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BECAUSE the Editor of Library Resources and Technical Services had been herself involved in the CIS experiment, she asked her Assistant Editor for Cataloging to take responsibility for obtaining a review of the Library of Congress published report of the experiment. (Library of Congress. Processing Department. The Cataloging-in-Source Experiment. A Report to the Librarian of Congress. Washington, 1960. 199p.). To this he agreed. What follows is, therefore, entirely of his doing.

Because the subject is important and because the Report is controversial, it seemed to the Assistant Editor that a single review would not be enough. Cataloging-in-Source is of great importance to many different kinds of libraries. He therefore asked for reviews from representatives of five different kinds of libraries: (1) school libraries, (2) small public libraries, (3) large public libraries, (4) university libraries, and (5) state libraries. He is glad of this opportunity publicly to thank all five authors for their generous response and the careful thinking which went into their work.

Finally, the Assistant Editor has taken advantage of the privilege allowed all editors and added The Last Word—P.S.D.

School Libraries

To a librarian whose familiarity with LC cataloging has been limited to ordering, adapting, and using the cards, the report of the Cataloging-in-Source Experiment is a most enlightening document. The behind-the-scenes activities within the Card Division of the Library of Congress, the personnel involved, and the intricacies of descriptive and subject cataloging are interestingly revealed, along with the detailed and carefully prepared report of the Cataloging-in-Source experiment.

As a preliminary to the explanation of the project, the report traces the historical background of the concept of printing cataloging information in the book. It is interesting to note that this concept dates back to 1870, followed a few years later by the suggestion of sending out with each book published slips containing the catalog entry. While these early experiments were not particularly significant, it is noteworthy that nearly a century ago consideration was given to the problem of alleviating the work load of the cataloger.
This report of the Cataloging-in-Source experiment traces in detail the purpose, scope, and method of implementing the project through its various phases. The reader cannot help being impressed by the careful planning, the attention to minute details of timing, the skillfully executed routines in the chain of operations involved in the experiment. The cooperation of the publishers is also noteworthy. It is most commendable that "despite the tight operating schedule, the Library was unwilling that speed should be allowed to interfere with the quality of the cataloging." Librarians who availed themselves of the Cataloging-in-Source were probably not aware of the numerous and complex problems which arose and the many obstacles which had to be overcome in cataloging books before publication. Reading about these problems gives one a keener appreciation of the experiment as a whole.

Following the explanation of the experiment, the report summarizes theoretical arguments for and against a permanent full-scale Cataloging-in-Source program, and concludes that from the standpoint of the publishers as well as the Library of Congress it is not feasible. One very compelling factor is the cost to the Library of Congress, which would be from $250,000 to $300,000 per year and $750,000 to the Library and publishers together. Undoubtedly this cost could not be justified, nor could many of the technical considerations, as well as the increase in price of books, which would be the inevitable result.

The suggestion made by the ALA Cataloging Policy and Research Committee that the Cataloging-in-Source entry might be reduced to the elements of author, classification number, and subject headings would seem an excellent alternative. For school librarians this information would be sufficient in most instances, and would save considerable time in cataloging. An objection which school librarians have to LC cards is that unnecessary information is given, with resultant confusion on the part of students who use the catalog. Furthermore, it is open to question as to whether it is more expedient to type cards than to spend the necessary time in ordering and adapting LC cards. It is safe to say that the vast majority of school librarians prefer to order Wilson cards whenever possible. In cataloging books for which Wilson cards are not available, it would be a great help to have the most essential cataloging information printed in the book. However, as the report points out, this, too, involves many problems from the standpoint of the publisher.

In answer to the question as to whether this essential information "can be provided through some less costly method for a number of titles sufficient to meet the needs of most libraries," the report comments upon the Publishers' Weekly plan of printing the catalog entry for the books included in the "Weekly Record." This plan, which has now been in operation for several months, has met with enthusiastic response from librarians, including those in school libraries. It incorporates most of the objectives of Cataloging-in-Source. Since the entry is made from the published book rather than the page proofs, the margin for error is greatly reduced. Furthermore, it is just as satisfactory to copy from the
periodical as from the book itself. The SACAP plan, recently inaugurated by Bro-Dart Industries, would seem to offer many advantages to large public libraries; but the cost of this service would be prohibitive so far as most school libraries are concerned. However, it would be a great boon to school systems which provide centralized cataloging.

Part II of the report, dealing with the Consumer Reaction Survey, describes in some detail the views of librarians in various types of libraries regarding the effectiveness of the experiment. While school librarians in general desire a much simpler type of cataloging geared to the needs of children and young people, they have found the LC entry to be helpful as a starting place. They are in hearty agreement with the statement that “it does establish an entry acceptable to most and does give the scope and coverage of the work. Adaptation is far simpler and less time-consuming than doing the work from the beginning.” The teacher-librarian in a small elementary school can make use of Cataloging-in-Source particularly for books without Wilson cards available, if she is to do cataloging with very little time, training, or experience. Unfortunately the report makes no mention of the good elementary school libraries, with well qualified librarians in charge—and there are many through the country. According to the report, the high school librarian would also be helped by Cataloging-in-Source by having the catalog entry available for copying, with or without adaptations. Since the cost of adequate machine duplicating equipment or photographic equipment would be prohibitive, this copying would of necessity be done by a typist. As far as school librarians are concerned, their greatest need is centralized cataloging for the schools within a given system. Great strides have been made and are currently being made in this direction. As previously stated, Cataloging-in-Source would greatly facilitate the work of a central cataloging center.

A criticism of Cataloging-in-Source, voiced by some school librarians, has been that very few of the 1203 titles cataloged were of the type generally purchased for schools. For this reason some validity of the experiment is lacking with regard to schools. Another consideration not touched upon in the report was the fact that many librarians order LC and/or Wilson cards simultaneously with the books. Not until the book arrived did the librarian know that it contained a Cataloging-in-Source entry. If the project were to be continued, some advance notice in book reviewing or book listing sources of the availability of cataloging-in-Source would be highly desirable.

The consensus of the Consumer Reaction Survey was that Cataloging-in-Source is “wanted, would be used, and is needed.” This seems anticlimactic, in view of the fact that the Library of Congress has definitely recommended that it be discontinued. However, the report closes, except for a comprehensive appendix, on a very optimistic note. It expresses the hope and dream that some day libraries will be provided with a “Cataloger’s Camera” and machine copying equipment that will make reproduction easy, that all published books will be cataloged by the Library of Congress, and all catalog codes in the world will agree. Perhaps we shall
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live to see that dream become a reality because Cataloging-in-Source has given it the necessary impetus—Mary Louise Mann, Head Librarian, North Central High School, Indianapolis, and Chairman of the School Library Technical Services Committee.

Small Public Libraries

Although readers may be annoyed to find the objectives of the CIS project reiterated in this paper, it is precisely these objectives that affect the value of the project to the small library. The definition of the small library here used is not that of those reasonably affluent units with budgets in excess of $25,000 although below $50,000. "Small library" as used here refers to those libraries that have struggled for years at less than $5,000 per year, and are now, somehow, reaching the promised land of "nearly $10,000." It may come as a surprise to brethren in the metropoli-
tan areas that people in the hinterlands read book reviews, see television, and are likely to request books as soon as they are published, if not before. The librarian is concerned with getting books to the public faster than is possible with current cataloging practices. He (more often, she) is also concerned with book selection, ordering, and censorship; he is also somewhat interested in reference, circulation, readers' advisory services, public relations, reports and personnel (or the lack thereof). Somewhere along the line, this matter of getting the books out of the boxes and onto the shelves (better yet, into the patron's hands) must be attended to. It is an annoying, time-consuming and time-wasting process, and furthermore, it requires concentration and thought, and, finally, decisions—is the extra subject heading worth the extra time in typing? Will people ever look there? Where might they look? No matter; the books must be cataloged before they go into circulation, because once they begin to circulate, heaven only knows when they will come back to the library and stay long enough to have all processing completed. And since Mrs. Pfleegel has been on the librarian's neck for this particular book for three weeks (or months) it had better get to her soon. Cataloging-in-Source does make it easier to get the book out faster.

The high cost of cataloging is of little consequence to the small library. Rather, the low cost of cataloging is the result of cataloging's being treated as a step-child, and low cost is directly related to the low quality of cataloging of individual titles and the ineffectuality of the catalog as a whole. The miracle is that the catalog is of any value at all, when so many other considerations take precedence. Obviously, the more time spent in reaching a decision, the higher the cost of cataloging any individual title. More important, however, would seem to be cataloging quality, for in the sub-standard library, time simply cannot be devoted to really good cataloging except at the expense of other services. The price of cataloging in such libraries is therefore often expressed in terms of quality and subsequent value in the public card catalog.

Standardization in entry and classification is closely related to the needs for speed and low cost. The first rule of cataloging in the small
library is expediency. The exigency of demand must be considered above all else. Therefore "get a number on it, and a pocket if possible, and give it to the patron." The results of this policy are probably familiar to most catalogers. Strange and wonderful things happen, with classification numbers being assigned to fiction and non-fiction titles being entered as novels. Reclassification is often the price of good public relations in the small library.

It follows then, that Cataloging-in-Source might have been the answer to the cataloging problems of the small library. It would have enabled the librarian to get the books out quickly, accurately, and at far less cost in time. More important, the cost in doing books over again might be eliminated. Despite what may sometimes seem a capricious approach to cataloging, the librarian in the small operation is usually as eager for accuracy as the full-time cataloger in the large department of a metropolitan system. It is frustrating for the small town librarian to discover, months after reaching a painful decision, that L.C. has put some book elsewhere and in a place that now seems perfectly obvious, and the only right place for it. The need for reclassification may nag for weeks or months, until the task is either forgotten or completed. He could do the job immediately, of course, except that among the seventy-five books just arrived from the jobber there are ten that people have been pestering him about for weeks; they must be attended to first. So the cycle repeats itself.

A great deal has been written about federations of libraries, with centralization of processing and purchasing. Enlightened librarians in small as well as large libraries pay lip service to the idea. Some may even be ardently in favor of such plans. It is possible, however, that the principle of autonomy is being defended blindly and bitterly. Boards and librarians, as well as communities, are likely to resist agreements that would commit them to financing projects not under their control, and to paying salaries to persons not directly dependent on the local library. Whether such attitudes are or are not reasonable is not the issue. The point is that Cataloging-in-Source would serve the end of providing quality cataloging promptly and at low cost, while obviating such agreements, at least, for the time being.

In his report on Cataloging-in-Source, John W. Cronin, Director of the Processing Department at the Library of Congress, concludes that (p. 52) "neither a full nor a partial extension of the Cataloging-in-Source program is desirable." He goes on to indicate that the Publishers' Weekly and SACAP programs might serve the same ends more economically. This is probable. However, SACAP has some of those impersonal characteristics which the small library, with or without reason, may tend to fear, while Publishers' Weekly leaves something to be desired from the viewpoint of speed (and in some cases, accuracy of reproduction of the copy provided). In addition, while the value of Publishers' Weekly to the librarian has been immeasurably enhanced by the inclusion of cataloging data, some poor souls (municipal library budgets in some places are

Volume 4, Number 4, Fall 1960
below $1,000) may still feel that they cannot afford to subscribe. These aids are but poor substitutes for Cataloging-in-Source.

It is just as well perhaps, that Cataloging-in-Source should remain a dream. If it should become a reality, it could well set back the cause of improved library service by several years, merely by delaying realization that wasteful duplication of effort may occur numerous times in a single 100 square-mile area, and that federation of libraries with centralization of technical services is the only real answer.

Cataloging-in-Source is rich food for daydreaming, however. For the one-man library: imagine being able to check in a shipment of books and completing both checking and cataloging in one operation, even to typing the cards as the checking progresses! For a somewhat larger library, with two or three professionals and a few clerical assistants, a manual of local practice in regard to L.C. entry and subject headings might be worked out. Checking and cataloging could become purely routine, save for those few exceptional cases which are always present. In the larger system, the cataloging department might find time to correct some of those horrible anachronisms in the catalog that have been ignored for years because no one had time before. In the meantime, however, how does one resolve the question of whether the book on the Frasch process of sulphur extraction belongs in 538.2 or in 546.7?—W. J. LeKernec, Director, Free Public Library, Somerville, N. J.

