CONTENTS

Universal Classification—Untenable. Vern M. Pings 5


A Fresh Look at the Treatment of Documents. Wilhelm Moll 43

San Francisco State College Library Technical Services Time Study. A. S. Pickett 45

Budget Control of Book Purchases and Binding Expenditures in Large Public Libraries. Alex Ladenson 47

Multiple Binding-Instruction Form. Marianne von Dobeneck 59

American Trade Catalogs vs. Manuscript Records. Lawrence B. Romaine 63

Is Bibliographic Standardization Possible? 67

Regional Groups. 70


The Current Revision of ALA Rules. Seymour Lubetzky 79

International Cataloging Conference. Wyllis E. Wright 85

The U.S.B.E. Survey. Edwin E. Williams 89

Publications in the Field. 92
EDITORIAL BOARD

Honorary Editor: MARIE LOUISE PREVOST
Editor: ESTHER J. PIERCY
Assistant Editors: HELEN M. WELCH, Acquisitions
                  PAUL S. DUNKIN, Cataloging and Classification
                  DAVID C. WEBER, Copying Methods
                  DAVID E. KASER, Serials
                  MAURICE F. TAUBER, Technical Services
                  EDITH SCOTT, Regional Groups
                  MARIAN SANNER, Studies and Surveys
Managing Editor: CARLYLE J. FRAREY
Assistant Managing Editor: RAY CARPENTER
Advertising Manager: DAVID TURIEL
Circulation Manager: MRS. ORCENA MAHONEY

Library Resources and Technical Services, the quarterly official publication of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association is published at 1407 Sherwood Ave., Richmond 5, Va. Undeliverable copies and changes of address should be sent to American Library Association, 50 East Huron St., Chicago 11, Illinois. Editorial Office: Processing Division, Enoch Pratt Free Library, 400 Cathedral St., Baltimore 1, Md. Circulation and Business Office: 50 East Huron St., Chicago 11, Ill. Subscription Price: to members of the ALA Resources and Technical Services Division paying ALA dues of $6.00 or more, $2.00 per year, included in the membership dues; to members paying less than $6.00, and to non-members, $5.00 per year. Single copies, $1.25; orders of five or more copies (same issue or assorted), $1.00 each.

Second-class postage paid at Richmond, Va. and at additional mailing offices.

LRTS is indexed in Library Literature, Library Science Abstracts, and Contents in Advance.

Editors: Material published in LRTS is not copyrighted. When reprinting, the courtesy of citation to the original publication is requested. Publication in LRTS does not imply official endorsement by the Resources and Technical Services Division nor by ALA, and the assumption of editorial responsibility is not to be construed necessarily as endorsement of the opinions expressed by individual contributors.
Universal Classification—Untenable

Vern M. Pings
Librarian
Ohio Northern University, Ada

Of the participants of the 1957 International Study Conference on Classification for Information Retrieval only Shera seems to have the humility to admit to the possibility that it is not within man's competence to devise a universal classification system for all human knowledge. The word humility is used deliberately: de Grolier writes rather undemocratically, "If I had a glass of champagne, I would propose to lift my cup to the future classificationist who will be master of the world." Modern psychologists have come to recognize that the individual who can control all the information supplied to a group of people in effect also controls the behavior of that group. It may not be an idle boast, therefore, that the individual who can impress his interpretation of human experiences on the rest of the world could indeed be its master. The aching question this master of the world could never honestly answer would be whether his classification of information is complete.

The attitude supported here is the one proffered by Shera that there is no such "thing" as a universal classification scheme. This attitude is neither maintained because of the political implications expressed by de Grolier, nor out of pessimism because of past failures to produce such a scheme. Scientists have raised fundamental epistemic problems which, while not absolutely denying the possibility of synthesizing all human knowledge into one categorical scheme, give powerful arguments based on empirical evidence supporting the Kantian dictum that Reason cannot ferret out its own existence. This attitude, then, runs quite counter to Ranganathan's in which he states, "I believe that we have had enough of discussion on the issue of special vs. universal classification. It is time that we agreed upon universal classification." The fact is that "we" can never agree upon a universal classification unless we are capable of dealing satisfactorily with the limitations of scientific inquiry.

The belief that an absolute categorical scheme exists can be securely upheld if arguments are used from the philosophy of science developed in the 19th century. But this attitude towards science has been challenged. While a short summary could hardly be expected to do justice to this revolution in science, it is hoped that sufficient information can be conveyed to be able to place the later discussion on present-day aspects of
classification for information retrieval into a meaningful context, and, further, that the assertions made so far are founded on scientific theory of which classificationists must be aware if they are to deal with knowledge arising from scientific inquiry.

19th Century Science

Each age of scientists criticizes the previous age for its anthropomorphic views, its subjective interpretation of the external reality. In the 16th century Western man abandoned the belief that changes produced in the external world were under the control of the will of some spiritual force possessed by mountains, animals, man, or equally unpredictable gods. Unvarying laws were discovered which were independent of any will; they operated unfailingly whether there were anyone to observe them or not. Once this concept of invariance was formulated for scientific practice, it came to dominate not only science but the whole panorama of man’s ideas.

Underlying this philosophy was the belief that the physical universe was a gigantic machine whose parts could be identified and interrelated and thus make it possible for a person equipped with a super-intelligence to describe the future state of the universe by knowing its present state. Newton’s theories of motion had provided the scientists with all the “causes” for the existing dynamic conditions. The fact that they were able to predict future and describe former states led them to believe that the elements they had isolated from the universe could be considered the fundamental causes of all phenomena. This supported the belief that not only was nature rational, but simple. The complexities of the universe could be reduced to mechanical or mathematical models. Hence man had available all the information and intellectual instruments needed to obtain a complete picture of the universe; the only difficulty was that the computations were too time-consuming.

The classical concepts which allowed the properties of the universe to be viewed mechanically might be characterized as 1) the universe could be analyzed into distinct systems; 2) the state of each system could be described in terms of dynamic variables that could be specified to any desired degree of precision; and 3) the interrelationship between the parts of a system (or between systems) could be described by exact causal laws which could interpret precisely the future changes of the dynamic variables in terms of their present conditions. The behavior of a system as a unit could be considered the result of the interaction of all of its parts.

Although it may appear redundant, the above assumptions and beliefs of the 19th century scientist will be restated because they have played an essential role in the way Western civilization has organized knowledge and the way it has gone about seeking new knowledge. The 19th century might be characterized as the “age of Rationalism and the quantitative method. Whatever was measurable or quantitative was real; all else was unreal and therefore beneath serious consideration . . . intuition and emotion came to be disparaged as minor attributes of human
nature.” Nature was regular and precise—its dynamism was controlled by unvarying laws.

The 19th century materialist did not necessarily believe that the universe could be organized into an hierarchical order—for this required “value” judgments—but he was convinced that each element of the universe was related to all other elements; everything had its own particular place. The process of measuring was independent of the order within the universe. Measurement meant objectivity, objectivity which was above and beyond the subjectivity of any one individual. Thus by applying the proper measurements on the universe, man could “know”, not just “know about” the universe.

Methods of Science

The 19th century scientist believed that the accuracy of any physical measurement could be increased indefinitely. He admitted that measurements made up to that time were subject to “experimental error,” but this was only a temporary situation. It was man’s slipshod methods that caused discrepancies between what he measured and what the Newtonian model of the universe predicted he would find. As simple as the question may sound today, it seems never to have occurred to the 19th century scientists: if theories are based on measurements and the measurements contain errors, is it not possible that theories constructed from them might also be erroneous?

A theoretical proof for the impossibility of an infinitely-accurate measurement was given in 1927 by Heisenberg with what is now misleadingly identified as the uncertainty principle. The term “uncertainty” does not mean that the empirical operation of measurement is “uncertain,” i.e., unknowable and unpredictable for the individual situation; it refers to the fact that measurements made on atomic processes cannot be categorized without also describing the point of view from which those processes are observed. Heisenberg says this situation “may be expressed in concise and general terms by saying that every experiment destroys some of the knowledge of the system which was obtained by previous experiments.”

If it is true that it is necessary to destroy knowledge to get knowledge, how does this “precise” science of physics proceed to construct theories when knowledge of the objects studied is always incomplete? To begin to find an answer to this question modern physicists had to deal with a problem the 19th century scientist felt was merely a philosophical exercise: what does it mean to know? The classical scientist believed he dealt with one reality and this reality was the same for everyone; all knowledge could eventually be reduced to this “true” reality. The modern scientist has not been able to use such a simplified ontology, or world picture. Why this is the case can be made clear if we observe how the scientist goes about obtaining knowledge operationally.

1) The first step is to define an object of study or system. The scientist devises measuring instruments (which may be his own sense
impressions) to apply to it. A set of measurements are taken which describes the system in terms of those measurements. This tells us nothing of the nature of the system other than its existence or that a relationship has been established between it and the process of measuring.

There are two vitally important conditions involved in this step toward knowledge acquiring. The first is that the scientist selected out of the total environment available to him only a certain delineable object. This may not appear to be of methodological or epistemic importance so long as we deal with objects like steam engines or guinea pigs, but as Heisenberg writes, “we have to remember that what we observe is not nature in itself, but nature exposed to our method of questioning.”

In this first step of knowledge acquiring the second condition is that there is a choice in the measuring instruments to be used. Here again the kind of instruments we use to measure or test our object of study is going to determine the kind and quality of information we acquire about it. Diffracting X-rays or ordinary white light by means of a crystal will produce different sets of data. Bohr has generalized this methodological (and logical) situation into what he calls the principle of complementarity. Simply stated, no one set of instruments used to observe an object can give us a complete picture of it. By varying our methods of observation we get many pictures each of which is complementary to the object.

2) Returning to the operations of knowledge acquiring, the second step involves a comparison of measurements. One set delineates the existence of a system; another set of measurements is needed to discover the “effect” of the variables introduced by the scientist. The methodological problem arises: if there is a difference between two sets of measurements, to what extent is this difference “caused” by interactions of the system or by the act of measuring? The process of knowledge acquiring cannot be relieved of the onus of the effort of observation. It is to this precept of inquiry that John Dewey so assiduously ascribed. Knowledge requires that some interaction or transaction occur between the knower and that which is known. Human knowledge therefore always has a certain quality of privateness and subjectivity.

3) The third step of inquiry which is important to recognize for the purposes of classification is the production of a theory or a picture which connects the two measurements into some kind of unity, i.e., a picture which, in a sense, tells us what happens between the two sets of measurements. Einstein was the first physicist to emphasize the importance of using only “sure knowledge” in the construction of theories. By sure knowledge is meant the information arrived at by observation and measurement. Such information can be secured by anyone taking the trouble to orient himself to a specific frame of reference. Ontological considerations are therefore not admissible as evidence in the formulation of theories even though they may have been necessary to obtain the data which go into them.

Modern physicists have spelled out a paradox from the 19th century physicist’s point of view for which there is no solution. While it is neces-
sary to have an ontology in order to ask significant questions and to carry out significant operations for inquiry, not all “facts” or human experiences can be reduced to that ontology. Or, to say it another way, to arrange empirical data into some kind of order or theory requires that we go beyond the empirical data to do so. But the only sure knowledge man possesses is empirical data. This leaves us in an awkward position. Are we to say that our theories and our classification systems are not “knowledge” but only imaginary mists? The answer the modern scientist would give is a loud “no.” It is this very fact that man cannot convert his experiences into one categorical scheme which makes science possible, and in truth this is science. When man transforms all possible experiences into one theory, science and inquiry will end.

Using the process of inquiry as a context, the possibility of creating a universal classification system seems remote. To give support to this statement, two kinds of classification systems will be examined, the postulate system and the language system. They are not singled out because of any particular failure as classification schemes, but because they represent two extremes.

The Postulate System

In the terse summary of scientific methodology two factors seem of import:

1) The scientist, before he can begin significant inquiry, must form some picture or some concept about the reality within which he is working. He ordinarily cannot expect to learn anything about nature by studying the universe as a whole. This Weltanschauung from which the scientist starts has been created by a system of postulates or axioms based on previous experiences of scientists or on the authority of the collected and ordered experiences of past epochs. 2) Once an object of study is defined and data is collected about its inter- and intra-actions, the data is then examined to see if it is consistent with the theories already in existence, i.e., whether the data fits into the generalized scheme of classified knowledge, or if the data produced conflicts with it. If the latter is the case, there are but two choices left to the scientist: he must admit that either he has erroneous data, or that the postulates are inadequate to include the ordering of the data.

The history of science is filled with instances of persistent scientists who trusted their observations and not the classification scheme of knowledge they inherited from their predecessors. The only recourse is to formulate a new postulate system in which the data can be logically ordered.

It is the very nature of science that data acquired through inquiry be organized or classified in some way to make it communicable. This classification always requires that we go beyond the empirical data for its formulation. But if we do this, we are dealing in speculative uncertainties. In the formulation of knowledge the modern scientists have come to realize it is useless to argue about which is more correct, the speculative
approach or the strictly empirical approach. The conflict is actually imaginary—there can be no empiricism without some underlying concepts which act as a vehicle for an attitude of perception, nor can there be realistic concepts without empirical activity. This cannot be generalized. It is the continual checking against our “theoretical” organizations which produces knowledge, not just trying to reduce all empirical data to one theory. For, as Eddington writes,

in regard to the nature of things . . . knowledge is only an empty shell—a form of symbols. It is knowledge of structural form, and not knowledge of content. All through the physical world runs the unknown content, which must surely be the stuff of our consciousness. Here is a hint of aspects deep within the world of physics, and yet unattainable by the methods of physics. And, moreover, we have found that where science has progressed the farthest, the mind has but regained from nature that which the mind has put into nature.8

Any attempt to construct a classification system based on existing knowledge must face at least the following two difficulties:

1) While there may be one actuality to which all knowledge refers, man as yet has no assurance that the various views he has of it are accurate. Consequently, any postulate system which could logically include all existing knowledge is built on uncertainty. Such a system would not only have to include what is now considered sure knowledge, but also what was once considered sure knowledge. By definition a universal classification system must deal with all knowledge, not just what the present epoch accepts as knowledge.

2) If a postulate system is to be devised to include future knowledge, the postulates must be arrived at by speculation unless it is assumed that no new knowledge is ever to be discovered. Speculation, while certainly a recognized intellectual activity, can hardly be expected to produce a scheme that would be capable of including all the possible future activities of man. Such a postulate system is based on uncertain knowledge just as surely as the one derived from existing knowledge.

The Language System

If the a priori or the a posteriori postulate system cannot serve as a universal classification system, is it possible to construct some other scheme not depending on stated axioms?

It is not an uncommon belief that indexing systems based only on words “do not offer logical or classificatory principles.”9 The very fact that such systems as Uniterm can be used mechanically of necessity requires that some logical consistency exists. A mechanical operation, as ordinarily understood, is never random. While the logic which makes it possible for such a method to be effective may not be the kind of logic that is ordinarily taught in a beginning course in philosophy or mathematics, it does have an ordered structure.

One of the major discoveries about language in the past few decades
has been the fact that it survives because of the acceptance of symbols by at least two individuals who wish to communicate. According to Mead's theory of the origin of language, it was created as a "tool" whereby one individual gets another individual to do something either for him or in cooperation with him. Whether this is the actual origin of language need not be debated here, but it is fairly well agreed today that language is a means whereby human beings influence each other's behavior.

The acceptance of a particular symbol, or sound, by a group of individuals to "mean" something is an arbitrary matter; the symbols themselves are unreal, and hence they cannot be logical. The symbols to constitute a language must be ordered, but the symbols are not logically derived entities. Although the actual type of sound of a symbol is irrelevant in communication, its meaning or "what it stands for" is not. For a symbol to be useful it must refer to some experience that is common to the community that use it as a vehicle for communication; Whorf noted:

We cut nature up, organize it into concepts, and ascribe significances as we do, largely because we are parties to an agreement to organize it in this way—an agreement that holds throughout our speech community as is codified in the patterns of our language. The agreement is, of course, an implicit and unstated one, but its terms are absolutely obligatory; we cannot talk at all except by subscribing to the organization and classification of data which the agreement decrees.10

If the meaning of symbols is dependent upon common experience, it is obvious that these experiences must be the "same" for all who use the symbol. But common sense tells us that all sorts of classifications of ideas are possible. What is a logical pigeonhole for an idea or experience (or the word it represents) to one person may not be the proper pigeonhole to another.

Even more complex is the fact that one experience can be classified in several different ways. For example, a whole group of words which have come to be greatly confused are those of the vocabulary and the conceptual framework that revolve around information theory. Although the symbols are the same, the meanings individuals have for them vary widely. Such words as noise, pattern, entropy, transmitter, receiver, feedback, code, etc., are now being used by many disciplines. A zoologist might think of feedback with reference to the relation of the production of hormones; a psychologist looks at it in terms of behavioral responses of a total organism; to the automation engineer, it is a relationship and response of machines to a certain product. When "properly" interpreted, the concept of feedback is useful to all these disciplines; but to assume that it has the same meaning for the biologist, psychologist, and engineer is to place a faith in language which, at present at least, is unwarranted.

In the United States there has been a continued effort to standardize a vocabulary for library classification purposes. Many of these standardized vocabulary lists have met with success if they do not last too long. The newer such a list is, the more people there are who can use it to
decode for communication and retrieval purposes; if, however, the system is antiquated, it requires an expert in this standardized code to classify and then to retrieve what has been classified. The reason the newer code is more understandable by a greater number of people is that the “meanings” of the words are more commonly recognized because they refer to contemporary experiences.

A standardized vocabulary can only be a universal classification scheme if both the subject content and the language are dead. It is quite possible that all the knowledge and events of the Roman Empire could be classified in Latin. The significant and erroneous knowledge of these centuries found its way into the language.

The efforts of bibliographers to standardize language only compounds the natural property of language to fail to keep pace with the experiences of man. Sapir wrote in quite a different context,

> It is almost as though at some period in the past the unconscious mind of the race had made a hasty inventory of experience, committed itself to a premature classification that allowed of no revision, and saddled the inheritors of its language with a science that they no longer quite believed in nor had the strength to overthrow. Dogma, rigidly prescribed by tradition, stiffens into formalism. Linguistic categories make up a system of surviving dogma—dogma of the unconscious.¹¹

There seems no way out of the dilemma inherent in language. Although it is absolutely essential that a language have symbols which are agreed upon, this agreement rests on the way human beings as a group experience the world. No age in the history of man has been so static that the relationship between man and his environment did not contain possibilities for new experiences. In this age of research, the possibilities for different orientations occur with a rapidity that would have been inconceivable one hundred years ago. When man will have adapted a universal language to which he need never add new meanings, bibliographers will have a ready-made classification system.

**Summary**

Any universal classification scheme must consider the content of that which it is designed to order. Any attempt to design such a scheme on existing knowledge must admit that it is an organization based on incomplete if not erroneous knowledge. To anticipate the trend of the future types and kinds of knowledge is surely just as uncertain as founding a classification scheme on existing knowledge. While language forms a natural classification scheme for existing knowledge, it has the inherent disadvantage of changing rapidly to meet the changing experiences of the community.

A question comes up, is it desirable to construct a universal classification for present knowledge? The answer in terms of the modern means of knowledge acquiring would appear to be in the negative. Each particular discipline develops its own means and Weltanschauung in order
to understand the elements composing the discipline. The generalizing of an idea or concept to cover all disciplines results in confusion of terminology and actual content of the ideas. The example of information theory given above is a case in point.

Keeping the functions of inquiry in mind, there is a decided place in the process for an individual who is capable of continually revising the organization of past knowledge to include new knowledge. That individual must be cognizant of the events and progress of the results of inquiry, scientific and otherwise. The question of how knowledge is to be organized can only be determined as a response to the current means and consequences of inquiry. The classificationist who tries to formulate the content of all knowledge within one system so that the means of inquiry can follow only certain directions has extended himself to be the master of all time. A more exciting and fruitful pursuit for the classificationist would be to participate in the continued inquiry of our environment for the purposes of controlling and predicting it for human benefit. This means that so long as man is curious about the universe around him, there is the possibility he will find some new orientation that is more beneficial to himself and the human community.
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7. To allay the argument that the science of cosmology deals with the universe as a whole, it should be noted that in most instances it is assumed that interactions occurring on earth can be generalized to include the whole universe. This “cosmological principle” has undergone rather severe criticism recently, e.g., see: Moon, P. and Spencer, D. “The Cosmological Constant.” Franklin Institute. Journal, 266:47-58. July 1958.
Dewey Reviews*

FROM THE U. S.

No Preacher is needed in order to support the thesis that there is no new thing in library practice. Card catalogs replace book catalogs and are in turn to be replaced; book stacks are opened as an aid to the education of users, closed to meet the needs of research, then reopened as subject divisional libraries. Interest in classification seemingly waxes and wanes with the opening and closing of the book stacks.

Cutter and Dewey, among other leaders in American librarianship in the late nineteenth century, considered classification as the foundation of library service, yet its requiem, with Shera as High Priest, was held at Columbia less than ten years ago. Traditional book classification, he declared, fell “between two stools”: “too complex” for the general public library and “completely inadequate” for the large research collection. He prescribed “reader interest” classification for the public or “popular” collection and a “simple chronological sequence” for research collections. The Lamont Library’s “simplified version of the Dewey scheme” [sic] received some praise as a half-way step, but other book classification had survived only because of “professional timidity and inertia and the costs of conversion.”

Cost is not a new consideration. Dewey was convinced that his system provided satisfactory subject access to library collections “faster and cheaper” than any other method. Its keynotes were “practical utility and economy” and “no theoretical refinement” had been allowed if it would “add to its cost.” Cost today, however, is figured from a somewhat different slant. According to Fussler, “some of the more space-consuming elements of the present library, e.g., the effort to arrange the books on the shelves in accordance with elaborate subject classifications, are devices that seem designed to make up, in part at least, for bibliographical deficiencies. Possibly in the library of the future, bibliography will become good enough to make it so superior an approach to information and print that the effort to arrange large numbers of physical books by subject can be abandoned, since such arrangement inevitably results in many arbitrary decisions.”

Another of Dewey’s objectives was “to make work done to-day permanent, instead of something to be superseded within a few years.” This

rearrangement of books according to current interests is precisely the virtue of the Reader’s Interest Classification by which “books are arranged on the shelves not so much according to their content or form or any strictly logical relationships but according to the manner in which the ordinary patron would want or expect to find them.” This, it is claimed, removes emphasis from both catalog and book and “puts it squarely on the reader.”5 Thus Cutter’s “reader”, previously psychoanalyzed in absentia, as Dunkin6 has phrased it, is now the “ordinary patron.” Whether he is aware of and accepts his rather heavy responsibility is not known. Which of two patrons expecting differing arrangements is the ordinary and which the nonconformist? In any event, it is said that he does not require the quick location of a specific book, the converse of the demand attributed to the user of the research library.

