the dealer is highly departmentalized, and there are several items under consideration, time is saved, because the claim may be broken up immediately and parts routed to the appropriate departments.

In some instances, still further correspondence is necessary. A double return postal card will frequently bring a reply from some who seem allergic to forms. For some knotty problems, follow-up letters are needful. We must remember, however, that all of this is a form of communication, and we are not trying just to express ourselves, but we want understanding of the dealer’s problems too; therefore, as in conversation, we must listen to what the other fellow is saying. I am sure that many dealers feel that librarians must file some of their reports in waste baskets! We should certainly have the courtesy to note the reports when received, and, if the order has been cancelled, to remove our orders from our active files until whatever next step is appropriate. A recent article in the Library Journal (February 1, 1959) is most informative as to “What wholesalers think of library customers.”

Let us consider some of the aspects of delays. If the report is temporarily out of stock with the publisher, the publisher may be waiting for orders to pile up to see if another printing will be profitable; if it is, then it may take as much as a month for the printing and another two weeks for the book to be distributed. Publishers too may do their own rationing, in partially filling orders for multiple copies; for some titles prove to be far more popular than anticipated. Further, both publishers and wholesalers have inventory and tax problems, and deliberately let their stocks grow low. In fact, they are almost as eccentric and unregimented in their routines as are librarians.

**WHAT RECORDS ARE KEPT**
Hazel Rea, University of Southern California

We have been describing innumerable order records and files and the
uses to which they are put. Now we come to the question: Which records are essential to keep permanently and which may safely be discarded? There is no simple answer, as we all know, and quite likely no two of us would agree completely on what files are essential.

The kind of records needed are determined in part by the size of the library, the administrative structure, and the services rendered. Tax supported libraries are usually required by law or city ordinance to keep certain records for a specified length of time. Privately supported libraries are generally obliged to observe administrative regulations in this respect, too. The age of the library is still another factor, not necessarily in the number of files needed but in the number maintained; for the number of files tends to multiply as time goes on. It is always easy to find an excuse for a new record. Let us examine the most commonly kept files.

THE OUTSTANDING ORDER FILE is one of the most important records in the order department. It consists of main entry cards for all titles on order, usually arranged alphabetically. Filing should be done carefully and kept up to date to avoid unintentional duplication of orders. A separate CONTINUATIONS FILE may be desirable if standing orders are sizeable. Weeding of the outstanding order file is necessary when orders have been cancelled or have not been received after a long period of time. This is especially true for second-hand items and for foreign orders. In some libraries the Outstanding Order File may be combined with the In-Process File, items advertised for, or other files. In rare instances outstanding orders may be filed in the public catalog.

After receipt of the book, the card is usually transferred from the Outstanding Order File to the IN-PROCESS FILE. Whether this file is separate or combined with another, the information must be available so that the order department can determine whether requests for purchases are duplicates of titles already in the library but not yet cataloged. Into the In-Process File should go, also, a record of books received as gifts and on exchange but not yet cataloged. Some libraries prefer to file the In-Process slip in the public catalog and destroy it when the catalog card is filed. The University of Southern California tried this for several years, but the weeding out of slips that failed to get pulled when the catalog card was filed was complicated and time-consuming. Misfiling and differing entries were numerous, and so the practice was abandoned.

The ACCESSION RECORD in old-style book form is now seldom kept, but a card accession record is not uncommon. To serve this purpose one copy of the multiple order form, arranged by serial number, may be used. Some libraries enter order data on the shelf card. Still others use book bills for accession records.

An ORDERS COMPLETED FILE, or dead orders, is maintained by some libraries. At SC the order card is transferred to the completed order file as soon as the book is received. This file is arranged alphabetically by author (first names and initials are disregarded) and then by title, except for material of special format. Cards for microfilm, microcards, microprint, tests, music scores, and recordings are filed separately. The Orders Com-
pleted File eliminates the need for the In-Process File. It gives the order information which would be found in the accession record and serves as an index to the chronological accession record if multiple order forms are numbered serially.

A DESIDERATA FILE, found in most order departments, is a list of material that is wanted but is out of print and not available, or is available at a cost that seems too high. SC keeps two desiderata files. One is active and contains titles which have been listed with agents. The other, much longer, consists of titles we hope to acquire but for which the need is not urgent. Such files should be weeded occasionally. Some libraries arrange their want files by subject. From my experience I have found that a straight alphabetical arrangement is easier to use.

Usually an order department is obliged to maintain budgetary records which conform to the general plan of the governmental unit under which it works.

Fiscal files differ greatly from library to library. At SC we keep a fund file, two purchase order files (outstanding orders and filled orders—kept three years), invoices (kept five years), payment records, daily journal (in which are posted charges against department funds and clearing of encumbrances), carbons of transmittals, and ledger sheets.

Most order departments find it necessary to keep some statistical records. Some are responsible for maintaining the inventory count of volumes in the library, though more often this is the responsibility of the catalog department. Statistics generally kept by an order department include the number of items searched annually, the number of titles ordered, the number of volumes received and passed to the catalog department, and the total annual expenditures for books, periodicals, and binding.

Robert W. Christ in a paper presented at ALA in 1948 made plea for more statistical records, such as the number of unintentional duplicates received in the course of a year, the number of incorrect items supplied, the percentage of successful orders from dealers catalogs (for every item ordered and not secured represents an actual loss to the library in time spent on searching, preparation of orders, and maintaining records), time lags in supplying books, and discounts received on domestic publications.

There are a multitude of other files which may be kept. Records in connection with gifts and exchange work, if extensive, are usually the responsibility of an order department, though part of the work may be carried on by the Librarian's office. Some order departments are responsible for bibliographical reference work and maintain information files on publishers, publisher's agents, author's agents, editors, and dealers in out-of-print books.

In closing, I should like to say that the work of an order department depends to a large extent on the quality of its records. They should be kept as few and as simple as possible. Unnecessary duplication of records in other parts of the library should be avoided. A few years ago, as part of a self-survey at SC, we made an inventory of all files in all departments of
the library. It was amazing what we came up with in the number of du-
plicate and seldom-used files. A periodic survey of this sort would be a
good thing in most libraries.

Keyes Metcalf, speaking before a library institute at the University of
Chicago in 1940, summed it all up in this statement:

A record should not be kept unless in the long run it saves more time or
money than it takes to make it. If you will keep this in mind, you can go
ahead and do as you like about records and still not come to grief.

WORK SIMPLIFICATION AND OFFICE PROCEDURES
Lloyd Kramer, Pomona Public Library

Work simplification is never completed. It may be worth asking why
this should be so. Many of you, who have been in library work several
years, are probably particularly conscious of the way the pattern of all
our technical work has changed, including order work. We have seen
processes challenged which had been accepted for many years: accessioning,
the handling of order work by professional librarians, the participation
by professional librarians in many phases of order work itself, and the
collating of received library materials. We see a growing emphasis now on
the part to be played by forms, by equipment and machines, by clerical
staffing, and by proper supplies.

If we are asked the reasons for these trends, I think we might answer
that they are a function of the enormous growth which we have experi-
cenced in library service. Certainly, a growing organization finds itself able
to make economic use of certain machines and equipment, for example,
that it could not have used before. Actually, however, I believe there is
something deeper at work here, namely, the faster increase in the cost of
labor as compared to the cost of equipment and supplies, a factor which
keeps us continually searching for machines, better forms, and new pro-
cedures which utilize less of our increasingly most expensive cost item:
labor.

It may be that the most useful thing that can be said about office
routines in an order department is that, once the books are selected, there
is very little difference between our order operation and the operation of
any purchasing department in any business concern. And so, perhaps un-
like most library operations, the order department presents us with the
opportunity to borrow wholesale from the literature and practice of
modern office management. And I think we do well to do so.

Along with good internal and external communications, along with
job descriptions and written procedures, with efficient records keeping,
and the rest of it, goes an active program of work simplification. We
try, in work simplification, to eliminate the unnecessary, arrange the
best sequence of operations, and find the best method and people for each
operation. Of these, perhaps the most important is the first: eliminate the
unnecessary. We ask ourselves: “What would happen if we just didn’t do
this job at all?” We must be willing to ask this question about every opera-
tion performed. What would happen if we didn’t accession? What would
happen if we didn’t maintain a numerical order file? What would happen if we didn’t verify the amounts on invoices at all? Or on invoices, say, of less than $100? What would happen if we didn’t waste a good librarian on running an order operation, hiring instead a good office manager with purchasing experience?

The best sequence of operations will be the result of bringing like operations together, arranging for the shortest and simplest work flow, combining steps where possible, simplifying by dividing a complex operation into simpler steps, and eliminating duplication. For example, can one searching operation be made to serve the purposes both of ordering and cataloging thus eliminating much duplicate searching?

The best method for each operation depends on careful consideration of mechanical as opposed to manual operations, eliminating the need for special skills (by breaking the job down into simpler parts or using pre-assembled products, or machines). For example, continuous, multiple, marginally punched order forms are expensive. But they are cheaper in the long run than manually interleaved carbons, or separate positioning in the typewriter of individual book orders. In typing our orders, is there any reason we cannot type them in full caps? It goes faster. Speaking of forms, they should be designed for full tabular control with a minimum of tabs. All forms used at one typewriter should be designed for use with the same tab stops.

Some other ideas we may or may not have utilized: 1) pre-addressed envelopes to our principal vendors, run off on our duplicating machines; 2) a plastic folder which fits over 3 x 5 cards and slips for use in an order file where several copies of the order form, the catalog cards, or reserve notices for one title are kept together in the file; and 3) the stamping of copies of the order form with the received date after the forms are pulled but before they are put with the books, so that the job can be done as a continuous, uninterrupted process.

An important principle of efficient operation is that any job should always be done in the same way, in the same sequence. This eliminates unnecessary decision-making of a trivial but time-consuming sort. We try not to waste expensive trained people on operations that can be performed with less expensive staff. Once a book has been selected, is there any order operation that requires the participation of a professional librarian?

Finally, and most important, new ideas for work simplification are not always greeted enthusiastically. We seem to be so constituted that we resist change of any kind, even relief from a burden. The best plan is to involve the entire staff in the problem of work simplification, to develop some sense of participation by each staff member in what is finally worked out. Adjustments must be made. If, after a full trial of a new method, an individual does a better, faster job with some method that is less efficient than the one you have worked out, it is the method giving the best results that must be used. The new methods will always seem slower and more difficult than the old at first, because the operator isn’t used to them. Making changes is slow and requires infinite patience, but we must do it.
The Library Board of Western Australia was established in 1952 to promote and subsidize public libraries throughout the State. It assumed responsibility, among other things, for the central purchase and cataloguing of books for all public libraries and established a Headquarters consisting of Accessions, Catalogue, Circulation and Administration Sections. Accessions were recorded in a full dictionary catalogue, which also served as the authority file.