**Large Public Libraries**

It is difficult to read this report without experiencing a sense of professional pride in the superb manner with which this experiment was conducted by the cataloging staff of the Library of Congress. It is equally difficult, after examining the report, to refrain from commenting on the cooperative spirit demonstrated by the publishers participating in this inquiry and by the many libraries that were involved in the Consumer Reaction Survey. No small commendation is due, also, the Council on Library Resources for providing the necessary funds to make the study possible.

As a representative of the large public library, the writer of this review is compelled to concur in the conclusions reached by the Library of Congress that a full-scale program of Cataloging-in-Source is not feasible. This is indeed regrettable, but realistically considered it is clear that the results of the experiment could not have been any different than what they were. The basic difficulty is that a book cannot be cataloged adequately until it has been endowed with all of the physical properties of a book. To attempt to catalog a book from galley or even page proofs is to ignore some of the fundamental bases of cataloging.

The high proportion (48%) of discrepancies found between catalog entries and books as published plainly invalidates the usefulness of Cataloging-in-Source from the standpoint of the large public library. Moreover, it would be difficult to reduce the number of such discrepancies because they are not the result of a lack of cataloging skill but rather a
product of the limitations inherent in the nature of the experiment. The publishing industry with its rigid production schedules and last minute changes makes Cataloging-in-Source an unattainable goal for all practical purposes.

Another major disappointment of the experiment is the inability of certain publishers to use the LC typographical format thus removing the possibility of making a photographic copy of the catalog entry. Without this feature, a great deal of the attractiveness of Cataloging-in-Source is lost.

Recommendation two of the ALA Cataloging Policy and Research Committee proposing a modified program of Cataloging-in-Source to include the main entry, subject entries and classification is a noble effort to salvage some gain from the experiment. But it is just a half measure, and as such it is questionable whether it can be considered seriously.

Since Cataloging-in-Source is not feasible, what about the alternatives? Here the picture is far more encouraging. The Publishers' Weekly plan to include cataloging information supplied by LC for the PW "Weekly Record" together with the monthly publication of BPR promises to be a boon to large public libraries. Since LC cards must be adapted before they can be incorporated into the catalogs of most of the large public libraries, the alternative offered through this plan could result in providing libraries with most of the advantages claimed for the Cataloging-in-Source program.

Administered jointly by LC and Publishers' Weekly, this plan should prove beneficial both to libraries producing their own cards as well as to those which purchase LC cards. For the former the cataloging information will be invaluable; for the latter it will mean that more LC cards will be procurable and be made available at an earlier date.

While this plan is in operation, it is important not to neglect the "All-the-Books" program. Every effort must be made to intensify this campaign so that every publisher recognizes the urgent need to send copies of their publications to LC on or before publication date. With speedy processing at LC, the goal of providing the necessary cataloging information for all new American books as they come off the presses could be achieved through the columns of Publishers' Weekly and BPR.

At this writing, it is a bit premature to comment on the SACAP proposal announced by Bro-Dart Industries in Library Journal of December 15, 1959. If it develops as planned, however, it can be of considerable assistance to large public libraries.—Alex Ladenson, Assistant Librarian—Acquisition and Preparation, Chicago Public Library.

University Libraries

A little more than a year after the last book was cataloged in the exciting "Cataloging-in-Source" experiment financed by the Council on Library Resources and carried out by the Library of Congress, this eagerly-awaited report is now issued. It consists of two major parts, supported by nearly 100 pages of documents and statistics.
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The first part of the report evaluates the experiment from the viewpoint of the Library of Congress; the second part presents the reactions of the “consumers.” The whole is preceded by a preface, in which the Librarian of Congress declares “that a modified Cataloging-in-Source program could not be justified in terms of utility versus cost and that the Library of Congress should not seek funds for a further experiment along these lines” (p. vii) and concludes with the recommendation of the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee, “that a national program of Cataloging-in-Source be undertaken immediately by the Library of Congress, with as complete publisher cooperation as it is possible to secure” (p. 97). That such completely opposing conclusions should be drawn from the same data is almost incredible.

The view of the Librarian of Congress is echoed by John W. Cronin, Director of the Processing Department, who ends the first part of the report with the sad words, “There should be no further experiments with Cataloging-in-Source” (p. 52). The recommendation of the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee is supported by the Consumer Reaction Survey, the results of which are summed up by Esther Piercy, Director of the Survey, with the statement that “the overwhelming response was that we need GIS service and as soon as possible. It would contribute to the library profession, to individual libraries, and to the whole book world” (p. 94).

The arguments advanced against a permanent full-scale program of Cataloging-in-Source do indeed appear devastating. The chief objection is “the very high cost of the proposed program to both publishers and the Library of Congress” (p. vi). This cost, according to Mr. Cronin (p. 47) might be $750,000 a year or more—a staggering figure to be sure. The publishers, however, when interviewed at the conclusion of the experiment, generally indicated that they were not discouraged by the cost, most of them agreeing “that they would be willing to cooperate in a continuing Cataloging-in-Source program, if it provided a useful service to libraries” (p. 34-35). As for the libraries, “almost everyone . . . expressed unqualified willingness” to support the movement financially (p. 58).

The second objection to the program is “the disruptions of publishing schedules” (p. vii). Publishers agreed that “scheduling was the most serious problem to be faced” (p. 38). Indeed, it was not only the publishers' schedules which were interrupted. The work schedules of those at the Library of Congress who took part in the experiment were also greatly disturbed. Of the suggestions for remedying this situation, the one made by some of the publishers that catalogers work from galley proof instead of from page proof appears to offer the best solution, by greatly reducing the need for speed in cataloging. This would mean that it would be necessary to eliminate the collation from the entry, at least for some time to come. I believe, however, that further experiment could solve the collation problem and make it feasible to print complete entries in many books.

The third argument against a full Cataloging-in-Source program is
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the “high degree of unreliability of catalog entries based on texts not in their final form” (p. vi). This unreliability has turned out to be fatal to the program as carried out in the experiment, but it is by no means fatal to the basic idea of printing catalog entries in books. By far the greatest number of inaccuracies observed in the entries printed in books during the experimental period occurred in the collation. I believe most of the difficulties encountered here would evaporate in time, when publishers have been made more aware of the importance, for cataloging purposes, of items which seem to them inconsequential. But until that time comes, libraries will be more than willing to settle for Cataloging-in-Source without collation, since that element of the entry can readily be supplied by the library from the book in hand. Last minute changes in the title page have also occasionally caused difficulty, but this too, is a matter which can be taken care of when publishers realize the importance of transmitting to the cataloging agency title page information in its final form.

Lastly, it is maintained that Cataloging-in-Source is inadvisable because of the “low degree of utility which would result from the copying of these entries, because of the variations in their format as printed, their unreliability, and the need for adapting them to the requirements of individual libraries” (p. vi). Quite the contrary. The second recommendation of the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee is that “if curtailment of cataloging information should prove necessary, priority for inclusion of information be given to those items not immediately obvious in the publication itself... It is recognized that a great many libraries either adapt subject headings and classification numbers supplied by the Library of Congress, or use entirely different subject headings and classification numbers. Even for such libraries the inclusion of this information in publications saves time-consuming study of the book” (p. 98).

This Committee also concludes from the Consumer Reaction Survey that “those libraries which will benefit most from a Cataloging-in-Source program are the thousands of public and school libraries whose acquisitions include the highest proportion of American imprints and which lack professional staff and bibliographical tools” (p. 98). As a matter of fact, in making a rough break-down of the libraries visited and reported by the Survey as of June 1, 1959, the Head of the Processing Department, in his 12th monthly report to the Librarian of Congress, estimated that of a total of 75 college and university libraries interviewed, 45 expressed unqualified approval of the Cataloging-in-Source program and 25 expressed qualified approval, while only 5 indicated indifferent or negative reactions. I think it is clear that, if conclusions were to be based only on the limited experiment just finished, university libraries would generally be lukewarm in their enthusiasm, but looking upon the experiment as a small and imperfect beginning of a vast and extensive project these libraries can expect to derive significant benefits from it.

Of inestimable service, especially for the Acquisition Department and for interlibrary loan, would be the bibliographical standardization of
entries in publishers' announcements, bibliographies, reviewing media, etc., which can be expected to result from a well-established Cataloging-in-Source program. In fact, this standardization alone would make the program worth while for most university libraries. For the Catalog Department, even assuming that the entries are printed without collation, the appearance of the correct entry and the title and imprint would mean that clerks could search for proof slips without requiring the supervision of professional catalogers. For libraries like the University of Illinois, in which many government documents are cataloged, author entries printed in these documents would save a great deal of searching time to determine the proper entry. In case a book is received before its proof slip, the entry could be copied at once, thus making book and cards available in the shortest possible time with the least expenditure of time and effort on the part of professional catalogers. There will always be plenty of books published outside the Cataloging-in-Source program to keep them busy. With good professional catalogers becoming as scarce as kings, it is getting more and more important that their skills not be squandered. Ideally, no book should be cataloged more than once. Of course, this ideal will never be reached, but an extensive Cataloging-in-Source program will go far toward approximating it.

It has been suggested (p. vii, 48) that the benefits of Cataloging-in-Source could be provided to most libraries by some less costly method, and that the recently inaugurated practice of Publishers’ Weekly of printing cataloging entries in its “Weekly Record” of new books and the cumulating of these entries in the monthly American Book Publishing Record might be this less costly method. But, useful as this service is, it has the same fault for which Cataloging-in-Source is condemned, without any compensating gain. That is, these publications, like the Cataloging-in-Source entries, provide “cataloging information which would be checked, adapted, and then used as the partial basis for an individual library’s own catalog cards” (p. 45) without offering the inestimable advantage of an entry directly at hand, one for which time-consuming search need not be made in outside sources.

As for the complicated SACAP plan of Bro-Dart, it would appear to offer some advantages to smaller libraries. It is doubtful whether it could be made to fit into the order and cataloging routines of a large university library in which current American publications constitute a relatively small part of total acquisitions. Like the Publishers’ Weekly plan, it lacks the chief virtue of Cataloging-in-Source, viz., an entry printed in the book which will stay with it forever making it unnecessary ever, at any time, to do any searching to determine the author, the classification, or the subject headings.

As the Cataloging-in-Source program extends its coverage to more and more American publications and finally to the publications of foreign countries also, the usefulness of the entries will be enormously increased. Such an ideal situation is still in the far-distant future, but it can be attained—or at least approximated—when everyone concerned
realizes how useful the service can be. Progress in this direction must necessarily be slow. If there is one lesson more than any other to be learned from the recently concluded Cataloging-in-Source experiment it is that complicated programs involving the cooperation of many different people and organizations, can be perfected only after a long period of intelligent thought and planning plus a certain amount of trial and error. Athena sprang full-panoplied from the head of Zeus; almost everything else has to grow from small beginnings to maturity. We tried to reach the top of the mountain in one great leap, and we did not make it. Now we must start at the bottom again and climb more slowly, a step at a time, working out the problems gradually as they arise. It can be done in time just as the publication of the National Union Catalog, after having frequently been abandoned as unattainable, was eventually accomplished, to the enormous benefit of the entire library profession. The problems attending the perfection of a Cataloging-in-Source program are different, to be sure, but they are no more insoluble. Perhaps the start should be made with the government publishers in Washington, where communication problems would be reduced to a minimum. After efficient procedures are worked out with this group, then it will be time to expand the operation, gradually meeting new problems and solving them before attacking others.

Meanwhile, the library profession owes a large debt of gratitude not only to the Council on Library Resources for financing the operation, but also to everyone who had a part in conducting this noble experiment; to the members of the Consumer Reaction Survey, to the cooperating publishers, and especially to the Library of Congress. The idea must not die.—Marian Harman, University of Illinois Library, Urbana.

The State Library.