The no-nonsense-about-classification school of administration on this side of the Atlantic is opposed on the other side by a group of specialists in depth indexing or intensive classification. The International Study Conference on Classification for Information Retrieval, held in 1957, may in retrospect become a milestone in the reconsideration of classification as essential to the organization of library materials. True, in the published Proceedings, the participants seem to avoid the use of the word book, preferring documents, literature, or graphic records. Yet Vickery, a leader in the Classification Research Group, went on record as believing that the aim of constructing a general (universal) classification scheme is both legitimate and practicable.7 This position was officially confirmed by a “number of members” of the Conference as one of the Conference’s “Conclusions and Recommendations.”8

Perhaps the road to progress is a circle. In the meantime, the publication of a new, 16th, edition of the Dewey Decimal Classification in October, 1958, is of great, although perhaps mundane, importance to those of us who in our attempt to serve our readers continue to use a formal classification scheme. Empirical, unpublished research by our colleagues in the public services areas of the library reveals that our readers use multiple approaches in their information searches. Many want a specific book or article immediately; others want the latest and/or best book on a subject, while others prefer the self-serve method of selection. Some of these individual readers protest vigorously the classification number assigned to a particular work, most frequently on the grounds that it removes the work from their other books. An overwhelming majority of the users say nothing about the classification. Their silence may be interpreted as either satisfaction or indifference.

Truly, no classification scheme can please all users at all times. If our system, intelligently applied and used as an extension of and complement to the author-title-and-subject catalogs and the available printed subject or classed bibliographies, provides a reasonably efficient and reasonably economical tool for satisfying the majority of the demands made by the users of the collections, we might be relatively relaxed in a relativistic world.
Is the Dewey Decimal Classification system such a tool? There is a large quantity of derogatory criticism answering "no." Too, there have been numerous desertions by American academic libraries to the Library of Congress system. Economy has been claimed most often as the major advantage. Certainly the acceptance of the LC classification numbers as printed on the LC cards can cut classification costs, but no mention is made of the classification costs for current publications not covered by LC printed cards, approximately 40% of the titles cataloged in the research libraries studied by Dawson. This is not to imply that classification by LC costs more than by DC; it merely points out the fallacy in the justification so often used to support a change from DC to LC. It is also a criticism of the superficiality of reports on cataloging and classification costs. One published report of a reclassification project excluded the cost of reclassifying those titles for which LC cards were not available.

Obviously DC has vitality or it could not have survived the continuous criticism which followed the extravagant claims of its founder and early supporters. To have recovered from the death blows incorporated in the 15th edition is merely the latest test of strength. Eaton's incisive analysis of that edition stands as its obituary and need not be repeated here. Mr. Dewey's practical nature would recoil from any imputation of symbolism to the red binding of the handsome two volume 16th edition. This reviewer, a user and teacher of DC, cannot but feel, however, that we have a resurrected Dewey, a rightful successor to the 14th and its predecessors, admittedly imperfect but still functioning.

The principles of hierarchical classification as adapted for book classification have been variously stated. Here they have been regrouped into four major points, followed by a statement of the conservative position on the principle of integrity of numbers:

1. Division of the universe of knowledge into classes (groups) characterized first by meaningful similarities; secondly, by meaningful differences.
   a. The order of the classes (groups) determined by affinity; the distance between classes (groups) being the measure of dissimilarity.
   b. Proper subordination achieved by consistency in use of chosen (most important) characteristic.
   c. Concomitantly, provision, at appropriate points, for general or comprehensive works on a class (group) as a whole.

2. Access to the system by a fixed pattern (usually an alphabetic index).
3. Terminology explicit and concise throughout.
4. Notation hospitable to expanding universe of knowledge as well as easy to write and remember.

• 16 •
The conservative position on integrity of numbers is pragmatic. The book as a physical object cannot be regrouped according to the changing patterns of knowledge nor can it at any time be placed to please all persons. Relocation therefore should meet the test of real necessity, not merely theoretical desirability.

On the first point, the logical order in hierarchial classification, the present editor, in a preview of the 16th edition, frankly admitted the difficulties in the way of meeting today's needs with a structure designed to meet the practical requirements of Melvil Dewey's day. In his "Introduction" to the new edition, however, he reiterates the expanded version of a controversial history, as follows: "After study of the classification of knowledge as conceived by Aristotle, Bacon, Locke, and other philosophers, and the recently published library classifications of Schwartz and Harris, Dewey decided to use a scheme of arranging books by subject based upon Harris's inversion of the Baconian order of History, Poesy, Philosophy."

Metcalfe has said that Dewey "now needs to be saved more from his editors than his enemies." Certainly he needs to be rescued from the mythmakers. If Dewey were the learned student of philosophy described by Mr. Custer, documentation is needed to support a claim so contrary to evidence now available. LaMontagne's accurate description of the library climate of Dewey's time supports Dewey's own statement as to the origin of the scheme. Too, the three papers Dewey submitted to the Library Committee of the Amherst College on May 8, 1873, give credence to the proposition that a structure for book classification based on the metric system, of which Mr. Dewey was an "apostle", preceded the division of the then existing universe of knowledge into a "classification of knowledge."

As to the order of the main classes, criticized so severely by Bliss and others, Dewey was convinced that no maker of a classification scheme "ever wholly suited himself or any one else, and probably no one ever will." He specifically denied a philosophical basis for the detailed subdivisions. "The selection and arrangement of the many thousand heads of the classification cannot be explained in detail for want of space. In all the work, philosophical theory and accuracy have been made to yield to practical usefulness. The impossibility of making a satisfactory classification of all knowledge as preserved in books, has been appreciated from the first, and theoretical harmony and exactness have been repeatedly sacrificed to practical requirements." He was fully aware that "many minor subjects are under heads to which they do not strictly belong" and defended its necessity on the grounds that they were placed with "the most nearly allied heads, or where it was thought they would be most useful." Distinctive type was used then for these headings as in the present edition, but the distinction is often overlooked, a point to be covered in more detail later in this review.

A change in the importance of a subject, from minor to major, or vice versa, causes difficulty today. This is particularly true in those cases
where the first eight subdivisions were assigned to aspects or topics important at that time and the ninth subdivision was considered a pigeonhole for everything else. In the 16th edition the individual philosophers formerly listed under 191.1-8 were deleted, possibly because few libraries have extensive collections by Laurens P. Hickock, James McCosh, and William Torrey Harris; but 949, formerly Minor countries (now Other areas) of Europe necessarily remains as the base number for, among others, Belgium, Switzerland, Greece, and all the Balkan countries.

In the few cases where blank numbers still remain available for the insertion of new subjects, a logical sequence is either impossible or given too little attention, e.g. 006 Information and communication theories, including Cybernetics. Although 007 has a new heading, Research in general, replacing the rather meaningless Activity and organization in general, the sequence, if any, beginning with Knowledge, learning and scholarship in 001, followed by The book, 002, is not obvious. Moreover, differentiation between books to be classed in 001 or 007 may be too fine to be practicable. Also questionable is the practicality of inserting Information Theory here; the lengthy “blanket” reference indicates the continuing wide dispersion of this material although omitting any provision in mathematics where a large part has been classified previously.

There is reason for some amusement in the juxtaposition of comprehensive works on Information storage and retrieval inserted at 010.78, with bibliomania, presumably including those works on the kinesthetic response to books, in 010. The machines used in information storage and retrieval do remain in 510.78.

The classical principle for subordination by the most important characteristic applied in combination with integrity of numbers results in an impasse for book classifiers. Changing political ties is a problem; position-on-the-map is invariable; and the retention of previously assigned geographic area numbers results in 954, headed India, being a jungle of Indian states and Pakistani provinces. An editorially suggested alternative, using the comprehensive number for Pakistan, 954.7, for specific provinces also, presents problems in time comparable to that of Alsace-Lorraine as a subdivision of both France and Germany. The 16th edition settled this question in favor of France. Had events turned the other way, the situation would be similar to the present classification of the island of Cyprus between south Turkey and east central Turkey.

An example of a theoretically sound structure, the expansion of 301 Sociology, raises as many questions as it answers. The new section beginning with 301.2 Culture first appeared in the 15th edition, but the terminology has now been revised, one comprehensive number and sixteen expanded numbers added, one number deleted and one relocated. The lengthy scope notes and careful references to previously established numbers merely point out fine distinctions which the authors of social science materials do not observe. As only one example, the technical distinction between Demography and Population cannot be maintained in the classification of recently published books. The detailed subdivision of
Social stratification and social status may satisfy the demands of logic but will be avoided by those classifiers who too hastily adopted the over-expansion of 301.15 in the 14th edition.

Prodigal use of numbers, either for current popular interests or for minute theoretical subdivision, invariably leads to difficulties, a lesson seemingly too difficult for successive editors to learn, with the exception of that edition representing the opposite extreme. Reductions of excessive theoretical subdivisions, e.g. 020 Library economy, present no problems other than the unnecessary bulk prior to reduction. In reducing 770-779 Photography from approximately 375 to 100 printed headings, however, the editors delete 778.5543 Endless film projection only to newly subdivide 778.71 Outdoor photography by Sunlight and by Night. As an example of a new interest 623.45 Ammunition is expanded to 451 19 for Nuclear projectiles, followed by 451 3 Projectiles (Comprehensive works) to 623.451 94 for Antimissile rockets. The same criticism, too detailed expansion for a rapidly expanding field, is true of 539.7 where subdivisions valid structurally only a short time ago are now obsolete concepts.

The previous lack of provision, at appropriate points, for comprehensive works has been repaired by most catalogers following Dewey's instruction to class a book dealing with two consecutive and closely allied subjects with the first unless the second were decidedly predominant. This rule, and others, for "Assyning clas numbers" may be found in "Melvil Dewey's Introduction" reprinted in the 16th edition. It is unfortunate that the current Editor abandons this rule in his discussion of "How to Assign a Class Number," and violates it in practice, e.g. 981 and 382, the latter now designated as the number for comprehensive works on commerce.

In other cases the need for a comprehensive number has not been recognized, e.g. Plant taxonomy, 582-589. Although 582 has a scope note "Comprehensive works," the heading is Spermatophyta. Whether taxonomy by pollen analysis is to be included here is not known. (The index, of which more later, is of no assistance. Under Pollen may be found Fossil, gathering beekeeping and plants beekeeping. Taxonomic botany yields 582-589, but Plant taxonomy and its variants are fruitless.) In 1958, the Decimal Classification Section assigned to one of these works the number 581.462352, the specific subdivision for Pollen under Plant morphology, an indefensible classification from the logical viewpoint. (These specific subdivisions of 581.463 have been deleted in the 16th edition, a sensible cutback marred by inadequate indexing.)

A more typical example involving a larger body of published material is Parks for which specific numbers are assigned in Planning (711.558), and Landscaping (712.5), with additional numbers provided for Water parks (714), Amusement parks (791.068), Parks planned to preserve natural landscape reserves (719.32), Parks administered as a unit of local government (352.7), those which are part of a recreation center (790.68), but no place for general works. In contrast, we must assume that the .01 Theory subdivision of 795 Games of chance will be the comprehensive
number for books on Game theory, a choice designed to infuriate further the mathematicians who already resent the present classification of Von Neumann's classic work in 390.182, a subdivision of Economics. (Here again the index is completely inadequate; none of the variants for Theory of games can be found.)

In the collecting of examples for this review, notes of omissions in the index accumulated so rapidly that the idea of listing them was abandoned. An attempt to categorize the weaknesses in the index often led back to structural weaknesses or omissions in the schedules, and a systematic criticism of the index was pronounced hopeless, a verdict already passed on the index by the staff of the catalog department in the reviewer's library.

The omissions fall roughly in three categories: new subjects, subjects in the 14th edition deleted in the 16th edition, and subjects omitted in both the 14th and 16th. In all cases there are publications on the subject. In the first category, two examples, Strategy of games and Pollen analysis, have already been mentioned. Only one more, Systems design, will be added, because a futile search under Engineering systems did reveal Engineering libraries administration 026.62. An idle check for local branch libraries from Architecture to Zoology then revealed 100% accuracy in the index. There is no local Bookbinders library, but there are two index entries for material on such a library.

Examples of the second category are Product design, formerly classed in 658.575, and House organs, formerly 658.826. Two examples of omissions from both the 14th and 16th editions are Speedball and Scissors (or shears) manufacture. (Tweezers manufacture is indexed, as part of the new expansion of 688 Manufacture of small articles).

The muddled trail which can result from a seemingly clear index reference is illustrated by Quinones 547.636 in the index but 547.633 is the last printed subdivision in the schedules. Reading upwards on the page, after a pause at .611 Benzene hydrocarbons, the note under 547.6 to "divide like 547.42-547.48" led back two pages to 547.436. Aliphatic aldehydes and ketones. This combination of a "Divide like" instruction with a partial list of printed subdivisions is a questionable printing economy. Another example illustrating both ambiguity and lack of logical sequence in the schedules is Slander law indexed as 347.5. Under 347.5, Law of tort, negligence, damage there is a reference, "For a specific action in tort, see the subject, e.g., libel and slander 070.13." Under 070.13, formerly headed Liberty of the press Censorship but now Press law, the scope note includes "comprehensive works on libel and slander." A third example is so complicated that space limitations prohibit its inclusion; it begins with the search for Rheology in the index.

If terminology is explicit and concise for one person, is it for another? To enumerate terms so new that even the specialist must pause, e.g. Glires, or terms specialized in meaning but commonly interchanged, e.g. Microbiology and Bacteriology, especially as in Food microbiology (again, not in the index), or common terms which defy conceptualization, e.g.
Elementary collective groupings and their behavior, is merely to reveal one's lack of knowledge. As has already been mentioned, some of the carefully phrased scope notes are more to be admired for fine distinctions than for practical guidance. Seemingly *Includes* and *Including* are synonymous. It would appear that *Includes* invariably indicates a partial scope note. Too frequently, however, a question arises as to whether *Including* might indicate a comprehensive scope note. "Including public relations, finance, management" is, for this reviewer, a comprehensive statement of the scope of Organization and Administration in Higher Education (378.1), but is "Including history, reports, charters, lists of members" a comprehensive or partial statement of the scope of the form division 06? Where are society proceedings and transactions to be classed? In the 14th edition, transactions were specifically included in 06, and Merrill's *Code for Classifiers* (1959) goes further in specifying the keeping together of academy or learned society "annals, bulletins, proceedings, transactions and other publications serially numbered."

A somewhat different example is the note under 378 Higher education. Here, "Comprehensive works" is followed by "Including junior colleges" on the next line. If 378 is the comprehensive number for higher education, including junior colleges, what is to be classed in 378.15-378.154 Types or levels of higher education, of which 378.154 is Senior and junior colleges? (The index which "shows relationship and subordination" for "all headings" lists only Junior colleges comprehensive works 378). Also parenthetically, the Editor's explanation of scope and "inclusion" notes is less than clear.

In other cases, specific terminology seems ambiguous because the notation does not reveal the irregularity in the structure, e.g. 751 Painting materials and methods, explicit for 751.2-6 does not cover 751.7 Paintings in specific forms. It is true that 751.7, by indentation and type face, is coordinate with 751, but this is not easily observed in an expansion which extends to the verso of the page. That too many classifiers are not aware of these devices, indentation and distinction in type face, is due to at least two different factors. First in importance is the inordinate emphasis placed on the decimal structure by editors, teachers, and critics. As only one sample of this false emphasis, the third summary table reappears in its "familiar geometric simplicity" in response to the critics of the 15th edition's "tabulation". Structural irregularities are much more easily seen in a condensed form. Why print a summary which merely maintains the fiction that Dewey is a "logical classification"?

Indentions, e.g. the headings for 222-224 under 221 Old Testament, and distinctive type, e.g. 429 Anglo-Saxon which is not a subdivision of English, have been used in the third summary table since the earliest editions. The base is truly proracustean if 387 must be continued as Marine & air transportation instead of 387 Marine transportation and 387.7 Air transportation, or, a more familiar example, 946 Spain & Portugal instead of 946 Spain and 946.9 Portugal.

Secondly, consistency in practice within the tables would be helpful
both in teaching library school students and in explaining the realities of DC to users. If Nuclear engineering is shown as coordinate with Prime movers by type and indention, how explain Luminescence as a subdivision of Geometrical optics and luminescence? Or why pretend that the physico-chemical effects of pressure in Effects of heat on matter? The lack of an appropriate subdivision in is accepted as a factual explanation by the interested patron.

Does the 16th edition meet the standards of classical hierarchial classification? The response is a more pertinent question. Are canons borrowed from a theoretical field and applied post factum to book classification schemes valid criteria for evaluation? This reviewer, at least, is convinced that the value of DC as a library tool is real, but independent of traditional theory. Its merits lie in the capacity to reflect the shifting patterns of knowledge common to the individual members of an educated society. Its durability is no more the result of “timidity and inertia and the costs of conversion” than verbal criticism is the measure of actual failure.

Mr. Custer, as Editor, deserves the highest praise for restoring health to a moribund monument. Furthermore, the recent merger of the Decimal Classification Section and the Dewey Decimal Classification Editorial Office promises an even better future.—Edith Scott, Assistant Director for Technical Services, and Associate Professor of Library Science, University of Oklahoma.
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It is a pleasure to welcome the two handsome volumes of DC 16, whose sturdy elegance makes them the best designed of all the general classification schemes and predisposes one in favor of their contents. These show a number of gratifying improvements on previous editions, including the provision of extensive annotations and definitions of terms, as well as the abandonment of the supplementary tables and the substitution of simplified form divisions. There has been a welcome rationalization in a number of classes; subdivisions have been restored and in some cases extended; and the whole forms a more effective instrument of librarianship than any previous edition.

DC still has, of course, many of the inconsistencies, illogicalities, and structural inadequacies which the purist and practical alike deplore; but these have been sufficiently indicated elsewhere, and one need not belabour the point. What follows are notes on the 16th edition of Dewey from a specifically British viewpoint, which should perhaps be indicated:

1. The classed catalogue, almost universal in Britain, demands minute subdivision of schedules.

2. Special collections of material in restricted subject fields, acquired under co-operative purchase agreements, also necessitate closer classification than is possible in many instances, even when using the 14th edition.

3. Topics peculiar to this country are either subordinated, insufficiently subdivided, or entirely excluded, in Dewey.

The main trouble has always been the numerical inadequacy of the subdivisions provided. The Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee have announced their readiness to subdivide where more than twenty titles under a specific number necessitate it. The reasons given above, combined with a differing subject-pattern of publishing (there is no specific place in DC for 45% of current British books) lead British librarians to hope for subdivisions of many numbers which are now intact.

In this respect, DC 16 is a great improvement, a good proportion of the classes most urgently in need of attention having been divided, although the closeness of classing now enabled still leaves something to be desired in a number of instances: there is a tendency here to hanker for a return to the elaborateness of the 14th edition, and to hope for the early fulfilment of the promise of a "bibliographic" edition. The sawn-off 15th
edition is widely regarded in Britain as an unfortunate aberration, to be tactfully ignored, not on account of its relocations, which were for the most part acceptable, but by reason of its truncations, which were not.* Some classes in the 16th edition still need considerable amplification to meet British needs, among them some of the most popular, and among the developing sciences. Examples are 574.192 Biochemistry and 796.358 Cricket.

In view of the conflicting factors which had to be taken into account by the DCEPC—the claims of chauvinists and the clamourings of overseas colleagues; the desirability of maintaining “integrity of numbers” against the need to bring DC into line with contemporary thought and knowledge; the appeal for simplicity versus the demands for expansion—they are to be congratulated upon a statesmanlike blending of reform with tradition, as well as upon a few departures from precedent which augur well for the future.

It is encouraging to note, for example, the thorough overhauling of classes 546 and 547; one hopes that similarly firm action will be taken in other instances where DC has been outstripped by events, or where the needs of readers demand it. In the latter category, for instance, falls Geography, whose schedules need recasting.

A category of subjects neglected by DC are those which transcend the more specific topics catered for. Books on the Lake District or the Cotswolds, for example, are unhappy in whatever place one puts them now, as are those on the Andes or the Rocky Mountains. New political groupings, such as those bordering the Indian Ocean, or the Muslim states, need provision. British librarians are uncomfortable about the equation of Religion with Christianity, and about the omission of a number of prose.

We are happy to note that the Protestant, Anglo-Saxon bias is now conscious, and are led to hope that steps to correct this will be taken in the future. One possible way in which this may be done is the provision of alternative subdivisions for use in different countries. This solution would also be acceptable in Britain in cases where American needs have been the first consideration, notably class 329 and parts of 350 and 370. Such a procedure should not cause embarrassment in any country, for our respective needs in these categories are mutually exclusive.

British librarians also welcome the announcement of the quarterly DC Additions, Notes and Decisions, as a means of continuous revision. They would be happier, however, if they were to feel parties to the revision process. It is understood that approximately a quarter of DC users are libraries outside the United States; how many of these were among the 1,000 “representatives libraries and library schools” consulted on a previous occasion? Libraries which use the UDC are accustomed to being able to comment on draft schedules before their promulgation; we

*Editor’s Note: For an opposite opinion see a review by E. J. Coates in the Library Association Record, 61: 187-190. August 1959.
should be glad of a similar opportunity when new locations or expansions in DC are being considered, prior to finalisation in DC and.

Melvil Dewey, at the end of his Introduction, wrote, “DC has become an international laborsaver. It therefore justly belongs to its users as a whole” We of the “steadily increasing thousands scattered all over the civilized world” look forward to being able to help maintain that quality of universality, and to extending it in the future—J. F. W. Bryon, Borough Librarian, Eccles Public Libraries, Eccles, Manchester.

FROM FRANCE

The publication of the 16th edition of the Decimal classification has awakened in France a strong interest. It presents a delicate problem according to the very particular conditions in which the DC has been adopted and used.

It is surprising to see how a classification is easily criticized in details as if it were possible to find an exact solution to all possible cases. What is essential, the general plan being accepted, is to find the necessary expansions of particular parts of the classification, provisions for new concepts, and modern terminology. Finally, an essential quality of a classification is to be able, thanks to the flexibility of notation—as in DC—to shorten the numbers “without damaging the structure of the schedules, so that the same editions can be used by libraries varying greatly in size.” The 16th edition seems to be satisfactory in these respects. It is more consistently expanded and much better balanced than the Standard (15th) edition which disappointed some of Dewey’s supporters since it was too much developed for small libraries, and insufficiently developed for the middle-sized and large libraries.

Librarians will appreciate first the quality of its presentation. The choice of different types underlines the main features of the classification which starts from general concepts to reach the particular points, without having to use all the subdivisions. Such a presentation makes easier teaching in library schools and junior librarians’ work. Using italics for cross-references is very convenient, and it is easy to apply the convention established to show relocations. It is a good thing to have kept the three summaries as in the 15th edition and to have used frequently the special summaries—the best guide to find the way through the tables. It will be valuable to have at the beginning of the first volume the form divisions, one of the very useful innovations of the DC. Latin and Catholic countries will now be satisfied to use class 200 without difficulties. Even after publication, in 1951, by the UDC of the new table 2, a new classification was often requested for religious books. When in 1956, Dom Roger Pierret, a Benedictine monk from Abbaye Sainte-Marie in Paris, offered his own scheme, he was welcomed among Catholic librarians. All classes have been studied with a great sense of “keeping pace with knowledge,” and in all countries such an effort will be greatly appreciated. But some European countries have to face special problems.
The DC was introduced in France during the first World War by American libraries created in France, especially at Soissons, Reims, and Paris (with a free library "rue Fessart" and a children's library "l'Heure joyeuse"). It has been applied principally and divulgated by the former students of the American library school. This school was maintained by the ALA, rue de l'Elysée, from 1923 to 1929. Miss Mary P. Parsons was the director, Miss Margaret Mann teaching classification and cataloging. When Mr. Henriot, Inspecteur des bibliothèques de la ville de Paris who taught also at the rue de l'Elysée, reorganized the libraries of the different Paris districts, he asked his collaborators to apply the DC (first 1000 divisions).