The Board's planned target was a stock of a million books within twenty years, and all professional practices were designed for that scale of operation.

In 1955, the Board became additionally responsible for the administration of the State reference and copyright library which had a stock of some 200,000 volumes. Its catalogue was handwritten on non-standard sized cards and did not conform to accepted cataloguing practice.

The Board immediately began a substantial expansion of the bookstock of the State Library and centralized all accessions and cataloguing into our Headquarters section. Entries for all books added to the State Library were therefore made in the Headquarters dictionary catalogue. In addition, another dictionary catalogue for public use was started in the State Library.

This was made necessary by two factors: (a) Headquarters was 1½ miles away, therefore its catalogue could not serve the State Library; (b) the Board's standard cards could not conveniently be interfiled into the existing State Library catalogue. It was intended to abolish the latter in time by transferring all entries (after revision and recataloguing) on to standard cards to be filed in the new catalogue.

At the end of 1956, following major building alterations, Accessions and Catalogue Sections moved into the State Library building. There were therefore by 1957, in the same building:

(a) The Headquarters dictionary catalogue of all books acquired by the Board for circulation stock and for State Library stock since 1955.
(b) The new (post 1955) public dictionary catalogue in the State Library, the entries in which were duplicated in the Headquarters catalogue.
(c) The old (pre-1955) non-standard State Library catalogue.
Of these three the most generally useful was the Headquarters catalogue which then contained entries for about 120,000 volumes, all recently selected and including all those acquired as a result of the State Library stock revision programme. It was, however, not available to the public, nor to the State Library staff in the evenings and at weekends when the Headquarters was closed.

The State Library is intended to be a central reference and research library, and only material appropriate to such a library is normally added to its stock. As, however, most of the metropolitan area of Perth is as yet without normal public library services, the State Library has, to some extent, to combine the roles of research and popular library and will have to do so for some time. It therefore makes considerable call on Circulation stock.

It is the policy of the Board to place material where there is most use for it and to provide a high quality of books for circulation stock. Thus, for example, most advanced books on agriculture are in Circulation stock, not in State Library.

An important function of the Subject Librarians in the State Library is to answer reference enquiries and select books to meet subject requests, originating in country libraries. If two titles have equal value in meeting such enquiries or requests and one is in State Library only while the other is in Circulation stock, the latter is chosen.

For all these reasons it became clear that the service would be improved if there were a union catalogue of the entire stock of the Board in the State Library for both public and staff use. While considering how this could be achieved, the idea of a divided catalogue cropped up.

Now, one of the features of the history of the divided catalogue is that division has been carried out mainly by large academic libraries. Few small or public libraries seem to have taken the step. The library service of Western Australia is both relatively small and a public library system, and we wondered whether it could gain any benefits from dividing its catalogues. After discussion it was agreed that we could expect the following advantages:

1. The division into separate author and subject catalogues would make the catalogue easier to use and understand for both staff and readers. Some of the complexities and confusion of even a relatively small dictionary catalogue would be removed. Each part of the catalogue would be clearly labelled and its use explained.
2. Filing would be easier through cutting out, for example, the confusion which arises between place as author and place as subject.
3. It would be more convenient in a separate subject catalogue to introduce full-width subject guide cards, thus eliminating typing of headings on cards and facilitating revision of headings. If this were done in a dictionary catalogue, we thought the author and title cards might tend to be obscured by the guide cards.
We therefore decided to:
(a) divide the new State Library catalogue into author and subject
catalogues;
(b) remove from the Headquarters catalogue all its subject entries;
transferring those for books only in Circulation stock to the new sub-
ject catalogues;
(c) replace conventional subject headings in the subject catalogue by
guide cards, and arrange the entries behind each guide in chronological
order, latest publication in front.
This resulted in:

**Headquarters**

An author and title catalogue of all books ever acquired by the Board
except the pre-1955 State Library stock.

**State Library**

1. An author and title catalogue of post-1955 State Library stock,
eventually to include entries for all pre-1955 stock as recataloguing
is completed.
2. A union subject catalogue of the post-1955 State Library stock and
of the stocks of all public libraries in the State.

We consider the subject catalogue as mainly for the use of the non-
expert and the author catalogue as for the use of the expert reader. The
non-expert reader does not normally require a conspectus of the subject,
but merely a selection, and in most cases he prefers the most recently pub-
lished books. The part of the catalogue which grows most rapidly is the
subject part, but if it is arranged in inverse chronological order it can be
kept within bounds by systematically removing cards for older and non-
standard works.

For these reasons, inverse chronological order was adopted in the
subject catalogue; as the pre-1955 State Library stock is recatalogued, sub-
ject entries will be made and inserted only for books published after 1939
and for earlier standard works.

In the subject catalogue, cards relating to books in the State Library
are stamped with the name of the subject library to which they belong;
those for Circulation stock are left unstamped.

These decisions having been made, we proceeded to implement them.
The job took a fortnight; during the first week four staff, two of whom
were professional, worked full time, and during the second week, two
staff, one of whom was professional, worked full time on the job. In
addition, two typists worked full time for the two weeks typing the dupli-
cate entries caused by the division and the 20,000 guide cards needed for
the new subject catalogue.

The procedures to be followed in dividing the catalogues were thought
out before hand and put into writing so that each person knew what to
do, and no confusion of disorganization would occur. The cards in each
catalogue were sorted tray by tray into (a) author and added entries, (b) subject entries and references, the latter being placed in spare trays. The professional staff examined the cards to determine when duplicate entries would be needed; and, when this was so, the cards remained in their original tray but were tagged. The trays were then passed to the typists who typed duplicates for the tagged cards.

The process took longer than we anticipated; because, although the catalogues contained only approximately 135,000 cards, after each catalogue had been divided, we had to interfile the two subject files, rejecting duplicate entries, and at the same time put the cards into inverse chronological order. We found these two processes very time-consuming and tedious.

Before the change to guide cards, there was some feeling that the catalogue would contain so many guide cards in proportion to entries that it might be difficult to use, but by limiting the number of guide cards for headings with subdivisions, this has been avoided, and the general feeling amongst the staff is that the subject catalogue is much easier to use than it was previously.

It was found that the filers had difficulty in arranging subject cards quickly by the imprint date and we now type the date again above the tracings. This is quite satisfactory.

Judgment on the effect of the whole change on the public will have to wait until more time has elapsed.

**Fluidity in Book Location in Relation to Catalog Records in University Libraries**

ROBERT H. MULLER
Assistant Director, University of Michigan Library
Ann Arbor, Michigan

IN A RELATIVELY small library system with only a few fixed branches it may seem to make little difference how branch library copies are recorded in the library’s central catalog. As a library system grows and proliferates, however, implications of catalog policy decisions reached during an earlier developmental stage often make themselves painfully felt. At the University of Michigan the removal of about 200,000 volumes to a storage annex, the absorption of two branch collections and other collections into the main library, the transfer of numerous books to a new undergraduate library, and the creation of a new branch library, to name only the most conspicuous recent developments, demanded
changes in catalog records. Yet the man-power required for some of these
tasks did not seem in sight.

As a temporary expedient, libraries can cope with such situations by
means of charge records in the circulation file. As the volume of such
charge records increases, however, the circulation file spreads to alarming
bulkiness. It is difficult to say at what point this file becomes unman-
ageable; but as it keeps growing, it begins to assume the stature of a
supplemental catalog of locations, whether it is officially so designated
or not. The locations shown in the public catalog become diminishingly
reliable as time goes on, tending to cause catalog users understandable
irritation. At some stage in this development, it becomes necessary to ask
whether existing methods for indicating the location of books in the main
public catalog are properly designed for the sort of fluidity of book loca-
tion called for by changes in library use, alterations of the curriculum
and the obsolescence of publications.

At the University of Michigan Library, the main public catalog cur-
rently shows locations of copies both in conjunction with the main entry
and also with secondary entries for the first copy of a title. It has recently
been proposed to change this cataloging policy so as to show locations
only in conjunction with the main entry. The purpose of such a change
would be to effect a reduction in processing cost, particularly in the cost
of record-changing in cases of transfers of copies from one library to
another, from one library to a storage location, or whenever withdrawals
were desirable. The change would, however, cause the library user some
extra work, because he would have to look up the main entry in every
case if he wished to be certain where copies of a given title were located.

Before reaching a decision to change the recording policy, an effort
was made to find out what practices prevailed in comparable libraries.
The present discussion is based upon returns from 17 of the largest uni-
versity libraries in the United States. In decreasing order of the number
of locations for which books are cataloged by their central catalog depart-
ment, these 17 libraries are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was found that all main library catalogs included main entries for
titles in branch libraries, except in certain cases for such materials as
books in selected Oriental languages, maps, slides, music scores, record-
ings, collections for children and young people, and items in a textbook
and curriculum collection. One library estimated that its main union
catalog failed to include author entries for about 10 per cent of its hold-
ings for a variety of reasons.
On the question as to whether the main catalog includes a full set of secondary entries (subject, series, titles, etc.) for all titles in branch libraries, the majority of the libraries (19) do or expect to include a full set of secondary entries, with the following significant exceptions: one library omits subject headings for science, but uses a form card under science headings referring readers to the card catalog of special departmental libraries and to the Reference Department. Referral cards to branch libraries for a few very general headings are used in one library. Several libraries omit subject headings for music scores and for all or some of the materials in their law libraries. One library omits subject entries for medical books in its Bio-Medical Library; another one omits subject entries for materials in an astronomy library located in an observatory at some distance from the main campus. Some libraries provide secondary entries for only one edition of a given title. Several universities have branch libraries which do their own cataloging and send only main entry cards to the main library for filing in the central public catalog.

Among the minority of libraries (3 out of 16) that omit secondary entries in their main catalog for all or much of the materials located in branch libraries, one defends this omission on the basis of economy; the second one attributes the omission to the complete decentralization under which the library system used to operate in its early days and expresses regret about its inability to supply secondary entries for branch titles acquired in the past; the third one tries to keep secondary entries in the main catalog to an extreme minimum and includes them only for its undergraduate and rare book collections and for a few departmental libraries of research strength that are closely related to the subjects and strengths of the main library collection, such as fine arts.

Libraries including secondary entries for branch titles in their main catalog follow a variety of recording practices. Six patterns were noted:

I. Secondary entries show all locations.
   Texas (except for law); UCLA's present plan (adoption of pattern V is being considered); Pennsylvania (except for business, law, and dentistry titles for which no secondary entries are shown).