My comments on the Report of the Cataloging-in Source Experiment will deal first with one aspect of this project which interests me very much and which, as far as I can determine, has been given little or no attention. About half the books acquired each year by the library in which I work are second-hand books, most of which are purchased from the catalogs of English and American second-hand booksellers. The checking of the entries in these catalogs against the library's own catalogs, order file, etc., is a costly and time-consuming process, for these booksellers' catalogs are not the best examples of what a catalog ought to be. One evening recently I picked up William Warner Bishop's The Backs of Books and happened upon his account of the making and checking of booksellers' catalogs. His description was so superior to mine that I am including it here in place of what I had written. Dr. Bishop wrote:

"One of the favorite arguments of certain folk who think cataloging an expensive and much over-lauded luxury of the profession is that booksellers and auctioneers make perfectly intelligible catalogs at a very low cost. Now I have been checking and searching such catalogs for many years, and I venture to say that as a rule they are the worst made product of the
cataloger's art. Their careless entries, their suppressions of names, their inaccurate proof-reading render it almost impossible at times to discover the fact that you really have the book advertised. It requires a specially developed detective ability to unearth the actual book hidden beneath their frequently seductive entries. Every large library has paid dearly for the errors of the book-sellers' 'simple' cataloging. And every such library develops a set of assistants who can 'search' the catalog for alluring items to the great benefit of the library's purse. You can not, then, do other work (and a large share of reference work) successfully unless you are particularly well versed not only in cataloging as conducted in your own library, but as it has been practiced by generations of book-sellers and bibliographers.

No person who has dealt with these catalogs needs any further description of the problem. If these catalogs were better prepared, searchers would not waste time searching the card catalog under non-existent names, under the wrong form or spelling of names, under Smith, or Smith, J., or in looking for serials masquerading as separates, for parts of books, for catch-titles. Other examples will come to mind quickly.

If the entries, titles, series notes, collections, etc. in second-hand book catalogs could only be taken from the Cataloging-in-Source information to be found in books which had received this "treatment"! To me, this "retrospective" value of Cataloging-in-Source could become, in time, one of the most important results of the project for the university and research libraries which buy so many books in the second-hand book market. Librarians cannot expect booksellers to observe the intricacies of cataloging rules, understood only vaguely by most librarians. Nor can they expect booksellers to hire professional librarians to catalog the great mass of material which appears in second-hand bookstores. No dealer could afford to do this for the great bulk of the books he sold for he could not compete in price with those who did not. And I am afraid that he could not persuade most libraries to pay a higher price for his books because of super-cataloging. But it does not seem unreasonable to assume that most of these booksellers, independent individuals though they be, would be willing and able to take the Cataloging-in-Source information from the verso of the title-page and use it in their catalogs. There would be relatively little evidence of the value of this by-product for some years to come. Within a generation, however, libraries buying second-hand books should see a considerable improvement in the accuracy of booksellers' catalogs and a corresponding decrease in acquisition work and in errors caused by inexact cataloging.

The reader of this Report wonders from time to time whether the writers of Part I and Part II are discussing the same experiment. On the last page of Part I the Director of the Library of Congress Processing Department concludes that "neither a full nor a partial Cataloging-in-Source program is desirable" and that "there should be no further experiments." On the first page of Part II the Director of the Consumer Reaction Survey reports that to the question "Is Cataloging-in-Source needed and would it be utilized? the overwhelming response was "Yes".
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Of course, those who answered "Yes" in Part II had not read Part I of the Report and so were not fully aware of the difficulties and costs of the project. It seems likely, however, that the majority would have voted "Yes" even if they had known all the facts. Does this mean that they were willing to pay the hundreds of thousands of dollars the LC says would be required to carry on this work? Had they stopped to figure out how much this would add to the cost of books? Would the savings of individual libraries be great enough to warrant the cost or could this money be better used in improving library service in some other way? Did the consuming librarians welcome Cataloging-in-Source primarily because it appeared to be free, or almost free, the work involved fell on someone else, and it couldn't do any harm and might be useful? While the answers to some of these questions may be found in the Report, I am not at all sure that the consumers who were interviewed were familiar enough with the whole picture to make really valid decisions on the worth of the project as compared to its cost.

There are several parts of the Report which interest me and which I want to mention briefly. One is the cost of carrying on the work of Cataloging-in-Source. It is not hard to understand that the special procedures, correspondence, postage, etc., necessary when cataloging is on a rush basis from page proof would make the work more expensive than if these books were cataloged under the regular routines. Much is also made of the fact that this work must be done under pressure and that the catalogers don't seem to be able to do their best work this way. The "rush" slips seem to have caused the catalogers to worry. Apparently, a cataloger who could do 10 titles a day if he didn't have to meet a deadline could do only 8 a day if he had to be sure to get them done. Is it not reasonable to suppose that if catalogers were regularly doing this type of work, they would come to do it without a feeling of rush and worry and would be able to do it as routinely as they now do their "regular" cataloging?

It is not clear to me just why Cataloging-in-Source should require so many more catalogers than are now needed to catalog the same books after they appear in bound form. Nor do I understand why permanent field offices are needed all over the country, why a traveling representative is needed, and why so many more persons would be needed in LC itself. When the routines for this kind of cataloging are well established and understood by all concerned, I cannot see why the cost need be so much greater than at present.

It is estimated that a full scale program cover 30,000 titles a year. Would the program be just as acceptable and satisfactory to the great majority of libraries if a few thousand of these titles were omitted—such as titles of marginal value to libraries either because of their content or distribution, titles from the many publishers who issue only a very few volumes a year, etc.? Is complete coverage necessary to make the program desirable?

The fact that the cataloging information printed in the books was so often wrong or incomplete is given as one reason for not continuing
the project. The three really important things on the catalog card are
the author entry, the added entries (both subject and other) and the
classification number. There seems to be no reason why these three can-
not be determined as well from proof sheets as from finished books. Assum-
ing that publishers and authors have no objection to including the
second and third of these in the book itself, we have left the author entry.
Some publishers and authors do not want their authors’ full names or
dates printed in the books; there seems to be no way to overcome this
objection. Would it be practical to indicate by an asterisk, or some other
symbol, that the entry is not complete and thus warn the librarian using
the Cataloging-in-Source information? Would it be possible to indicate
authors’ dates by some sort of code number which could be printed in-
conspicuously at the bottom of the card? (btac—would mean 1904)
The fact that the collation was often wrong and that titles were
sometimes altered seems relatively unimportant except to libraries which
accept blindly everything on a printed card.
I could not help feeling that the first part of this Report tended to
bring out the bad in the experiment more than the good, that it put the
costs of a continuous program at a pretty high level, and that it sug-
gested the creation of a whole new organization of chiefs, sub-chiefs, co-
ordinators, clerks, messengers, etc. This last point is discouraging, and if
Parkinson does not have a law to fit it, he should. On the other hand, it
does not seem fair to imply, as some have done, that LC just doesn’t want
to get mixed up with a difficult project. The record of the Library of
Congress in both beginning and taking over new projects and new ideas
is good. It hardly seems fair to assume that this library would recommend
dropping a project it thought really valuable to libraries solely because
it does not want to assume the responsibility of operating it. I do not
know why there cannot be an honest difference of opinion.—Ray O.
Hummel, Jr., Virginia State Library, Richmond.
The Last Word

“I am compelled to the conclusion that a modified Cataloging-in-
Source program could not be justified in terms of utility versus cost and
that the Library of Congress should not seek funds for a further experi-
ment along these lines.” The drastic words of the Librarian of Congress
(p. vii) are backed by the Library’s Director of the Processing Depart-
ment: “There should be no further experiments with Cataloging-in-
Source” (p. 52).

They came to bury Caesar, not to praise him. But did they have a
corpse?
Broadly speaking, all five of the LRTS reviewers are disappointed
that the LC experiment failed; but only one agrees with the LC decision
that the idea is dead.
Perhaps it is only because I find it hard to give up a dream old as
cataloging itself. Be that as it may. With these four dissenting reviewers
Further experimentation might consider one or more of a number of possibilities. Among these we may note three:

1. Establishment of a central cataloging office in New York City which would not interfere with LC routines and which would make communication with many publishers much easier.

2. Cataloging from regular proof sheets with no attempt to give collation. Collation can be mighty tricky even in a regular book, and it is, I suspect, little used. Certainly those libraries which wanted it could add it in whatever form they wished.

3. Abandonment of the “card idea.” The “card idea” was a sort of perfectionist cataloger notion anyway—and like all perfectionist ideas it had lost sight of the real problem. Author entry, added entries, subject headings, call numbers—these are the costly items in cataloging. And they could every one be sent along with the manuscript to the printer. With author entry, added entries, and call number given in the printed book somewhere, any intelligent clerical help could construct a master card—and use the cataloger’s camera to produce it in quantity.

The “Trouble with Harry” is not that he won’t stay buried. It is only that he is not yet dead.

The LC report is an unexpected abdication of leadership by what we had come to look to as the National Library.

Is the Library of Congress also the Library of the Nation? This is an administrative decision which must be faced by every Librarian of Congress. The present trend seems to be toward what would be strictly a Library of Congress serving only the Congress.

But is there a real distinction?
Can the Library of Congress be the Library of Congress without being also the Library of the Nation? Can the Library of Congress really serve the Congress effectively without serving also every Congressman’s constituents—i.e., every user or potential user of libraries in the country?

The distinction is impossible theoretically; it also goes against history. Ever since Herbert Putnam became Librarian of Congress, the Library of Congress has vigorously led and served the American Library world. To talk of cataloging only: LC men like Hanson and Martel led the great developments of the early half of the century, and LC cards brought them into every library. Then, when it became obvious that cataloging had gone too far in the direction of elaboration, LC led the revolt. Osborn’s “Crisis” written with LC fresh in mind, the famous LC Studies of descriptive cataloging, the LC Rules for descriptive cataloging, the Lubetzky Report and Mr. Lubetzky’s work on the new code—all of these are milestones in that revolt.

It is to be hoped that the LC report on CIS does not mark the beginning of a break in this tradition of distinguished service.—Paul S. Dunkin, Professor, Graduate School of Library Service, Rutgers University, and Assistant Editor for Cataloging, LRTS.

[Latest developments: The Cataloging and Classification Section wrote the Librarian of Congress, asking if a partial program as recommended by the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee were possible (see the RTSD President’s Report in this issue). The Librarian of Congress regretfully answered that, because of accumulated work, a “desperate” shortage of space, commitments, etc., the “Library of Congress at the present time finds itself in a position in which it is quite impossible for it to consider undertaking any additional projects.”]

**REVIEWS OF MICROPUBLISHED PROJECTS**

From time to time LRTS will publish reviews of new micropublication projects of interest to librarians. The reviews will be prepared by scholars in appropriate subject fields, who will be asked to comment on the usefulness of the work in the particular form of microreproduction, on the organization of the material, and on the helpfulness of indexes, catalog cards, or other bibliographic controls planned for the project. When appropriate, photographic technicains and librarians will provide supplemental reviews concerning specialized questions of optical quality, adequacy of cataloging, etc. The reviews will be prepared under the general direction of Dr. Gustave A. Harrer, Assistant Director of the Stanford University Library.
The Future*

VERNER W. CLAPP, President
Council of Library Resources, Inc.
Washington, D. C.

TO DESCRIBE the future, I must refer briefly to the past.

The work of catalogers became necessary only when the plethora of books made it impossible for even a learned man to know the literature of his field.

But when the time came to find a substitute for knowledge and memory, there was no single answer. Several methods were tried.

Thomas Jefferson, for example, used classification as the finding device; he concluded that he could most easily identify a book if it were placed in a systematic arrangement with other books. He set little store by entry; any sort of identifying catch-title, such as “Smith on Warts,” was satisfactory to him.

For Panizzi, by contrast, classification seemed insufficient as the identifying device. For this he developed entry; and entry has ever since been the principal concern of catalogers.

But the work of catalogers as an organized group and profession became possible only as generally accepted standards of cataloging and classification became accepted and applied. Jefferson and Panizzi were lonely figures in the sense that though they gave their systems to great libraries, the bibliographical organization which these systems conveyed was largely restricted to the single copies possessed by those institutions, and did not extend to other libraries or to all the copies of an entire edition.

The great achievement of American nineteenth century librarianship was, by contrast, that from Cutter and Dewey and Putnam we derived the mechanisms for putting both entry and classification to work in the organization of collections, for all libraries and for all copies of an edition.

The work of the Cataloging and Classification Section rests on these two foundations—the necessity for bibliographic organization, and the possibility for joint effort toward it offered by the fact that books are mass-produced products.