This classification is well known in France and is learned by all students of library science (state and private diploma). The DC has been appreciated as an excellent working instrument in practice; it was adopted, in spite of criticisms, when the open shelf was introduced by Direction des bibliothèques de France in public libraries and when children's and social libraries were created in France. But it may be noticed that, until now, the number of books in these libraries does not exceed 25 or 35 thousand. It does not mean that public libraries are less important; at the end of the 18th century, during the great Revolution they inherited famous monastery and old castle libraries, and there is no question of classifying with DC the old stocks any more than the books of the university and the national libraries. Special libraries and documentation centers (of pure and applied science especially) use the Brussels UDC. In the small libraries is used the translation which was published by Yvonne Oddon—which corresponds to the third summary; more important libraries refer for the necessary subdivisions to the recent editions of the DC. These editions exist in limited numbers of copies in the central departments and in a few libraries. The need of such a classification as the 16th is more urgent every day. It would seem well to translate this new edition into French; language difficulties should be eliminated for teaching and use, even though now published in conventional English spelling. But, speaking frankly, this idea of translation meets with two main difficulties: the DC is an American classification and has to be modified in relation to European and French needs; points of view and centers of interests are different, and such a wish is normal even in a time when internationalization of problems has to be considered. Is such a work necessary when the FID has just published an abridged French edition of the UDC adequate for small and middle-sized libraries? The detailed tables allow for the classification of books if one section of the library is developing more than the others, or for the use of a special library, or for a bibliography; but it must be understood that certain simplifications would be necessary for the call numbers.

---

The solution for the future seems to be in a stronger collaboration between the editors of the DC and of the UDC. With each edition of the DC, variations are accentuated. The conclusions of the meeting which took place in the Hague, at the FID in March, 1959, indicate that an effort is being made to end the dualism which has existed for 64 years. Each member of the central commission has agreed to study certain classes, and their work is followed with great interest in French libraries.

—A. Puget, Professor à l’École de bibliothécaires, Institut Catholique, 21 rue d’Assas, Paris 6ème.

FROM NORWAY.

An evaluation of the 16th edition of the Dewey Decimal Classification from the point of view of its applicability to Norwegian libraries may well be based on practical experience with the system gained at the Deichmanske Bibliotek, the municipal library of the city of Oslo. The Deichman Library dates back to 1785: it is a general public library, the largest of its kind in Norway, counting approximately 500,000 volumes and serving a population of 460,000 inhabitants. It has a General Reference department; a subject department in the science, technology and commerce literature as well as large holdings in local history and genealogy; and it has branches and school libraries—all centrally classified and catalogued.

The size and also the character of the collections necessitate a detailed classification, a fact which should constitute a sound basis for judgment. Besides, our library has quite a Dewey tradition. It was the first library on the European continent to adopt the system, it having been introduced before 1900 by the newly-appointed director, Haakon Nyhuus, shortly after his return from the United States.

From the Deichman library the influence spread rapidly from Kristiansand in the south to Hammerfest in the north, so that within 20 years we had a nationwide adoption of the DC in our libraries. At first the city libraries were affected, later on the state-supported rural libraries were inspired by the State Supervising Office for Libraries which had introduced Dewey numbers in their selective catalogs. This process is described in detail in J. P. Danton’s book, “United States Influence on Norwegian Librarianship, 1890-1940”.

Modifications had to be made, it is true. These are notable in the 400’s and in the 900’s where local and period divisions for the Scandinavian countries needed a further subdivision. Some of the sections in 340 Law and in 350 Public administration also require modifying. These are, however, minor changes, and care has been taken not to violate the structure of the system in any way. This will be seen from the abridged Norwegian edition: Klassifikasjon etter Melvil Dewey’s System, ved Arne Arnesen, published by the Norwegian Library Association (2d ed. 1955).

Some of the other larger public libraries in this country have found it practical to make departures on a somewhat broader scale.
Our life with Dewey thus dates back to the beginning of the century, and since then Norwegian librarians have anticipated every successive edition up to the 14th and 15th, and now the 16th edition. One thing is certain, the 15th edition was not sufficiently detailed to meet the needs of the larger collections in our library, neither the schedules nor the index.

How is it then with the 16th edition which has been awaited with even more anxiety than its predecessors? It is, of course, not possible to form any definite opinion after such a short period of working with the new edition; however, generally speaking, the impressions so far seem to be favorable. The relocations have been kept within reasonable limits, and there is reason to believe that it may well suit the needs of a general library in expansion.

We can but briefly touch on specific numbers within the scope of this article. Unfortunately, we still have to tolerate the inconsistencies in the philosophy class (I refer to the perplexing overlapping of 130 with 150 and 140 with 180-190). Otherwise the changes in this class seem satisfactory; the numbers have been adequately reduced and the language modernized. The relocation of religious novels from 244 to the literature class with other fiction is a good one; likewise, religious poetry, excepting hymns, from 245 to the 8oo’s. Is the Oxford group and Moral Rearmament movement to be placed under 248 Personal religion or under 269.2 Revivals, or where? Neither the tables nor the index show any provision for these movements which have given rise to a rather comprehensive literature. The expansion of the 301’s is welcome, but one might have hoped for a relocation of 396 Woman’s role in society to this group. (Placed as it is between Etiquette and Gypsies it is a constant source of amusement to students in library school.) The amalgamating of 654 with 384 and 656 with 385-388 is probably a happy solution. Gymnastics is advantageously moved from 613.71 to 796.41; so is the relocation of Heating, ventilation, air conditioning from 628.8 to 697. The development of 674-676 is important to Norwegian libraries and has been awaited; we have had to resort to the Brussels system for these topics. These examples are just a few of the points we have encountered in practical classification during the months we have worked with the new edition.

We note with satisfaction extensions of the standard form divisions 01-09, also the summary tables heading complex groups. The full explanatory notes and the frequent indications of relocation from the 14th and 15th editions are of great value. A major drawback to classifiers using the Dewey classification, its lack of up-to-dateness in rapidly developing fields, has now been eliminated by the announced new quarterly publication, DC Additions, Notes and Decisions, which will be free to users of the system. Such a tool will be of great value as it will save libraries from making their own tables or from introducing traits from other systems more up to date which may later on result in reclassification.

May I also mention a question of practical importance. The volumes
to the Dewey classification, the work being done in close contact with usage at Deichmanske Bibliotek. There is thus good reason to expect that Norwegian libraries as a whole will profit by this new edition and use it wherever feasible.

From the time of the opening of the Norwegian Library School in 1940, the current complete edition of Dewey has been the basic tool in teaching classification. The 16th edition has now been tried out for a period of six months, and the reactions so far seem satisfactory. The scope notes are of special value in teaching. Since January, 1956, the Norwegian National Bibliography, Norsk Bokførtegnelse edited by the Norske Avdeling of the University Library in Oslo, classifies each item according to the Dewey classification, the work being done in close contact with usage at Deichmanske Bibliotek. There is thus good reason to expect that Norwegian libraries as a whole will profit by this new edition and use it wherever feasible.

Norway is the one among the Scandinavian countries that uses the Dewey system practically according to standard. Denmark uses a rather radical modification of it, and Swedish public libraries have a system of their own based on letters as main notation, their new edition (1956) having UDC numbers attached. In all three countries, however, the special libraries and information centers most frequently use the Universal Decimal Classification. It has been maintained by the Dewey Editorial committee that one should collaborate with the Brussels system for the benefit of uniformity; such cooperation will strengthen both national and international bibliographical activities. In April, 1959, the Joint Committee of the Norwegian Research Councils appointed a classification committee whose mandate, among other things, is to seek contact with different classification systems in order to secure due regard to Norwegian interests. The Committee has turned to the Library of Congress to secure cooperation regarding the systems sponsored by that institution.—Birgit Foss, Chief, Catalogue Department, Deichmanske Bibliotek, Oslo.

FROM INDIA

The two-volume, 16th Edition of the Dewey Decimal Classification and Relative Index marks another step in the evolutionary process of the system devised by Melvil Dewey. Though the DC is avowedly an enumerative system of classification concerned more with the practical classification of printed material than with the organization of knowledge, the editors of the successive editions have been adapting the former to the latter, with such modification and relocation of notation, provision of form categories, and other adjustment as would make their efforts more really adequate to library conditions and needs. The editors of the present edition have considered the adjuncts to the notation provided in earlier editions and have wisely restored most of them, with expansions
at points considered necessary, e.g. the complete regular form divisions, special author table for William Shakespeare, a table for college and university publications. The use of letters of the alphabet for various purposes to supplement the schedules has also been recommended.

In preparing Edition 16 the editors have taken Edition 14 as the base. To that base, new material, modern terminology, explanations, notes and definitions have been added. The extensive use of annotations, scope notes, inclusion notes, definitions, cross references, etc., has enhanced its value to classifiers. The decision to use Edition 14 as the base has been influenced by "the broad consumer opinion" which "was brought to bear on the editorial processes for Edition 16, particularly in the applicability of various sections and sub-sections to actual library collections" in the United States.

The editorial policy of Edition 16 is to follow "the fixed unvarying significance" and the integrity of numbers devised by Melvil Dewey. Edition 15 made some departure from the strict traditional policy of integrity of numbers, for the editors aimed at "keeping pace with knowledge"; and they restated, redefined, and regrouped certain subjects according to the changed concepts of the new generation. As a result, we find in Edition 15 relocations of about a thousand topics. These relocations presented a problem to the editors of Edition 16, who wanted to follow strictly the traditional policy of continuity and integrity of numbers. In order to bridge the gulf between Edition 16 and Edition 15, the editors decided that the DC should, as far as possible, keep pace with knowledge and at the same time avoid excessive relocations. As a result, Edition 16 has retained only 55 per cent of the relocations of Edition 15 in cases where old numbers are absurd or unworkable or where there is an insistent demand for a new number, while 45 per cent of such relocations have been restored to the 14th edition locations. The editors have also enunciated the guiding principle for future editions, viz. not to rule out relocations of subjects altogether but to resort to them sparingly only upon overwhelming need and demand.

It is pleasant to find that Edition 16 has not relied on earlier editions for certain topics where it has been found nearly impossible to make practical use of old numbers. For example, Edition 16 has made completely new schedules for 546-547: Inorganic and Organic Chemistry. Although this is the "preferred schedule," the "obsolescent schedule" containing expansions based on the 14th has been appended to volume 2. Edition 16 has also made provisions for modern concepts like Automation, Ghana, Nuclear fusion, Pilot plants, Radioactive therapy, etc.

In some cases systematic classification is suspended or replaced, as an alternative, by alphabetic arrangement. For example, countries and cities in a given state in the U. S. may be alternatively arranged alphabetically.

Edition 16 has made alternative provisions for certain topics, and in

1 Descriptive circular, dated October 1958, p. 3.
all such cases the "Editors' preference" has been clearly stated. For example, in the classification of the history of territories or areas which have undergone changes of political affiliation, the editors have liberally provided for alternatives. This has been done to prevent a reclassification of works on these territories or areas. For example 954.7 Pakistan has the following note: "Class works on a specific part of Pakistan with the part, e.g., East Bengal 954.145; if preferred, class specific parts of Pakistan in 954.7." The principle followed by the editors in solving the vexing problem of classifying territories or areas with a changed political affiliation is, "Position on the map rather than political ties should determine classification, so far as 'Editors' preference' goes, but still to permit alternative arrangements for those libraries which require them.

Let us take an illustration from 954 History of India:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>954.7 Pakistan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.71 Karachi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.73 Sind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.79 Bombay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A casual observer's national predilections may be humored to find the number for Bombay decimally subordinate to the number for Pakistan, but the editors have been careful to indicate by bold face letter and indentation the coordination and subordination of topics. Pakistan and Bombay have been brought under the same indention in bold face letter; this indicates that they are coordinate, while Karachi and Sind have been brought under a subordinate indention. Indian librarians are still to experiment on the lines suggested.

Similarly, Edition 15 recommended that ancient Indian history be classified in 954 instead of 934 of the previous editions. Edition 16 has restored it to 934 with a note, "If preferred, class ancient history of India in 954.01." It will, however, be more convenient for Indian librarians to put the history of India at one place, e.g. 954, with the period divisions indicated in the schedule for 954.

The growing popularity and increasing use of Dewey in all types of libraries in various parts of the world has prompted the editors to consider the international aspect of improvement of the schedules of Dewey which were originally based upon a Protestant Anglo-Saxon culture. It is, therefore, encouraging to find the following statement of the editors' aims and expectations: "... the present edition has made a start toward providing more useful expansions of topics in which libraries of cultures other than the Protestant, Anglo-Saxon, and Western are likely to excel. It is the editors' expectation that the next edition, the 17th, will do still better"—Editor's Introduction, p. 16. Though it is difficult to find a solution to the problem of classification universally acceptable, we do hope that the proposed 17th edition will be more representative of aspirations of classifiers in Eastern countries. Meanwhile, let us examine what start the editors of Edition 16 have made toward providing expansions of Indic topics and consider provisions needed:
Indian philosophy

In Edition 16 provision has been made for Mimamsa, Nyaya, and Vaisheshika philosophies. The number 181.43 Nyaya philosophy should have been subdivided as follows:

181.431 Old school (Nyaya)
181.432 New school (Navyanyaya)
181.48 ‘Vedanta philosophy’ relates only to pre-Sankaracharya period.

There is, however, scope for expansion under 181.481, which is vacant. 181.482, represents Sankaracharya. (Advaita school). Provision should also be made for the following schools of thought:

Ramanujacharya—Visishtadvaita school.
Madhavacharya (Purnaprajna)—Dvaita school.
Vallabhacharya—Suddhadvaita school.
Nimbarka—Hedabheda school.
Chaitanya—Achintyabhedabheda.
Saiva Philosophy—Sivadvaita school.
   a) Pratyabhijna school (Kashmiri Saivism).
   b) Pasupata.
   c) Nakulisapasupata.
   d) Virasaivism (Lingayata school).
   e) Srikantha school.
   f) Srihara's school.

No provision has been made in the 16th edition for the following philosophical schools:

Charavaka.
Bauddha—Kshanikavada.
Bauddha—Madhyamiha.
Bauddha—Yogachara.
Bauddha—Sautrantika.
Bauddha—Vaibhasika.
Bauddha—Sankiranabuddha.
Jaina—Syadvada.

In this edition 294 stands for Brahmanism and religions deriving from it instead of Buddhism and Brahmanism as featured in earlier editions; this is helpful.

294.5 Hinduism. Scope has been provided for expansion. Besides, specific numbers have been provided for Vishnuism (Vaishnavism)? 294.554, and Ramkrishna movement (Vedanta Society) 294.555. For Sources of Hinduism a specific number has been provided—294.59 (except for the Vedas, which is 294.1), and this number can be subdivided as 291.8 (sources of comparative religion and mythology).

294.598 stands for Morals, ideals, duties in Hinduism.
Edition 16 has made provisions for Religious doctrines and dogmas,
Objects of worship and veneration, Forms of worship, Asceticism, Religious organization and leaders, and Activities inspired by religious motives (e.g. foreign missions, religious education).

It is encouraging to find that Edition 16 has made provision for Hindu Religious Law, which is a peculiar mixture of custom, convention, legislation, and judge-made law. The specific number for it is 348.945. Similarly we find a number for Mohammedan law (Islamic religious law) viz. 348.97.

491.1—491.4 (Indic languages). The basic structure of Edition 14 has been retained, subdividing at certain points. Assamese which did not figure in earlier editions has been assigned a place under 491.49, which stands generically for Other modern Indic languages to individualize which a note has been inserted with the direction that alphabetical sub-arrangement may be made to represent the particular language concerned.

It is, however, good to find that Caucasian languages, grouped with Dravidian languages in Edition 15, have been separated and restored to 499.96, originally assigned to them in Edition 14. Dravidian languages are represented by 494.8. Himalayan and Assamese dialects (not Assamese language) including Munda languages are classed under 495.5.

So far as Indic literature is concerned, it follows the lines indicated in 491.1—491.4, 494.8 and its sub-divisions.

The present expansions will not go a long way in solving the peculiar problems faced by Indian librarians. The editors have visualized this, and in the Introduction, the following panacea has been suggested, "Although DC is a classification based on figures used decimally, it may be modified and supplemented by letters of the alphabet used in several ways and for a variety of purposes." Following this advice it is open for Indian librarians to use and expand 4A0-4A9 for Indian languages 8Ho-8H9 for Hindi literature, etc. In case of religion we may represent Buddhism as 2B and expand it instead of using 294.3. But it will be unwise to start experimenting on stop-gap devices without weighing the full consequences of such a step.

The Relative Index is more exhaustive, containing about 25,000 more entries than the Index of Edition 14, which contains 63,000. It includes all terms appearing in the schedules and also currently used synonyms, parts of topics, names of outstanding persons, and organizations associated with subjects, aspects of subjects, common as well as scientific names.

From the Editor's Introduction we find that to "minimize the periodic major readjustments incident to the coming of a new edition and to establish a continuous flow of information keeping pace with knowledge," the publishers have arranged that DC Additions, Notes and Decisions will be issued as such material accumulates, probably quarterly, and distributed free to all interested DC users. This arrangement will be really very helpful.—B. S. Kesavan, National Library, Calcutta.
An Evaluation
Of U. S. Document Bibliography*

PHILIP SHORE
Assistant Librarian
Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana

IN 1956 the Subcommittee to Study Federal Printing and Paperwork of
the Committee on House Administration of the House of Repre-
sentatives undertook a comprehensive study and survey of the federal
depository system. As one phase of this study a questionnaire, Inquiry
Concerning U. S. Government Publications, was sent to libraries all over
the country, both depository and non-depository. This questionnaire
sought the opinions of librarians on all phases of the program. It was
sent to 1,193 libraries, of which 666 responded. Table 1 shows the number
and type of libraries responding. Replies were tabulated in the spring of
1957.

A report, prepared by Benjamin E. Powell and William R. Pullen
with the assistance of Jerome K. Wilcox, based on the information thus
received was made to the Subcommittee by the Public Documents Com-
mittee of the American Library Association, Resources and Technical
Services Division, Acquisition Section. The report was published as an
appendix to the U. S. Congress, House, Committee on House Admin-
istration, Revision of Depository Library Laws, Hearings before the
Subcommittee . . . 85th Congress 1st-2d session, 1958. The Public Docu-
ments Committee was chaired by Benjamin Powell, Librarian of Duke
University.

Two of the questions asked related directly to government bibliogra-
phies. One sought to determine the sufficiency of the Monthly Catalog
and to solicit suggestions for its improvement. The other attempted to
identify other bibliographies or types of bibliographies, not now pub-
lished, which are needed by the users of government publications. Since
the answers to these questions reflected subjective rather than objective
opinion, content analysis of the answers in depth seemed desirable.
Another reason for content analysis was the at least partial misunder-

* Based on the author’s M.S. essay, “Federal Document Bibliography, An Inquiry
into Adequacy and Potential,” School of Library Science, University of North Carolina,
Chapel Hill, 1958.
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standing of one or both questions exhibited by some respondents in their answers. With such analysis it was possible to detect some common trends in the opinions of the respondents, and these provided the basis for the generalizations reported.

**Monthly Catalog**

The question concerning the *Monthly Catalog* was stated as follows:

> Does the *Monthly Catalog* now sufficiently serve your needs with respect to current publications in the classification and use of U. S. Government publications? If not, what suggestions do you have for its improvement?

A total of 486 libraries thought it adequate; one hundred, inadequate; and eighty made no answer. Table 2 summarizes the answers to this question. However, it should be noted that several of those that replied “yes” to the question qualified their answers. Suggestions for the improvement of the *Monthly Catalog* were given by 132 of the 486 libraries. Of the eighty libraries which did not indicate whether or not their needs were being filled, thirty-seven added suggestions for improvements. Alto-

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Depository</th>
<th>Non-depository</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>432</strong></td>
<td><strong>234</strong></td>
<td><strong>666</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Depository</th>
<th>Non-depository</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>156</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td><strong>245</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Adequacy of the *Monthly Catalog* as a Bibliography of Current Publications.
gether, 267 (40%) of the responding libraries made suggestions for improvement of the Monthly Catalog. This suggested rather strongly that improvements were needed, even though 73% said their needs were then being filled. 70% of those 267 libraries, 180 libraries in all, specified a need for improvements in the index to the Monthly Catalog. This is 28% of all responding libraries.

Of other suggestions made (120 libraries in all), twenty-five either reflected a complete misunderstanding of the question, or they could not be interpreted for this study. The two suggestions made by the largest number of libraries were: 1) the Monthly Catalog should include more material, i.e., processed, field publications, agency publications, etc., and 2) items should be listed more promptly after publication. The former was suggested by twenty-eight libraries and the latter by thirty-eight. Another eighteen made suggestions concerning classification numbers in the Monthly Catalog. Another twelve proposed cumulation of the catalog entries in a manner similar to that used by the H. W. Wilson Company in its indexes and bibliographies. It was evident that the chief defect of the Monthly Catalog, according to its users, was its index.

**Improvements in the Indexing**

Suggestions for improvement of the index varied considerably, but they may be considered to have fallen into six categories:

1. General improvement and completeness of the index. (58 libraries).
2. Expansion and standardization of the subject indexing. (57 libraries).
3. Inclusion of names entries. (33 libraries)
4. Inclusion of titles. (23 libraries)
5. Additions of more cross references. (13 libraries)
6. Cumulation of the index. (41 libraries)

Most of the general comments simply called for “better indexing” or observed that “the index could be improved.” Some, however, were more specific. In particular, the specific comments described a need for more consistency, more system, and more detail in the index. In the present index, some items are entered only under the subject with which they deal, some only under their titles, some only under the name of the series of publications to which they belong, and some comprehensive publications, such as the Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution or the reports of the several congressional committees, only under one entry instead of under the several different subjects to which they relate.

The specific suggestions made by these libraries included the following: 1) that each item be listed under author, title, subject, and issuing office (when this differs from the name of the author); 2) that the subject indexing be done in more detail, that is, that the same publication be listed under each of the subjects to which it relates; 3) that comprehensive publications be given analytical indexing, at least when such publications have discrete sections or articles dealing with different subjects.
Suggestions concerning subject indexing fell into two groups: those proposing an increase in the amount of subject indexing, and those which described a need for some standardization of the subject headings used in the index.

There were really two separate ideas incorporated in the suggestions that more subject entries are needed. The first described a need for more subject entries and cross references for each item. The second proposed an increase in analytical subject indexing, especially for those series and reports which include a variety of subject material under one title. A few libraries wanted more specific subject terms used for the entries. In general, however, the most frequently cited needs were for more references and for more analytical entries.

The subject headings themselves seemed to present more serious problems. Some libraries mentioned consistency and others indicated—by reporting that they have constructed their own subject catalog—that they have found the published index completely unsatisfactory. Several libraries indicated dissatisfaction with the inconsistencies which appear from month to month, or even within one month’s index. Some libraries would be satisfied with a standardization of the present headings. However, a larger group would prefer that some standard list of subject headings be used. The degree of dissatisfaction with the existing subject headings is evidenced in the suggestion that even the modification of some standard subject heading list would be preferable to the current practice.