II. Secondary entries show first copy plus main library copy.
   Ohio State; Chicago

III. Secondary entries show only one location. They show stack copy only if more than one location.
   California; Duke; Columbia (except science)

IV. Secondary entries show only first copy cataloged.
   Cornell; Northwestern; Minnesota; Wisconsin; Michigan (except for law library books)

V. If copies of a title are in one or more locations or both in the main library and in a different location, secondary entries are stamped “For location of copies, see author or main entry.” A colored location card filed behind the main entry shows
locations by means of check-marks, except when all copies of a title are in the main library. If all copies of a title are in the main library, secondary entry cards are not stamped, and no colored location cards are shown. These rules apply only to separate books, closed entry serials, and analytics of monographic serials; locations of serials are shown in a public serials shelflist.

**Illinois**

VI. Location is class-determined. Entries show location only when books are located outside their class-determined location. If a book is in class-determined location, no other location is shown. Not more than 2 locations are ever shown on secondary locations and not more than one location if both locations are outside General Library.

**Chicago.**

If we are primarily interested in offering the greatest convenience to readers, the showing of all locations on secondary entries will be our choice (Pattern I). Patterns II, III, and IV provide retrogressively less service to readers. Patterns II and III reflect the principle that the main library catalog should give prominence to books located in the main library stacks; in Pattern IV, the main library is on the same footing as the branch libraries.

If we consider the element of cost, the practice of showing all locations is the most expensive one (Pattern I). Pattern II is less expensive because it shows at most two locations. Patterns III and IV are even less expensive because they show only one location. The practice of changing secondary cards to show a General Library stack copy in place of a branch library copy previously received (Pattern III) involves, of course, a greater expense than the practice of showing only the first copy cataloged (Pattern IV).

In Patterns II, III, and IV, readers will often be required to consult the main entry in order to locate all copies of a given title. In some libraries, to ensure readers remembering to consult the main entry, all secondary entry cards for duplicated titles carry a stamped notation to the effect that “other copies will be found under the author's name.” As an economy measure, this practice of stamping of secondary entry cards was abandoned at the University of Michigan in 1956; and substituted for it was a sign posted in the public catalog area, reading “The Library has duplicates of many books. The locations of these copies are given on the author cards only.”

Pattern V shows no locations on secondary entries; it merely refers readers to the main entry for information on locations. However, the absence of stamping (on secondary entries) referring readers to the main entry for titles located only in the main stacks and the presence of call numbers on secondary entries will enable readers to infer that the titles are located in the main stacks. This inference will be justified in most
instances, but not always. When a title is transferred from a branch location to the main stacks, the stamping on secondary entry cards is not changed. In this respect, Pattern V represents an economy. However, when a title is transferred from the main stacks to a branch library or to storage, it is presumably necessary to stamp secondary entry cards as well as to file a colored location card behind the main entry.

Pattern VI is a different approach in which the assignment of books to branch libraries has been made to correspond to a considerable extent to the library classification system. This pattern does show location information on secondary entries; the location must either be deduced from the class number or is shown in cases where a book is shelved outside its regular class-determined location. Although savings may accrue in initial cataloging, no cost reduction appears to be involved in the transfer process from one location to another of single books, since changes in secondary entries are then required. Block transfers, of course, are quite readily made.

In addition to the six patterns noted, a untried Pattern VII is conceivable under which no call numbers are shown on secondary entries. The absence of call numbers will force readers to consult the main entry; in the place of the call number will be a stamp referring readers to the main entry. In cases of transfer, secondary entries will not be touched at all. Under this pattern, in contrast to Pattern V, secondary entries in the main catalog cease to serve as a direct approach to main stack books.

Although this pattern promises long-range savings in transfer work, the initial card work may become more complicated. If cards are reproduced without call numbers, it will be necessary to type call numbers on individual cards that are to be filed into catalogs other than the main catalog, and to prepare location cards to be filed behind the main entry of the central catalog. If cards are reproduced with call numbers, the call numbers, unless blacked out, may confuse and irritate the library user unfamiliar with the rule that call numbers should be disregarded on secondary entries and the main entry consulted in every instance.

One way of reducing the initial cataloging cost is to omit subject headings for selected subjects either in the main catalog only or in both the main catalog and the branch library catalog. The following types of publication were listed by one or more libraries as having been exempt from secondary-entry treatment: dissertations, law books, Congressional hearings, microreproductions, selected analytics of monographic series, books in non-Roman alphabets, books written in minor foreign languages, books published before 1801 (except bibliography, individual biography, criticisms of individual authors or works, Latin and English grammars). In one library, all books are screened by the Reference Department or branch librarian concerned to decide whether subject treatment is called for. In another library, for books published roughly between 1800-1900 in selected science fields, such broad science headings as aeronautics, astronomy, chemistry, zoology, mineralogy, pharmacy, photography, and physics are omitted.
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Among the 16 libraries, only 5 have a divided catalog (California, Wisconsin, Duke, Indiana, Texas). The issue of catalog division relates to the question of secondary entries insofar as it is conceivable to divide the main catalog into a main entry portion, which would include the location record, and a secondary entry portion, which would omit the location record. Although such a division may not always be the most advantageous one from the point of view of bringing together all entries relating to a name, it may make it easier for an inexperienced catalog user to understand in which portion of the catalog to look for information on locations.

The question of ease in transferability and withdrawal is important from the long-range point of view. Space limitations will continue to force librarians to transfer books to storage. Changes in the curriculum will require from time to time the closing of branch libraries and the withdrawal or transfer of their collections to the General Stacks, to other branches, or to storage. A high degree of fluidity in location is desirable whenever books that have lost their pertinence in one location are deemed to be of greater usefulness in another location. When a new branch library (such as an undergraduate library) is established, some books are likely to be transferred to it from other locations. In such cases, the transfer process should be as simple as possible. Otherwise it may often be less expensive to buy a new copy than to pay for the labor involved in the transfer of a copy previously acquired.

If we can reduce the number of records to be changed in cases of transfer and withdrawal, we will have reduced the transfer and withdrawal cost. Whether such cost reduction is worth the price we pay in terms of greater inconvenience to readers is a difficult question to answer. For instance, the inconvenience of not finding location records in conjunction with secondary entries must be weighed against the inconvenience of not finding the books one needs in the most logical or useful location because of the inability of a catalog department at a given time to work off its backlog of record changing with sufficient promptness.

If we attempt to visualize a university library as it existed, say, 50 years ago, we must admit that its collection of books would today be out of date in many fields; a large portion of the books would either be useless or superseded. Our present libraries will probably be regarded as equally outdated 50 years hence. Therefore, it is safe to assume that substantial quantities of the books in our collections will eventually require transfer to storage or complete withdrawal. Simplification in the recording of locations will facilitate this inescapable transfer and removal task and thus enable us to employ a library's usually limited man-power resources for more essential current library services.

Hypotheses and Incidental Observations

(1) As compared to patterns that give all or some locations under secondary entries in the main catalog, the recording of locations only under main entry may result in economies realizable in the future. This gain must be weighed against the inconvenience this pattern will cause.
catalog users and the probable increase in the complexity of initial card production.

(2) For subjects of which most of the books are in a single branch library or location, cards referring catalog users from the main catalog to the branch catalog may prove preferable to the duplication of subject entries in the main catalog.

(3) Omitting subject entries for carefully-selected subject groups may prove to be an acceptable economy.

(4) Screening all publications prior to cataloging to identify titles requiring no or only minimal subject treatment will reduce the work load in the catalog department without seriously impairing reader service.

(5) Screening all publications prior to cataloging to identify titles that may immediately be placed in storage will reduce the volume of transfer work over a long period of time; to facilitate retrieval, such books may have to be given fuller subject treatment than would otherwise be necessary.

(6) Close attention to the time-and-motion aspects of record-changing in connection with transfers may yield dividends. Systems permitting changes made by clerks while at the catalog will be less expensive than systems requiring the work to be done away from the catalog.

Appendix

The omission of location information on secondary entries in the central catalog of a university library affects only a relatively small, although not negligible, portion of the total work required in accomplishing the transfer of a volume from one location to another. To place this portion of the work in proper perspective, it may be instructive to present a brief enumeration of the typical steps involved in one of the simpler cases, the transfer of a non-duplicated monographic volume in the University of Michigan Library system, let us say, from the Mathematics to the Physics Library, under existing rules: (1) The branch librarian routes the book, together with all the branch library catalog cards, to the Catalog Department (via the Selection Department, for approval of the transfer). (2) The Catalog Department removes the main entry card from the official catalog, this card containing the only record of tracings, and places a dummy (giving author, title, date of publication and transfer information) in its place. (3) Non-subject secondary entry cards in the official catalog are corrected by crossing out “Mathematics Library” and stamping “Physics Library” above call number. (4) The card for the title in the union shelflist is similarly changed. (5) The location stamping on the verso of the title-page of the book is changed. (6) An instruction slip is made out, calling for correction of all the cards for the title in the public catalog. (7) Temporary catalog records (fanfold) are typed for the Physics Library’s catalog and shelflist, as well as a new book card for circulation purposes. (8) The book is relabelled and routed to the Physics Library, together with the temporary catalog records. (9) The catalog cards that were removed from the Mathematics Library are corrected to show
Physics Library location. (10) The corrected cards are routed to the Physics Library for filing, and the main entry card is refiled in the official catalog.

Only step Number 6 would be affected by the elimination of location information on secondary entries. For titles with many secondary entries, the reduction in work load may nevertheless be noteworthy, especially in view of the fact that it seems impossible to arrange the secondary entries in alphabetical sequence to reduce the amount of walking (time and motion) required by the clerical assistants as they move from a drawer in one part of the alphabet to a drawer in another part of the alphabet of a catalog containing over three million cards. At the University of Michigan, until about a year ago, any card that had to be changed was removed from its catalog drawer and taken to the Catalog Department, where the changes were made at a desk; the card was then refiled and the filing revised. At present, this work is done right at the catalog while the slot for the card in the drawer is kept open, so that the card can be returned without refiling and revising operations. Such savings in labor can obviously be obtained only if a dependable and experienced clerk is available; otherwise the risk of irretrievable errors occurring on cards is too great.

The transfer of books from the main library to the storage annex is slightly less complicated than the transfer described above, because it involves no changes in branch catalog card sets. On the other hand, the transfer of a serial set, especially when many analytics are involved, is more complicated; it also requires changes in the serials checklists and bindery records.