But now a curious fact appears. The cataloging work of libraries, having begun with books—monographs—has tended by and large to stay

* Remarks made at the Dinner in Observance of the 60th Anniversary of the Cataloging and Classification Section, American Library Association, Sheraton-Mt. Royal Hotel, Montreal, P.Q., Tuesday June 21, 1960.
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there. We have never been really happy in doing anything with the bibliographic organization of the periodical literature, which we distinguish from "cataloging" as "indexing." Although we early undertook a major cooperative job in periodical indexing (Poole's Index), we found it extremely difficult to keep up, and readily surrendered the responsibility to others (Faxon, H. W. Wilson) who offered to do the work on a commercial basis. Similarly, although we cannot get along without the great specialized indexes (Chemical Abstracts and all the rest), and although in the final analysis we pay the major portion of the pipers' fee for these without being able to call the tunes, we have not (with signal exceptions) assumed this kind of work to fall within our responsibility.

Why do we make this distinction between books and periodicals?

The obvious answer is that the cataloging of books is an activity related to particular collections of books, while the indexing of periodicals is a general service, not restricted or even necessarily related to the contents of particular collections.

This is the obvious and superficial reason, but is it adequate? If it is possible to catalog periodical articles as a general service for all libraries, whether or not they possess those periodicals, is it not equally possible to catalog books in the same way? You will tell me, No; periodical articles, which are by nature ephemeral, can be cataloged on a year-by-year basis; but books are more enduring. The collection of a particular library, which may contain printed books from the 15th century to the present, would require a catalog of 500 annual volumes on a year-by-year basis, whereas our present methods can get the catalog into a single, convenient, and timeless card file.

OK, I accept this reason, but I want to point out some of the consequences. The first is the high cost of institution-by-institution cataloging as opposed to total-literature cataloging. Through a subscription to Chemical Abstracts I can buy the catalog (index) of the total literature of a subject, approximately 100,000 separate titles, indexed at the rate of some 125 entries per title, for a mere $500 per year, or half a cent per title. Contrasted with this, it costs me somewhere between $1 and $10 to enter each title into my institutional catalog, with perhaps only 3-5 entries per title. Yet I do this, I say, because I want my catalog to show only what I have and not be burdened with showing what I do not have; because I want my catalog to be in one alphabetic file and not in a number of separate annual, quinquennial, decennial or otherwise chronologically divided files; and because my collection is unique, and differs from the collections of every other library.

Taking the last argument only, how different is my collection? Of course we all make different book-selections, based on differences of size of book-fund, geography, local needs and interests, and book-selection judgment. Yet I would be willing to wager that among libraries of equal purchasing power and similar constituencies, the differences in collection would be found to be minor in quantity and for the most part trivial in importance—in truth, largely the result of accident. In other words I
am prepared to believe that a standard catalog, centrally created, could be devised that would for many libraries do a better job at much less cost than the home-made product.

But the second result of our abnegation of responsibility for periodical indexing is perhaps more important than the first. It is that because of it we run the risk of being left in a backwater of tradition-bound activity while the mainstream of cataloging progress flows by us. Because the urgencies of contemporary scientific, technological, industrial and commercial interest are concentrated largely on the periodical literature, there is now a mobilization of interest toward the application of new techniques to the exploitation of this literature. What do we know about this activity? As an organized profession, I fear we know too little. Is our wealth of experience in the organization of informational materials consulted in these investigations? Again, I am afraid, too little. The people who are engaged in them start by and large from scratch, discovering painfully for themselves things that we have known for years, announcing as triumphant discoveries knowledge that is traditional with us, and inventing neologisms like “descriptors,” “guidons,” and “association-ladders” for our age-old “subject-headings,” “index-terms,” and “classification schemes.”

While this is going on around us, we are still, in the name of our single and timeless catalog, trying to make traditional techniques conform in spite of their resistance to the complexities of a modern age, to rationalize and streamline our cataloging code, though in the full knowledge that we may not be able to afford to apply it when streamlined!

Let me be specific. What do we know, as a group, about the “permuted index” which has recently been adopted on an experimental basis by Chemical Abstracts and which is under consideration by the American Institute of Physics also—a form of indexing that can be performed by machine but which seems to offer certain satisfactions to the users? What do we know about the “data bank” which proposes to concentrate 2 million documents in one room and interrogate them instantly through an analysis at the rate of ten terms per document? Why did a big aircraft company give up its engineering library in substitution for a mechanized information center? These and other examples are all listed in the National Science Foundation’s Current Research and Development in Scientific Documentation, no. 6, May 1960. As a final example let me cite the results of a test in machine indexing performed by the Ramo Woolridge company in the literature of nuclear physics. This test was controlled by a parallel indexing operation conducted in a physics library with traditional techniques. The questions asked could all be answered by source documents in the file. The machine was able to identify 86% of the source documents, the traditional techniques only 38%.

But I hear you say, this is all very well for those who can afford computers and such; we can not. This, I believe, is the point. We can’t individually afford H. W. Wilson or LC, but we each have H. W. Wilson and LC working for us (at least that is the theory!)
And so I come to the future of C & C. C & C has a great mission and a great record of accomplishment in its mission. But I am sure that if C & C's record of accomplishment in the future is to equal that of its past, it must recognize that in dealing almost exclusively with monographs it is dealing with only part of the job, and that, perhaps, the less important part; that in confining its activity to institution-by-institution organization of collections it is taking the most expensive method and at the same time the method of less general use, benefitting only a local constituency; and that if it is to achieve its mission of providing the basis and form of organization which make library materials useful, it may have to contemplate methods of cataloging, forms of catalog, and kinds of central services as yet unattempted.

But just as Cutter and Dewey and Putnam provided us with forms of organization which met the needs of their day (and many, still, of ours) so I am sure that C & C, if it views its mission in ample terms, will discover forms of organization that will meet the challenge imposed by the changing conditions of publication and the demands of contemporary life.

But I would not have you think that the library world is without assistance in these and others of its problems. In the Council on Library Resources we get many offers of assistance. Let me read you a letter I received just the other day:

Council on Library Resources,
Washington, D. C.

Gentlemen:

I was for many years the chief engineer of a well-known firm engaged in the development of mechanical devices. Although now retired, I would like to continue to apply my talents in the interest of human welfare, and feel that I can be useful in your program. I have a baker's half-dozen of ideas which may interest you, and believe that working models could be produced comparatively inexpensively. I have listed them below, with the amounts needed for development. I hope to hear from you.

1. The Librarian's General-Purpose Uplifter. This would be very simple to develop. It would consist of a pair of jacks, concealed in the librarian's shoes. These would be actuated by small electric motors which could be plugged into any available outlet and would enable the wearer to raise himself at will up to approximately a foot above his natural height. Two principal purposes are envisaged. (a) The device would make it possible for short librarians to reach books easily on the upper shelves. (Indeed, the device might result in a new standard height for book-stacks, producing enormous savings in building costs.) (b) It would enable librarians who have to meet the public to achieve a commanding stature, conducive to high morale and very useful for staring down obstreperous customers, etc.
Estimated cost, $1,500.

2. *Pocket MicroBraille® Library.* Although it is well known that the hand is quicker than the eye, libraries for some reason prefer the slower organ. Nevertheless, I believe that they might benefit from the possibilities of tactual communication.

Just as Microcards® contain a great deal of information in condensed form which can be read by the eye through the use of a suitable magnifier, so I believe it will be possible to develop a suitable magnifier to enable the fingers to read a kind of MicroBraille®. This would enable the reference librarian to keep quite a library in his pocket, and while the customer was asking a question he could be feeling for the answer. (He might, for example, keep the catalog of his library in one pocket, *Familiar Quotations* in another, and the *Dictionary of American Biography* in a third. He would rapidly get the reputation for being quite a knowledgeable person.) It is easy to extend the principle. Female reference librarians could keep a MicroBraille® library tucked in their hair; then, while seeming to be patting their locks or thoughtfully scratching their heads they would be really finding the answers.

Estimated cost, $100,000.

3. *Librarian’s Bond-Issuer.* It has come to my attention that one of the great difficulties of promoting library work consists in persuading municipal authorities to authorize bond-issues on behalf of the library. I propose to provide each librarian with a device with which he could issue his own bonds as needed. This would solve most library problems.

Estimated cost, $50 (the price of a second-hand mimeograph machine).

4. *Library Recruiting-Kit.* In all the libraries I visit there is a shortage of page-boys. This amazes me because libraries usually have the staff facilities as well as the incentive for producing and rearing their own page-boys; but a certain old-fashioned prudery—perhaps understandable in the circumstances—seems to stand in the way. I propose to get around these taboos by developing a special test-tube for library use by which libraries could produce their own regular crops of page-boys, not only without offending any of the mores, but actually providing an attraction which should prove useful in community relations.

More recently, it has come to my attention that the recruitment of catalogers also constitutes a problem. If this indeed is the case, the proposed development would be simplified, because we wouldn’t have to work out methods for restricting the test-tube librarians to boys.

Estimated cost, $27 billion (less than the national debt).

5. *The Librarian’s X-Ray.* I am also informed that hunting through books for elusive quotations and other stray facts is a great burden in libraries. I propose to construct an X-ray machine which would do this automatically. In use, the sought reference would be displayed in the machine as a target; the machine would then see right through the pages of the book till it found the match to the target. By a process of zeroing-in the particular page would be found in a jiffy.

6. *The Librarian’s Weed-Killer.* This is a spray which would be
sprinkled over the catalog from time to time. It would immediately extirpate the entries for all unwanted books—unnecessary extra copies, unbindables, obsolete works, etc., in accordance with a formula which would be adjusted according to the need. By a process of osmosis, the powerful hormone contained in this spray would proceed to the shelf-list and to the shelves, and would obliterate all traces of the undesired books. It is obvious that this spray will have to be kept from the knowledge of various groups who are a prowl in our land, and I leave it to you whether it had perhaps better not be developed.

7. The Cataloger’s Dream. From what I know of catalogers, there’s not much that can be done to assist them; they are doing everything possible already. But it seems to me that something can be devised to give them the sense of accomplishment and achievement which their work merits, instead of (as seems to be too often the case) a feeling of frustration. For this I propose the Cataloger’s Dream.

This is a pill which all catalogers would take each night upon retiring. It would assure sweet, restful, and beauty-preserving sleep; but it would also produce an enchanting vision: a neat, bright, and flowery cataloging room in which every day’s work is finished a quarter of an hour before closing time and in which there are never any arrears; in which a perfect system of cataloging is applied, and every book fits the system; in which there develop no conflicts in the catalog, no jams of filing or of confusing or obsolescent entries to be unsnarled, no recataloging and certainly no reclassification to be done, and in which authors, organizations, and serials never change their names or designations; where all the books are perfect, and all the necessary bibliographic data can be secured from one authoritative reference work right there on the desk; where all the unexpected questions (including unknown foreign languages) can be answered by the cataloger at the next desk; where all the books are interesting and there is time to browse through them; and where—finally—the administration fully recognizes the real importance of cataloging and rewards the catalogers accordingly. What a place to work!

But the vision might change. It might show a room in which the cataloger does not have to go grubbing around in various places for bits and pieces with which to catalog the collections—information which can be better provided by others and which should be right at hand. This information would come in as part of the book; for books and the bibliographical data which incorporate them into a bibliographical system of library organization are equally products of the mind, and can equally and simultaneously be mass-produced and disseminated so that the two are always together. The role of the cataloger in this room is not so much to create the bits and pieces as to create and supervise the catalog itself—the all-important tool by whose excellence or deficiency the excellence or deficiency of the library is to a large degree measured, and without which the greatest collection is a dead thing. More than this: the cataloger in this room, having delegated to others, who are closer to the manufacture of the books, the job of incorporating the books into a
bibliographic system, now automatically takes her place as a member of the board of directors which supervises the system—a national bibliographic authority charged with developing a first class mode of library organization for a first class country—a system in which her library would be the local representative of a nation-wide movement which has for its purpose the putting of books to their maximum use for the welfare of mankind.

If these pills were taken nightly by catalogers, and occasionally by administrators also, who knows but that the vision might really come true!

Estimated cost, the value of one good cataloger!

Sincerely,

(signed) R. Goldberg

---

Chiang Small Duplicator

ANDRE NITECKI,
Processing Director
Joint Processing Department
University of Michigan
Flint, Michigan

ONE OF the perennial problems of any catalog department is that of card reproduction.

The Joint Technical Processing Department of Flint Junior College Library and Flint College of the University of Michigan Library finds itself in this position. The book budget is approximately $50,000. The staff of the catalog department consists of 1 1/2 catalogers, 3 full-time clerks, and 60 hours a week of student help. To process an average of 1,100 volumes a month, the department uses Library of Congress Printed Catalogs, the National Union Catalog, and a current subscription to the Library of Congress proof sheets. The Department is unable to invest in an expensive card reproducing machine, and typing of cards by hand is also costly. Library of Congress printed cards have been found to be costly in terms of both money and time.