Suggestions about the author or name entries showed not so much dissatisfaction with current form as concern that this information should be included on a much expanded basis. Some libraries mentioned the need for listing of personal authors of all monographs and of compilers, committee chairman, and chairmen of special commissions (such as the Hoover Commission) when reports are popularly known by the chairman’s name. One suggestion specified that agency entries in the Monthly Catalog should be made uniform with the Library of Congress entries. Another suggestion was that cross references be provided for some bills, reports, or other documents from the popular name by which they are known to the official name under which they are listed. (It should be noted that names of authors and compilers are now intentionally excluded from the Monthly Catalog.)

Twenty-three libraries suggested the more regular use of full titles rather than of “catch-word” entries. Whenever possible this should be by distinctive title rather than by series title. A need for such listing was especially felt for general publications, miscellaneous publications, and annual reports, since the present method of indexing is unusually weak in these areas. The suggestions concerning cross references related mostly to the use of additional subject headings and the inclusion of popular names for bills and hearings with references to the official names. These have already been discussed.

The last group of suggestions concerning the index of the Monthly
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Catalog dealt with cumulations. This included suggestions for a more frequent cumulation for periods longer than a single year. Though the several respondents did not agree about the most effective cumulative period, all were persuaded that more frequent cumulations than the annual volume are desirable for the most effective use of the Monthly Catalog. Whether the greater efficiency would be worth the added expense was not mentioned.

A large number of libraries indicated that the decennial index is very helpful. There was, however, an approximately even division of opinion as to whether it should be continued as a decennial or as a quinquennial index. Some libraries suggested a quinquennial cumulation to be superseded by a subsequent decennial one. Presumably such a plan would be equally acceptable to the librarians who specified only one or the other.

In addition to the suggestions made in the first question, sixty-seven libraries suggested improvements in the Monthly Catalog index in their answers to the second question, where space was provided for suggesting reference guides not now published. The suggestions were much the same as those encountered in connection with the first question.

Improvements in the Body of the Catalog.

In addition to suggestions about the index, many libraries made suggestions for other improvements in the Monthly Catalog. These included:

1. Promptness of inclusion of items after publication. (38 libraries)
2. Comprehensiveness of coverage. (28 libraries)
3. Inclusion of classification numbers. (18 libraries)
4. Cumulation of entries. (12 libraries)

Concerning the promptness with which items are listed in the Monthly Catalog after publication, one library remarked that it can never be as up-to-date as a newspaper; however, it was obvious from the body of comment that quite a few users believe that better currency than that now achieved is highly desirable and also possible. Declassified items and material not issued by the Government Printing Office were singled out as two types of material in which the lag is especially noticeable.

Some of the types or classes of material which are not included comprehensively are: publications not designated for distribution to depository libraries, research papers of various agencies, maps, processed publications, items issued in cooperation with universities or state agencies, agency items considered “administrative” in nature, and regional office publications. In general the Monthly Catalog does not sufficiently cover those items distributed by the Documents Expeditor. Individual entries for some, if not all, of these non-depository materials which are now included under the term “releases” for many of the agencies are needed. It was noted by a few that the Monthly Catalog can never be considered complete until it includes this type of material. Some libraries
mentioned that the gaps in listing might be more the fault of the issuing agencies than of the Superintendent of Documents.

The suggestions concerning the classification numbers were so highly various that no effective grouping was possible. It suffices to say at this point that most were of minor importance in achieving control over the documents or that they advocated only minor changes from present practices.

The responses to the question revealed some opinion that a cumulation of the entries themselves, not just of the index, is desirable because of the difficulty in locating a single item among so many separate lists. Some thought that the annual volume with its cumulated index is satisfactory as it is, but that a cumulation of the entries of several volumes would be desirable. Others suggested an annual cumulation, possibly by using some photographic process to eliminate setting the type anew. A cumulated volume could either be distributed as a regular part of the subscription or could be sold separately.

Retrospective Bibliographies.

The second question in the questionnaire which was directly relevant to this study is stated as follows:

Which of the following reference guides are sufficiently needed to warrant publication by the Federal Government:

( ) 1) A cumulated biennial or quadrennial catalog of U. S. Government publications, similar to the discontinued Documents Catalog.

( ) 2) A comprehensive catalog or checklist of Congressional hearings.

( ) 3) An up-to-date checklist of documents (similar to 1909 Checklist)

( ) 4) Other.

(In the brackets, before 1, 2, 3, 4 indicate importance to you in numerical order.)

As may be seen in Table 3, the general opinion was that a publication similar to either the Documents Catalog or the 1909 Checklist is most needed. The weighted scores shown in the table were derived by assigning the values of 3, 2, and 1, to each first, second, and third rank, respectively. Among both depository and non-depository libraries, the differences between the Documents Catalog and the 1909 Checklist, were so small as to be insignificant. A weighted score of 1998 would be possible if all responding libraries had identified a publication as their first choice. The weighted score for the Documents Catalog is 53.5% of the maximum possible, for the 1909 Checklist, 52%, and for the checklist of hearings only 27.5%. This suggests that the need for the hearings checklist is felt to be only about half as great as the need for the other bibliographies.

Documents Catalog.

In expressing a preference for one or another of the three specific guides named in the question, many respondents commented upon the
### Table 3
Ranked Indication of Preference for Retrospective Bibliography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice by rank</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Special</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depository</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-depository</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Documents Catalog

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depository</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Checklist of Hearings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depository</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1909 Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depository</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>393</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Non-depository

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Documents Catalog. These comments for the first section may be summarized as follows. The predominant suggestion concerning the cumulated catalog called for the inclusion of Superintendent of Documents classification numbers (11 libraries). The next most frequent suggestion related to the period of time each issue should cover (8 libraries). Three
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respondents preferred biennial issues, and five suggested the time and effort might better be spent on improving the *Monthly Catalog*.

**Checklist of Hearings.**

The number and content of the suggestions gave about the same idea of the importance of this item as the choice vote did. A total of only nine libraries made suggestions, and three of these indicated that the need is already being filled fairly well.

**1909 Checklist**

Fourteen libraries made comments about this type of publication. Of these, seven stressed the importance of a subject index for such a listing. Two mentioned the desirability of making such a publication cumulative. The following is a quotation from one of these comments:

> Assuming it were possible to issue a complete checklist of the same form as the 1909 masterpiece, though extremely useful, it would begin to go out of date by the time it was published and before another 50 years, people would want it done all over again. If the checklist could be issued in loose-leaf form (a standard size please) pages for discontinued agencies and classes could be done once and ended. Also distribution could be begun before the work was finished.

The question as stated provided each respondent with the opportunity to suggest some other reference guide besides those specifically named which might provide more effective bibliographical access to government publications. The suggestions made can be separated into two distinct categories: 1) those which propose some cumulation or expansion of the index to the *Monthly Catalog*, and 2) those which identify some other bibliographical guide. The suggestions came from libraries which received as many as 25% of the documents offered on deposit. The tabulations were limited to these because suggestions from other libraries were so diverse that they seemed to derive more from personal biases than from any general agreement upon the needs for improvement in bibliographic control of government publications. All but seven of the libraries tabulated received between 75% and 100% of the documents available on deposit. The suggestions made by one of the two largest groups of libraries (7) was that departmental and agency bibliographies, catalogs, or checklists be issued. The other largest group (also 7) suggested that indexes be prepared for department and agency publications. The two suggestions might well be combined if any such series of publications were undertaken.

The only other suggestions made by more than one library were that an index to governmental periodicals is needed, and that an up-to-date official publication of the Superintendent of Documents classification system showing changes would be valuable.
Summary

It would appear doubtful that all of these suggestions (or even a majority) could be acted upon—if for no other reasons than their mutual contradiction and their considerable cost. The report mentioned earlier, which was written by the ALA Public Documents Committee and was submitted to the Subcommittee, contained many specific suggestions which covered all phases of the federal depository library system. Two of the recommendations pertained to bibliographies in particular. The basis for these recommendations was found in the answers to the questionnaire which have been analyzed in rough form in this article. These recommendations are as follows:

VII. The Superintendent of Documents shall improve the *Monthly Catalog* by:
   a) Expansion of the index to include author, personal names, committees, committee chairmen, etc.
   b) More prompt listing of all publications, particularly the printed and processed publications of departments and agencies not now printed at the Government Printing Office.
   c) Expansion of subject coverage and use of more cross references.

VIII. The Superintendent of Documents shall publish a quadrennial "Documents Catalog" and a "Documents Checklist," both of which shall, if possible, be distributed free to depository libraries.

These recommendations would achieve admirably the level of bibliographic control indicated as necessary in the literature on the subject. Ideal bibliographic control for United States government publications might be achieved if all of these suggestions could be implemented. They are sound and desirable but possibly include some luxuries. Bibliography is expensive, and in most if not in all areas some compromise short of the ideal has been necessary. In lieu of such an extensive program as is outlined above, perhaps some such compromise as the following might be practicable for the *Monthly Catalog*:

1. Retain the dictionary form of index but expand it by providing:
   a. More subject analysis.
   b. Inclusion of personal names of authors, compilers, committee and commission chairmen and any other important names.
   c. Inclusion of the names of committees and commissions.
   d. Inclusion of titles (distinctive, as well as series).
2. Change or modify subject headings to make them conform to the Library of Congress subject headings.
3. Elaborate the system of cross references.
4. Cumulate the index annually, quinquennially, and decennially, but not more often than annually.
The above recommendations appear to be the changes most needed in government bibliographies. If funds become available for more undertakings, the following projects might also be considered, probably in the order they are listed:

1. Index the 1909 Checklist to provide complete control over the documents to 1909. This index should include titles, authors, and subjects, for all documents in the Checklist, whether they are mentioned by title or only by a number in a series. The index should refer to items by complete classification number rather than by page number.

2. Publish a checklist from 1909 to date in the same form as the 1909 Checklist. This should include an index like the one provided for the 1909 Checklist or, preferably, provide a combined index to the two checklists.

3. Continue the publication of the Documents Catalog from 1940 to date in the same form but with the inclusion of the Superintendent of Documents classification numbers for all entries or at least for the primary entry of each item.

A Fresh Look at the Treatment of Documents

WILHELM MOLL
First Assistant Documents Librarian
Indiana University, Bloomington

WITH THE growth of governmental functions and responsibilities generally and with the establishment of new regional and international organizations there has been a notable increase in the production of government publications or documents. The importance of this mass of mostly non-book material is enhanced by the fact that the race for scientific development and exploration has become a matter of public policy and is being carried on or supported by governments. The organization and administration of documents, therefore, continues to occupy a prominent place in library literature and discussions.

One of the most frequently discussed questions revolves around the problem whether a library should spread its documents according to subject or keep them together in a separate, uncataloged collection. It appears that recent developments would favor the establishment of separate, uncataloged collections for certain parts of the documents holdings, at least for the larger research library containing sizable holdings of federal, state, local, foreign, regional, and international official publications.
Removing large groups of materials from traditional cataloging would reduce cataloging costs and check the growth of the ever-increasing public catalogs, thereby improving their general usefulness. Another argument against traditional cataloging is that it duplicates existing bibliographies and indexes. This charge should not be dismissed lightly. Efforts at exercising better bibliographical control over government publications are not limited to the domestic scene, but have been noted in many foreign countries and also on the regional and international level.

The availability of government publications on microfilm, print, or card should also be weighed in determining the treatment of documents in libraries. With the deterioration of older documents and processed publications and in view of space requirements, it may only be a matter of time until large segments of documents holdings will have to be replaced by materials on micro-form. In addition, some libraries may wish to acquire certain categories of documents exclusively in micro-form. The acquisition of such materials as the printed and/or processed United States government publications, or the publications of the United Nations, will undoubtedly have far-reaching repercussions on traditional cataloging policies. Access to these materials will be had mainly through checking records and published indexes and bibliographies.

Official publications by United States federal, local, regional, and state agencies should probably form the core of any separate collection. To this may be added publications by international organizations. The inclusion of publications of foreign governments in other than the English language, and in particular in languages using non-Roman alphabets, may pose difficulties. The acquisition, processing, and servicing of such foreign language materials would require staff trained in such languages among the documents personnel. Newspapers, maps and "rare-book" materials published by official agencies may also be excluded from a documents department which may neither have the facilities nor the specialists to properly administer such types of materials.

Other official publications to be excluded would be non-administrative, monographic works by individuals in the employment of agencies which are merely controlled, directed, or sponsored by some "direct" government agency; or, reports by public institutions, such as colleges, banks, hospitals, railroads, and other similar agencies which cannot be regarded as "direct" agencies of the government.

These considerations are cited here to show that much administrative planning must precede the establishment of policy as to which materials of an official nature should be segregated and organized in a separate, uncataloged collection. Any decision must depend on the over-all needs of the particular library, the size and use of its holdings, future expansion, personnel, and structural peculiarities. It is recommended that groups of materials to be included in a separate documents collection should be specifically enumerated in a policy directive to avoid a situation whereby library staffs would decide at random whether a publication or series should receive traditional cataloging or not.
FOR THE past decade San Francisco State College library has made a study of the length of time required to purchase and process books as a means of analyzing its technical services routines and determining which procedures need examination and improvement.

The purpose of the study is two-fold: 1) to discover the time required to purchase and process the book, and 2) to discover the time required in the different steps of the acquisition-preparation procedures. Thus it is necessary to measure three time periods for each book purchased: a) date, order received to date, order placed, b) date, order placed to date, book received, and c) date, book received to date, book released. The total time lapsed in purchase and processing is determined by adding these three factors.

Sampling was necessary to make the study feasible. The Orders Completed file is arranged alphabetically by author, and twenty-five cards were drawn from each of twenty of the alphabetical divisions of the file, the letters Q-U-V-X-Y-Z not being included. To establish a non-selective procedure in the sampling, the first twenty-five usable cards filed in the A section were drawn, the last twenty-five cards in the B section, and so on alternately throughout the rest of the alphabet. Thus each year 500 cards were used which represent roughly 8% of the books ordered at the earliest date of the study to 4% currently.

The following categories of titles were excluded from the sample as they were considered to be atypical: not yet published, out of print, out of stock, standing orders, confirming orders, split shipments, and orders requiring advance payment. Individual titles (e.g., loans to faculty and students before cataloging) and groups of titles (e.g., where catalog department was reclassifying) were also excluded. These items were indicated by clipping the corners of the cards.

To be usable, the order card and catalog work slip for a title must have the following dates recorded: a) date, order received stamped on order card, b) date, order placed stamped on order card, c) date, book received stamped on order card, and d) date, book released stamped on the catalog work slip. Calendar days rather than working days is the unit of measure. For each time interval, the median is calculated as a measure of central tendency, and the range and standard deviation is used as measures of variability. The results of the study are given below to enable other libraries to compare them with their own performance records.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Time in Days Order Received-Order Placed</th>
<th>Time in Days Book Received-Book Released</th>
<th>Total Time in Days Order Received-Books Released</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>S. D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1951</td>
<td>0-44</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>9.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-1952</td>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>11.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952-1953</td>
<td>0-44</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953-1954</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-1955</td>
<td>0-47</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955-1956</td>
<td>0-49</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-1957</td>
<td>0-45</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>6.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Budget Control of Book Purchases and Binding Expenditures in Large Public Libraries

Alex Ladenson
Assistant Librarian
Chicago Public Library

There are three principal methods used by large public libraries to maintain budgetary control over the purchase of books and other library materials ordered by the various departments and branches of a library system. One is based on actual cost; the second is geared to a unit system; and the third is a scheme employing a combination of list price together with an estimated average discount or a slight variation of these two factors.

Under the actual cost method, agencies are allotted fixed amounts of money on a periodic basis. As books are ordered by the departments and branches, the actual cost of the items as appearing on the invoices is distributed and charged to the respective agencies ordering the material. In the unit system, agencies are allotted a fixed number of units instead of dollars, based on a predetermined table of values. As books are ordered, the proper number of units is charged against the agencies ordering the material. In the third scheme, agencies are also allotted fixed amounts of money, but the allotment is augmented by an amount which represents an average percentage of discount which the Library customarily receives in its book purchases. In ordering books, the agencies are charged with the list price of the material that has been purchased.

Any system of budgetary control to be effective must serve the following purposes:

1) Provide the administration with a periodic record of how much is being spent for books broken down into recognized categories, viz: Adult, Juvenile, Replacements, etc.
2) Provide the administration with a periodic statement showing whether the agencies are spending within the budgetary amounts allotted to them for books.
3) Assist the agencies through periodic reports to keep within their budgetary allotments.
In devising a system of budget control for the purchase of books by large public libraries, there is one basic difficulty—and that is the question of discount. It is no easy task to determine in advance what title is a trade item which carries a “long” discount and what is not a trade item and therefore subject to a “short” discount or no discount at all. In ordering large quantities of books, it is impossible to know beforehand what the actual cost is to be. For that reason, it becomes necessary to give the agencies ordering books some basis on which to estimate cost in order to avoid overspending.

Determination of what method of budgetary control to adopt depends on whether the administration of the Library believes that actual cost figures are required in this operation, or whether a system involving an average cost record is adequate. Stated in other words, does the administration need or want to know to the last cent, how much each agency actually spends, or is it sufficient to know that a department or branch spends an approximate number of dollars for books? This is the essence of the matter, and as in other areas of librarianship there is no unanimity of opinion on this question. Each institution must decide for itself what method is best for its peculiar conditions and how fine or how rough its cost figures need to be.

It is quite apparent that the actual cost method is more expensive to operate, requiring more staff and mechanical equipment to maintain, and is more time-consuming for the agencies in ordering books. But the figures it produces are accurate, and each agency is charged with the exact amount of its expenditures. There is no guess work! The unit system and other schemes in use, on the other hand, are simpler than the actual cost method, but the resulting figures that these systems produce are merely approximate amounts and not true cost data.

A description of the various systems of budgetary control to be found in some of the large public libraries of this country has been prepared in response to an interest that has developed on this subject.

**Actual Cost Method**

*Enoch Pratt Free Library*

The first break-down of funds is made by the Director in conference with the Assistant Director, the Coordinators and the Chiefs of Extension and Processing. The individual agency allocations are made by Committees appointed by the Director: one each for Central Adult, Adult Extension, and Juvenile departments.

Each agency is allotted three or more separate budgets: one for books (two if both adult and juvenile collections are maintained) one for continuations and periodicals, and one for binding. In addition there are gift funds, etc. In all, records on some 177 separate accounts are maintained in the Processing Division.

Invoices are analyzed, and the actual cost of materials is tabulated and distributed to the accounts of the various agencies on work sheets. The
totals for each agency are posted on cards through the use of an Underwood Model C bookkeeping machine. The records are kept on 11 × 16 inch ledger cards, buff color for adult funds, pale green for juvenile. For each agency there is a separate card (two if both adult and juvenile). Each card carries two accounts in parallel columns, one for book funds and the other for continuations. There is also a “control card” carrying totals for each type of fund.

Each card shows for each entry: 1) the number of the invoice (numbered consecutively), 2) the date posted, 3) the nature of the material, 4) the number of pieces, 5) the sum being charged against the account, 6) the accumulated amount charged since the last report was made (the 15th of every month), 7) the balance remaining in the budget (cumulated through the entire year), 8) a proof showing that each posting is arithmetically correct. All the computations and the notations are done directly on the cards by the machine which carries a cumulative total of the day's work. (For a summary of the advantages of the use of this machine, see Piercy, Esther. “Machines Keep Books,” Library Journal, 76, no. 12: 1013. June 15, 1951.)

The Library permits under- and over-spending by each agency in its three budgets (books, periodicals, binding) providing the total expenditure for all three allocations is not exceeded. Thus a children's librarian, who is responsible for three funds, may consider what the collection needs most to strengthen it and, with the Coordinator's approval, use the money to buy more new books than the book fund allows, or bind more, or buy more magazines, cutting on another fund to balance.

Balances remaining in the individual accounts of the various agencies at the end of the year are carried over and added to the book allocations for the following year. Thus, a department's balances from books, periodicals and binding are added together and added to (or taken from) the book funds allocated for the new year. The rate of spending throughout the year is supervised by the appropriate Coordinator; the over-all spending is watched by the Chief of Processing.

Chicago Public Library

Each department and branch is given a semi-monthly authorization card for books which shows the amount of money authorized and the estimated average discount to be employed by the respective agency in ordering books. The amount of money allotted to each department and branch is fixed by the Divisional Supervisors in conference with the Librarian, and is based on a consideration of the size and special needs of the agency. Separate allotments are made for adult and juvenile books. The agency heads indicate the number of volumes ordered and the total net cost on the authorization card which is approved by the Assistant Librarian—Central Library, the Regional Branch Librarians, and the Regional Supervisors of Children's Work.

After the books have been received and processed, the order cards are attached to the invoice and routed to the Bookkeeping Unit in the Order
Department. Here the actual cost of each item appearing on the invoice is distributed on tally sheets and charged to the agency ordering the title. The total agency charges on the cost distribution sheet must correspond to the total on the invoice. Once a month the figures are totalled for each agency, and a report is issued to the administrative officers and agency heads showing the total expenditures for the month and the total to date for both adult and juvenile books. In the bookkeeping process, electric adding machines are used to expedite the work. The Bookkeeping Unit also keeps a statistical record of total book purchases by number of volumes and dollar amounts, broken down into “Current” and “Extra Copy,” “Fiction” and “Non-Fiction” which is reported on an annual basis.

When a title is ordered which cannot be supplied, the Order Department notifies the agency and the amount involved is reauthorized.

Boston Public Library

Bookkeeping records covering expenditures for books and other library materials are kept on actual dollar and cents basis. I.B.M. prepares monthly reports from the data taken from punched cards. The reports include the following information:

I. Trust Fund Expenditures
   A. Tabulation by fund code number, showing agency charged and amount for current month and total amount to date, giving a starred total for each fund and a grand total at the end.
   B. Tabulation by place charged for expenditures from trust funds, showing totals for each agency, current and to date.

II. Expenditures from City Appropriation
   A. Expenditures for Central Library Departments and Offices
      1. Tabulation by place charged for books, showing class of books, number of volumes, amount for current and total amount to date, giving totals for each place and a grand total at the end.
      2. Tabulation by place charged for periodicals and newspapers, showing quantity and amounts in the same manner as in (1).
      3. Tabulation by place charged for miscellaneous items, giving quantity and amounts as in (1).
   B. Expenditures for Classes of Materials
      1. Tabulation by class of books giving place charged, quantity and amounts, current and to date, showing the total for each class.
      2. Tabulation by class for periodicals and newspapers giving the same information as above.
      3. Tabulation by class for miscellaneous items in the same manner as in (1) above.
III. Expenditures from City Appropriation for Branch Libraries and Division
(Tabulations broken down as in II above).

IV. Expenditures from Trust Funds for Central Library
(Tabulations broken down as in II above).

V. Expenditures from Trust Funds for Branch Libraries
(Tabulations broken down as in II above).

Unit System

Free Library of Philadelphia

The distribution of the book budget is the responsibility of the Coordinators of Adult work, Young Adult work and Children's work. These Coordinators, together with the Director and Deputy Director, determine the manner in which the book budget will be distributed among the various agencies. Following this, the individual book budgets are converted by the Accounting Department from dollars into "units."

A unit, as considered by an individual agency buying books, is equivalent to a dollar or a fraction of a dollar of the list price. For example, if an agency orders a book whose list price is $1.25, two units are counted; if an agency orders a book whose list price is $9.90, ten units are counted. The Accounting Department, in distributing units, assigns more units than dollars to allow for the difference between the list price and net price. For example, an agency may have a $4600 book budget but be assigned 6,000 units.