What has been outlined in the way of procedure will differ from library to library. For instance, some libraries have no official catalog; others apparently get along without temporary catalog records as far as work in the Catalog Department is concerned; still others have a rule that the call number of a title must be uniform throughout the library system, thus making transfers simpler.

As catalogers know, even the withdrawal process does not get done without expenditure of staff time. It is important that branch library collections be kept free of deadwood. Withdrawal procedures should, therefore, be so simple that they will not function as obstacles to whatever weeding is required in branch libraries or the main stacks. At Michigan, a main entry record of any withdrawn title is filed in the official catalog for future reference after the records have been withdrawn from all other files. If no secondary entries are involved, the number of cards to be removed from the public catalog will, of course, be minimal.

A NEW AID

The W. A. Shaeffer Pen Company has come out with a Script writing fluid in jet black which will reproduce in a Thermofax copy. This development will please all those libraries having Thermofax machines for correspondence.

...
One of the primary objectives of my previous article ("On Pre-filing Sorting Methodology," Spring, 1957) was to cause people to think about some practices we too often take for granted. In this the article was successful. There were critical reactions, and there were questions. Good questions deserve to be answered, and I am indebted to the Editor for the opportunity to provide answers and to expand, somewhat, on the earlier article.

Among the letters written concerning this novel approach to an old problem was one from Margaret Windsor, Senior Cataloging Librarian at Stanford Libraries, Stanford, California. Because it is especially incisive, her letter is reproduced below.

"The discussion of 'Pre-Filing Sorting Methodology' by D. W. Johnson (in LRTS, I: 109-113, 1957) interested me very much, even though I became completely confused in trying to follow the examples given. I don't understand why it works, and I'd like to see it done, slow motion, with a fairly large number of cards.

"Isn't it true that most people read by phrases? Aren't they encouraged to do so? I know I would find it very difficult to learn to pinpoint to a letter in the manner suggested. To scan entire words and names, even when sorting into a rough alphabet, does not slow down the filer using the conventional method.

"Mr. Johnson is quite right to remind us of the dangers of filing by 'sound.' (I have a few good tales on this such as Jorge before Isaac, and Quaterly for Quarterly.) However, if card arrangers are reminded of that danger and of pitfalls such as Philips (and variations), doubling of 's' in Scandinavian names, variants due to language (such as Anales, etc.), errors are usually few and can be rectified when the lot is interfiled into the catalog. A device which I use to keep me aware of spelling is to sub-arrange by doing it backwards. For example, I sort the S cards or slips into groups according to the second letter; then I take the SZ pile and arrange, the SY pile, SW pile, etc. This means that the SA lot will complete the arranged pile of S's.

"Mr. Johnson says at the end of his article: 'by ordinary techniques a group of cards is divided into 26 groups, each of which is then subdivided into another 26, etc.' The number of cards in hand for any letter influences
the number of groups formed by the filer for further sorting. Words begin-
ning with A, E, I, O, and S could in theory sort into 25 or 26 groups, but
practically never do. (The letter S ordinarily has the greatest number of
subgroups in our experience.) In his method he handles every card during
every sort. In the conventional method, all sorts after the first one involve
small groups of cards, and one soon begins to 'retire' those that are arranged.

"I have some queries regarding his procedures, as follows:

1. If he is working with large groups of cards can his file be consulted
easily before he has completed all the sorts? (Someone might need to make
a correction on a card which is in the filing.) My main experience has been
with the Library of Congress proof slips received each week in packs of
from 1200-2000 slips. Even after the first sort (into a rough alphabet) the
file may be consulted without difficulty, though with some inconveniences,
to be sure. Our catalogers are quite willing to pick up a group of slips and
fan them out to search for an exact slip or for authority for an entry.

2. In Library sorting we meet up with official entries in numbers, and
certain other situations which would, it seems to me, confuse the letter count
in his method. How does he deal with the following, for example:

"Gt. Brit., and all its agencies
"United Nations, and all its agencies
"United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization
"U.S., and all its agencies
"St. Joseph (and any other type of entry involving abbreviations filed
as though spelled out)

"Von Hagen, Los Angeles, and similar type names
"modified vowels
"titles which begin with articles (which vary according to language)

3. If subject cards are omitted as he indicates, they would necessarily
have to be arranged in another process, and then be filed into the other
file,—an extra step for any library with a dictionary catalog?

"Finally, if he thinks 'it is demonstrably superior to conventional sort-
ing methods' I hope he can demonstrate his method at a library meeting. I
for one would be there in the front row."

Before I answer these questions, allow me to emphasize that in the last
analysis, the best answers to these and all questions concerning the method
will be found by those using this system. But I am not offering a panacea:
there is no quick, painless cure for the ills of filing. What is offered is a
method which will increase speed and accuracy of sorting, while economiz-
ing on the space required for the operation. As for problems, life will be
dull and unnatural if we ever find ourselves with none!

As Miss Windsor has noted, it is true that most people read by phrases. In
reading this is desirable: it speeds up the reading process and increases
efficiency; in filing, however, I contend that it slows the process and re-
duces efficiency. Reading is reading, and filing is filing. Many filing er-
rors result from 'reading' on the part of the file clerk. It is one thing
to tell file clerks to alphabetize with consideration to the letters rather
than to the sounds, and it is quite another thing to obtain compliance.
They will continue to take the path of least resistance, reading names or
words as units, while it is obvious that the alphabetic characters are the
units. If there exists a file clerk who, by application of reason and logic, can be induced to forego habit and concentrate on the letters that constitute the words before him, he probably deserves a raise in pay; if, further, he will avoid the many pitfalls of sorting upon being provided with a map of them, he certainly deserves a raise in pay. But persuasion and instruction are rendered unnecessary by backward sorting; I have yet to meet anyone who can read backwards!

It is true that seldom, if ever, does continuous expansion by a factor of 26 occur in sorting; in theory, however, such is the case, and in practice each group, beginning with the first, does subdivide into many others, each of which requires some space. And each group must be separately handled, while the others are pushed out of the way.

There is no difficulty in scanning entire words or phrases, as apparently required by backward sorting. It is simply a process of reading the letters that constitute a word (instead of the word, itself) in a rhythmic fashion, and anyone can do it without lessons.

With respect to Miss Windsor's first question, the answer is an unqualified yes. An alphabetic arrangement does exist at all stages of the sorting; all that is required (and this is required of any sorting system) is a familiarity with the method and the stage of sorting to locate any given card that is in process, and all sorting, by any system, proceeds by stages. It is true that by ordinary methods small groups can be retired and filed into the public catalog or the shelf list prior to the completion of the sorting for the entire group; if this is of primary importance, then backward sorting has nothing to offer. The question to be answered, though, is this: which is more important, getting some cards into the catalog sooner (conventional methods), or getting all cards into the catalog sooner (backward sorting)? (Incidentally, backward sorting usually requires less handling of the cards, not more. Even by conventional methods, the amount of handling is the number of cards multiplied by the number of characters on which sorting is done.)

Miss Windsor's second question is in reality three questions. These must be considered individually. As concerns divisions of government, it is highly unlikely that any library sorting system, by itself and without "sight-sort," fully and efficiently arranges complicated governmental entries. Therefore, backward sorting is not unique in this respect. It differs only in that fuller use of sight-sorting is made. The sight-sorting aspect is particularly useful in handling phrase subject headings and title entries, as well as in sorting governments into component agencies. There need be no particular difficulty in dealing with these various types of entries, and I hope that the impression has not been created that backward sorting is inapplicable to anything but author entries.

Compound names need not pose a problem, as these are customarily filed as one word. Where they are filed as two words, rule six applies. As for abbreviations, these must be spelled mentally in order to file by any system that requires them to be filed as though spelled in full. Wherein is backward sorting more involved here than with conventional methods?
Modified vowels will be treated in different ways in different libraries, depending upon whether the local filing rules regard or disregard such modifications. Where they are filed as modified, they must be read as modified. As for initial articles, these, as in conventional sorting, are disregarded.

I'd certainly like to provide Miss Windsor with the demonstration she craves, and if the opportunity should ever present itself, I shall be happy to oblige.

I have claimed that this method is superior in accuracy, economy of space, and efficiency (as measured in speed). A comparative study recently made at the University of California in Berkeley substantiates these claims. They had about four thousand slips in relatively random order, and these were divided into two equal groups. The first group, sorted by conventional methods, required eight and one-half hours to sort; the second group, sorted backwards, took only 4.8 hours, a saving of 43 per cent of the time needed for the conventional group. Mr. George Piternick, Catalog Analyst at the University of California, is my authority for this report, and he has recommended that all library departments at the University of California "having groups of cards to alphabetize ... consider being 'backward' about it."

There are four practical applications of backward sorting. These are: 1) alphabetic sorting, 2) numerical sorting, 3) combination alphabetic-numerical sorting, and 4) chronological sorting. As can be seen, one or another of these can cope with any kind of filing. As Miss Windsor has observed, a demonstration of the method would be a good thing, but, in the absence of such a demonstration, perhaps the best thing would be imitation. Therefore, I have examples of each type (except chronological) in what follows. Sorting has been limited to four units in order to conserve space, and in each of the examples I have shown the original order of the items to be sorted. Unusual spacing has been employed in order to emphasize the ordered sequence at each stage of sorting, and abbreviations have been spelled out, as they would have to be spelled mentally in filing them. Subject entries have been represented by full capitalization. It is suggested that those desirous of learning this system make sets of cards corresponding to the examples given, place them in the initial sequence, and proceed according to the rules. At each stage, the sequence ought to be just as I have given it; any variations must be construed as indicative of something being done wrong.