In searching for the most satisfactory solution, the staff of the Library came across the Chiang Small Duplicator (CSD), manufactured in Notre Dame, Indiana, by John Chiang. The decision was made to purchase the CSD due to its low cost of $34.50.

The CSD is a small, compact machine measuring 8" x 3 1/2" x 2 3/4". It is made in one piece, does not have automatic parts (such as an automatic ejector, feeder, etc.) There are no parts to be oiled or cleaned, nor any requiring special attention. The only upkeep is to dust the machine.
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and replenish the ink supply. The CSD does not require special knowledge nor skill to operate it.

The following are simple steps in the reproduction of cards:

1. Type the card on a special stencil, supplied by the manufacturer of the CSD. (The stencil is the same as usually used for mimeographic purposes; it is pre-cut to 5¾” x 3½” size, and edged for easier handling. The corrections on the stencil can be made with correction fluid; they do not affect the appearance of the finished card.)
2. Insert the stencil into the CSD
3. Insert a catalog card into the CSD, under the stencil
4. Press the knob on the top
5. Remove the printed card; the ink dries rapidly and does not smear.

The first CSD machine used by this Library was not satisfactory. The pad in the machine was dry in some parts and too wet in others; the ink did not come through evenly. It was necessary to ink each stencil individually, creating great difficulties. The work was not economical, and it was difficult to keep it clean.

The manufacturer replaced the machine, and the new machine has performed satisfactorily. It should be stressed, however, that the overall quality of the cards, although satisfactory, is not as good as the quality of cards reproduced by the Multilith machines. The Library plans to continue to use the Multilith machine for reproduction of reference sets requiring a large quantity of cards (e.g. series cards).

The main difficulties encountered in the use of the CSD are as follows:

1. Finding the best typewriter for the stencil. The electric typewriter cuts too deeply into the stencil; some manual typewriters do not cut enough. The solution came with time, through practice and experience of a typist.
2. Storage of the CSD while not in use. The dryness and warmth of the office has a definite effect upon the pad. This Library discovered that the window sill is the best place to store the machine, particularly over the week-end.
3. Allowing enough time for the ink to penetrate the pad. The instructions for the use of the CSD read: “fill the reservoir ... and replace the knob immediately.” This Library discovered that the instructions should read: “fill the reservoir ... and replace the knob after the ink disappears into the pad.” This process may last as long as 5 minutes.
4. Keeping the quality of work consistent. It seems as though on certain days the inking process is defective. It becomes necessary to run a large number of scratch cards through the CSD until the pad is evenly wet. This Library is unable to discover the real cause for this; it might be the quality of the ink, defective inking
apparatus, a defective pad, or climatic conditions of the office.
5. The ink pad cannot be replaced since the machine is made in one
piece. The CSD will have to be discarded if the pad becomes
loose, dry in some parts, or worn out after short use.*

This Library has been using CSD for the last six months, steadily in-
creasing the number of sets reproduced from 24 sets the first month to
almost 500 sets per month currently. The CSD appears to be a useful
machine, but it does take experience and a certain amount of experi-
mentation to discover the best methods of operation.
The following is the cost analysis of CSD, Multilith, hand-typed cards,
and Library of Congress cards, per set of 8 cards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CSD</th>
<th>Multilith</th>
<th>Hand Typed</th>
<th>LC Cards*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>$.0925</td>
<td>$.2044**</td>
<td>$.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stencil</td>
<td>.0460</td>
<td>.0181</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>$.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cards (8)</td>
<td>.0400</td>
<td>.0400</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.1785</td>
<td>.2625</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The cost applies to orders with full information supplied.
** The Library does not own nor operate the Multilith machine. The card repro-
duction job is contracted outside, and the Library pays for labor costs only as charged
by the outside firm. The depreciation and maintenance of the Multilith machine are not
included in this cost analysis.

* Editor's note. The latest models have removable ink pads so that replacement is
possible.
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The above cost is estimated on the basis of clerical help at $1.50 an hour. It should be remembered that any mechanical card reproduction is cheaper than hand-typed cards because of the saving of time in card revision.

* * * * * * * * * * *

Dr. Chiang holds an MLS degree from the University of Michigan and a Ph.D. in political science from the University of Michigan. He is a librarian and is presently employed at the University of Notre Dame Library in charge of a special project reorganizing serials and documents.

He first thought of his machine in 1956. It took him two years and about $7,000 to develop it. CSD has been sold to special libraries, regional libraries, middle-size college libraries, and public libraries throughout the United States, United States possessions, Canada, and South America.

There is a companion machine to the CSD called the Chiang Numbering Machine. Its operation and principles are similar to the CSD. It is smaller and is used almost exclusively in the reproduction of call numbers only. Its cost is $29.50.

THE POLICY AND RESEARCH COMMITTEE
of the
ACQUISITIONS SECTION
URGES

Each Library to Report at Regular Intervals
Its Acquisitions of Microfilms—both negative and positive films—of monographs, serials, and manuscripts

to
Eleanor Este Campion, Director
Union Library Catalog of the
Philadelphia Metropolitan Area
36th and Woodland Avenue
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

for inclusion in the

UNION LIST OF MICROFILMS
For the two years preceding 1953, I was the Periodicals Librarian at the Georgia Institute of Technology in Atlanta. The job had been an exciting one; just before my coming to Tech, the Library had received a generous General Education Board grant and at the same time an equal, matching amount from the State. The money had been given for the explicit purpose of strengthening the scientific periodical holdings in the library, and it fell to me, with guidance from the Librarian, to utilize the grants as advantageously as possible. How this was accomplished is not in itself an exciting story; certainly any university librarian who has been handed a large amount of money to be spent for a specific purpose within a specified period of time has experienced the cycle of events: the faculty inquiries, the subsequent suggestions, the preparation of lists, the requests for quotations, the checking of dealers’ catalogs, the orders, the invoices, the claims, the binding, the last minute rush to encumber the few remaining dollars before the expiration date. However, what does make an interesting story, I think, is the resultant byproduct of the ordinary occurrence: the metamorphosis of a periodicals librarian to a periodicals dealer, and the experiences of a librarian in this little-known segment of the book trade.

The initial impetus behind the transition occurred quite casually: a suggestion from my Head Librarian that I spend some time with the dealers with whom I had been corresponding. The fact is that I had been planning a trip to New York anyway that summer of 1953, and I was quite curious to see who these people were. Certainly they had been extremely helpful in working with me on the immense project of building a first-class periodicals collection, and I had been in constant, almost daily, contact with them during those preceding two years. So the casual remark became fact when the letters of introduction were written, the reservations made, and the many appointments confirmed.

The plan was to allocate the majority of my time to the four dominant companies of the periodicals field: Kraus Periodicals, Inc., Walter J. Johnson, Inc., and the H. W. Wilson Company, all of New York, and J. S. Canner and Company of Boston. The remaining time would skimpily, but
necessarily, have to be divided among the host of smaller periodicals
dealers: Stecher-Hafner Company, Ashley-Ratcliff Corp., Abrahams Maga-
azine Service, F. W. Faxon Company, P. & H. Bliss, Mapleton House, H. G.
Fiedler, Denster Company, and Astor Place Magazine Service, to mention
only a few. The very fact that all the periodicals dealers of importance
were concentrated within the New York-Boston area (the only exceptions
that come to mind are N. A. Kovach and Zeitlin & Ver Brugge on the West
Coast) made this itinerary possible.

Since 1953, of course, the dominant quartet referred to above has been
reduced to a trio. On September 1, 1955, one of the largest, and in point
of continuous operations the oldest, supplier in the field—the Periodicals
Department of the H. W. Wilson Company—was purchased by Kraus
Periodicals, Inc. As a result of this purchase, Kraus established the Back
Issues Corporation, which carries on the basic, and in the field unique,
concept of the Wilson Company: the supply of single issues and volumes
for the completions of files. As this article is being written, only a few years
after the establishment of Back Issues, the success of that company is
assured, and the subsidiary itself has moved into a position of major
importance in the periodicals field. Of the other, smaller dealers men-
tioned, the F. W. Faxon Company has retired from this activity and is
exclusively a subscription agency. Their stock was sold, and in 1957 moved
to the warehouse of the J. S. Canner Company in Boston.

Actually the envisioned Grand Tour was never accomplished com-
pletely. I did have the opportunity to visit most of the major companies
and many of the smaller ones, meeting their personnel, seeing their stock,
studying their methods. In the time since that summer I have visited
several more—now, however, as a colleague rather than a client. Four
months after returning from the Tour, I joined the firm of Kraus Peri-
odicals as its Assistant Manager—and my life has never been the same
since

The World of Periodicals

What I had seen during those visits, and what I have experienced and
learned since, has transformed and developed a major interest into a dedi-
cated life’s work. The entire periodicals field was to me, as it is to many
practicing librarians, the most fascinating area of the book world. Tracing
the publication history of a century-and-a-half old journal through its
multifarious forerunners, mergers, divisions, suspensions, resumptions,
title (and sub-title) changes, frequency changes, format changes, and an
infinite number of other possible permutations, is an exhilarating adventu-
re into bibliographic detective work. Even so menial a practice as colla-
tion offers an exciting experience if the material to be collated is a file of
the Proceedings (formerly Journal, with as many as five separate sections
at one time) of the Institution of Electrical Engineers or the complex
publications of one of the German academies. Spend any afternoon physically
compounding a set of the American Journal of International Law—the
volumes, and Supplements, and Special Supplements, and Indexes, and
General Indexes—and you’ll find it a most trying but satisfying ordeal. And then there are the mysteries of periodical publishing, some of which have never been solved and apparently never will since their solutions often died with the respective geniuses who initiated them. Why, for example, does Metal Progress begin publication with v. 18, no. 3, or Mechanical Engineering with v. 45, or Roads and Streets with v. 65 (and why were vols. 72, 73, and 74 of this publication omitted entirely in the numbering scheme)? Why were volumes 3 and 5 of the American Geophysical Union, Transactions considered in the volume numberings and then never published; and since they were not, why did not vols. 4 and 6 become vols. 3 and 5? And why, finally, are there three separate and distinct volumes numbered “1” of the American Geographical Society of New York, Bulletin? The present Editor of the Society theorizes that his predecessors failed on two earlier attempts to publish second volumes, and so simply started anew in their volume numbering with each effort. But he is quick to tell you that this is only a personal theory.

The above constitute merely a handful of the examples that come to mind of the irregularities in past periodical publishing. There are literally hundreds of others. Perhaps some day a good, and well-informed, Samaritan will catalog them for the benefit of all mankind. But until he does, the manifold complexities will continue to exist and collectively to form the fascinating world of periodicals.

The Periodicals Dealers

Without exception it may be said that the periodicals dealers in the United States have done an awful job of public relations. Indeed they have simply abstained from any attempt at it. The country’s book dealers have done infinitely better, and even the subscription agents have managed to arouse a little curiosity from the library world.8 But the periodicals dealers have shrouded their activities in mystery, and the librarians have accommodatingly looked the other way.

It is doubtful whether there are many major research libraries in this nation which spend as much for current subscriptions as they do for the acquisition of back files; my own experience is that they spend far less. Yet Dr. Osborn, in his otherwise excellent book, Serial Publications,9 allots only one short paragraph to the entire subject. All principles and practices of serials work are discussed there almost exclusively in terms of new and current titles. Actually, the published literature devoted to the subject is extremely sparse,4 as K. B. Shaw discovered while preparing a paper for a symposium on the acquisition of second-hand periodicals:

Shortly after I agreed to take part in this symposium, I realized that I knew very little about the acquisition of second-hand periodicals. . . . I did not remember ever reading an account of principles on which one should base one’s practice . . . (and) I had no recollection of a thorough exposition of periodical selection practice in general (as distinct from the processing and use of periodicals).5
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Upon searching the literature, Mr. Shaw discovered that his memory was quite sound.

This "blackout" of the entire periodicals area has existed and exists for different reasons on each side. From the dealers' standpoint it can be explained in terms of economics. Frankly speaking, most periodicals dealers are concerned with making money, not in enlightening their clientele through contributions to library literature. Also, since the field today is dominated by relatively few companies doing the majority of the business, there is the fear of divulging trade secrets and the apprehension of letting the enemy know. After all, does Macy's tell Gimbels! But the error of keeping the public in the dark is a serious one: for the dealer because he should be striving for understanding, and for the librarian because a good percentage of his funds are spent in this area.