It has been found convenient to calculate average discounts—and hence unit values—separately for the following categories of book purchases: 1) Central Adult, 2) Branch Adult and Young Adult and 3) Children.

Each agency is responsible for keeping its own record of units spent. However, a monthly statement is issued to each agency by the Acquisitions Department giving the following information: 1) Annual Book Allotment in Units; 2) Ordered End of Previous Month; 3) Ordered This Month; 4) Total Ordered; 5) Less Orders Cancelled; 6) Total on Order to Date; 7) Balance.

It will be noted that the monthly statement from the Acquisitions Department includes a credit item, expressed in units, for orders cancelled.

The figures issued by the Acquisitions Department are official. Agencies are encouraged, however, to discuss with the Acquisitions Department any variations between their own record of units spent and that of the Acquisitions Department. When an agency has spent its allotted units, no further book orders are accepted.
The number of units available each year is based on average volume costs, and the units are divided among the branches and offices according to their needs. To check unit costs, bills are analyzed two days each week, for both adult and juvenile materials. The following table shows the dollar value that is assigned to a given unit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adult and Young Adult Material</th>
<th>Units Charged Branch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List Price of Volume</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ .00—$ .50</td>
<td>None. These materials are considered pamphlets, and are charged against a general, system-wide pamphlet fund. No specified allotment is made to each branch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ .59—$ 6.00</td>
<td>1 unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 6.01—$12.00</td>
<td>2 units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12.01—$18.00</td>
<td>3 units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An additional unit is charged for each $6.00 increase in the list price.

Quantity purchases of inexpensive paper backs are charged to the branch at the rate of one unit for each $2.45 (current average volume cost) spent.

Juvenile Material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List Price of Volume</th>
<th>Units Charged Branch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$ .00—$ .50</td>
<td>Same as for adult materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ .51—$3.00</td>
<td>1 unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3.01—$6.00</td>
<td>2 units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6.01—$9.00</td>
<td>3 units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An additional unit is charged for each $3.00 increase in the list price.

All recording and tabulating of branch expenditures of units is done by the Book Order Office. The Library is planning to install Vari-Tally Tabulators to record the daily branch charging. All bookkeeping is done by hand. Using the order forms that are submitted weekly by the branches, the Book Order Office tallies the units that are chargeable to the various agencies. The number of units used by each branch are accumulated monthly, and the remaining balances are posted on a bulletin board in the book examination room.

Three types of purchases are exceptions to the unit system: rental collection books; books for the free collection but paid from rental collection funds; purchases from special branch funds. The bookkeeping for these purchases is handled on a strictly cash basis. Separate invoices are received from the book suppliers for these categories and the actual
dollar costs are charged to the agencies. A balance is reported monthly to the branches of the amount earned, less the amount spent for the rental collection funds. A periodic report is made of the balances in the various gift accounts, and balances on Capital Budget accounts are available on request to the Accounting Office.

Other Systems

*Brooklyn Public Library*

Each agency is given an annual book allotment for the Adult, Young Adult and Juvenile collections. Book order slips are sent at regular intervals for each of these three groups to the Book Order Department and are forwarded to the Finance Department for "order-charging." The Finance Department "order-charges" the items for each Department separately and lists the encumbrances for each agency on a distribution sheet. The agency is charged the list price of each book ordered less 33 1/3 percent discount. It has been found that this discount is a practical average figure for all types of purchases made by the Library. Where the net price is shown, orders are encumbered at that amount. Standing orders for yearbooks, continuations and the like are "order-charged" from the actual invoices against a general fund set aside for this purpose. Out-of-print and out-of-stock items are cancelled by the Book Order Department, and a photostat of the original order slip is sent to the Finance Department with the notation "Credit" stamped on it. The Finance Department credits each agency with the amount of the item cancelled.

A monthly report is prepared by the Finance Department. Total monthly encumbrances and credits for each agency are rounded out to the nearest dollar and then posted to a ledger sheet. The monthly statement issued by the Finance Department to each agency is broken down into the three categories: Adult Allotment; Y. A. Allotment; Juvenile Allotment. The statement contains the following data: 1) Allotment for the Year, 2) Encumbered End of Previous Month, 3) Encumbered This Month, 4) Less Canceled Orders This Month, 5) Total Encumbered to Date, 6) Unencumbered Balance.

To prevent over-encumbrances, a periodical check of each agency whose balance is $50.00 or less is made during the last month of the fiscal year. All expenditures in excess of the annual allotment of an agency are deducted from the subsequent year's allotment.

Semi-annually, reconciliations of actual cash expenditures are made with the encumbrances to determine whether the unexpended cash balance and the unencumbered balances are in close agreement with each other. Any wide differences are reconciled and if necessary adjusted.

*Cleveland Public Library*

The sum allotted for books in the Library budget is apportioned among the various agencies as book quotas. These book quotas are assigned at the beginning of each quarter. Each agency has a book of quota
sheets. The quota sheet consists of two identical forms perforated in the middle. The right hand portion is sent to the Order Department with every order; the left half of the sheet remains in the book for the agency record.

The quota sheet contains the following items of information: 1) Balance Last Report, 2) Credits by Due Slips, 3) Total Quota, 4) Debits by Quota Notices, 5) Balance Available, 6) Amount of This Order, 7) New Book List, 8) Adult Replacement Items at $2.00 Each, 9) Adult Replacement Items at Misc. Prices, 10) Adult Replacement Total, 11) Juvenile Items at $1.50 Each, 12) Present Balance.

The quota sheet is also provided with five columns of spaces marked No. and Price to tabulate current items ordered.

The order cards which accompany the quota sheet are arranged alphabetically and are numbered consecutively to agree with the numbers on the quota sheet.

New titles are put on quota at the list price, duplicates and replacements at an estimated cost of $2.00 for adult and $1.50 for juvenile. Any adult book costing $5.00 or juvenile at $4.00 or more is put on quota at the list price. Orders from the "New Book Meeting" are put on quota at the prices given on a list furnished by the Order Department. These prices are compiled by the Head of the Order Department on the basis of the first copy.

This quota system has been used for a number of years. When necessary, changes are made in the estimated cost of duplicates and replacements to help balance the quotas with actual expenditures.

*Detroit Public Library*

The Director of the Library divides the annual book fund into several categories. The Reference Service Director and the Home Reading Service Director further divide the amount allotted to them by agency and by quarter. A certain portion of the money is withheld for emergencies and for special purposes.

At the beginning of every quarter each agency initiates a new Quota Card. The quota is the amount allotted to the agency and includes a predetermined average discount which the Library receives on its book purchases. Separate quotas are assigned for Adult, Juvenile and Rental books, and therefore separate Quota Cards are used for each type of material. Allotments for special purposes are also made, e.g.—to build up the Labor Collection which requires the use of a separate Quota Card.

Adult books, free and rental, are ordered on weekly blanket orders by Home Reading agencies. Juvenile orders are processed monthly. The total amount for an order is computed by the agency at list price for each of the above groups and is subtracted from the balance indicated on the Quota Card. A new card is used for each order that is submitted with the resulting balance on the Quota Card getting progressively smaller.

The Quota Cards are sent to the Book Selection Department for filing. The latter Department issues credits and debits for cancellations and
significant price changes. Except for test checks made by Book Selection, all the record keeping is performed by the individual agency. No mechanical equipment is required. The Quota Cards bears the following data: 1) Quota for Quarter, 2) Balance Last Report, 3) Credits, 4) Total Quota, 5) Debits, 6) Balance Available, 7) Amount of This Order, 8) Present Balance.

The quotas allotted to the agency must be used up quarterly and are carried forward only under special conditions. The Business Office of the Library watches the rate of expenditure of the total book fund as a further check on this system.

 Binding

The problem of budgetary control of binding expenditures is not as difficult as it is for book purchases. The systems that are in use in several of the large public libraries are described below.

Chicago Public Library

Each department and branch is given a monthly authorization card for binding which shows the amount of money allotted for this purpose. Departmental and branch allotments for binding are fixed by the Divisional Supervisors in conference with the Librarian on the basis of size and special needs of the agency. In filling their allotments, agencies use an estimated average price per volume for “circulating” and “reference” books which is supplied to them. Agencies send books to be rebound in accordance with a staggered schedule arranged by the Bindery Department. Accompanying each shipment of books is the authorization card which is filled out by the agency head and shows the number of “circulating” and “reference” books being shipped. Books from the branches are grouped together into lots of approximately 700 volumes and are prepared for shipment to commercial binders. The books from the various Central Library departments are also grouped in this fashion and prepared for shipment.

After the books have been returned from the commercial binders, the invoices are checked by the Bindery Department and each agency is charged with its respective share of the total amount. Invoices for Central Library departments are processed separately from Branches. In both cases charges to agencies are distributed on the basis of average cost per volume. This is determined by dividing the total number of books rebound into the total amount of the invoices for the month. The number of books bound for each agency is tabulated, and the monthly totals are multiplied by the average cost per volume. Foreign books, however, are charged on an actual cost basis.

Charges for “reference” books including periodicals are also distributed on an average cost per volume basis. Exceptions to this are newspapers, documents, patents, music and books for the blind which are charged on an actual cost basis.
Each month the Bindery Department issues a report to the administrative officers and to the agency heads showing the total amount expended for the month and the total to date by each agency.

Cleveland Public Library

At the beginning of each year a schedule is sent every agency giving the dates each month when the books are due in the Book Repair Department to be prepared for shipment to the commercial binder. The schedule is staggered for the various agencies over a four week period so that the books come to the Book Repair Department in an even flow throughout the year. Each agency has a quota of books to be sent each month. This number is based on their need as determined by their book collection, circulation and use. Books from different agencies are grouped together in lots, and four lots per month of approximately equal size are sent to the binder.

When the books for one lot have been accumulated, a shipment sheet is filled out showing the number sent by each agency. The number of books, periodicals, etc., is totalled on the back of the sheet. The cost of the lot is then estimated, using the average price per volume, to keep until the invoice arrives about four weeks later. This total estimated cost helps to determine how well the agencies are staying within the limits of the budget. The books are then packed by lot number and sent to the binder.

The books when returned by the binder have been sorted and separated by size. The Book Repair Department counts the total number of books received and sorts them by agency. Each book is then tabulated on a form which shows number of books to be charged to each agency and added charges (call numbers—first line; call numbers—additional lines; symbols; hand sewing, etc.) One sheet is used for each size. Totals are computed on the back of the sheet. To save time, tables are prepared at the beginning of the year showing the price charged by the binder for 1 to 50 books. The figures from each sheet are then transferred to the distribution sheet. Charges for periodicals, newspapers, patents, directories, and portfolios are entered directly on the distribution sheets.

Figures are taken from the distribution sheets and cumulated by lots of four which are called “rounds.” Two cumulations are made, one by agency and one by size. The former enables the Book Repair Department to determine the current cost of binding for each agency; the latter, the current total cost. Finally a weekly itemized statement of cost is typed and used for checking against the binder’s invoice when received.

Blanket orders for binding are issued in amounts of $5,000 and $10,000 to cover binding invoices. After each invoice has been checked, it is forwarded to the Accounts Department for payment. The amount of the invoice is deducted from the blanket order so that an accurate record of the amount remaining in the binding fund is always kept.

Los Angeles Public Library

Each central library department and each branch has a separate
budget for binding. The departmental binding budgets are in dollar amounts; the branch budgets are stated in number of books per month. The departments send books for binding on a weekly schedule to the Bindery Department. Branches ship on a monthly and semi-monthly basis.

The Bindery Department maintains a record of the number of books shipped by the departments and branches. A ledger sheet is maintained for each agency showing the number of books shipped and their estimated cost. A monthly report is issued to the departments showing the current balance in their binding budget. At the end of a six month period, binding budgets for the branches are reconsidered and revised according to need.

Each week the Bindery Department prepares an “Outstanding Statement” of the shipments to the commercial binder. The statements are itemized to show the number of books sent by departments and branches and is broken down according to size and price of books shipped.

Since there is a lapse of approximately six weeks between the shipment of books to the binder and their return and a lapse in the receipt and payment of invoices, a combined budget sheet is kept. This is maintained on a weekly basis and includes all estimated expenditures for the week which are deducted from the total budget. In this way a current balance is easily determined. Discrepancies between the estimated cost and the actual invoices are reconciled quarterly and thus overspending is avoided.

New York Public Library (Circulation Department)

The total amount of money allotted to binding is divided into four types of binding: regular adult, foreign, regular juvenile, and picture books. Each of these amounts is divided by the average cost of binding of each type of book, and the resulting binding units are divided among the branches. The monthly branch allotments are not reported to the branches, but are only used in the central Binding and Processing Office as a rough check on the amount of binding requested by each branch.

Every month each branch asks to have a certain number of books bound and after checking the branch’s allotment and previous rate of binding, the request is either approved or modified at the discretion of the Superintendent of the Binding and Processing Office. All binding is done by commercial contractors; when the invoices are received, they are paid by the Accounting Office and charged against the general binding fund.

Free Library of Philadelphia

At the end of the calendar year each agency is given a quota for the following year. For the branches this quota covers all books which are repaired and all books, old and new, which are bound according to Grade A specifications (i.e., regulation library binding with signatures sewn and with covers of boards and cloth). The quota for the Central public departments covers the same types of material with one exception. The
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one exception is a group of approximately 900 periodicals which are currently received and are regularly bound and cataloged. These periodicals are prepared for binding by the Serials Section, and the Serials Section is given a quota for this purpose. Quotas are subject to change from year to year. When any given quota proves so small that it hampers the service of an agency, request for permission to send additional work to the Bindery can be made in writing to the Chief of Processing.

**Detroit Public Library**

The Detroit Public Library operates its own bindery. Bindery quotas are handled as follows:

1. A book is considered one unit; a periodical three units; a newspaper six units.
2. Each agency is assigned a quota of units per week. The agency keeps no records but simply ships material to the Bindery weekly within its quota. The Bindery keeps statistical records.
3. An attempt is made to set the quotas somewhat below the capacity of the Bindery. Any agency can appeal to its Supervisor for additional emergency units. These additional units are lump sum quotas and not on a weekly basis.
4. When the backlog at the Bindery is too large or too small, the quotas are revised. The Bindery attempts to give three to four weeks service on binding.

**STATE STANDARDS FOR PUBLIC LIBRARIES**

The Library Services Branch of the U. S. Office of Education will publish late in 1959 a compilation of State standards for public libraries. The compilation will list measures certain States have taken to make the American Library Association standards of Public Library Service more specific and should be useful to States preparing or revising standards. Marian Magg, formerly an editor for the Council on Library Resources, Inc., is now working in the Library Services Branch preparing the compilation (a continuation of her M. A. thesis) under the direction of Rose Vainstein of the Branch.

**MEXICAN PERIODICALS**

Directorio de Publicaciones Periodicas Mexicanas was to be published about June, 1959, by the Centro Mexicano de Escritores, Mexico, D.F.

This directory, comprising 250 pages, contains 610 entries with full information on 840 Mexican periodicals, including title, editor, frequency of publication, data of first issue, and data on type of contents, name of present and first editor, subscription price, circulation and advertising.

The publication will be paper bound, and will sell for $10.00 U. S. It can be secured from the Centro Mexicano de Escritores, Rio Volga No. 3, Mexico 5, D.F.
Multiple Binding-Instruction Form

Marianne von Dobeneck
Head, Binding Department
Columbia University Libraries

The Columbia University Binding Department recently introduced a multiple binding-instruction form. This form has been designed after careful consideration of the needs of the libraries, those of the commercial binders, and those of the Binding Department. It combines three functions of a binding routine which required separate forms or separate handling under the old system.

The new binding-instruction form is a “No-Carbon-Required” form in four colors (see Fig. 1). The dimensions are 3⅞ x 7 inches, and it is divided into three main columns. The left-hand column is for the lettering on the spine and the middle column for collating instructions. The right-hand column is used by the commercial binder as a record of his work and the entry of the itemized cost for each volume. It includes such details as descriptions of the type of book or periodical volume, the size of the book by inches, and the basic cost. Such deviations as extra lettering, hand sewing, and guards can be checked or entered by the binder; and the cost for each operation can be written next to it and totaled at the bottom of the column.

Across the top is the space for the information needed for processing of the volume in the Binding Department. Included are items such as “Name of Account” and “Serial” which inform the clerical worker in the Binding Department whether the bound periodical must be entered on the shelf list after binding. It also tells him whether or not a book pocket must be typed and pasted into the book. Until recently, it required knowledge and experience on the part of the clerical worker to determine whether or not a newly-bound periodical had been added to the shelf list and which books were circulating in which library in order to decide that a pocket should be inserted.

Above this is a blank space on which a transaction number is stamped and the date on which the book is being sent to the binder; a code letter which stands for the name of the binder is included. This is done on an automatic numbering machine with pressure hard enough to penetrate all four forms of the “No-Carbon-Required” instruction slips.
COLUMBUS UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
AUG-3 '59 B02854

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF ACCOUNT</th>
<th>Pocket</th>
<th>Collating Instructions</th>
<th>Book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO. OF VOLS. SENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Periodical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pamphlet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BIND COVERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check One</th>
<th>Check One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Discard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Only</td>
<td>At Back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Set</td>
<td>In Place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BIND ADVERTISEMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check One</th>
<th>Check One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Discard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Set</td>
<td>At Back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Par Ed</td>
<td>In Place</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**OTHER INSTRUCTIONS**

- Do Not Trim
- Rebind
- Make Rub
- Match Vol.
- First Binding
- Rub No.
- Color

TOTAL

RETURNED
RS1.1

- 60 -
After the slips have been numbered, they are separated. The original first copy (white) and the second copy (yellow) are sent with the book to the commercial binders. The third copy (pink) is kept in the Binding Department and filed there in numerical order. Since the numbering machine numbers in consecutive order, all those volumes which pass through the Binding Department in a day are automatically in the order in which they are to be placed at the end of the file of "Outstanding" books.

The fourth copy (orange) is sent back to the library from which the book came. Any transaction from there on is made by the transaction number.

The second copy (yellow) is returned by the binder with the completed book. In checking books in, the third copy (pink) is removed from the file in the Binding Department; copies two and three travel with the book during shelf-processing, and one of them is removed when the book is ready to be delivered to the proper library.

The original is returned by the binder with the bill. On the bill only the total expenditure for each lot for each Library appears. This is checked with the cost of each volume which appears on the original binding-instruction slip. Then each original slip is checked against the one which has been removed from the completed volume, giving assurance that each billed volume has been returned and processed. Finally, the original slip is filed in a permanent home file, and the circuit of the binding process is completed.

The advantages of the new form and savings in time which it has induced were recorded during the trial year, July-June 1957/58. They are the following:

a) the typing of lists for over 27,000 volumes which formerly took about 300 hours a year has been completely eliminated;

b) the alphabetizing in preparation for typing and subsequent inter-filing has been eliminated; and

c) the filing of slips in the home file has been changed from alphabetical order to numerical order and thus has been stepped up from 100 slips filed per hour to 400 slips per hour.

d) the "No Carbon Required" Form represents a saving in time in itself. As the name implies, no carbons have to be inserted between the copies, and none removed. The paper is chemically treated and will release a blue dye under a pressure of 35 pounds normally used in writing with a hard pencil or a ball point pen or with a typewriter. However, once the dye is released, it will continue to spread even under light pressure. This is only true of the copies. The original, the only form in which we are interested for our home file, is permanent.

There are other savings which cannot be given in man-hours. The checking of the bills against lists has been eliminated, and the present method of receiving the original slip from the binder with the bill has simplified and reduced the time of this phase of work greatly. No longer
is a careful spelling of the titles over the telephone needed; the transaction number (not even the date when the book was sent) is all that is needed to locate a book in the Binding Department or at the commercial binders. Making each volume a separate transaction and not having to hold up many volumes until a list was completed is appreciated by the librarians as well as by the commercial binders.

Advantages which were not anticipated when the slip was designed include the fact that overdue books are now easily detected. The file of outstanding books has a file guide every fifty numbers. The file empties itself from the front and grows at the back. A single slip left between a file card calls immediate attention. The four colors also have been helpful in facilitating the tracing of books and the unraveling of snags, because the colors on hand tell to which stage the book has progressed.

From the Binding Department's point of view, the new form is successful. There are minor problems that need solution. But the savings in training clerical workers, typing, filing, and removing much of the guesswork in the processing, outweigh all such problems.

**Expert Service on Magazine Subscriptions for All Libraries**

Faxon's Librarians Guide free on request

For the very best subscription service at competitive prices—ask about our Till Forbidden plan.

F. W. FAXON CO., INC.
83-91 Francis Street Boston 15, Mass.
Continuous Library Service Since 1886

**MARADOR PLASTIC BINDERS**

NEW CHALLENGER #126 PENNY PINCHER #132

STARTLING NEW BEAUTY WITH THE OLD RELIABILITY

Write for Information.
American Trade Catalogs vs. Manuscript Records

Lawrence B. Romaine
Weathercock House
Middleboro, Massachusetts

Is there a library in these United States with plenty of room for the increasing volume of printed and manuscript matter that must be purchased and saved? Is there an historical institution with acres of air-conditioned shelves, seething with assistant librarians and historians and archivists cheering as tons of material seep in the windows and doors daily? Do I misinterpret William D. Overman’s address at the annual dinner of the Society of American Archivists in Salt Lake City last summer? Are the curators and librarians who write about this gigantic battle of the bulk overlooking some simple answer? I would think the evidence conclusive: American historical institutions are completely swamped and frustrated with the problem of how and where to catalog and preserve properly American business history.

In spite of those who will believe that I am merely building a firm foundation for my own future, I suggest at least a partial substitution: ten good, well considered, thoroughly illustrated, American trade catalogs in place of four tons of manuscript ledgers, possibly two tons of correspondence, and a scattering of leaflets, circulars, sales managers’ instructions and charts of business development.

I am not an archivist in any sense of that scholarly word, but I do speak from some years of experience. I have (unfortunately) acquired in twenty-five odd years of dealing in Americana a good many tons of manuscript ledgers and correspondence relating to American production in various fields from about 1790 to 1900. I have struggled to see that such accumulations went to the institutions where such materials might be used, and where, if one believed all he read, they would be welcomed. In most cases, lack of money, staff, and space prevented acquisition and proper preservation.

Possibly because of the very fact that trade catalogs have been printed and distributed free of charge for centuries, they have been tabbed ephemeral by curators, librarians, and historians. Because American advertising has always had a bit of P. T. Barnum spark in it—and perhaps
justifiably—business executives don’t trust its facts and figures. American trade catalogs have been considered too ephemeral in value to warrant the cost of saving them. Instead, our institutions have cherished tons and acres of manuscript materials that have now just about eaten them out of house and home.

In one of these truck-load accumulations recently sold by a century old manufacturer, I found one ledger in which a clerk had faithfully recorded every catalog printed from about 1860 to 1900. This volume listed not only every catalog issued, but also the names of every firm to whom each had been mailed. After Harvard turned this collection down, I returned the samples, and so do not know what became of the records or the truck. Not long ago I sold a folio catalog of this very firm to the Library of Congress. It is my conviction that this catalog, profusely illustrated, with detailed text, lithographs of the plant and works, and a short history of the company, will in 2059 be a far better picture of American production than the haystack of manuscript. Isn’t a full page plate of a 19th century chandelier, with sizes, designs, models and prices, a better record than all the correspondence about the manufacture and sales in some huge copy book in some clerk’s scrawly hand?