I. Alphabetic sorting.
   A. Initial sequence.
      United States. Advisory Committee on Education.
      Vanguards of the frontier.
      UNITED STATES. CONGRESS.
      Vanderbilt, Cornelius, 1898-1970.
      Vanderbilt, Arthur T., 1888-
Van Alstyne, Richard Warner, 1900-
United States. Congress.
UNITED STATES. CIRCUIT COURT (8th CIRCUIT).
Values in personality research.
VANDERBILT, CORNELIUS, 1794-1877.
UNITED STATES. AMERICAN RELIEF ADMINISTRATION.
United States Catholic Historical Society.
United States international timber trade in the Pacific area.
United States. Dept. of State.
The United States and the Far East.
UNITED STATES. AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION.
Vane, Derek.
B. Sequence after first sort (4th unit, picked up from Z to A).
Values in personality research.
UNITED STATES. AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION.
The United States and the Far East.
United States. Dept. of State.
United States international timber trade in the Pacific area.
United States Catholic Historical Society.
UNITED STATES. AMERICAN RELIEF ADMINISTRATION.
UNITED STATES. CIRCUIT COURT (8th CIRCUIT).
United States. Congress.
UNITED STATES. CONGRESS.
United States. Advisory Committee on Education.
Van guard of the frontier.
Van e, Derek.
VANDERBILT, CORNELIUS, 1794-1877.
Van derbilt, Arthur T., 1888-
Van derbilt, Cornelius, 1898-
Van A lstyne, Richard Warner, 1900-
C. Sequence after second sort (3d unit, A to Z).
United States. Advisory Committee on Education.
UNITED STATES. CONGRESS.
United States. Congress.
UNITED STATES. CIRCUIT COURT (8th CIRCUIT).
UNITED STATES. AMERICAN RELIEF ADMINISTRATION.
United States Catholic Historical Society.
United States international timber trade in the Pacific area.
United States. Dept. of State.
The United States and the Far East.
Now, as we sort for the last time, the “sight-sort” is essential. Much sight-sorting can be done while sorting on other letters, too, provided that the sorter remembers that alphabetic sequence is in reverse on the even-numbered units (see above for an example). The cards sight-sorted into position in the following are preceded by a plus sign (+).

E. Sequence after fourth sort (1st unit, A to Z).

UNIT ED STATES. AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION.
+UNIT ED STATES. AMERICAN RELIEF ADMINISTRATION.
+UNIT ED STATES. CIRCUIT COURT (8th CIRCUIT).
+Unit ed States. Congress.
+UNIT ED STATES. CONGRESS.
+Unit ed States. Dept. of State.
The amount of sight-sorting will vary, both as to quantity and as to proportion of cards requiring it, depending upon both the size and the "complex-ion" of the group. In the example given, there was a concentration of entries in a relatively small part of the alphabet, and so more than half, in this instance, had to be sight-sorted into precise position, although they were correctly in order as far as the fourth letter. The sight-sorting should be done as the cards are placed in the sorter, rather than as a separate operation, thus saving time, but it becomes progressively easier as one approaches the final sorting and may be left until that sorting to be done.

Perhaps the numerical sorting which follows will help to clarify the principles of backward sorting.

II. Numerical sorting (count backwards from the decimal point).
A. Initial sequence.

| 684  |
| 743  |
| 284  |
| 948  |
| 265  |
| 969  |
| 967  |
| 24   |
| 63   |
| 7    |
| 36   |
| 4324 |
| 98   |
| 76   |
| 2    |
| 1670 |

B. Sequence after first sort (units. Picked up from 9 to 0).

| 96 9 |
| 9 8  |
| 94 8 |
| 7    |
| 96 7 |
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<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Sequence after second sort (tens. Picked up from 0 to 9).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(read as 02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(read as 07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| D. Sequence after third sort (hundreds. Picked up from 9 to 0). |   |   |
| 969 |   |   |
| 967 |   |   |
| 948 |   |   |
| 743 |   |   |
| 684 |   |   |
| 1 | 670 |   |
| 4 | 324 |   |
| 284 |   |   |
| 265 |   |   |
| 98 | (read as 098) |   |
| 76 | (read as 076) |   |
| 63 | (read as 063) |   |
| 36 | (read as 036) |   |
| 24 | (read as 024) |   |
| 7 | (read as 007) |   |
| 2 | (read as 002) |   |

| E. Sequence after third sort (thousands. Picked up from 0 to 9). |   |   |
| 2 | (read as 0002) |   |
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7 (read as 0007)
24 (read as 0024)
36 (read as 0036)
63 (read as 0063)
76 (read as 0076)
98 (read as 0098)
265 (read as 0265)
284 (read as 0284)
684 (read as 0684)
743 (read as 0743)
948 (read as 0948)
967 (read as 0967)
969 (read as 0969)
1670
4324

III. Alphabetical-numerical sorting. Suppose the following initial sequence of L.C. Class numbers.

L 111
HD 1511
HC 335
HV 6793
J 11
JK 1061
JX 1971
Z 253
DS 518
HD 9750
BF 698
E 183
CT 275
PZ 3
F 591

The numerical part of the sorting will be done first, exactly as in the preceding, leaving the following arrangement.

PZ 3
J 11
L 111
E 183
Z 253
CT 275
HC 335
DS 518
F 591
BF 698
JK 1061
HD 1511
Our next step is to arrange the group, now numerically sorted, alphabetically (incidentally, decimals are usually sight-sorted into position but can be sorted if desired). Here we have a variant of usual procedure, in that ordinarily we place "blanks" preceding the A's, and we would normally consider and sort (on the second sort) F as Blank F. However, it must be read, instead, as F Blank. With this in mind, the sequence following our first alphabetic sort will be as follows.

P Z 3
J X 1971
H V 6793
C T 275
D S 518
J K 1061
B F 698
H D 9750
H D 1511
H C 335
F 591
Z 253
E 183
L 111
J 11

The sequence after the final sort will be as follows.

BF 698
CT 275
DS 518
E 183
F 591
HC 335
HD 1511
HD 9750
HV 6793
J 11
JK 1061
JX 1971
L 111
PZ 3
Z 253

Backward sorting is something that is difficult to explain via the medium of writing, yet it is rather simple. I feel, however, that if those interested in it follow the foregoing examples closely, they will understand far more than I could tell them about this system. Should any
questions remain, I shall be happy to be of whatever assistance I can.

A re-statement of the rules for backward sorting is here appended.

1) Determine, from the size and “complex-ion” of the group of cards to be sorted, how deeply, i.e., on how many units, the sorting should be done;

2) Begin sorting on the last unit of depth;

3) In counting from the first letter, count Mc as three letters, for it will be filed as Mac (in most libraries);

4) Handle each letter of the alphabet separately, without combination;

5) Handle cards one at a time, dealing from the top of the deck;

6) Where no letter exists at a given point, read it as “blank” and place the card preceding the A’s;

7) On odd-numbered sorts, counting from the first unit, pick up cards from A to Z (or o to g), but on even-numbered sorts from Z to A (or g to o);

8) As sorting is completed, sight-check the cards for arrangement beyond the number of units sorted.
WISH it were possible for all of you to attend the meetings of the Board of Directors at the Midwinter and annual conferences and listen to the reports of the Chairmen of the Sections and the Committees; for hearing one person after another tell of the interesting and oftentimes exciting projects or activities that his Section or Committee is doing would make you realize more than I can in a brief report how much is being done continually to improve our standards, to enable us to work more efficiently in our fields, to help technical services librarians make an important contribution to the profession. You would also gain a sense of how much a great many people are contributing in time, energy, and ideas to making our profession better for all of us. To all of these able, willing and forward-looking people we owe a great debt of gratitude.

It will interest you to know that the members of the various boards and committees of the Division and its Sections this year include approximately 275 different people. This means that nearly six per cent of our members are contributing actively to the work of the Division, a fact of which we can be very proud.

This report will be divided into four sections: 1) Division-wide activities; 2) Section activities; 3) Actions of the Board of Directors; 4) The President’s activities.

DIVISION-WIDE ACTIVITIES

Publishing

The most important activity of the Division is the publication of Library Resources and Technical Services; and as technical services librarians we are all indebted to Esther J. Piercy, editor, and Carlyle J. Frarey, managing editor, for their able direction of this journal, which is the only periodical devoted exclusively to the field of technical services. Miss Piercy has been very much concerned that, because of its limited budget, LRTS can not cover the field adequately. The editors have tried various means of saving space; but, in spite of these efforts, they have had to hold a good many papers for a year or more before having space to print them. The RTSD Board of Directors, therefore, feels that the periodical must be enlarged and has taken two steps to effect this: first, we are trying to expand the receipts from advertising; and second, we have asked PEBCO for an increased subsidy for the journal to permit enlargement of the total annual pagination by twenty percent.
Also in the field of publishing the Division has a Publications Committee, which, under the chairmanship of Helen Welch, has been making a survey of publications covering fields of RTSD interest. The survey will not be an exhaustive bibliography but will list the titles which best cover the topic and will point out lacks in the literature with the hope that this may encourage future publications. The study will be published in the University of Illinois Library School Occasional Papers.

Library Resources

Two committees of the Division are interested in the coordination of library resources and the dissemination of information about them—the Interlibrary Cooperation Committee and the Resources Committee. The first of these, of which Ralph Esterquest has been chairman, has provided the profession with a frequent roundup of news on projects in interlibrary cooperation through its column Progress in Interlibrary Cooperation in the ALA Bulletin. In this report the Committee tries particularly to provide information about projects not reported elsewhere or described in obscure or out-of-way places. The Chairman of the Committee has been called upon frequently this year to speak on interinstitutional cooperation at library conferences.

The Resources Committee, under the chairmanship of Ralph Ellsworth, has been devoting its attention to two areas: the publication of the National Union Catalog and the development of a clearing-house for micropublishing projects. Its Subcommittee on the National Union Catalog, Charles W. David, chairman, has completed plans for the publication of the National Union Catalog for 1952-55 and is studying the problem of a subject index to the Union Catalog. The Subcommittee on Micropublishing Projects, Raynard C. Swank, chairman, is serving as a coordinating body to which publishers who wish to inaugurate micropublishing projects may turn for advice and from which librarians may seek an evaluation of proposed projects which they are considering purchasing. It is also studying a proposal for a national cooperative microfilm deposit for the preservation and storage of library materials.

Bookbinding Committee

The Bookbinding Committee, chaired by George E. Smith, has been studying the physical makeup of books as it affects their conservation and has been cooperating with the Library Binding Institute in clarifying standards for library bindings.

Regional and Centralized Processing

The Regional Processing Committee, under the chairmanship of William H. Lowry, in an effort to meet the growing demand for information about this aspect of technical services, has sent a questionnaire to all the state libraries, which was designed to discover the number and location of regional processing centers in the United States and to determine in a limited way the scope of their operations. Answers have been received
from 41 of the 49 states. The Committee now plans to make a comprehensive study of the 31 regional processing centers which it has located and, with the information collected, hopes to develop a manual of procedures that will help toward standardizing processes in this field.

Centralized processing in school library systems is being studied by the School Library Technical Services Committee, of which Mary Louise Mann has been Chairman. The tentative plans of the Committee call for collecting sample manuals from school library systems which now have centralized processing, preparing a bibliography of articles that have been published in this field, asking library schools for graduate theses on centralization, summarizing this material, and preparing a manual based on accepted practices, which will serve as a guide for setting up systems of centralized processing.