Cocktail parties and small dinners at the major conventions are an attempt, of sorts, at public relations, but information rather than entertainment is of paramount importance. My own company, for example, at the last Medical Library Association meeting in New York transported librarians by the busload to our Mamaroneck warehouse to show them our plant and to explain our problems and our way of doing business. The letter response after this visit, from medical librarians all over the country, was overwhelming and extremely gratifying.

From the librarians' standpoint the laxity is equally culpable, but far less understandable. It is to me beyond imagination why some enterprising doctoral candidate has not rushed into this virgin territory to explore and explain and to perform a really original piece of research. And why, with all of the committees and sub-committees of the American Library Association, has not one (even on a sub-sub-level) ever been appointed to investigate the area? With literally millions of dollars annually being poured into this most important phase of acquisitions, it is difficult to understand how it can be ignored.

If all of the above sounds strange coming from a dealer (né librarian), let it be emphasized that such an enlightenment could only be considered healthy. A knowledge and an understanding of the dealers' activities and problems would not only help to clarify some badly and incorrectly-stated facts, but would also make for a smoother working arrangement between acquisition departments and dealers. The word "investigation" is intended, of course, to denote here academic investigation, but I know of no reputable dealer who has ever been displeased at a visit to his premises by a librarian or other interested individual. Indeed, frequent visits (i.e. planned investigations) by appointed officials could serve as a method of accrediting those companies which are deserving of such accreditation and exposing that very small group which is undeserving. Unfortunately, we have heard unkind remarks about certain "dealers"—people who remove a library's duplicates, for example, with the promise that "a check will be sent shortly," and then from whom nothing is ever heard again. These "dealers" are harmful to the industry as a whole, and it is for such reasons that I believe the regular and established periodicals
dealers would welcome an accreditation committee.

By accreditation I am not suggesting anything like the methods which were outlined in an article 7 in this journal a few years back—an article which, of course, very clearly circumscribed its ratings exclusively for book dealers. However, that article did promise that "Our agents for serials and periodicals remain to be completely rated, and an easy, automatic . . . system is still in the planning stage." I very much admire the authors' optimism and belief that "easy" and "automatic" evaluations of periodicals dealers are possible through the methods which they outline for book dealers. Rather, I would suggest that only through visits to and detailed study of an organization's operations could a meaningful and cogent evaluation be made. Certainly a management consultant firm, retained at a very high fee to analyze a company's efficiency, value, production, growth potential, problems, etc., actually occupies a company's premises, interviews its personnel, and studies its methods of operation before any theoretical ratings are devised.

The Operations of a Periodicals Dealer

For the benefit of those librarians who are not able to participate in such an analysis, and by way of assistance to that—as yet unborn—investigating committee, I would like to offer a brief and necessarily sketchy outline of the functions and operations of a large and established periodicals firm. The one with which I am, of course, most familiar—Kraus Periodicals, Inc.—will serve as an excellent example.

The first notion that the American university librarian must dispel when thinking of the American periodicals dealer is that he is exclusively a supplier to the domestic university library. Indeed, nothing could be further from the truth. Kraus Periodicals, Inc., presently furnishes scientific, scholarly, and general periodicals to every important country in the world—and to most minor ones, as well. At the present time we actually ship more material abroad than we do to American libraries, and at the rate foreign libraries are building the ratio should substantially increase in the years to come. Besides university libraries, public, industrial, governmental, and private libraries (in addition, of course, to other periodicals dealers) are the recipients of this material.

To be able to serve the broad demands of these diverse and dissimilar groups requires, as one would imagine, an enormous stock. Kraus Periodicals, which presently stocks one of the great collections of journals in the world, actively deals in approximately 8,000 to 9,000 individual titles in quantities that reach millions of issues and volumes. Where the normal library is delighted to claim one set of a title, the large dealer must stock several sets of the same title in anticipation of demands. Such a commodity as Chemical Abstracts, for example, is stocked in huge quantities because there is a continuous and, in fact, growing demand for complete sets from newly-established libraries. Of this title, our own stock usually contains a minimum of ten sets (in varying stages of completeness), 3,000 to 4,000 volumes, and thousands of single issues. For many titles we have had to
put ceilings on the number of copies of any volume or issue that will be retained, lest our warehousing problems (already great) become insurmountable. This idea of limitation of stock is especially significant in the case of the trade journals, which seem to be doubling in size annually. For example, we discovered recently, after a careful analysis, that our allocation of space for Mechanical Engineering had doubled within the period January, 1957, through July, 1959, (less than two and a half years) although there was no comparable increase in the number of volumes and sets sold of this title within that time. We decided, therefore, that after our best five sets had been built we should pulp everything over seven copies of each volume and three copies of each issue. (Our used-paper man hauled away Mechanical Engineering by the truck-load!) Thus the formula of five sets, seven volumes, three issues will apply to this title for at least the next couple of years, or until we have been proved wrong. The analysis goes on continuously with literally hundreds of titles, for the space problem exists with us as it does with almost every library; in fact, we pay rent by the square foot.

Actually, the space of Kraus Periodicals is a composite of many things in many places: a very large warehouse in Mamaroneck, New York, comprising some 60,000 square feet and the depot for the main stock; a five story office building in the heart of New York City (16 East 46th Street); another warehouse in Vaduz, Liechtenstein, which houses the majority of the European stock; fully staffed offices in Paris and in Buchs, Switzerland; and a string of paid and/or commissioned agents running from Madrid to Tokyo. John Winterich in a recent article discussing the President of our firm, H. P. Kraus, described the Mamaroneck warehouse as a “converted rubber-boot factory”, which it is. He goes on in his description:

> Here, in a three-story brick building twenty miles northeast of the city ... are stocked technical, scientific, and scholarly serial publications in every language in which such material has ever been printed, of every date at which it has been published, and issuing from any conceivable place of publication.9

Mr. Winterich excludes only “and in every possible format in which it has been seen or imagined”—a factor which further contributes to our shelving problems.

The far-flung complex as described above is tied together by a communications system that includes direct, inter-office telephones; a New York-to-Zurich TWX machine, with a connecting line for the Paris office within the near future; and telegraph and overseas cable facilities on all premises. Essentially ours is a “mail order” business, as distinguished from the personal, retail book shop. Thus, an efficient, immediate, and constantly functioning communications system with our clientele, as well as within the branches and divisions of our own organization, is absolutely indispensable.

To keep this prodigious operation from disintegrating into utter chaos requires a large and well-trained staff of specialists and technicians. Recog-
nizing this fact at the outset (some fifteen years ago) the Manager, Frederick Altman, and Mr. Kraus agreed upon a basic principle of development for the Company. Believing as they then did (and still do) that an organization is only as effective as are the people who are involved in its operation, they hired, trained, and experimented with subject and language specialists until they had developed a basic core around which the Company could expand. Subsequent additions to that nucleus, resulting in the phenomenal growth and extraordinary success of the business to what we know it today proved the theory sound. At the present time almost a hundred people are involved in one way or another in helping to carry out the activities of Kraus Periodicals and its affiliates. It is a well-knit group, and the clearly-delineated divisions of responsibility and chains of authority are regulated to a degree of effectiveness comparable to that of the best operated businesses.

There is, however, one salient feature which differentiates our Company from that of any manufacturing operation; simply, we are not primarily peddling a product; instead we are offering for sale knowledge and information. The catchword upon which we function then is imagination, and this is reflected in our approach to marketing, to internal management, and to planning for future growth.

Thus, in spite of its present size, the organization does not disintegrate; instead, it continues to flourish and becomes more efficient. Every effort is made to improve the stock and stock records, to build hundred-volume sets with every issue and title-page-index included, to make catalogs more readable for and meaningful to librarians, to assure the correctness of every bibliographic entry—in short, to expand and develop both qualitatively as well as quantitatively.

I have, admittedly, presented only an outline and sketch of the activities of a large periodicals dealer. I have hardly scratched the surface. I have not even approached many points which are for us, the dealers, the most interesting in our daily operations. I would like to discuss many more aspects of this complex business: the actual methods and practices of buying and selling periodicals; the theories behind the preparations of catalogs; the competing media of microfilm, microcards, Xerography and how they have affected our business; the relationship of the United States Book Exchange and other exchange unions with the periodicals dealers; our feelings about the present movements of co-operation among American libraries; the European and Asian periodicals dealers; the emergence of the specialized collections; the standards and philosophies behind periodicals acquisitions. These are merely a few subjects that come to mind among the many that I think would be of interest to practicing librarians.

Actually, as practicing periodicals dealers these and related subjects interest us greatly at Kraus Periodicals. Unfortunately during the rush of business hours—the days, the nights, the weekends, for there never seem to be enough hours—these topics are never discussed fully. Until recently it had been all practice and no theory. But about a year ago Fred Altman decided to do something about this and began a series of
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informal weekly meetings. Conducted in the form of a seminar, about a
dozen members of the staff discuss in detail topics of interest to all of us.
We all think it a lot of fun. Certainly we feel that it is the only seminar
in the world conducted exclusively in the field of periodicals. And we are
constantly surprised at the amount of subject matter there is to be
examined.
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RUSSIAN BIOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE
IN TRANSLATION

The American Institute of Biological Sciences has instituted a program of
translation. They are currently translating and publishing seven Russian re-
search journals in biology; Doklady: Biological Sciences Section; Doklady:
Botanical Sciences Section; Doklady: Biochemistry Section; Plant Physiology;
Microbiology; Soviet Soil Science; and Entomological Review. In addition, it also
has started a separate program of translation and publication of selected Rus-
sian monographs in biology.

Additional information may be obtained from the American Institute of
Biological Sciences, 2000 P Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
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The Program of the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials*

F. Bernice Field, Head Catalogue Department, Yale University Library, New Haven**

INTRODUCTION

The YEAR 1959/60 has been one of fulfillment for the members of the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials; for, after three years of planning and consideration of possible programs for union list control of serials, they now see in operation the program which they developed.

The plans of the Committee have evolved from an initial program calling for complete bibliographical control of all serial publications, at a cost which proved to be prohibitive, to one which we believe will be practical, not too much of a burden on the contributing libraries, and for which we were able to secure financial support.

The program is two-pronged. It provides first for the publication of a third edition of the Union List of Serials, to include information regarding serials up to 1950, and, secondly, for the expansion of New Serial Titles, which now includes only serials that began publication in 1950 or later, to be a continuing supplement to the third edition. In other words, the third edition of the Union List of Serials will be the final revision of this very useful work; henceforth the changes in pre-1950 serials and new titles of this period will be found in New Serial Titles.

A year ago in Washington announcement was made that the Council on Library Resources had granted $244,651 to the Joint Committee to carry out this program and that the Library of Congress would do the work for the Committee under the supervision of John Cronin, Director of the Processing Department. Late in August Edna Mae Brown, Head of the Serials Section, Descriptive Cataloging Division, Library of Congress, was appointed Editor of the new edition, and work got under way. This paper will report to you on policies relating to this third edition, on the progress made to date, and on the place of New Serial Titles in the total program.

* Paper presented at meeting of the Serials Section, ALA-RTSD, Montreal, June 22, 1960.
** Miss Field is ALA Representative on the Joint Committee.
Policies and Plans

The third edition of the *Union List of Serials* will not be a complete revision of the second edition; for the Joint Committee not only has not the funds for this, but also it decided that it could not ask libraries to do the job of rechecking all the serial titles in the second edition and its supplements that such a revision would require. It will reprint the titles and holdings in the second edition and its two supplements with all titles merged into a single alphabet and will make such major changes in information and holdings as libraries are willing and able to supply or have already sent in. To this will be added a substantial amount of new material which began prior to January 1, 1950, and which is within the scope of the *Union List*, as defined in the second edition. This latter is being gleaned from records in the National Union Catalog, the *Southeastern Supplement to the Union List of Serials*, and reports from participating libraries, including the National Library of Canada. The new titles, estimated at about 15,000 in number, are being listed in a checking edition which is to be sent to contributing libraries.