In 1831, Jocelyn, Darling & Co. of New York published what is generally considered the first American Advertising Directory. The index divides the contents into seventy-five crafts, professions, and trades; these are split up into twenty-seven hundred craftsmen and firms. In 1890 the Seeger & Guernsey Co., also of New York, compiled a Cyclopaedia of American Products and Manufactures. This solid octavo of CIXXX, plus 855 plus 260 pages divides its findings into fifty-five departments, twenty-four thousand five hundred odd goods and products manufactured and sold by fifty-one thousand three hundred American firms. In 1831, there was, of course, no mention of trade catalogs. In 1890, quite a number of those listed offered to mail catalogs free, or for postage. I could count among our own purchases and sales during the past twenty-five years, hundreds of catalogs issued by American firms not even listed in Seeger & Guernsey’s Cyclopaedia. If any library or institution tried to rescue and save (even assuming it possible, which, thank the Good Lord it isn’t) the manuscript records of even the fifty-one thousand three hundred businesses represented in this volume in 1890, their buildings would cover many square miles.

I recently made an index of the contents of a thirty-two page catalog issued by William H. Carr & Co. of Philadelphia in 1838; the title page reads American Manufactured Hardware. As a record of American goods produced by sixty American firms, I’ll match it against one acre of correspondence and ledgers of this year (1898) now preserved in any institution in the country. If anyone is really interested in checking this challenge, I’ll be glad to write the librarian in charge and ask if he may study it.

Consider this one simple case. One small thirty-two page catalog with a card in the files telling its location; the librarian merely brings it to
you, and you sit comfortably at a handy table. Take just one of the manufacturers—what is now the fabulous Fairbanks, Morse & Co. Suppose you try to find a listing of their complete line in 1838 with the archival material about which there is so much controversy. First, where is it; and second, how long would it take to hunt through how many tons of paper if it had all been preserved to find the size and price of a book binder’s press, or a set of scales for an apothecary shop for 1838.

I believe the American trade catalog might be considered as the solution to this exasperating problem—with, perhaps, one or two ledgers and a few contemporary letters bearing on the same period.

---

At your service—

Over 85 years of experience in outstanding service to libraries for publications the world over. Place your order, large or small, with us for efficient handling. Thorough searching, here and abroad, for out of print titles.

Eliminate complications of foreign correspondence and payments. Send your requests for ALL foreign titles to Stechert-Hafner in New York.

STECHERT-HAFNER INC.
FOUNDED IN NEW YORK 1872

The Worlds Leading International Booksellers
31 EAST 10TH STREET, NEW YORK 3, N.Y.

London Paris Stuttgart

---

LIBRARY RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

The first number of Library Research in Progress, published by the Library Services Branch of the U. S. Office of Education, appeared in October. This bulletin, to be issued at irregular intervals, is “designed to serve as a clearing-house of information about new developments in the field”. Brief descriptions are given of research projects as reported by individual researchers, library schools, professional associations, and foundations.
DEWEY
Decimal Classification
and Relative Index

8th Abridged Edition
June 1959

An abridgment of Edition 16 published in October 1958. All classes expanded consistently and extensively annotated. Special attention to school needs.

3 Summaries. Form division and divide like schedules—2,097, Tables entries—18,000—Index entries—495 pages.

$6.50 postpaid in U.S.A.

Also Available

Edition 16
October 1958

Completely revised and modernized.

Reviewed in this issue

Volume I—an extensive introduction and explanation, 3 summaries, form divisions, symbols and devices and 17,928 Tables entries arranged numerically on 1,410 pages.

Volume II—60,000 Index entries arranged alphabetically on 1029 pages

Set—2 Vols.—$30.

Published and sold by

FOREST PRESS, INC.
Lake Placid Club, Essex Co., N. Y.

This L.B.I. Literature has been prepared for you, the Librarian, and all others associated with Libraries. It contains a wealth of helpful information to assist you in getting responsible binding advice and service from approved binders.

1. LBI POSTER — Issued yearly to assist you in your Public Relations program.
2. 41 OPERATIONS — Shows you exactly what you must expect from rebinding.
3. LBI STANDARDS FOR LIBRARY BINDING.
4. LBI STANDARDS FOR PRE-LIBRARY BOUND NEW BOOKS.
5. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT LIBRARY BINDING for Librarians, Trustees and Purchasing Agents.
6. LIST OF CERTIFIED BINDERS.
7. STANDARDIZED LETTERING FOR PUBLICATIONS.
8. BROCHURE — salvaging water damaged books.
9. BROCHURE, Talk About Library Binding.
10. COLORED SLIDES.
11. SOUND MOVIE.

All of these available without charge from

LIBRARY BINDING INSTITUTE
10 State St., Boston 9, Mass.
Is Bibliographic Standardization Possible?

WITHOUT attempting to document the statement, it is probably safe to say that the goal of standardizing bibliographic usage is as old as scholarship itself.

Recently the concept has returned to prominent discussion because of the Cataloging in Source experiment. One of the great accomplishments foreseen for that service would be the printing of a catalog entry within each book, thus providing an always-accessible entry available to cataloger and bibliographer alike. Thus, if catalogers, reference workers, bibliographers, scholars, writers, publishers, book dealers, and all others concerned with handling, citing, or discussing books could be persuaded to follow the same entry, the means would be at hand. Aside from the feasibility of the CIS service, would it, if available, be so used? Can we get the often-expressed variance in library and bibliographic purpose compromised? Is there a possible meeting ground of purpose and practice? If so, who will be served and who will suffer? These are questions requiring discussion and airing.

One such discussion recently appeared in print and was called to our attention by Lucile M. Morsch, Deputy Chief Assistant Librarian, Library of Congress. The July, 1959, (v. 4, no. 2) issue of the Mental Health Book Review Index* carried an editorial written by the Editorial Committee (Ilse Bry, Chairman; Margaret M. Kinney, Co-chairman). Parts of it (reprinted by permission) read:

"Book reviews exert an influence not only as a medium of selection and criticism, but also, more subtly, through bibliographic entries. These entail decisions of the reviewers or editors regarding authorship of the books reviewed. In the mental health sciences, the specialists, who often review the same books, appear to agree on the principle of attributing authorship. They follow—and thereby sustain—a tradition that is admittedly no longer fully applicable to many books published today. Whether intended or not, their entries single out the senior author for explicit credit. Even when additional authors are included in the original citation, the longer the list of names, the sooner will it give way to the briefer et al.

"To a degree, this same usage prevails in libraries and library-oriented bibliographies. When books of complicated origin were still relatively

---

* Available from Lois Affierbach, Queens College Library, Flushing 67, N. Y.
rare, however, librarians introduced the concept of corporate author entry, to be used for works published in the name or by the authority of corporate bodies. They then linked the new with the old system by adding an entry under the appropriate personal name. Today the monographic literature as a whole has become far more complex. For instance, books with multiple authors are also apt to have multiple sponsors. Just as the first-named individual need no longer literally be the ‘senior’ author, but may take his place in alphabetical order rather than according to academic rank, so the listing of several sponsoring groups need not imply that any one of them has a particular claim to corporate authorship.

"These developments have strained the sense and use of both bibliographic traditions, and the gap between them has widened. Information deemed essential by librarians for identifying the book is often ignored by reviewers, or relegated to the descriptive part of the review, where it is lost for the citation. Conversely, recent library practice tends to omit names of individuals from the catalog, when the book is clearly based on a collective effort. As a result, it is often hard to recognize the same book under two almost completely different bibliographic guises.

"This issue of the Mental Health Book Review Index contains more than the usual number of examples illustrating this problem. We should like, therefore, to point out the main discrepancies. Specialists conceive of an author as a person, and only when no person is indicated as author, will they accept corporate authorship. This does not mean that the author must have written the book. Author status can be conferred upon editor, compiler, committee chairman, an authority signing the preface, the participants in a discussion, and the nameless, yet still personalized ‘Various authors.’ In current library practice, catalogs contain as author entries an abundance of carefully verified official names. These may be the names of conferences, of their sponsors or places of meeting, or, intermingled with well-known institutions and associations, the quite unfamiliar names of minor agencies and ad hoc committees. Works issued repeatedly, such as annual reviews, are recorded under their title; the title of a periodical from which articles were chosen for republication in book form, is also preferred over the editor’s name; and in posthumous publications, the original writer remains the author, no matter how much the living compiler contributed in editing unpublished essays, letters, or notes.

"The divergent usage in bibliography can be explained by the difference in professional responsibilities. The person submitting the book to the scientific community ranks as author in its channels of communication, even when the book appears under official auspices. In library records that personal identity takes second place, and may even be lost, in favor of the more lasting, institutionalized, impersonal designation of authorship. Each approach is guided by a long-term view. The scientific community, which creates the history of ideas, identifies a name with a school of thought and often chooses the men who made a notable con-
tribution as spokesmen for new developments. Those concerned with the continuity, structure, and permanent use of the literature, on the other hand, look for the organized authority behind the book that will outlast the individual and perhaps sponsor similar efforts. Attempts to impose the concepts of one group upon the practice of the other seem neither desirable nor likely to succeed.

"The Mental Health Book Review Index integrates the bibliographic interpretations of librarians and specialists. In principle, we follow the form of authorship accepted by the Library of Congress and printed in the National Union Catalog, the form in which books appear in the catalogs of most libraries in this country and in a growing number of libraries abroad. In giving additional bibliographic information, we include names and details which will be useful to specialists and librarians in the field of mental health. And in our cross-references, we connect the variations of bibliographic entry, usually the form prevailing in the reviews, with the form adopted in the interest of library cooperation."

Some attempt has been made to encourage more discussion on the subject. From George Piternick, Library Administrative Analyst of the University of California, Berkeley, comes some pertinent comment. Although it is main entry with which we are primarily concerned, his remarks are necessary to the background of the discussion. He says:

"It should be emphasized that most bibliographical entry of the type dealt with is single entry, whereas library catalog entry is multiple, and in this fact lies the basis for some reasonable compromise of objective and methods between the two camps. Basically, all that is desired is that people going from a bibliographical citation of a book to a library catalog will find information on whether or not the library possesses that book. It is desirable that this information be produced at the first step, but it is not essential; a cross-reference to a library entry for the book is adequate if not optimal. Neither is it necessary that the catalog user find a main entry card under the bibliographical citation with which he is armed; an added entry will suffice. What is intolerable is a blank, when the library actually has the book.

"Standardization of main entry among bibliographer and library catalogers does not seem feasible in view of the varying objectives of the two crafts, as pointed out by the authors. There seems no compelling reason, however, why there should not be a common entry between the single entry chosen by the bibliographer and the group of entries selected by the catalogers. This degree of standardization is both desirable and feasible, and, in fact, does exist in the majority of cases. To reduce the number of blind leads from citation to catalog, however, both camps must make adjustments.

"1. Bibliographers should make concerted effort to see that the personal name selected for entry when more than one is available should be the one most relevant to the concept of authorship, i.e., author over compiler, compiler over editor, editor over chairman of sponsoring group, etc. When personal entries are not available, the bibliographer should
choose the corporate entry most relevant, i.e., corporate body producing a work over corporate body to which the work is addressed, etc.

"2. Catalogers and catalog codes should be cautious in continuing and extending the practice of reducing the number of added entries, especially personal added entries, and especially for works given corporate main entry. Certainly no work given corporate main entry, but including prominent display of a person or persons responsible for the preparation of the work, should be cataloged without providing added entry for the person most emphatically listed, as well as for title, if distinctive."

Further opinion, comment, and discussion will be welcomed.—EJP.

REGIONAL GROUPS

This report is being prepared while the Regional Groups are holding their fall meetings. Only the Catalog Division, Pacific Northwest Library Association, which met early in September, was able to report in time.

At their meeting Erma Albertson (Pacific Northwest Bibliographic Center) reviewed the ALA Conference papers on "Cataloging in Source: a Review of the Consumer Reaction Survey." Rodney K. Waldron (Oregon State College) in his "Custom Made Catalog Cards—Faster? Cheaper?" investigated the relation between time lag and expense in cataloging procedures. Both these papers will appear in summarized form in the PNLA Quarterly.

Reports of the spring meetings of the New York Technical Services Librarians, the Northern Ohio Technical Services Librarians and the Twin City Catalogers Round Table, received too late for inclusion in the last issue, added to the total those groups participating in the CIS Consumer Reaction Survey. Bella E. Shachtman (U. S. Dept. of Agriculture) spoke to the New York group; Margaret Kaltenbach (Western Reserve) led the discussion at the Northern Ohio meeting; and a member of the Survey team, Richard Pautzsch (Brooklyn Public) met with the Twin City group.—Edith Scott, Chairman, Council of Regional Groups.

EDITOR OF UNION LIST OF SERIALS ANNOUNCED

The appointment of Edna Mae Brown as Editor of the Third Edition of the Union List of Serials, effective August, 1959, was announced by John W. Cronin, Director of the Processing Department, Library of Congress.

Miss Brown, who received her B.S. from Purdue University and her B.S. and M.A. in Library Science from the University of Illinois, had various library experience at the University of Illinois, University of Tulsa, and Purdue University before becoming Head of the Serials Section of the Descriptive Cataloging Division of LC in 1942.

She is the author of the yearly summary of new periodicals which appears in College and Research Libraries.
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Cataloging Practices and Problems in Selected Military Academic Libraries

ROBERT K. JOHNSON
Assistant Director of Libraries*
Drexel Institute of Technology

Introduction

THIS is the second of two papers concerning certain aspects of technical services in libraries of some of the higher-level military educational institutions in the United States. The first (in the Winter 1958 issue of LRTS) described some features of acquisitions work; this covers briefly some cataloging activities.

For the purposes of this article, the institutions and libraries studied have been assigned alphabetic symbols: the former Armed Forces Information School, now Army Information School (AIS); Armed Forces Staff College (AFSC); the former Army General School (AGS); Army War College (ArWC); the Artillery School (TAS); Command and General Staff College (CGSC); Industrial College of the Armed Forces (ICAF); the Infantry School (TIS); National War College (NatWC); Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT); Air Force School of Aviation Medicine (AFSAM); Military Academy (MA); Naval Academy (NA); Naval Intelligence School (NIS); Naval Postgraduate School (NPS); Naval School of Aviation Medicine (NSAM); Naval War College (NavWC); and Air University Library (AUL).

Cataloging Departments

Practices in cataloging vary more than those in acquisitions, largely because the latter are severely circumscribed by strict military and government regulations. The lack of such outside restrictions in cataloging permits considerable latitude in adapting processes to local needs.

* The author, formerly Chief of Cataloging, Technical Services, Acquisitions, and Circulation at the Air University Library, visited over twenty military schools and their libraries, and prepared extensive survey reports concerning details of certain of the operations and services of eighteen of them. Seventeen of these studies have been published in the ACLR Microcard Series, nos. 62-67, and 82. For a detailed bibliographical listing and an abstract of these, see College and Research Libraries, 17:583-584, November, 1956, and 18:343, July, 1957.
The NSAM and NIS library staffs are so small that they have no separate cataloging activity or personnel. The former AGS Technical Reference Library was also similarly situated. The librarian at NSAM performs professional aspects of all work, as did the AGS librarian. The Archivist and Assistant Archivist at NIS perform all professional duties in connection with security-classified and non-classified materials, respectively.

Similarly, at ICAF, the one librarian in the Classified Reference Unit does all the professional work. The librarian of the Logistics Library at NavWC performs most of the professional duties, as do the librarian and the assistant librarians of the Classified Library. At TIS the staff is large enough for assignment of compartmentalized duties to a large extent, but each of the four librarians performs some work in most professional areas except administration.

The cataloging activities of the remaining libraries have separate professional staffs varying from one, as in each of the two library divisions at CGSC, to seven, as at ArWC and AUL. There is one cataloger each at AIS, AFIT, and AFSAM; and the equivalent of one and one-half each at MA and NA. NPS has two as does the Mahan Library at NavWC. The Main Library at ICAF has three catalogers plus the head of Acquisitions and Cataloging; TAS has three, and AFSC has approximately three and one-half.

Likewise, considering the size of the libraries, their acquisitions programs, and number and interests of clientele, NatWC, ArWC, and AUL all operate just barely at the mere subsistence level, with five, seven, and seven catalogers respectively.

Tools

For most of the non-classified materials, certain bibliographical works such as the LC catalogs are not available in all the libraries. Found in almost all, however, is the LC List of Subject Headings. Some particularized tools also are found in some, such as the subject heading list of the LC Technical Information Division, the SLA list, Subject Headings for Aeronautical Engineering Libraries, and others, although such lists are more heavily used in work with security-classified materials than with commercially published items because of the extremely technical and specialized nature of the materials. Also to be found occasionally are gazetteers, biographical dictionaries, etc.

Author and Title Entries

The practices of these libraries are fairly consistent concerning author and title entries, probably more so than in any other cataloging area. Most of them follow closely the ALA Rules for Author and Title Entries, particularly in cataloging books and other non-security classified items, although MA follows the 1908 edition. Many also follow the ALA Rules in making entries for classified materials, although there is more deviation in dealing with these items. NatWC gives authors' names as
completely as possible, but no dates are given for personal name entries to be placed in its Classified Records Section catalog.

TAS has a large, special corporate author heading list, and AUL recently developed its own manual on limited cataloging—e.g., AUL eliminates the “U.S.” from United States Government author and subject entries, but retains it in some other instances.

**Descriptive Cataloging**

Practices in descriptive cataloging vary so much that it would be impossible to describe the situation correctly without presenting a detailed picture of the processes of each library. However, certain similarities and dissimilarities may be noted.

Approximately half of these libraries follow the LC Rules with reasonable faithfulness. Of these, MA and ICAF simplify them for their own use. Most of these libraries do as their needs require: if the Rules are too detailed or not detailed enough for local needs, adaptations are devised or the Rules are ignored.

For example, the Mahan Library at the NavWC, like the Technical Reference Library of the former AGS, gives full description only where it is felt to be of value; AFSAM finds collation of little use, and uses notes as required; and ordinarily the Main Library at ICAF simplifies descriptive cataloging as much as possible, but always brings out flow charts and gives fairly complete collation.

Preliminary paging is indicated by only seven of these libraries: NIS, NSAM, AFSAM, AFIT, TIS, TAS, and AFSC. Of these, only AFIT does not use specific terms for the different varieties of illustrations; but one library outside this group, MA uses all such terms. All others, however, lump most types of illustrations under the term “illus.,” except for those which are of particular importance to the schools' patrons, such as charts and maps.

Size is indicated by only NPS, AFSAM, and AFSC. The first two give size in inches. AUL uses only “F” over the call number for folio-size materials, and size in inches is given for pieces 4 inches or less in height.

A notable variation in the series note position occurs at AFSC which uses “short-titles” notes extensively in this place.

Ten of these libraries use notes only occasionally; the remainder are more liberal. NatWC does not detail contents to any extent for documents, while CGSC gives abstracts of contents wherever possible, and often gives contents notes as well. AUL does considerable detailing of contents for documents, but not for general, non-security classified items as a rule. NatWC adheres to LC practice for general, non-classified materials. AFSC, while it does not detail contents regularly, does it occasionally for some sets and for some military materials.

Most of these libraries seem to provide titles without much thought. NPS purposely uses titles consistently, heavily, and seemingly without much discrimination, often providing two title cards; AFIT and AUL suppress titles felt to be superfluous.
Subject Headings

Fifteen of these institutions use the LC subject heading lists to varying degrees. Most of them use this guide as the foundation for subject heading work, particularly with general, non-classified materials. Some, like the libraries of the Military and Naval academies, use LC lists where applicable, or, like ArWC, they usually accept provided headings on non-military subjects. The LC list is basic for subject heading work at AFSAM. The CGSC Main Library uses LC aids as guides, but has its own official typed subject authority list. TAS uses LC lists for suggestions but cannot often use the provided headings without adaptation. NSAM makes little use of LC headings except for its vertical file. The subject heading list of the LC Technical Information Division is used by several either as a source for headings or for suggestions. A few other specialized sources such as the SLA list of aeronautical engineering headings and the headings used in the Air University Periodical Index also are consulted. Field Manuals, the Dictionary of United States Military Terms for Joint Usage, and other military publications are widely used for suggestions. NSAM adapts headings from all lists freely, leans heavily on the Boston Medical Classification, and obtains much guidance from the table of contents of Hoff and Fulton, Bibliography of Aviation Medicine, Supplement, 1944, and the Quarterly Cumulative Index Medicus.

MA has a special list for Academy materials which are to be placed in the LC classification. CGSC libraries have their own lists, and TIS uses the CGSC lists as the basis for its subject work. AFSAM has its own subject authority file, based on the LC list; and valuable suggestions for additions are obtained from the Quarterly Cumulative Index Medicus, the Current List of Medical Literature, the National Library of Medicine Catalog, etc. NIS has a special list of security classified publications. At AUL, the LC list, plus the AUL list, are searched for suitable headings. For needed headings not in either list, slips are placed in the subject authority file.

A few libraries which do not have their own subject authority files consider their card catalogs the final subject authority. This is particularly true in documents cataloging, as at the Classified Library and the Logistics Library of the NavWC, and the Classified Reference Unit at ICAF and AFSC, although the public catalog of the latter library is the chief subject authority for all of its cataloging activities. The unclassified catalog of NIS is the subject authority for unclassified materials, as is the catalog at NSAM.

Levels of Analysis

Few of these libraries appear to analyze the same types of materials to the same degree except for the analysis provided for documents. The academies give simple cataloging to fiction. MA gives a middle level of analysis to most materials, much like LC practice. At NA, the level varies from simple to very detailed, depending on the materials, but the bulk of the items here, too, is given a middle level.
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The libraries of the schools of aviation medicine vary somewhat in their analysis. The Naval school gives only a general level, as a rule, providing somewhat closer analysis for reports and other documents. The Air Force school gives only one level if printed cards are not available, and that is quite detailed.

AGS followed LC practice largely, as does AIS, but similarly to AGS, AIS gives somewhat more detailed analysis for materials particularly important to the curriculum, than does LC.

There is a tendency in most of the smaller libraries to follow LC practice more closely than do the larger libraries, but certainly not uncritically. The larger libraries receive more publications for which LC cards are not available, and hence do more original cataloging. For instance, at the Mahan Library of the NavWC, rare books in naval areas and items of special curricular interest receive more detailed analysis than is usually given to the more ordinary materials. This highlights two points worthy of mention: (1) much of the material is often of local importance for reasons other than those brought out by LC; and (2) the analysis by LC often is not sufficiently detailed or the headings used are not appropriate for the local needs. The more specialized the collection, the school, and its needs, the greater the likelihood that LC subject headings will not be satisfactory. Deviations consist chiefly of adaptations of LC headings, or added or more finely subdivided headings.

A few libraries, like AFSAM, use LC cards largely unaltered except for needed subject heading changes, but give quite close analysis in original cataloging of materials for which printed cards are not available. On the other hand, TAS, the Main Library of the CGSC, NPS, and NatWC analyze all their non-classified materials closely whether they have LC cards or not. Thus even for those that make rather heavy use of LC cards, considerable revision of the subject readings is often required.