Regional Groups

The Chairman of the Council of Regional Groups, Edith Scott, reports the decease of one regional group and the addition of one new one this year, thus leaving the total number of regional groups at twenty-nine. The Miami Regional Group has disbanded; and the new group, which the membership voted to accept as an affiliate at the membership meeting in Washington, is the Arkansas Resources and Technical Services Group. Twelve groups have changed their names to reflect the change from cataloging to technical services groups, while others are considering it or are in the process of making the change.

Miss Scott visited two of the regional groups this year, the Executive Secretary two, and the President four.

Section Activities

In addition to these Division-wide activities, the four sections have flourishing programs in the fields of their particular interests. Space does not permit a full report on these, but the following gives the high lights.

Acquisitions Section

Committees of the Acquisitions Section have had a busy year and one of accomplishment, according to the report of Robert E. Kingery, Chairman. The Cost of Library Materials Index Committee, under the chairmanship of William H. Kurth, has compiled price indexes to United States periodicals in the fields of political science and agriculture and is working on one for medical periodicals. It is also working on a price index for children's books and U. S. books in economics. The purpose of these indexes is to reflect the changes in price of library materials and to meet the needs of libraries and the book trade for this type of data in acquisition planning and budget preparation.

The Joint Committee of the Acquisitions and Serials Sections on Long-Term Periodical Subscriptions, also under the chairmanship of William Kurth, completed its assignment this year by publishing Periodicals Available...
The Foreign Desiderata Publications Committee, Frank Schick, chair-
man, has established the mechanics whereby the present publisher of
TAAB will extend his coverage to provide this kind of service for France,
Italy and Spain. Libraries will be able to place desiderata lists in TAAB
without cost.

The Reprinting Committee, chaired by Joseph Brewer, devoted its
energy to developing means for improving the effectiveness of the Re-
print Expediting Service.

Cataloging and Classification Section

The Cataloging and Classification Section, of which Gertrude L. Oell-
rich has been chairman, reports many major accomplishments, beginning
with the Institute on Cataloging Code Revision at Stanford University in
July 1958, which was attended by nearly two hundred enthusiastic cata-
logers and administrators. With an international conference on cataloging
rules projected for 1961, the Cataloging Section is laying plans for a similar
institute in connection with the Montreal Conference next year.

In the cataloging world, 1958/59 will long be remembered as the year
when the Cataloging in Source experiment was launched by the Library of
Congress and a Consumer Reaction Survey was made to ascertain the re-
action of librarians to the idea of having cataloging information published
in books. The Cataloging Policy and Research Committee expended much
of its energies this year in helping to plan this survey.

Cataloging rules and codes were as usual the subject of much activity
in CCS. The revision of the catalog code continues with Seymour Lubetzky
as editor, under the direction of the Catalog Code Revision Committee,
Wyllis E. Wright, chairman. Mr. Wright and Mr. Lubetzky will represent
the United States at a planning conference in London in July of the Inter-
national Federation of Library Association’s Working Group on the Coor-
dination of Cataloguing Principles, the purpose of which will be to deter-
mine the scope and objects of the International Conference in 1961.

An Arabic transliteration table and manual of cataloging rules, the
work of the Special Committee on Near Eastern Materials, was approved
by the Descriptive Cataloging Committee and has been published by the
Library of Congress. The Special Committee is now at work on a similar
table and manual for the Persian language.

The Descriptive Cataloging Committee also approved a set of rules
for cataloging pictures, designs, and other two-dimensional representa-
tions, which will be published shortly.
The Classification Committee has continued to work toward building up the Special Libraries Association loan collection of classification schemes which is on deposit at Western Reserve University. The Committee is now searching for schemes in special areas in which there is a shortage of schedules, namely, science, social science, and medicine.

The Committee on Cooperation with Latin American Catalogers and Classifiers is making a survey by mail of Latin American libraries in eleven countries to assemble information about current library policy and existing cataloging practices. From the information obtained the Committee plans to develop a guide to practices used in these libraries with the purpose of standardizing procedures in these countries.

Copying Methods Section

The main accomplishment of the Copying Methods Section during 1958/59 has been the compilation and publication of a Directory of Institutional Photoduplication Services in the United States, Chairman James E. Skipper reports. This guide, compiled by Cosby Brinkley, will serve as a useful reference list of photographic services available in this country.

The CMS Executive Committee has initiated action toward trying to provide either centralized indexing or cataloging for microtext projects and is considering the desirability of a standard order form for photoduplications similar to the interlibrary loan form.

Serials Section

The Serials Section, headed by Dorothy J. Comins, in addition to participating in the work of the Joint Committee on Long-Term Periodical Subscriptions, mentioned above, has appointed a Serials Policy and Research Committee, which has been considering areas that need study and investigation. The Committee is at present making an investigation into the possibility of compiling an international list of subscription agencies with their areas of specialization.

Actions of the Board of Directors

Turning now from the programs of the Division and its Sections, I should like to report to you on several actions taken by your Board of Directors during the year.

1. ALA Policy on General Sessions. The first relates to ALA policy on general sessions at the annual conferences. Your Board was disturbed at the apparent trend in ALA toward multiplying the number of general sessions at the annual conferences and at the Midwinter meeting instructed me to write to Benjamin Powell, the incoming President of ALA, expressing its growing concern over this policy. In San Francisco there were four general sessions, at this Conference five. With Council meetings, a membership meeting and a free afternoon preempting five more of the available meeting times, this left for this year only fifteen periods to ac-
commodate the meetings and programs of the 126 groups within the Association.

The Board felt that, with the ALA organized on an interest basis, there should be more time for programs related to those interests; otherwise the ALA is running counter to the basic pattern of its organization. We recommended that the Montreal Conference Program Committee reduce the number of general sessions to two or three and that the ALA adopt a policy of limiting the number in the future in order to free more time for the programs of the groups.

Mr. Powell replied that he was in sympathy with this recommendation and would report it to the Program Committee. John Fall, our representative on the ALA Conference Program Committee for next year, reports that there will be only three general sessions at Montreal.

2. ALA Publishing Policy. The second action of the Board relates to ALA publishing policy. The Executive Committee of the Cataloging and Classification Section was much perturbed in the fall because the ALA was publishing a manuscript containing rules for cataloging materials in the Persian language and a transliteration table for that language without having referred it to the committees within CCS which are working in that area. The CCS Executive Committee felt that, if the ALA publishes anything which includes cataloging rules, the library world will assume that it has official ALA approval.

The matter was referred to the RTSD Board at Midwinter since ALA publishing policy affects all sections of the Division, not just CCS; and it was voted to appoint a committee of one to investigate with the proper officials and committees in ALA the methods of handling similar material in the future so as to avoid this happening again. Arnold Trotier accepted this assignment and reports that the ALA Publishing Committee is considering the problem in Washington. We hope to have a recommendation from them by Midwinter.

3. Assignment of Responsibility for Copying Methods. An organizational matter which took a great deal of our time and attention was the assignment of responsibility for copying methods. Shortly after the establishment of a Copying Methods Section in RTSD in 1957, the ALA Committee on Organization questioned whether copying methods did not belong in the Library Administration Division rather than in RTSD, since LAD has been assigned the responsibility for equipment, and equipment plays an important part in copying methods work.

At Midwinter the Chairman of the Committee on Organization discussed the matter with the RTSD Board of Directors, and subsequently the Board was requested to consider the problem and submit a recommendation.

After a careful study of the factors involved, the Board came to the conclusion that the responsibility for the overall aspects of equipment should be centered in one ALA group but that there should be a distinction between this phase of equipment, which includes testing, standardi-
zation, etc., and the use of equipment in library activities. It therefore recommended to the Committee on Organization that the responsibility for photocopying equipment be transferred to the Library Administration Division as part of its general responsibility for equipment and that the Resources and Technical Services Division retain as part of its organization a Copying Methods Section with the particular emphasis of its program being the application of copying methods to library operations, especially in the field of technical services. We urged that a decision be made soon so that the Copying Methods Section could turn its energies to program rather than expend them in worrying about its organizational status.

At its meeting in Washington the Committee on Organization accepted our recommendation and we are happy, indeed, that we are not to lose our Copying Methods Section.

**THE PRESIDENT’S ACTIVITIES**

To round out this formal report on program and activities, I thought that I might add a more personal note as to what a Division President does during his year in office.

In the first place, he is constantly under pressure to meet deadlines set by ALA, to keep aware of all that is going on in the Division and in the profession, and to keep up with the correspondence that comes his way day in and day out.

The President’s activities may be divided into two parts: those which come as a result of the Division being part of the American Library Association, and those which the administration of the Division itself brings about.

Since the Divisions are consulted about general actions of the ALA as well as those which affect the Division specifically, a President must spend a good deal of time on such matters as assembling opinions of the Board of Directors on the draft statement of the Committee of Five on ALA program and policy and writing a critique of it, studying and submitting opinions on proposed changes in the *ALA Constitution and Bylaws* as they affect the Divisions, considering and presenting opinions on organizational matters such as copying methods. All of these require consultation with the Board members and many hours of concentrated thought; for in matters dealing with the ALA as a whole the Board is speaking for the members of the Division, and the President must try to make certain that statements which he makes in the name of the Board and the Division give a consensus of the thinking of the elected representatives.

In addition, there are the almost daily matters that emanate from activities of the Division and its Sections. A day without mail is an exception. Many of the Divisional matters consist of meeting the deadlines which the carefully planned ALA calendar for regularly recurring activities requires. Examples of this are submitting budget requests for the following year, requesting meeting space at conferences, sending in copy for conference programs. Each of these requires much planning or consultation with other officers, Board or committee members. But much of the daily
flow of correspondence comes from the Section or Committee Chairmen and particularly from the Executive Secretary and the Vice-President. Let me say, however, that it is all enlightening, broadening, and most enjoyable.

This year, in addition to these regular duties, I was invited to speak to two regional groups about the Division and to write an article for the *ALA Bulletin* on its program. This appeared in the May 1959 issue.

In closing, I wish to express my heartfelt thanks to the other officers of the Division and to the members of the Board of Directors for their very fine cooperation in the work of the Division this year and for their interest and their willingness to spend the time and energy necessary to carrying out our program. My thanks go also to the committee chairmen and members for their many valuable contributions. But my special gratitude goes to John Fall, who as Vice-President has given me wholehearted support throughout the year, and to Mrs. Orcena Mahoney, our Executive Secretary, who always had the answers to my questions and took much off my shoulders. It has been a privilege and a pleasure to serve as your President, and I look forward to a year of accomplishment under your new leader.—F. Bernice Field, President.