Changes and Additional Locations. The prospectus of the third edition of the *Union List of Serials*, which was sent to all cooperating libraries, gave the details of the plans for this edition; but apparently libraries did not understand its statements about the recording of changes in holdings and additional locations, for many libraries which are reporting to the *Union List* for the first time seem to have the idea that their symbol and holdings will be added to the titles in the second edition and its supplements for all titles they send in. Other libraries appear to expect the third edition to carry a revision of their holdings for every title they have ever reported.

In view of this misunderstanding, it should be made clear that only *major* changes in holdings of titles now recorded in the second edition and its supplements, such as the transfer or discarding of entire sets, will be made in the third edition. It will not be possible to show all minor changes in holdings. *Additional locations* for serial titles acquired by libraries since the second edition and its supplements were published will be recorded in the third edition only for titles not commonly held. When ten or more locations for a title have already been listed in the second edition or its supplements, additional locations will be listed only when considered both desirable and necessary, e.g., because of geographical considerations. The purpose of this policy restriction is to avoid the need to record an excessively large number of locations for commonly held titles; also, the Joint Committee considers that in most instances ten locations are sufficient.

Thus libraries that are reporting to the *Union List of Serials* Project may save time and money for themselves as well as the editorial staff of the third edition by reporting holdings of titles already listed in the *Union List* only when fewer than ten libraries have already been listed.
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as having holdings or when the coverage of their geographic region is poor. Libraries are encouraged to send in information about changes in title or heading, however.

New Titles. Reports on new titles will be added to the third edition up to the time of final editing and will include titles which are not listed in the checking edition. Reports received after the final editing will be recorded in New Serial Titles.

Checking Edition. The Project plans to issue the checking edition of new titles in four parts, and cooperating libraries are requested to search and return reports of their holdings to the Project within three months after receipt of each part. At this time, new titles not included in the checking edition but discovered in the course of searching should also be reported.

Publication. The Editor expects to begin final editing of the titles about April 1, 1961, and to have copy ready for the printer about December 31, 1961. Publication of the third edition is expected in the spring of 1962.

Participating Libraries. It is hoped that approximately 800 libraries will participate in the new edition of the Union List. All libraries which contributed information to the second edition and its supplements and contributors and subscribers to New Serial Titles have been invited to participate.

The Joint Committee also invites libraries with unusual or unique holdings to participate. We wish to have as wide a coverage as possible of serial titles which began publication before 1950 and are within the scope of the second edition. Therefore, if your library has serial titles which are not included in the second edition of the Union List or its supplements, or which are included but list holdings in less than ten libraries, or which indicate few or no complete sets while your set is complete or nearly so, we urge you to send your holdings to the Union List of Serials Project at the Library of Congress. Since this will be the final revision of this tremendously useful publication, it is the hope of the Joint Committee that it may be very inclusive in both titles of the pre-1950 period and in holdings of the libraries of the United States and Canada.

Report on Progress

Miss Brown, the editor of the third edition, issues monthly reports to the members of the Joint Committee on the progress and problems of the Project. A brief summary of some of the information contained in these will show what a monumental task the issuance of this edition is, even though it is not undergoing a complete revision.

Removal of Cards From the Union Catalog. The first phase of the work was the removal of cards for serial entries from the National Union Catalog. At the ALA Midwinter Meeting, Miss Brown reported to the Joint Committee that all serial entries except documents had been removed from the Union Catalog—approximately 370,000 cards. She also had in hand at that time some 95,000 cards from participating libraries—
and more have come in since then—from which new titles for the checking edition are being chosen and from which changes in the second edition and its supplements will be made.

**Union List Symbols.** One of the early problems which the Project had to solve was the variation between the symbols for location used by the *Union List of Serials* and those used by the *National Union Catalog*. Since the third edition is to be a cut-and-paste job in so far as entries in the second edition and its supplements are concerned, the Project can not change the symbols already used in the *Union List* to those used by the *National Union Catalog*; but new reports which come in carry the new symbols. By decision of the Joint Committee the reprinted entries will retain the *Union List* symbols, with new entries using the *National Union Catalog* symbols. In the explanation of the symbols on the end papers or elsewhere of the third edition, both sets will be given; e.g., University of Virginia, which is VU in the *Union List* and ViU in the *National Union Catalog*, will have both of these given in the list of symbols, and both will be used in listing holdings in the body of the publication.

**Preparation of Checking Edition.** The Project staff is now searching the entries withdrawn from the Union Catalog and those received directly from libraries against the *Union List of Serials* and its supplements to find new titles and is selecting and editing these for inclusion in the checking edition. Some titles are being rejected as not within the scope of the *Union List*; these will be kept in a separate file at the Library of Congress for possible future union list activities. The staff is also assembling records of changes and deletions of holdings, bibliographical changes, and additional locations for incorporation into the third edition.

Miss Brown reports that the A-C section of the checking edition will be sent to libraries in July, the D-K section in September. The Joint Committee joins her in urging you to do your checking promptly and to return each section to the Library of Congress within the specified three-month period. This is essential if the publication schedule is to be maintained.

**New Serial Titles**

*New Serial Titles a Supplement to the Union List of Serials.*

At the time of the beginning of the final editing of the third edition of the *Union List of Serials*, *New Serial Titles*, which gives information about serials that began in 1950 or later, is to be expanded to include information about pre-1950 titles that are within the scope of the *Union List*. *New Serial Titles* will then become the permanent continuing supplement to the third edition and will record additions and changes of titles and holdings in the third edition and also new titles not included therein but coming within its scope.

It is unnecessary to describe the scope of *New Serial Titles* or to outline the history of its development; this was covered thoroughly and ably by Mrs. Mary Ellis Kahler in a paper given at the Serials Section meeting in San Francisco in 1958 and published in the Spring 1959 issue of *Library Resources & Technical Services*.
brary Resources and Technical Services (pages 145-149). There are some points about New Serial Titles which should be brought to your attention, however.

Importance of Libraries Reporting

First, the Joint Committee would like to emphasize the importance of having all libraries whose holdings are important and whose reports will enrich the bibliographical resources of New Serial Titles become active contributors. Although the cooperation of all libraries which are members of the Association of Research Libraries insures the inclusion of the major research libraries in NST, there are still a number of sizable public libraries and some important special ones which are not reporting. The second edition of the Union List of Serials and its two supplements recorded holdings of 650 libraries, while New Serial Titles now receives reports from only 411. The value of this tool as a continuing supplement to the Union List of Serials depends on the effort that the library world is willing to put into it. If you depend on the Union List of Serials for locations, you will also need New Serial Titles for this purpose; for, as the continuation of the Union List, it will be the only place where information about location of serials will be recorded after the third edition of the Union List is published. There will be no going back to pick up added locations after the ten-year cumulations are issued, so we urge you to help make NST as useful a tool as the Union List of Serials by sending in reports of titles and holdings that you have for post-1949 serials.

Number of Subscribers

Secondly, we wish to call your attention to the fact that there are now only 879 subscribers to New Serial Titles. The second edition of the Union List and its first supplement sold 2,500 copies. With New Serial Titles serving as a continuing supplement to the Union List, it seems to the members of the Joint Committee that there should be at least 2,500 subscribers to New Serial Titles. What accounts for the difference of 1,600 libraries? The answer that many of you will probably give is the cost. Fifty-five dollars per year plus postage out of a limited book and serials budget is a sizable amount. But, if you realize that henceforth New Serial Titles will be your only approach to post-1949 serials, both for bibliographical information and for holdings, and that, after the third edition of the Union List of Serials appears, it will also be the only publication to give information about changes in pre-1950 titles, perhaps you will reconsider. The subscription price includes both the monthly issues and the annual cumulations; the latter are not sold separately.

1960 Ten-Year Cumulation

The third point which the Joint Committee wishes to emphasize is that the 1960 annual cumulation, to be issued in 1961, will be a ten-year cumulation that will supersede all earlier cumulations of New Serial Titles. It will bring together in one alphabet a complete listing of all
post-1949 serials which have appeared in issues of NST through 1960 and will be the first supplement in advance of the forthcoming third edition of the *Union List of Serials*. Since it will cover the ten years of serial publication following the cut-off date of the third edition, it will, therefore, be an essential element in union list controls. The staff of NST expects to be able to include in the 1960 ten-year cumulation all reports received by September 1960; so, if you have not already done so, plan to send your holdings to them by September.

This ten-year cumulation is available only on subscription to *New Serial Titles*. If you wish to receive it—or if you need extra copies of it, make certain that you have a subscription, or subscriptions, to NST for this year. Don’t let your library miss this important publication for lack of a subscription. As previously stated, the cumulations are not sold separately.

**Classed Subject Arrangement of NST**

Your attention should also be called to the classed subject arrangement of *New Serial Titles*, which is issued monthly at a subscription rate of $25.00 per year. Although the subject classification numbers appear in the regular alphabetical issues, it is only in the classed issues that the subject analysis is given full play.

The classed issues do not give all locations but only the first to be reported. They do, however, give the full bibliographical information included in the alphabetical arrangement and provide a convenient approach for acquisitions and bibliography in specialized fields. It seems to the members of the Joint Committee that this tool should be particularly useful in acquisitions work and in special libraries. Since it does not have annual cumulations, the cost is only half that of the alphabetical publication.

**Summary**

In summary, the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials urges you to cooperate with the Union List of Serials Project to produce a third edition of the *Union List* that will be as valuable a tool as we can make it, and not only to report your serial holdings to *New Serial Titles* but also to subscribe to it. Your support of NST is needed both in supplying information and financially. *New Serial Titles* will be only as important a tool in union list of serials control as you, the contributing libraries, will make it.
THE TECHNICAL LIBRARY of the Air Force Cambridge Research Center began twelve years ago with fifty foreign-language dictionaries. Today it has one hundred thousand bound serial volumes, fifty thousand single titles, a minimum of thirty thousand unbound serials and monographs, and an estimated two hundred thousand documents. In this period of explosive growth, documents have not only presented concrete problems of management and control, but have also been symbols of the new pattern in scientific information.

Managing this flood of informational wealth within the framework of library procedures, which are contorted by security considerations, has been the responsibility of seven of the twenty-three members of the Technical Library staff. Organizationally the Library comprises three sections: Acquisitions, Processing, Reference and Circulation. The Documents Unit is part of the Reference and Circulation Section. But, typical of the ability of documents to invade the host organism, every part of the Library is concerned with documents in some form.

"Documents" in the usage of the Cambridge Research Center have been officially described as "Technical Documentary Reports":

"Reports containing information required or prepared for the specific purpose of recording for future use and assimilation into research and development the significant technical and scientific results and conclusions of military and contract activity."

Although certain of these reports have security value and are therefore "classified," they are all related to the primary research interest of the Center and have been supported and produced with government research monies. Also considered “documents” by the Center are materials received on exchange from foreign governments, universities, or research organizations as serials or data series within this same concept for convenience in control. Center requests for foreign materials or foreign requests for publications on gifts or exchange must be processed by Intelligence channels, so that these materials also are closely related to documents in acquisition, handling, and control.

* Miss Quint was formerly Supervisory Librarian, Serials/Monographs Unit, Air Force Cambridge Research Center Technical Library, Bedford, Mass.
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Not only are the materials and the methods of acquisition complicated, but it is also important to consider some of the special characteristics of documents before proceeding to a discussion of their processing in the Technical Library. Documents in this broad sense have an endless variety of forms. They are fathered by an array of independent agencies, they are completely undisciplined in their production, they are inadequately indexed or not indexed at all, they have a high initial demand and often a sharply-waning decline and oblivion, they are distributed in what can only be kindly described as an absent-minded fashion, they live and die without regard to the researcher's need and are often disowned by the agencies which originated them, and they are further likely to be reincarnated in various forms like some hydra-headed monster. And in every facet of their being they challenge the usual resources of libraries and reference aids.

In spite of all this, they are absolutely essential to proper research in the sciences. Even though they range in value from the newsworthy to the scholarly treatise, they typically represent a mass of knowledge too recent to be available in the scholarly journals and still too experimental to have been tested in general application. To illustrate the processing of this material in the Technical Library, the procedures of the Document Unit, rather than that of the Library as a whole, will be described.

When documents are received, they are assigned an accessions number, and a temporary main card is prepared on duplicate slips by the documents catalogers. One copy of the slip is sent to the documents room for a temporary shelf list while the second is used as the basis of the accessions list. Each list includes one hundred documents. The list, typed on multilith master, is both the basis for the printed cards and for the accessions list. Fifteen copies of each card are made, and more than six thousand documents are cataloged each year.* Added entries, which average eight in number, include contract number, project name, project and task number, individual author and series information.