Without exception the analysis of documents material, both security-classified and non-classified, is of such a close nature that it is actually indexing instead of cataloging. The degree of analysis of similar documents materials varies somewhat from library to library, depending upon the school's needs, the skill of the catalogers and their knowledge and understanding of the curriculum, the individual services, and the nature or the military in general. In at least one library, TIS, the analysis of documents is so detailed that sometimes as many as thirty-five subject cards may be made for one document. On the other hand, the field, the information available, and the way it is presented in publications also affect the analysis of materials. At NIS, for instance, so many of the documents deal with one subject only that they do not require cataloging beyond the assignment of one subject. Those which can be treated in this way can be filed by subject.

Library Classification Systems

Seven libraries use Dewey for their non-security-classified materials:
MA, AIS, CGSC, NPS, NIS, AFIT, and AUL. NSAM uses the Boston Medical Classification, and the others use LC. When the Air Force was under the Army, as the Army Air Forces, its technical libraries were required to use Dewey “where practicable.” AFSAM recently changed from Dewey to LC.

At MA, LC is used for military, naval, and World Wars I and II; Dewey is used for all other items except materials issued by or concerning the academies, or written by or about their graduates, which it places in a local expansion of LC. AFSC has a special numbering and dating system for use with military operations plans and orders, modelled on the LC classification for House and Senate Hearings.

Thirteen libraries also have special “classification” systems for particular types of materials, most of which are security-classified documents. NatWC has a classified accession numbering system based on the originating agency for its security-classified publications: an arbitrary mixed notation, arranged alphabetically. This system has been adopted with some local modifications for use with classified documents at ArWC, which places in it service school publications issued since 1940 regardless of whether or not they bear a security classification. The Classified Reference Unit at ICAF likewise uses an arbitrary system for its documents similar to the system used at NatWC. AUL uses an arbitrary classified shelf-list system for its documents materials; it is numerical and is arranged by origin or issuing agency.

AGS Archives had two classified shelf-list systems for its documents. One, the primary system, was geographical. The secondary system, known as the “key-list,” was a “subject” system for arranging “non-geographical” materials. The Classified Library at NavWC uses a similar system. It consists of two local, alphabetical classifications: the “geographical intelligence system” and the “technical intelligence system.”

In the Logistics Library at NavWC, a locally devised logistics classification is in use, primarily alphabetical, and containing nine main classes. NIS uses a special classification system built into its own subject heading list for certain of its classified documents which cannot be placed in a file under a single subject heading. This is an arbitrary, mixed-notation shelf-list system, arranged alphabetically. CGSC Archives uses a local, grouped accession numbering system for its classified publications. For its picture file, it uses the Army Intelligence File which is a decimal classification in two parts: an index and a numerical index (schedules). The documents at AFIT are not given a subject classification, but are arranged in groups by source and within these groups by the self-contained numbering systems (“serial numbers”) used by the originators.

NPS now uses coordinate indexing for materials placed in the aerology pamphlet file, although the Brussels classification was used for these files until recently. This library’s Technical Reports Section used log (accession) numbers for arranging documents until a few years ago, but these are now being arranged by source although the log numbers are still used as a control feature.
Cards

All but TIS use LC printed catalog cards. The academies, AFSAM, AFIT, and ICAF use these cards without much alteration. The changes are chiefly in the subject headings because of the specialized nature of the schools and the needs of their patrons. All of the others generally make more changes, largely in subject headings. NPS uses LC cards, but only for the main entry; their added entries are reproduced on a Flexo-Writer automatic typewriter. Cards used at TIS are produced locally, because there are so few LC cards available for their materials or which can be used without considerable alteration.

Types of Main Catalogs

All the libraries have card catalogs, although NA had a printed catalog from 1860 to 1869. All but four have the traditional dictionary catalog. Among these with dictionary cards, TAS has two: one for classified materials, and one for non-classified items. ArWC tried a divided catalog, but it did not prove to be popular with the library staff. AFSAM has a separate journal catalog. At AFSC there are official as well as public catalogs.

Of the four libraries not having dictionary catalogs, the NPS catalog and the unclassified catalog at AFSAM are divided into author-title and subject files; NSAM and AUL divide by subject-title and author. NSAM formerly had a dictionary catalog, but divided it in order to facilitate a weeding project. The librarian found it so useful under the subject-title and author arrangement that it has been left that way. The AUL catalog was in author-title and subject form before 1954. As part of an over-all program of catalog repair, improvement, and reorganization, it was re-divided into subject-title and author files.

There are, or were, other types of catalogs in these libraries in addition to these cited. Most of them are for documents materials. Among the libraries with documents, those having complete documents handling units, as opposed to those which have the work with documents integrated with other types of materials, have separate documents catalogs. At the Classified Library at NavWC there are "source" (main-entry), subject, title, and "quick reference" catalogs. At NIS, the classified catalog is purely a subject catalog: source and title cards are not used. The newly organized separate documents activity at AFSAM has separate source and subject files. At AUL, since the main catalog is public, there are separate catalogs for classified cards and certain classified materials.

Summary

Catalog departments are much more common in these libraries than are acquisitions departments. Only four of the libraries operating as complete units do not have separate cataloging activities. In those libraries having independent cataloging units, the number of cataloging librarians runs from one to seven, including the head catalogers where they exist.
Collections of bibliographic and other aids to cataloging vary from the meagre to the well-stocked, with most of the libraries having in general what the catalogers believe to be the necessary tools to backstop their work successfully. The ALA Rules are used as the guide for preparing author and title entries for unclassified materials in most of these libraries, as well as in many of those which process security-classified items ("documents," or "technical reports," etc.). Only two libraries have special local lists or practices in this area. The descriptive cataloging Rules of LC are followed to a large extent by about half of the libraries, and the remainder use or ignore them as they see fit in particular instances.

Local deviations from LC subject heading practice occur in some libraries, largely because of the special nature of the institutions, the needs of their constituencies, and the content of the materials being analyzed, but on the whole, LC practice is followed in assigning subject headings to the bulk of general materials. Most of the libraries finding it desirable to adapt standard headings or make up their own, use LC and similar lists. Special local subject heading lists are often found, but the greatest activity in adaptation of standard headings and the manufacture of new headings to fit special needs occurs in the cataloging of contract and security-classified documents. LC practice in applying various levels of subject analysis to differing types of materials is followed in the preparation of general materials in most of the libraries, although local variations toward very simple cataloging and also toward the more detailed are also found. On the whole, documents are given such detailed analysis that it amounts to indexing.

The LC classification is used by ten of the libraries, Dewey by seven, and the Boston Medical Classification by one. A few use LC for certain kinds of materials, and Dewey or a special classification for others. Most of the special classification or shelf-list systems have been devised especially for use with security-classified items.

LC printed cards are used by most of these libraries, only a few using them with little or no change. In general they are altered, but to varying degrees, and the greatest and most important changes occur in the adjustment of subject headings.

Card catalogs are used universally among these libraries, although for a period of several years shortly after the middle of the nineteenth century one had a printed catalog. Fourteen libraries have dictionary catalogs; two have divided catalogs of the author-title and subject variety; and two recently have adopted the author and subject-title plan. Some special catalogs are found, largely in libraries having collections of documents.
FEEL very honored and pleased to be invited here to tell you about the current revision of the ALA rules with which I am privileged to be associated. In the very limited time I can take at this meeting I can give you only a sketchy account. I should, nevertheless, like to tell you something about the background of the revision, the procedures followed in carrying out the revision, and the objectives and principles on which the revision is based. This is to be an informal and factual account. Should I in the course of discussion be carried into the realm of opinion, I must ask you to bear in mind that the opinions I may express are my own and not necessarily those of the Catalog Code Revision Committee or of the Library of Congress.

Background of Current Revision

As for the background of the current revision we might begin with 1941. When, in that year, the preliminary American second edition of the *A. L. A. Catalog Rules* appeared, it generally met with a reserved and cool reception. There was widespread frowning, followed by audible complaints, that the new edition was too complex, that it would complicate the work of the cataloger as well as of the user of the catalog, that it had too many rules and too many exceptions, and “even exceptions to exceptions.” But the criticisms were, largely, not constructive. It is idle to complain of complexities and exceptions unless one can demonstrate that the complexities are unnecessary and that the exceptions are not productive of any desired results. In the absence of such evidence the profession at large reluctantly began to acquiesce in the complexities and exceptions as inherent in the nature of the cataloging situation.

At this time, in the Library of Congress, Herman H. Henkle, now Librarian of the John Crerar Library and then Director of the Processing Department, decided to have some analytical and experimental studies made of what was regarded as the most irksome part of the rules, the

---

* Talk given before the Cataloging and Classification Section of the Catholic Library Association, April 2, 1959, during its 35th annual conference held in Chicago, Ill. The paper, accompanied by the transcript of panel talks and the discussion which followed, also appears in the CLA Proceedings. 1959.
rules relating to the description of a work. The results of the studies were subsequently incorporated in a report of Mr. Henkle entitled *Studies of Descriptive Cataloging, A Report of the Director of the Processing Department* (Library of Congress, 1946). The report presented an evaluation of the rules and proposed a statement of functions and principles which might provide a basis for a functional revision of these rules. An Advisory Committee on Descriptive Cataloging appointed by Luther H. Evans, then Librarian of Congress, supported Mr. Henkle's report *(cf. Report of the Advisory Committee on Descriptive Cataloging to the Librarian of Congress, Library of Congress, 1946)*, and following an agreement with ALA, Lucile Morsch, then Chief of the Descriptive Cataloging Division, was detailed to prepare a revision of these rules in accordance with the functions and principles set forth in Mr. Henkle's report.

When, in 1949, the ALA rules of entry ("the red book") and the LC rules of description ("the green book") appeared, it became apparent that the two codes differed intrinsically more importantly than they did extrinsically. In a discussion of "Some Recent Developments in Cataloging in the U.S.A." *(in the Journal of Documentation, June 1950)* Leonard Jolley, Librarian of the Royal College of Physicians in Edinburgh and an advocate of progressive thought in cataloging, contrasted the two codes and deplored that no studies such as those made of the rules of description had been made of the more important and more difficult rules of entry, and that the functions and principles of these rules, unlike those of the rules of description, had been left unexplored and unclarified. This feeling was shared by many members of the cataloging profession in this country, and in the middle of May 1951, at the request of the Board on Cataloging Policy and Research of that time, the present editor was assigned by the Library of Congress to devote himself "to an analysis of the ALA rules for entry with special reference to the problem of corporate entry, and to prepare a critique of those rules which will point the way for constructive revision." The result of this assignment was published by the Library of Congress early in 1953 under the title *Cataloging Rules and Principles, a Critique of the A.L.A. Rules for Entry and a Proposed Design for Their Revision*. In July of that year, at the ALA conference in Los Angeles, this report was discussed by the Cataloging and Classification Division of that time, and following that meeting a planning committee was appointed to consider ways and means for carrying out a revision of the ALA rules of entry.

**Procedure of Current Revision**

In the course of the next several years the Catalog Code Revision Committee and its various subcommittees came into being, and a great deal of thought and soul searching were devoted to questions of revision policy, to the objectives and principles upon which the revision should be based, and to the procedure which should be followed in carrying out the revision. One of the decisions adopted at that time was that, in the
some recipients abroad, particularly from the cataloguing Rules Sub-
committee of the British Library Association which participates actively
in the revision. The comments, criticisms, and suggestions received are
studied and evaluated by the editor and noted for future revisions or for
presentation with pros and cons to the Catalog Code Revision Committee.

Meanwhile comments are being received from the members of the Catalog
Code Revision Committee and of its subcommittees and later also from
some recipients abroad, particularly from the Cataloguing Rules Sub-
committee of the British Library Association which participates actively
in the revision. The comments, criticisms, and suggestions received are
studied and evaluated by the editor and noted for future revisions or for
presentation with pros and cons to the Catalog Code Revision Committee.

Prior to the meeting of the full Committee, which is normally held at
the annual ALA conference and at the Midwinter meeting, the Steering
Committee (consisting of Wyllis E. Wright, Librarian of Williams Col-
lege and Chairman of the Catalog Code Revision Committee; Arnold
Trotier, Associate Director for Technical Departments of the University
of Illinois Library; Laura C. Colvin, Professor of Library Science at
Simmons College; Audrey Smith, of the Philadelphia Free Library and
Chairman of the Descriptive Cataloging Committee of the ALA Catalog-
ing and Classification Section; and C. Sumner Spalding, Chief of the
Descriptive Cataloging Division in the Library of Congress) has an
extended two-day-long meeting with the editor, going over the draft rules
in considerable detail, discussing the criticisms and suggestions made,
and deciding on desired changes and modifications to be incorporated
in subsequent revisions of the drafts. The discussions and conclusions of
the Steering Committee are later reported to the full Committee where
the conclusions are approved or modified, and additional questions are
raised and discussed. This is, in general, the procedure followed in carry-
ing out the revision, subject to such changes as circumstances may require. The procedure, of course, does not guarantee a perfect solution for every problem or a unanimity of opinion on every solution; it does, however, provide for a reasonable balance of conflicting considerations and for a democratic balance of conflicting opinions.

Objectives and Principles

We now come to the last part of my account concerning the essential character of the revision. A critical examination of our own and other cataloging rules will, I believe, indicate that their most serious deficiency is the absence of a clarification of the objectives which the rules are designed to serve, the methods contemplated for achieving the various objectives, and the general principles which underlie the many rules. Such a framework is necessary if the rules are to represent a rational system of cataloging rather than a mere collection of arbitrary individual decisions, made by different people at different times, pursuing different purposes and following different principles. Take, for example, the Bible. An edition or translation of the Bible, whatever its individual title, is entered under Bible. Here our first concern is clearly not with the particular edition or translation in hand, which may be identified by a particular title, but rather with the work represented by the item in hand, which is commonly identified by the name Bible. The main entry is thus designed to bring in the catalog together the various editions and translations of the Bible, and added entries are used to facilitate the location of a particular edition or translation under its own title. With the same objective in view, an edition or translation of the Constitution of the United States is entered, under its corporate author U. S., not under its own title but under the name Constitution, by which the work is most commonly known; but in this case Constitution is not presented as the title which is to be filed alphabetically among the other titles under U. S., but rather as a subdivision of U. S. to be filed alphabetically between the various Bureaus and Departments. Editions of certain types of works, as you know, are entered under group headings such as Laws, statutes, etc., Treaties, etc., or Liturgy and ritual, which serve to bring together different works of a certain type rather than the editions and translations of a certain work. Again, the editions and translations of most other works are entered under their own titles as distinct works, whether the entry is under author and title or under the title only. Suppose, now, you had an edition or translation of the Declaration of Independence of the United States with a particular title of its own. Would you enter it (under its corporate author U. S., of course) under its own title as if it were a distinct and separate work, or under the conventional title Declaration of Independence of which it is an edition or translation, or under a hybrid author-title heading similar to that used for the entry of the Constitution of the United States, or under some group heading similar to that used for the entry of laws, treaties, and liturgical works? There is no principle to guide one in deciding which course to follow, nor any
apparent reason to explain why the Bible, the Constitution, a service book, and some other work should be treated in four different ways rather than in the same way.

The proposed revision, therefore, begins with a declaration of objectives and proceeds to set forth the method and principles by which the objectives should be achieved. The objectives are (1) to facilitate the location of a given work and of the given edition of a work, and (2) to relate and bring together in the catalog the editions of a work and the works of an author. Since a work may variously be known and sought in the catalog, and since the editions of a work may appear under different names of the author and under different titles, the proposed method of cataloging is to use several types of entries: main entries, added entries, and references. The function of the main entry is to identify a given author by one particular name and a given work by one particular title, so that the works of an author and the editions of a work will be found together in the catalog. And the function of the added entries and references is to facilitate the location of a work or of a particular edition which might be sought under a different name of the author or under a different title, and to guide the inquirer to the main entry where the various editions and translations of the work, and also the other works of the author, might be found. And in these objectives and this method lies the first fundamental difference between the present rules and the proposed revision.

Having explained the objectives which should be held in view and the method which should be used to meet the various and often conflicting requirements which follow from the objectives, the proposed revision goes on to set forth the basic principles which underlie the proposed rules and which should be followed in the interpretation and application of the rules. These principles are mostly imbedded in many of our present rules, but they also include new and different principles, and are generally and consistently followed in the proposed rules. They relate to the basic questions involved in the problem of cataloging: the general question of entry, the entry of a work having more than one author, the entry of an author having more than one name, the entry of a work having more than one title, and the entry of a work of corporate authorship. The proposed principles on each of these questions are as follows:

General. A work whose author is known is entered under the name of its author, whether or not the author is named in the edition or piece in hand. A work of unknown or diffused authorship is entered under the title. A work without a title is entered under the name by which it has come to be known in reference sources, or under whatever designation is used to identify it. Failing these, the entry is under a descriptive title supplied by the cataloger. Subject or form headings, where necessary or desired, are used to form supplementary added entries, to bring together works on the same subject or of the same type, but they are not to be used to form the main entry of a particular work.
Work of Multiple Authorship. A work having more than one author is entered under the author represented as principally responsible for it; if no one is so represented, the entry is under the author named first on the work if there are not more than three authors, or under the title if there are more than three authors. A work prepared by one person for another in whose name it is issued is entered under the latter, who is implicitly responsible for the work. A continuing work whose successive parts or editions are subject to change of authorship is entered under its title. An edition or translation of a work follows the entry of the original work.

Identification of Author. An author identified in his works by a given name—whether real or assumed, full or brief name, or any variant of his name—is entered in the catalog under that name, in the language and form used in the original works, unless in the course of time he has come to be generally known by another name. An author identified in his works by different names, not representing a change of name, is entered preferably under his real name. An author who changed his name is entered under his latest name. In the case of compound surnames or surnames with prefixes the custom of the author's country is followed.

Identification of Work. A work is normally identified in the catalog by its original title, except when in the course of time it has come to be generally known and commonly referred to by another title. If the original title is vague or obscure, the entry is under the title by which it is most commonly known or under its most distinctive title. A continuing publication which is subject to repeated changes of title is entered under its successive titles as so many different publications, with notes to link the titles.

Work of Corporate Authorship. A work which, explicitly or implicitly, represents an act, communication, or product of the activity of a corporate body—that is, of a group of individuals acting jointly and identified jointly by a given name—is entered under the name by which the corporate body is identified in its works. A corporate body whose name has changed is entered under its successive names as so many different bodies, with notes to link the names. A work representing an act, communication, or product of the activity of a department or division of a corporate body is entered under the name of the department or division. A department or division of a corporate body which has a distinct name of its own not implying subordination to another body is treated as an independent body.

These, then, are the principles which underlie the rules evolved so far and which are to form the ideological fabric of the revised code. They will not provide a ready and easy answer to every problem in cataloging and will still leave ample room for differences of opinion on many detailed questions and proposed rules; but they provide a view of the cataloging problem as a whole, so that a given question may be seen in the context of the whole problem, and guideposts to indicate where an answer to the question might be found.
UNDER THE sponsorship of the Working Group on Cataloging Principles of the International Federation of Library Associations and with financial support of the Council on Library Resources, Inc., a Preliminary Meeting of an International Cataloging Conference was held in London on July 19-25, 1959. Representatives of Argentina, Australia, Austria, Brazil, England, France, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, Sweden, the United States, and Yugoslavia were present as well as observers and guests from Canada, East Germany, the British Library Association Cataloging Rules Subcommittee, the British Standards Association, UNESCO, U. S., and Venezuela. The designated representative of the U.S.S.R. was unable to be present due to illness but was unofficially represented by Mme. Beliaeva of the staff of the UNESCO Library. The American representatives were Seymour Lubetzky and Wyllis E. Wright. American and Canadian observers were Katherine L. Ball and Susan Haskins.

Frank C. Francis, Director of the British Museum and Chairman of the IFLA Working Group, presided. A. Hugh Chaplin and L. Sickmann were Joint Executive Secretaries and not only handled the distribution of preliminary papers, but prepared minutes of each day's discussion for correction at the next session.

Fifteen working papers were distributed in advance of the meetings, ranging in subject matter from suggestions of topics to be considered, through considerations of specific areas such as corporate entry, to reports on the present situation of cataloging in various regions. The American representatives had as their preliminary assignment the preparation of a paper on “Principles for the Construction of a Cataloging Code.”

After the adoption of the agenda for the meetings, the group turned to a discussion of the purposes and limitations of an international cataloging meeting, with general agreement that the current meeting could only identify the questions for the later conference to decide without attempting as yet to reach agreement on the specific issues raised. Nevertheless it was apparent from the tone of the discussions that a large area of agreement already exists and that the proposed final conference will be largely successful in reaching international agreement on cataloging principles. (The lack of expressed opposition to the idea of
Corporate authorship was, perhaps, due as much to a sense of the inevitability of the adoption of this principle as to a conversion to the advantages of this type of entry. The final sessions of the meeting were devoted to discussing arrangements for a general conference on cataloging to be held in 1961. The UNESCO delegates extended an invitation to hold such a conference at UNESCO House in Paris and offered the facilities of their organization in preparing for and carrying on the conference.

It is perhaps best to present the results of the meeting in the words of its official final report, a portion of which follows:

**Matters for Consideration by the International Conference**

6. As a result of the discussions, the Preliminary Meeting agreed unanimously that a basis exists for a broad agreement on important cataloguing principles. The Meeting therefore affirmed its conviction that an International Cataloguing Conference should be held, and that such a Conference could achieve practical results which would materially facilitate access to and international exchange of bibliographical information.

7. To ensure success the scope of the Conference must be limited to a definite objective. Its aim should be to reach agreement on basic principles governing the choice and form of entry in the alphabetical catalogue of authors and titles. Its consideration of these principles should, moreover, be based on the following assumptions about the character of the catalogue:

   a) that the catalogue must serve two purposes
      
      (1) to locate a particular publication by its author’s name or its title as given in the publication;
      
      (2) to bring together entries for all editions and translations of one work and all works of one author;

   b) that the catalogue will consist of a main entry for each item, with added entries and references where necessary.

8. The Conference should direct its attention to those important aspects of cataloguing practice which present marked variations under different cataloguing systems. Questions on which substantial agreement already exists should not appear on its agenda. The Meeting accordingly proposed the following list of matters on which agreement in principle should be sought:

   **A. Function of the main entry**

   Function of the main entry in relation to assumption (a), (1) and (2) above.

   **B. Choice of main entry**

   (1) Use of author or title as main entry for works of known authorship published anonymously.
(2) Choice of main entry for works of multiple authorship, with special reference to
   (a) different forms of multiple authorship (e.g. collaboration, separate contributions, collections);
   (b) use of title entry when the number of authors exceeds a certain figure (e.g. three)

C. Personal Authors
   (1) Choice of one name for an author who has used or is known by several names.
   (2) Adoption of one form of a name which varies in orthography or exists in different linguistic forms.
   (3) Part of name to be used as entry word.
       (a) for compound names and names with prefixes, of European origin;
       (b) for non-European names.

D. Corporate authors
   (1) Whether, and in what circumstances, entries should be made under the names of corporate bodies.
   (2) Use of names of subordinate bodies (a) as independent entries, (b) as subheadings under the names of superior bodies.
   (3) Use of geographical names as entry-word for corporate bodies other than those of a territorial character (states, provinces, cities, etc.)