---

**Studies and Surveys in Progress**

**MARIAN SANNER**  
Enoch Pratt Free Library  
Baltimore, Maryland

**INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CATALOGING RULES**

The preliminary meeting to plan for the International Cataloguing Conference was held in London, July 20-25, 1959 (see *LRTS*, Winter and Summer 1959 issues for previous information). Copies of various national cataloging codes and a number of other publications and reports received prior to the meeting gave evidence of a wide interest in the problems to be dealt with by the International Conference.

The work of the preliminary meeting fell into two parts: determination of subjects to be discussed by the International Conference, and the constitution and organization of the Conference. Working papers on the following special problems were prepared by members of the group: Principles for the construction of a cataloguing code; Compound names and names with prefixes; Varying and changed names; Rendering of oriental names in western catalogs; Multiple authorship; Geographical names in headings, and other problems of corporate authorship; Anonyma requiring special types of headings.
Classification in the Modern Library

The role of classification in the modern library will be the subject of an institute to be conducted by the University of Illinois Library School and the University Extension Division at Allerton House, Monticello, Ill., November 1-4, 1959. Some of the questions to be discussed by leaders from the field of classification will be: whether classification is accomplishing its stated aims; the value of the classified catalog in research libraries; the use of LC classification for research collections; the problems involved in classifying special collections; what the future can be expected to produce.

Complete information about the institute may be obtained from the Chairman, Thelma Eaton, University of Illinois Library School, Urbana, Ill.

Acquisition of Publications of Roving Congresses

One of the chief matters under study by the Serials Policy and Research Committee is a method for improving the means of discovering and acquiring the publications of international and domestic roving congresses, conferences, and societies which have no headquarters. This is a serious and fairly general problem for which the Committee is attempting to find a satisfactory solution.

“Readers’ Interest” Classification

After its January meeting, the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee continued its study of reader interest arrangement of books through correspondence on the subject (see Summer 1959 issue of LRTS for earlier mention of this topic). At its April meeting, the Committee tentatively approved this area of classification for more extended investigation, to be initiated perhaps with an ALA conference workshop.

Library Technology Project

Two staff members have been appointed for the Library Technology Project: Frazer G. Poole, Assistant Librarian at Santa Barbara College of the University of California, has been appointed Director; Forrest Carhart, Chief of the Public Service Division of the U. S. Air Force Academy Library at Colorado Springs, has been named Senior Editorial Assistant.

The purpose of the Project is to make available to librarians information that will insure use of the most efficient library equipment and supplies (for additional information see Winter and Summer 1959 issues of this magazine).

Deterioration of Paper in Book-stock

A CLR grant to the Virginia State Library in 1957 enabled it to make a study of the causes of deterioration of paper in the book-stock of libraries and to seek remedial measures. The study, which was concluded late in 1958, was conducted by William J. Barrow, a document restorer.
associated with the Virginia State Library. The findings of this study were reported in an article entitled "Permanence in Book Papers" by W. J. Barrow and R. C. Sproull (in Science, April 24, 1959, vol. 129; 1075-1084).

The investigation disclosed that acidity seems to be the chief cause of deterioration. During the study, a process for neutralizing the acidity was developed, but more research is needed to provide a stable paper for books of permanent importance.

The Council on Library Resources has made a new grant to the Virginia State Library to continue its study in an effort to find methods for producing permanent book papers at a cost competitive with present papers, and to apply to existing book-stock the preservative measures derived from the earlier study.

LEGAL ASPECTS OF PHOTOCOPYING IN LIBRARIES

A two-year grant from the Council on Library Resources has enabled the Joint Libraries Committee on Fair Use in Photocopying to engage the services of a New York law firm to make a legal study of the problems of photocopying in libraries.

The Committee, which represents ALA, ARL and SLA, was established in 1957 to work on copyright problems arising in the photocopying of materials in library collections. Committee members include: Edward G. Freehafer, Chairman, Lowell A. Martin, and Robert S. Bray.

CLASSIFICATION SCHEME FOR ANGLO-AMERICAN LAW LITERATURE

A joint committee of specialists in law and in library classification has been formed to advise the Library of Congress on the development of a classification scheme for the literature of Anglo-American law as a part of Class K. The committee has been established through the co-operative efforts of LC, the American Association of Law Libraries, the Association of American Law Schools, and the American Law Institute. A grant to the Library of Congress from CLR will finance meetings of the joint committee.

STUDY OF LIBRARY MATERIALS IN RELATION TO TEACHING NEEDS

The University of Chicago has received a grant from the Council on Library Resources for the purpose of studying the scope and characteristics of the library materials required to support a high level of teaching and research.

In announcing the grant, Verner Clapp, President of CLR, stated that "the massive production of modern research literature is creating both an intellectual and a physical problem for contemporary scholars. The space problems of large research libraries are among the most serious the CLR has found." Herman H. Fussler, Director of the University of Chicago Library, said that "the grant will permit a detailed study of the types or categories that seem to have the greatest actual or potential value in research libraries."

The search for workable answers to the problem will include: the col-
lecting of data on the frequency and distribution in time of the past use of books in perhaps as many as twenty different fields; an analysis of the relationships that seem to exist between past and current patterns of use; invitations to several small panels of experts to assess selected lists of titles in their fields as to probable “importance” or desired levels of accessibility; a scientific check on the habits of browsing to discover use patterns of research materials by readers consulting books directly from the shelves.

Most of the information for the study, which is expected to require about one year for completion, will be drawn from an analysis of the use of materials at the University of Chicago, but it is expected that related information will be collected from other large research libraries.

The project is very closely related to Yale University Library’s Selective Book Retirement Program (for information on this study, see LRTS Summer 1959 issue). Lee Ash, formerly editor of Library Journal, joined the Yale University Program in July as Editor and Research Analyst.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF MUSIC LIBRARIES


Among the papers selected for presentation by the International Association of Music Libraries, one dealt with the technical problems of music in public libraries and documentation centres, another with the problems of collections of gramophone records: conservation, a comprehensive code for cataloging, exchange of information and of non-commercial recordings. Papers presented by the Galpin Society were devoted to the subject of musical instruments: their history, significance, etc.

UNION LIST OF SERIALS, THIRD EDITION

A grant of $244,651 from the Council on Library Resources, Inc., will make possible the third edition of the Union List of Serials in Libraries in the United States and Canada. The grant was made to the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials, Inc., a non-profit group representing all segments of library work in the United States and Canada. The project, which will probably take three to four years to complete, will be carried out for the Joint Committee by the Library of Congress under the supervision of John W. Cronin, Director of the Processing Department.

The first edition of the Union List, in 1927, recorded 75,000 titles; the second edition, 1943, listed 120,000 serials. The new edition is expected to require some 4,000 to 5,000 pages. The increasing size of each edition and rising publication costs make it obvious that the series cannot continue indefinitely. Interested parties in the U. S. and Canada have approved a proposal of the Joint Committee that the third edition cumulate serials information only to 1950, and that the post-1950 record be continued in the monthly-cumulative LC publication, New Serial Titles.
Foreign Desiderata

The generally recognized need of libraries to devise more efficient means to acquire foreign out-of-print materials led in January, 1958 to the creation of the Foreign Desiderata Publications Committee by the Acquisitions Section. Its beginnings were described in Acquiring Books From Abroad, which appeared in the Winter 1959 issue of LRTS (Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 46-50). During the past year the Committee, consisting of Helen M. Welch (University of Illinois), James E. Skipper (University of Connecticut), Gordon R. Williams (MILC), and Frank L. Schick, Chairman (Library Services Branch, U. S. Office of Education), ascertained that exclusive desiderata publications don't exist in France, Italy and Spain and that secondhand book dealer associations in these countries are not in a position to start a publication of the scope envisaged by the Committee.

Several American firms showed decided interest in the Committee's project, and discussions were held with Daniel Melcher, Vice President, R. R. Bowker Company; Dominick Coppola, Vice President, Stechert-Hafner, Inc.; and Albert Saifer, publisher, TAAB.

During the Washington Conference two meetings were held in which the above-named guests participated in closed sessions. In an open meeting featuring a panel discussion and attended by over 100 (while less than forty were expected at 8:30 in the morning) Messrs. Melcher and Saifer explained their plans.

Mr. Saifer will issue, during the second half of 1959, an exclusively want list type of publication called Foreign Desiderata, which will be sent to secondhand book dealers in France, Italy, the Low Countries, and Spain and to American book dealers handling foreign materials. American libraries are asked to send their desiderata to Mr. Saifer on 3 x 5 cards. Photographic reproductions of cards will be acceptable to him. No charge will be made for listings, but libraries may order copies of the large initial monographic list for one dollar if they wish. Foreign and American book dealers will receive the publication during an introductory period free of charge and will later be asked to subscribe. The initial list will be arranged by libraries requesting the materials. The supplementary lists, which will be issued periodically, will be arranged alphabetically within each of the three language groups with some symbol to show which library wants the title.

The purpose of the publication consists in stimulating dealer quotations directly to listing libraries. Helen Welch is coordinating a survey by which fifteen representative libraries in the foreign acquisition field will act as control group to supply the Committee with data on their success in ordering through Foreign Desiderata.

For the present Mr. Melcher is shelving a proposed Bowker exchange bulletin designed to facilitate the acquisition of Latin American and Spanish titles. This will allow a clear field for Mr. Saifer's experiment.—Frank L. Schick, Chairman, Foreign Desiderata Publications Committee.

• 322 •
Marking of Books

THE ITEM by Gerard McCabe on "Cloth Labels" which appeared in the Spring 1959 issue of this magazine has attracted so much interest, we have obtained and present herewith a few more book-marking practices. Although this particular problem may be low in professional considerations, it is high in administrative ones. For there is possibly not a technical services administrator who is not irritated and frustrated by the disproportionate amount of time and money eaten up by this simple task and by his inability to whip it satisfactorily.

For, no matter how satisfied each of us may be with his present method, he must (if honest and thoughtful) face the fact that the satisfaction is only relative—that this is only his choice of the best of the methods known to him. Following, then, are a few procedures for what help they may be. And we are interested in hearing of others.—E.J.P.

First, Mr. McCabe has received so many queries of information as to exact products employed, he has prepared the following form answer:

Several inquiries have been received concerning our news release Cloth Labels, in the '59 issue of Library Resources and Technical Services. The typewriter used is a Smith-Corona with oversize type, and it is equipped with a Library Platen. (See page 10 of Handbook for Smith-Corona Operators, for an illustration of this platen.) Similar equipment is available from other manufacturers of typewriters.