E. Title entries
   (1) Choice of entry for anonymous works appearing under various titles.
   (2) Entry of serial publications whose titles have changed.

F. Form headings
   Use of form headings and form subheadings for certain types of publications.

Composition and Organization of Conference
9. The Conference should be held in Paris in 1961, preferably in April or September, and should last ten days.
10. (a) The Conference should be widely representative of organizations of the following types:
    1. National and regional library associations.
    2. International organizations concerned with librarianship, bibliography and the book trade.
    3. National libraries whose catalogues have an important influence on cataloguing practice.
4. Bodies responsible for national bibliographies and union catalogues.
5. Government organizations for the control and assistance of libraries and bibliographical activity.

Representatives should be empowered to speak and vote on behalf of the organizations appointing them. Individual experts might also be invited to participate in the Conference.

(b) The work of the Conference will be facilitated if, in countries where several interested organizations exist, joint discussions are held on the questions coming before the Conference. Where the appropriate organizations are not well developed, several countries may usefully join together for such discussions.

(c) Final decisions regarding participation and representation will be made by the organizing committee (see below, par. 11) in the light of the financial resources available.

11. All preparations and administrative arrangements for the Conference are entrusted to an Executive Secretary (who should be provided with the necessary staff) and a small organizing committee directing matters of policy. The Committee will consist of the following (subject to their ability to act);

Mr. A. H. Chaplin (acting also as Executive Secretary)
M. Paul Poindron
Dr. Ludwig Sickmann

The appropriate organization in the U.S.S.R. will be invited to nominate a further member.

12. In preparation for the Conference, papers on particular problems should be prepared by individual editors, assisted in some cases by special working groups. Each paper would briefly analyze the problem, discuss alternative solutions and make recommendations. Papers would be widely circulated for comment before being put into final form. A draft statement of principles, based on the recommendations in the working papers, would then be prepared for submission to the conference.

13. The successful organization of the International Conference must depend to a large extent on the practical facilities available at the place of meeting. They should include, besides suitable conference rooms and translating and duplicating services, the provision of interpreters in several languages. The Meeting therefore asks the Council of IFLA to enquire from the Director General of UNESCO whether accommodation and technical services for the Conference might be made available at the UNESCO headquarters in Paris, the cost of these services to be borne by IFLA.

14. The Meeting also requests the Council of IFLA to take steps to obtain financial support sufficient, with any other resources already avail-
able for the purpose, to cover the cost of holding the Conference. The Organizing Committee should prepare as soon as possible a budget designed to ensure the successful achievement of the purposes of the Conference on the lines set out above.

In connection with Paragraph 11, it may be well to report that several of the European delegations urged the inclusion of an American on the organization committee. We Americans pointed out that the committee should be able to get together when necessary for face-to-face discussions and that the inclusion of an American would add excessively to the cost of such meetings. After considerable discussion, our view prevailed.

Of course, not all of the week was devoted to business. Pleasant social hours were arranged for the delegates by Mr. Francis, Mr. Chaplin, ASLIB, the Cataloguing Rules Subcommittee of the Library Association, and Miss Piggott of the Faculty of the Library School of London University. The personal meetings and exchanges of views which take place outside of as well as in the official meetings are always of value in contributing to our understanding of each other's viewpoints and to arriving at mutually-acceptable conclusions.

In sum, the Preliminary Meeting showed that there already exists a very significant convergence of ideas in the various national bodies and that a general conference will undoubtedly be successful in reaching international agreement on cataloging and bibliographic principles.—Wyllis E. Wright, Chairman, ALA Catalog Code Revision Committee.

The U.S.B.E. Survey

EDWIN E. WILLIAMS
Assistant Librarian for Book Selection
Harvard College Library

AN AUTHOR can be expected to review his own work favorably, and a favorable review normally encourages people to read the book it praises. But facts reported in a survey of any organization may go out of date rapidly, particularly if the survey recommended changes and if no time was lost in starting to make these changes. The report of his survey of the USBE* has been read by those to whom it was particularly addressed. Some other librarians, the author hopes, will find it worth reading. It is much less important, however, to call attention to the report than to emphasize the following points:

The survey seemed to demonstrate that ignorance of these points is widespread, and that both the USBE and many libraries would benefit if they could be publicized effectively. Indeed, if this problem of communication could be solved, the USBE apparently would benefit so much that dealing with its other problems would be a relatively simple matter.

It may seem that a discovery more profound and complex than this ought to have been made in the course of an expedition on this scale. The survey, after all, was a six-month project generously financed by a grant from the Council on Library Resources. It had the assistance of a distinguished advisory committee—Flora B. Ludington (Chairman), John R. Russell (Vice-Chairman), Emerson Greenaway, and Joseph C. Shipman. The surveyor visited ninety-two libraries or library organizations and corresponded with more than one hundred others. He profited from opportunities to talk over his plans and, later, his preliminary findings with the Board of Directors of the USBE, and discussed an outline of his report with its Corporation, which consists of representatives appointed by the Library of Congress, the Smithsonian Institution, five research councils, and nine library associations.

Simple or not, the discovery of a great need for improved public relations was not what the surveyor had expected. As has just been noted, the USBE Corporation includes representatives of nine library associations, and most of the country's libraries and librarians belong to one or more of these. Members of a profession might be expected to be familiar with services of an organization that may be described as their own cooperative for the redistribution of surplus materials. The USBE, moreover, is something that American libraries needed as long ago as 1876, according to Melvil Dewey; it has been operating effectively since 1949. An organization that has supplied more than 3,000,000 items to libraries during ten years and that has more than 3,000,000 on hand at present is not so insignificant that it can have been overlooked. Most librarians must have been aware that it exists, and most of them have probably had the impression that it, like its ancestor, the American Book Center for War Devastated Libraries, has done a praiseworthy job of helping foreign libraries to acquire publications they need. This is true. The trouble seems to be that most American librarians have not realized that the USBE can also be useful to them.

The surveyor recommended that the USBE give first priority to supplying missing issues and gaps in serial files. It should be able to do more in this field than in any other to supplement the services available from
dealers, who cannot afford to break up good sets in order to supply a few numbers. This service, moreover, is needed by libraries of all kinds, including the large and mature collections that have the most to contribute to USBE stocks.

The USBE, it was recommended, should become the American national center for exchange of library surplusage; but this does not imply that it should become the center for exchange of official documents or for other “publishing exchanges”—i.e., exchanges that serve as a means of distributing books or serials issued by libraries themselves or by the universities or other organizations they serve. Neither does it mean that the USBE should be the only exchange operating nationally in this country. On the contrary, it was recommended that the USBE ought to supplement rather than supplant the other exchange systems that are now being sponsored by national library associations, and specific methods of collaboration were proposed.

The USBE was commended for the flexibility it has achieved in spite of the mass-production techniques that are necessary in economical and efficient handling of great masses of material. This flexibility must be maintained, it was emphasized, if the organization is to collaborate usefully with other exchange systems and if it is to meet the diverse needs of a great variety of libraries.

A major experiment was proposed in order to determine the practicability of local or regional clearing-houses for library surplusage. One such center, in the Dallas Public Library, has already begun operation; but a variety of plans ought to be tried, and financial assistance from a foundation will probably be required for this purpose.

The necessity for requiring libraries to pay shipping charges on the materials they contribute to its reservoir has been a serious obstacle to full achievement of its objective by the USBE; this seems to be clearly demonstrated by the fact that more than forty percent of all material received from American libraries has come from those located in the District of Columbia. Consequently it has also been recommended that funds be sought to pay shipping charges, during an experimental period, on publications that are wanted.

A major difficulty, it has been said, is that most American librarians, while they may have been aware that the USBE was doing good abroad, have not realized its domestic value. The survey was concerned almost exclusively with services to American libraries, and its appraisal of these services led to the conclusion that the USBE is a sound organization, remarkably well managed, that deserves to be used much more than it has been. It would be unfortunate if the survey gave currency to an impression that this part of the truth is the whole truth. If altruistic considerations had been taken into account and the USBE contribution to America's foreign aid program had been appraised, domestic services undoubtedly would have been found to make up only a small portion of the organization's total worth.
For all librarians presently involved in centralized processing operations and for all those considering the future possibilities of such an action, the Southwest Missouri Library Service, Inc., is serving as a milestone in a generally uncharted field. In her excellent report of the project, Mrs. Kenney has brought this information to many more librarians than those in the immediate area.

In presenting her survey of the work of the Processing Center established by the Southwest Missouri Library Service, Inc., she has first provided the background for understanding the need for centralized processing. She points out that as far as is known, this Center is the only agency which has been established solely for the purpose of processing books for currently-operating libraries. Its aims are: "To save time for each library, to permit more efficient use of library personnel, and to introduce certain economies in library administration."

In order to determine to what extent the Center has achieved its aims in the first year of its operation, the surveyor first attempted to find costs of technical processing procedures in the member libraries before the Center was inaugurated. Since most of the libraries did not do all their processing as an isolated activity, it proved to be most difficult for them to give exact costs; enough information was received to allow Mrs. Kenney to make comparisons with the centralized costs, however. The initial questionnaire to member libraries also ascertained the number of bibliographic tools used in each library, the types of catalog cards, the types of catalogs maintained, the physical preparation of the books, and the number of staff members involved. The answers to these questions provide some comparative tables that are of interest in themselves, because the libraries range from new regional or county setups to large, established municipal units.

Next, Mrs. Kenney proceeds to a detailed description of the Center's activities. Her explanations are very exact, and her charts extremely helpful. Naturally, each reader will find some questions unanswered, but the over-all picture is clear and includes a great many details.

The Center is financed by contributions from the member libraries with the charge to each library being based on the relation of its total annual budget to the grand total of the budgets of all libraries cooperating. This percentage is then applied to the budget of the Center. By using this method, the cost per book to each library is in direct ratio to the extent each member makes use of the Center. In other words, a large library must make extensive use of the Center to justify the cost of participating.

Processing procedures at the Center were agreed upon by mutual consent and are identical for all libraries. Since each member library furnishes its own book pockets and cards to the Center, the problem of different charging systems does not enter. The physical preparation of the book does not include labeling.
nor the addition of plastic jackets. It is rather interesting to note that those libraries adding several processes to the physical preparation of the book after receiving it from the Center are the larger—and older—libraries with longer-established routines.

Each library is responsible for its own ordering, although uniform order slips are being used. Shipments are made to the Center, invoices are checked and returned to the libraries for payment. Centralized ordering would eliminate some of the duplication of effort now caused by having several copies of a book in different steps in the work-flow. However, the time lapse involved in pooling orders would probably over-balance this handicap. Mrs. Kenney indicates that at least one member library is looking forward to the possibility of adding the ordering process to the Center’s activities.

Mrs. Kenney’s description of the physical quarters and the equipment purchased is valuable to those contemplating the establishment of any kind of centralized processing. A scaled floor plan is included in the report.

In her summary of the Center’s activities Mrs. Kenney evaluates first the planning of the librarians. The financial support was sufficient for the size of staff as originally planned, but the staff was not adequate for the amount of work involved. With one year’s experience, the budgeting for the second year is expected to be more satisfactory. The equipment as planned was suitable, with only minor additions needed for the second year.

The member libraries are divided into three groups in judging the effect of the Center’s activities upon them. They are: first, those libraries deriving considerable benefit; second, those which did not benefit to any great extent; and third, new libraries for whom comparisons could not be made. Six county and regional libraries appear in the first group, and a new county and a new regional one in the last. The two large municipal libraries did not feel they had benefited greatly, but the librarians expressed the hope that the Center could become more effective as its procedures became established. The municipal libraries in one case did not make extensive enough use of the Center to reduce per book cost, and in the other instance made numerous changes and additions in books and cards processed by the Center. One county library fell into both of the above categories and so did not benefit greatly from the Center’s work.

The most common complaint from all the librarians questioned by Mrs. Kenney was the time lapse between ordering and receiving books. Some criticisms of classification practices were made, but most librarians were satisfied with the catalog cards received from the Center. All seemed to feel that with continued efficient administration, additional staff, and another year to establish procedures, the centralized processing will become a success.

Although any actual financial saving might be questioned in some cases, the saving of time and the freeing of staff members for new library projects were welcomed by all participants. The two new libraries were emphatic in saying that they could not possibly have accomplished their satisfactory beginnings without the Center’s help.

In conclusion, Mrs. Kenney states: “... the Southwest Missouri Library Service, Inc., in spite of its difficulties and shortcomings, has made a positive contribution to the libraries it serves. If it has done no more than alleviate their personnel problem, prepare better catalogs, and permit the release of time for other services, it has scored a definite plus. It is not too optimistic to claim that with experience the Center in the future will expand its services and prove of benefit to the members in ways that can today be only dimly perceived.”
It is difficult and dangerous to attempt to criticize a project with only a printed report as a basis for judgment. From our library’s experience with centralized processing on a much smaller scale, I should like to raise a few questions.

Since some criticism of the cataloging and classification was made by several of the member libraries, I feel that perhaps my reaction to the lack of personal and professional handling of many titles is justified. Although LC proof sheets are excellent, I should prefer that a check of their complete suitability as to classification and subject headings be made by a professional cataloger when the book has arrived. This would apply only to non-fiction, of course. We have found that this checking and a shelf-list file are invaluable in classification work if continuity is desired from year to year.

The problem of subject cross-references is an ever-present one, and the Center would seem to have chosen the least time-consuming method. The question arises, though, concerning the statement that “some libraries discard certain sets”. Since this heading, according to my understanding, has been checked in the LC list of subject headings and the stencil discarded, how will a member library obtain cross references later when the subject heading is added to its catalog? It would seem that a checklist of cross-references for each library might justify the time spent.

The complaint of too much time elapsing between ordering a title and receiving it would be increased for me if I were a member librarian by having the labeling and plastic jacketing still to do after the arrival of the book.

With this, I reach my only real criticism of the project, and it is not a criticism of the Center at all, but rather of the libraries participating. Such a centralized procedure cannot, in my opinion, be of real benefit, unless all libraries are willing to agree to a new way of doing the work. Mrs. Kenney spoke of compromises being made, and this must be done, of course. But if the participating libraries could have continued the cooperative spirit, so evidenced by their forming of the Center, to the extent of planning the processing as an entirely new system, the book could be completely prepared at the Center and no changes would be necessary on catalog cards. Additional files would continue to be needed by the larger libraries, but the making of these would not be a duplication of the Center’s processing as are the changes now being made.

The reading of Mrs. Kenney’s survey is a “must” for every administrator and for every supervisor of technical processing at least. It is exciting and thrilling to know that such a project is being developed, for it proves that cooperation in this area is possible and practical for most libraries. The future of the Center will be the concern of many interested librarians as they watch for its continued growth.—Elizabeth Adcock, Librarian, The Weld County Library, Greeley, Colorado.


Each time I try to begin a critical review of this book, I read Mr. Ash’s introduction and I find that he has explained why he didn’t do the thing I think he should have done. This is disarming.

It should be obvious that this list will be useful to reference librarians for the simple reason that it is far better than any other such list in existence. It does manage to catch in its net a great many topics that, in the past, were hard to locate.
But who will be served by such general headings as Economics, Law, Medicine, Mathematics, or Literature? No one that I can think of. Wouldn’t the volume have been more useful if a decision had been made in advance to omit general topics and then to have concentrated on a more detailed list—such as the Library of Congress Subject list? It is when one is hunting information on a specific problem that such a list becomes useful, not when one is investigating a large general subject area. For instance, I couldn’t remember which midwest university had acquired the Upton Sinclair collection recently. The Ash list listed the collection under Sinclair’s name. I looked for this not under the heading “American Literature” but under the specific name.

In future editions it would seem wise to cut out most of the general entries and to expand greatly the number of specific headings.

The problem of how to compare special collections in different libraries remains unsolved. For instance, under the heading “English Drama” the first two entries are for the Universities of Colorado and Michigan. One would expect the Michigan collection to be much larger than Colorado’s, but how much bigger? The University of Illinois Library is not listed, nor is Yale’s. Is one to assume that the Colorado English drama collection is larger or better than Illinois’ or Yale’s? Obviously not. But what then do the listings mean, and what good are they?

But something is better than nothing, and the Ash volume is a good start. Just how instructions to librarians can be drafted that will enable each librarian to know when to include or exclude what he thinks is a special collection is a problem that must be solved if guides of this type are to be as useful as they could be.—Ralph E. Ellsworth, Director University of Colorado Libraries, Boulder.


This attempt to list all nationally adopted standards relevant to the field of documentation covers the period from 1924 to 1957. The files of the Deutscher Normenausschuss, which contain the standards of all 34 countries belonging to the International Organization for Standardization (formerly to ISA), were used as the main source for the compilation. The first part of the bibliography lists standards by number within an arrangement by country. The title is followed, in most cases, by French, English, and German translations. The second part consists of the same standards in a systematical arrangement by the Universal Decimal Classification number. Since the UDC may be regarded as a standard classification, there is included a list of all complete, abridged, extended, and special editions of the UDC which are recognized by FID. It is unfortunate that the series code letters for the various standards are not given so that one may determine the ‘DIN’ is a standard of the Deutscher Normenausschuss or ‘MNOSZ’ is of the Magyar Szabványügyi Intézet. The boundaries of ‘Documentation’ very naturally constituted a problem. The bibliography, however, follows the definition accepted by the Federation; i.e., ‘All standards relating to collecting, arranging, and use of documents.’ In fact, the inclusion covers items such as catalogue cards, library furniture, stationery, microphotography, and many details of editing and bibliographical work.—D. C. W.
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INDEX TO THE CLASSED CATALOG OF THE 
BOSTON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, Based on 
The Library of Congress Classification 
1000 pages. $49.50

SUBJECT HEADINGS of The New York 
Public Library. 4775 pages. 5 vols. $195.00

MUSIC SUBJECT HEADINGS of The New 
York Public Library. 512 pages $25.00

THEATRE SUBJECT HEADINGS of The New 
York Public Library. 285 pages. $20.00

Dictionary Catalogs of Special Collections in the 
New York Public Library:

SLAVONIC, 25,800 pages, 26 vols. $910.00
JEWISH, 12,600 pages, 14 vols. $590.00
ORIENTAL, 16,000 pages, 16 vols. $960.00

We have available many other important card catalogs in 
book form. Please write to us for details.

A. K. HALL & CO.
97 OLIVER STREET  BOSTON 10, MASS.
SCARECROW BOOKS

New Titles

The American Counties
By Joseph Nathan Kane
1960 500 Pages Cloth $12.00

Here is another "Facts about . . ." book which will join the other two by this famous historian. As in his "Famous First Facts" and more recent "Facts About Presidents," so this new volume full of important and largely unknown facts about the 3067 Counties which comprise the fifty states of the Union. Vital information about History, Origin and founders are, for the first time, collected in a single volume.

A very much needed source of information for all State, County and Local Officials, as well for Educational and Public Libraries.

Bookman's Guide to Americana
By Norman J. Heard
1960 Second Edition 500 Pages $10.00

This eagerly awaited new edition has undergone considerable changes. Volume I, HISTORY and BIOGRAPHY, published in 1953, and VOLUME II, LITERATURE, published in 1956, are now combined in one volume which will increase their usefulness in establishing values.

The Literature of Liberal Adult Education, 1945-1957
By J. D. Mezirow and Dorothea Berry
For The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
1960 308 Pages $6.50

This bibliography on liberal adult education, including the major periodical literature from nada and England, provides an annotated de to a vast body of useful information.

THE SCARECROW PRESS, Inc.
Park Avenue South
Publishers of Professional Books for the Librarian

Other Outstanding Books

A Union List of Publications in Opaque Microforms
By Eva Maude Tilton
346 Pages Second Printing $7.50
The primary aim is to provide a broad subject approach.

Subject Classifying and Indexing of Libraries and Literature
By John McAlfe
347 Pages Second Printing $7.50
This book is based on twenty years' learning, teaching, and examining the subject.

Building Library Collections
By Mary Duncan Carter and Wallace Bonk
256 Pages Fourth Printing $6.00
This is the first book written on this subject in many years.

Personnel Administration in Libraries
By Kathleen B. Stebbins
304 Pages Third Printing $6.00
A valuable handbook for everyone responsible for a library staff—large or small.

Index to Plays in Collections—An Author and Title index to plays appearing in collections published between 1900 and 1956.
By John H. Ottemiller, Yale University
496 Pages Third Edition $9.50
Supplements will keep this work up to date.

American Historical Fiction
By A. T. Dickinson, Jr.
314 Pages Fifth Printing $6.50
Novels published from 1917 to 1956 dealing with American History are the subject for this bibliography.

Communication—A concise introduction to the history of the alphabet, writing, printing, books and libraries.
By E. D. Johnson
Second Revised and Enlarged Edition 1960 $5.00
A story of the gradual development of writing, of books and libraries.

American Bibliography—A preliminary Checklist 1801-1805 Inclusive
By Ralph R. Shaw and Richard H. Shoemaker
5 Volumes 1080 Pages $27.00
Checklists for the years 1806-1810 will be ready in the Fall of 1960.

THE SCARECROW PRESS, Inc.
Park Avenue South
Publishers of Professional Books for the Librarian

New York 10, N. Y.
CLR GRANTS FOR CATALOGING CONFERENCES

The Council on Library Resources, Inc., has announced a grant of $95,410 to the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) towards meeting the costs of an international conference on cataloging practices. The conference will be held at UNESCO House, Paris, during the spring or autumn of 1961, under the auspices of IFLA's Working Group on the Coordination of Cataloging Principles. Mr. Frank C. Francis of the British Museum is Chairman of the Group. Conference deliberations will be aimed at securing agreement on basic principles for the entry of printed works in alphabetical catalogs arranged by authors and titles.

Arrangements for the conference are being made by an Organizing Committee, of which Mr. A. H. Chaplin, British Museum, is Executive Secretary. As reported in the Winter 1960 issue of LRTS (vol. 4, no. 1, p. 88), the Organizing Committee was appointed at the conclusion of a preliminary meeting of the Working Group in London in July 1959, a meeting also supported by the Council on Library Resources.

CLR has also announced a grant to the American Library Association to enable it to invite the members of the Organizing Committee for the 1961 conference to attend the sessions of the Institute on Catalog Code Revision to be held in Montreal in June 1960, as announced elsewhere in this issue.

CATALOGING RULES AVAILABLE


According to the announcement, this publication brings together all of the additions and changes in the ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries (Chicago, 1949) and the Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress (Washington, 1949) which have been jointly adopted by the ALA and LC since Supplement, 1949-51 was issued in 1952. Except for music, microprint materials, and one rule dealing with entry for motion pictures, however, it does not include rules or changes in rules for nonbook materials. The additional material contained in this publication has appeared previously in issues of Cataloging Service, a bulletin issued by LC's Processing Department. The title has been changed to indicate more clearly the scope of its contents.

NEW INDEX ANNOUNCED

G. K. Hall & Co. is planning to publish an author index to the Psychological Index (1894-1935) and Psychological Abstracts (1927 to date) cumulated into one alphabet. This single index has been prepared and maintained in the Psychology Library of Columbia University by clipping the author entries from the original issues of the two journals and pasting them onto individual cards which are then filed in one alphabet. The Index will be reproduced in a limited edition in book form in 8 volumes of about 2,000 pages each, bound in library buckram. The prepublication price is $265.00 per set. Orders and inquiries should be sent to G. K. Hall & Co., 97 Oliver Street, Boston 10, Massachusetts.