The Labels used are made by the Dennison Mfg. Co., Framingham, Mass. We use three sizes, the middle size most frequently. Occasionally, even larger labels are needed but no adequate brand has been located. These labels already have glue on them but we do not attempt to use this glue, rather applying another kind.

These are the steps followed en masse, i.e. large groups are done at the same time:

1. Type all labels, clip each to book page.
2. Smear back of label with glue and place on spine.
3. Cover label with paper to avoid smearing and rub to spread out glue. Curling labels result from insufficient spreading of the glue.
4. Line up the books on one side of a book truck and spray with Krylon. (Krylon Crystal Clear no. 1503 Spray Coating; Krylon, Inc., Norristown, Penn.)

This does not constitute an endorsement of any product mentioned. Supplies should be obtainable from any library supplier.

This routine is now used for all books, both new and reclassified.

—Gerard B. McCabe, Acquisition Librarian University of South Florida, Tampa
From Harvard College:

The Harvard College Library Catalogue Department uses an ordinary gummed label (Dennison A 22) but adds a full coating of Upaco adhesive which is purchased from the Union Paste Company, 1605 Hyde Parke Avenue, Hyde Parke, 36, Massachusetts. The price to Harvard has been $6.00 per gallon. From information at hand, it is apparently a polyvinyl acetate adhesive.

The Harvard Library has not found it necessary to prepare the surface of the book in any special way. The primary difficulty in this process is in the awkwardness of coating any piece of paper as small as a shelf-mark label. The approach has been to use a metal sheet onto which the paste is brushed evenly, but not too thinly. The labels are then placed, gummed side down, in the glue on the metal sheet. As the label is placed on the spine of the book, a damp sponge is used to smooth the label out and to wipe away excessive glue. Experience with this system has been highly satisfactory. There has been no trouble with labels falling off despite the fact that the main stack is not controlled for temperature or humidity.

Labels are used on most Harvard books since it has been felt this method of identification was much easier to read, and no trouble is caused by occasional re-classification or transfer of materials from one unit of the Library to another or from one unit to storage in the New England Deposit Library. The black India ink stands out exceedingly well on the labels no matter what color the binding or what material had been used for binding.

—Robin Blaser, Administrative Assistant for Cataloguing

University of New Hampshire:

At the University of New Hampshire Library we have used for three years Dennison roll labels (Dace Card & Index Co.) which are attached with a mending paste, Book-Saver. The labels are typed on an electric bulletin type machine. Two colors of labels are used, green for books that circulate, yellow for non-circulating materials.

—Helen D. Abbott, Head Cataloger

Public libraries have a somewhat different problem since the introduction of plastic book jackets. They must first decide whether to mark twice (the book itself plus the jacket); most have eliminated the first for they find that a very high percentage of the books are ready for discard or re-binding by the time the jacket's life is over.

The large public library or library system has also the factor of multiple copies, and this situation may offer the opportunity for further short cuts. Two varying practices follow:

New York Circulation Department:

For all books in the Circulation Department of The New York Public Library, call numbers are prepared in the following manner—

(a) Books with publishers' dust wrappers.

Pressure Sensitive labels, permanent adhesive style (obtained from Demco Library Supplies) are imprinted on an Addressing machine after plate has been cut on the Graphotype machine (equipped with Style 35 type, 9 to the inch, all caps)—both machines are from Addressograph-
Multigraph Corporation. This applies to quantities of three or more copies of the same title. On singles (one or two copies of a title) labels are typed on a regular typewriter with pica face. These labels are then adhered to the spine of the dust wrapper before the wrapper is incased in a plastic jacket. (We use Bro-Dart Plasti-Klear jackets.)

(b) Unjacketed Books—For quantities, also singles listing at $5.00 and over, call numbers are imprinted directly on the spine of the book by use of the Altair Call Number Stamping Machine. Eighteen (18 point type is generally used—12 point type on thin volumes. On very thin, flat books, where there is no room available on the spine, the call number is imprinted on the lower left hand corner of the front cover. The machine used for this purpose is a Qwik Print Big Bench, also from Altair. Stylus is used on singles where list price is under $5.00. Contrasting colored foils purchased locally, are used, depending upon the color of the book cloth. (Gold is not used because of its comparative illegibility).

—William Stern, Superintendent of Binding and Processing

Enoch Pratt Free Library, Baltimore:

On books having no dust jackets and on non-book materials, call numbers are hand-lettered, using white or black ink, whichever makes for clearer reading. Higgins Black India Ink or Rogers Artists Supply White Ink is applied with sable #2 lettering brushes. (Ink and brushes are purchased locally from Rogers Artists Supply Co.) We have found, through experimentation, that shellacking an area before applying the ink makes for a much smoother lettering surface. After careful revision, call numbers applied with white ink must be shellacked (clear shellac from any hardware store) to prevent chipping.

For books with dust jackets, call numbers are typed by a regular typewriter equipped with bulletin-sized type on pressure sensitive labels, 1 x 1½ inch (purchased from Demco Library Supplies) and applied to dust jackets before covering with plastic jackets. We formerly used differently sized and shaped labels but find that the one, typed either widthwise or lengthwise accommodates all call numbers. If for any reason, the label is applied on the outside of the plastic jacket, it is covered with scotch cellophane tape to prevent soil and picking at by reader.

Single-line call numbers (used for juvenile fiction, picture books, etc.) we have printed on pressure-sensitive acetate tape, which is cut and applied as needed.

About 65 per cent of all new books are jacketed, those not jacketed include reference books, prebound children’s books, and the first copy of every new title. Jackets are removed from the last group to maintain a collection for display or exhibit purposes.

—Vera A. Reynolds, Head, Preparations and Binding Department
The affiliation of the *Arkansas* Resources and Technical Services Group, approved at the annual meeting, brings the total member of Groups to twenty-nine. The new group, now headed by Opal Walters (Arkansas State Teachers College, Conway), was initiated by LaNell Compton (Arkansas State Library Commission) and given able advice by Margaret W. Ayrault (University of Michigan), then DCC President.

Nine of the Groups holding Spring meetings participated in the Cataloging-in-Source Consumer Reaction Survey. The Director of the Survey, Esther Piercy, talked with the Oklahoma group; Virginia Drewry with the Nashville and Ohio Valley groups; Richard Pautzsch to Chicago; Eleanor E. Campion with Philadelphia and New Jersey; and Joseph Treyz with Connecticut. The official Survey team received assistance from Cataloging Policy and Research Committee members Margaret W. Ayrault (University of Michigan) at the Ontario Regional Group meeting and Jennette Hitchcock (Stanford) assisted by Dorothy Bruno and George Pternick at the Northern California group meeting.

In the excitement over CIS, catalog code revision was not forgotten, nor could it be. J. Elias Jones (Drake University) as a library administrator and Ruth Richardson (Cedar Rapids Public Library) as a reference librarian joined with a cataloger, Thera P. Cavender (State University of Iowa) in presenting the proposed new *Code* to the Iowa Catalog Section. Mr. Jones, after describing the transition from bibliophile, or protective, administrator to the indifferent, or even hostile, welcomed the potentials of the new code as an effective aid to the solution of the bibliographical organization.

Charles L. Higgins (Michigan State Library and member of the Advisory Board, Catalog Code Revision Committee) was the speaker for a tri-sectional (Technical Services, Reference, and College) Michigan meeting, followed by discussion of specific questions by the small groups at each table. In contrast to the optimistic Iowans, the Michigan group raised the question as to whether tweedle-dee-dee was being substituted for tweedle-dee-dum with nothing gained. The Group felt that an adequate answer to the question "who uses the catalog and why" should precede code revision.

Four users of the catalog, Martha Frances Smith (Florida State University), Jane M. Neel (Sarasota Public Library), Eleanor Miller (Jacksonville Free Public Library), and Madeline S. Riffey (University of Miami), order, circulation, reference and readers assistant librarians respectively, did state their catalog needs to the *Florida* Cataloger's Roundtable. Their combined list of fifteen concrete suggestions would not cut cataloging costs. They need more—cross-references of the various kinds, title cards for nonfiction, added entries for editors and local authors, subject analytics, etc., and they need them faster.
The New Jersey group continued its workshop sessions with Hazel Van Voorhees and Fred H. Graves (Rutgers School of Library Service) as leaders. Aids to assist the user of the catalog were emphasized. The 16th edition of the Dewey Decimal Classification received general approval.

A second program on serials drew ninety-eight persons to the Boston, now New England, group meeting. Participants were: Helen G. Kurtz (Brown University), moderator, and Elaine Walker (Wellesley), Katherine Dwyre (Worcester Public Library), Barbara Hill (Massachusetts of Pharmacy), and Edith E. Clitheroe (Brown University).

Three aspects of internationalism appeared in group programs. S. R. Ranganathan (India) spoke to the Northern Ohio group. Elizabeth Peeler (University of Miami) described her work at University College, Ibadan, Nigeria, for the Florida catalogers. The third, Lorna Fraser (University of Toronto) reported to the Ontario group on visits to American university libraries, a three-months survey supported by a travel grant from the Canada Council.

The organization of acquisitions departments for different types of libraries was the topic for the Northern California group. Ethel Kerns, Harriet Coolpy (Merced Branch, San Francisco Public Library), Anne S. Creese (San Leandro Public Library), and Joe Biggins were the panel participants. "The Business End of Library Work" as seen by the Comptroller of the University of Pennsylvania, Harold F. Manley, was of special interest to acquisition librarians at the Philadelphia meeting.

The Texas group was also business-minded. Doraly Hickey (Rice Institute) drew practical details from her recent study at Rutgers in describing and evaluating "Mechanical Devices Used in Catalog Departments."

The Chicago Regional Group completed a directory, and potential member mailing list, of Librarians in Technical Services, Chicago Area. One hundred twenty-six libraries are included in the publication which has a "cover illustrated by Teresa Lynn," daughter of Jeannette Murphy Lynn (John Crerar), immediate past Chairman of the Group.—Edith Scott, University of Oklahoma, Chairman, Council of Regional Groups.

CUSTER RECEIVES DEWEY MEDAL

The 1959 Melvil Dewey Medal was awarded during the ALA Conference in Washington to Benjamin A. Custer, Editor of the Dewey Decimal Classification. Mr. Custer has served in many capacities in the Resources and Technical Services Division and in the former Division of Cataloging and Classification. Among other positions, he was President of DCC, a member of the organizing committee which shaped RTSD and a member of its first Executive Board. He has served as Chairman of the Division's and the ALA's committees on Constitution and Bylaws, and he is a member of the ALA Council.

Most appropriately, the award was given for his work in bringing the 16th Edition of the DDC to a successful and timely completion.
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