Documents cards are filed in the Documents Catalog, which is separate from the main library catalog and located in the documents vault area. It is used by the documents staff rather than by the public. Cards are annotated to indicate disposition of material to the Serials Unit or to the Library Cataloging Section, with additional notes on reports available also on microcards and on the destruction of titles.

Two tools are of particular value to the catalogers: Corporate Author Headings and the List of Subject Headings now in its fourth edition and containing detailed and up-to-date subject headings in some 758 pages. Both of these texts have been prepared by ASTIA (Armed Forces Technical Information Services) and may be purchased from the Office of Technical Services, Washington, D. C. Useful as these sources are, much original research remains to be done by the catalogers in establishing

* Editor's Note: Miss Quint later reported that "cards are now being reproduced by a photostatic process and reproduced in units of 24 cards."
entries and subject headings, with variations from the printed lists ranging from twenty-six to fifty-nine percent.

Both the cataloging and processing of these documents require frequent conferences with reference, cataloging, or distribution personnel, so that practical solutions of users' needs can be made. Many unclassified foreign series are referred to the Serials Section, and the cards retained in the Documents Catalog are so annotated. Monographs are also cataloged in the Library Cataloging Section and also annotated on the Documents Catalog cards.

Many variations of handling are possible. For example, the useful *Handbook of Geophysics for Air Force Designers*, published by the Center's Geophysics Research Directorate in 1957, is not only annotated in the Documents Catalog, but is added as a reference copy, with additional copies available for circulation. *Meteorological Abstracts* is received free, as it is partially subsidized by the Center; it is noted in the Documents Catalog and also bound and treated as a reference serial.

Reference work in documents is difficult. Many bibliographical and reference tools exist, however, and a large reference bibliography file is maintained in the Documents unit. Free borrowing and exchange of ideas and materials coordinate the library resources available in the Reference and the Documents Reference Sections. *American Men of Science*, for example, is supplemented by special biographical compendia, which greatly extends its usefulness. Access to many such "classified" reference tools is possible only by those who have both the "need-to-know" and who follow proper security procedures for using this material. To establish their right to use such a classified documents unit, they must have prior clearance through their appropriate contract monitors, and this must be supported by written, rather than oral, approval.

The Library's general facilities are available on a reference and research basis to the qualified public, for the library area is an "unclassified" area within a restricted agency. The Library does not lend serials, but it does lend books to those local libraries which can pick up and return materials. The library tries to service requests of other government agencies and can send reproductions of serials requested. Through these services to the individual and to the library, the Technical Library shares as fully as possible in the informal atmosphere of mutual co-operation consistent with its own security and Center responsibilities.

**Editor Recommends**


Miss Kyle reviews the general classification schemes (DC, UDC, Bliss, Colon) and special outlines in the social sciences according to such criteria as the order of subjects, provisions for compound subjects, new subjects, and related subjects.
The Margaret Mann Citation in Cataloging and Classification is awarded in 1960 to M. Ruth MacDonald for distinguished and devoted service in the field of cataloging and classification as well as for high ideals and outstanding leadership which have made a distinct contribution toward advancement of the library profession as a whole.

If Ruth MacDonald was not born a cataloger she soon became one, for in her freshman year at the University of Washington, she was recruited from a class in library orientation to a job as student assistant in the Catalog Department. With a B.S. in L.S. from the University of Washington, she went at once into cataloging, first in a small college (Reed), then in a public library (Seattle). Midway she paused for a year of study at Columbia University. Her initiation into head cataloging occurred in a small university library (Idaho) whence she progressed to a larger university (Washington). Three years later, in 1939, she moved out of home territory and up to the position of Chief of the Catalog Department of a large public library (Detroit). In 1945 she moved, again eastward and upward, to Washington, D. C. and a challenging position as Chief of the Catalog Division in the (then) Army Medical Library, a position which she held until the spring of 1960 when she became Assistant to the Director of the (now) National Library of Medicine.

Her work at NLM is well known, for it has been well reported. The assignment was formidable: nothing less than the complete reorganization, without interrupting service, of a century-old collection that was increasing rapidly under an expanded acquisitions program. It is an indication of Ruth MacDonald's approach to cataloging that she accepted the assignment as an opportunity, one rarely offered to catalogers: to start over with a clean slate. It is a measure of her cataloging powers that by the end of 1952, the new catalog contained 100,000 titles, the NLM card service had been established, and published catalogs stood as a public record of her achievement.

By 1952, also, Miss MacDonald was able to accept a foreign assignment. During the latter part of that year she acted as consultant in pro-
cessing to the American Memorial Library in Berlin, a service rendered especially valuable because of her broad experience in public and research libraries.

It is remarkable that the years of Ruth MacDonald's most important professional achievement were also the years of some of her most significant work on behalf of the DCC. In this field, as in her personal career, she had laid down a broad and firm foundation.

Beginning at the famous "grass roots," she early became an active member of the PNLA Catalog Section, one of the strongest of the regional groups. In the first Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook (1929) her name appears in the list of members of the ALA Catalog Section. In 1937/38 she was a member of the Board of Directors, and in 1938/39 a member of the "Committee to Consider ALA Reorganization insofar as it affects the Catalog Section, also to Consider the Revision of the Constitution of the Section." As its first Secretary-Treasurer (1941/44), Chairman of the Council of Regional Groups (1944/45) and successively Vice President, President and Past President (1946/49) she served the DCC on its Executive Board almost continuously during the most important period in its history.

It was during the Forties that the DCC made its most spectacular progress. These were the years when the DCC became self-conscious, took an accounting of itself and defined its objectives; when, marshalling its strength, it increased and extended its membership, and found its voice in an official journal. These were the years when the DCC began to look beyond itself, when it sought recognition of its professional authority within the boundaries of its special field, and strove to secure the financial support necessary to the exercise of that authority. These were the years, indeed, when the DCC struggled to find, and to attain, its proper place in the congress of librarians. Ruth MacDonald was involved in all these developments, sometimes at the head, more often in the center. She was the continuing force, in a very real sense serving in the place of the permanent officer the DCC so sorely needed.

The conclusion of her service as a member of the DCC governing body by no means terminated her interest, or participation in DCC affairs. Called on continually in the Fifties by successive Executive Boards, she has contributed her knowledge, experience and talents to various cataloging enterprises, notably the Board on Cataloging Policy and Research and the Catalog Code Revision Committee.

Underlying all Miss MacDonald's achievement is the warm human spirit that animates it, and makes of it a devoted service. Catalogers, individually and collectively, will rejoice in the award of their highest honor to an old friend.
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Making a Catalog Department Manual: A Case History

Robert B. Slocum
Associate Catalog Librarian
Cornell University Library, Ithaca

The following presents a brief history of the formulation of what calls itself: "a nearly complete and authoritative manual of cataloging procedure" for the Catalog Department of the Cornell University Library. It is hoped that it will be helpful to those who may be contemplating a similar project.

The introduction to the Manual states: "Throughout its history the Catalog Department operated with word-of-mouth instructions, memoranda and directives, and some decisions and sample forms on [3 x 5] cards." The situation had become so complex that an authoritative account of present-day procedures was needed if new members of the cataloging staff (professional, semi-professional, and clerical) were to be quickly and accurately indoctrinated and if the work of the Department were to be consistent. The act of writing a manual was an opportunity for thorough review of past and present policies.

A committee consisting of the two Associate Catalog Librarians and three catalogers was formed to work on a manual. Members with varied experience were chosen in order that both old and new outlooks would be represented.

The first task confronting the Editorial Board was to collect every scrap of material concerning past procedures in the Catalog Department. The Editors met daily for several weeks to examine and evaluate this material. Simultaneously the Committee began to construct a preliminary sketch of the manual-to-be. After the production of several scratch copies, the Committee issued a 'final' "Outline (Suggested)." Below is a skeleton of this outline, which in its entirety covered eleven pages:

Title page.
Preface.
Table of Contents.

I. Introduction.
   A. History of the Catalog Department.
   B. Organization of the Catalog Department.

II. Pre-cataloging procedures.
   A. Acquisitions Department.
   B. Typing Section.

III. Statistics.
IV. General cataloging procedures.
   A. New titles and editions.
   B. Added copies, replacements, added volumes.
   C. Rush books.
   D. Revision.
   E. Reproduction of catalog cards and editing.

V. Reclassification.

VI. Recataloging.

VII. Area classification.

VIII. Pamphlet classification.

IX. Theses.

X. Government documents.

XI. Special materials.
   A. Photographic reproductions.
   B. Music.
   C. Other.

XII. Files and filing.

XIII. Special collections and special catalogs.

XIV. Cornell University Libraries.
   A. State College libraries.
   B. Cornell University endowed college, school and departmental libraries.
   C. Independent school libraries.

XV. Serials Department [relationship to the Catalog Department.]

XVI. Circulation Department [relationship to the Catalog Department.]

Appendix
   A. General reference works.
   B. Aids to cataloging and classification.

Index.

Copies of the outline were reproduced and distributed for comment to catalogers, department heads, the Library Administration, and others. The Chief Editor began assigning sections of the first half of the outline to the members of the Committee for writing.

A month after the distribution of the outline, the Committee discussed the comments received from staff members. Actually, only two or three outlines with marginal comments were returned. Whether this indicated the excellence and inclusiveness of the outline or a lack of interest is not known. However, the Committee reviewed the outline and made a few changes in emphases and terminology.

The formal meetings of the Editorial Staff were reduced to a minimum while its members worked at writing their sections, the Editor-in-Chief periodically checking the progress of his cohorts. Whenever a particular section had been completed, the result was routed to each Committee Member for comment, correction, or additions. Meetings of the Editorial Staff were resumed after a major portion of the assigned material had been cast in its 'final' form. The written material was re-studied by the Committee for any necessary revision. When the Committee had completed a preliminary draft of the 'first half' of the Manual (which covered sections I-IX and XI-XII of the outline), forty or fifty
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copies were reproduced by Xerography and Multilith and distributed to the Library Staff. The Committee requested that the draft be read carefully for criticism, suggestions, and corrections which were to be written and returned to one of the Committee members. Since this request evoked little response, it was followed by a second note which brought forth some comments.

For several weeks, the Committee, in session, carefully weighed every criticism, correction, and suggestion offered by the Library Staff. Many of the items were accepted and incorporated into the *Manual*; others were rejected as inconsistent with the organization and purpose of the *Manual*. Whatever writing was necessitated by the accepted items was done by the Committee even as it focused its attention on the remaining sectors of the outline.

This second half was chiefly concerned with areas of specialization which often fell outside the ordinary routines of the Catalog Department. Catalogers of special collections or materials were asked to write out descriptions of their operations and their spheres of responsibility. The Editor read over these descriptions and, wherever necessary, joined with the authors on revision. In general, these 'final' drafts were not submitted to all Library Staff members for comment; however, they were read by some of the librarians directly concerned with these special areas. Then remaining sections of the outline were distributed to regular Committee members.

The final sheets of the *Manual* were prepared by a professional typist for eventual reproduction by Xerography and Multilith. The original typed copy received last-minute appraisal by the Chief Librarian, the Head of the Technical Services Division, and the Catalog Department’s Chief. Approximately one hundred copies were run on pre-punched paper. The separate leaves were laid on long tables and were collated by teams from the Catalog Department clerical staff. The finished product was then distributed to Catalog Department personnel and other staff members.

The *Manual* was two years in the making. Pressure of current work within the Catalog Department, the death of the senior member of the Editorial Committee, and the illness of another editor forced postponements of varying lengths within this two-year period. But the long period of gestation permitted reflection that a hasty job would not have allowed. The Library Administration gave the fullest support to the Committee’s efforts to carry the task to a successful conclusion. It is difficult even to guess at the number of hours used by those who participated in the writing of the *Manual*—hours both on and off Library time.

The Committee faced difficulties in the form of vague decisions, policies that had to be set, and new approaches that had to be approved. These things were settled in the weekly meetings of the Head of the Technical Services Division with his Department Chiefs and Associate Chiefs, as well as in occasional sessions of the Editorial Staff with the Technical Services Head.
Throughout the often exciting but also tedious adventure of piecing together the Manual the Editors followed closely the criteria of a brief article which had appeared just a few weeks before the Committee meetings began.*

The completed Manual is simply and logically arranged—title page, preface, table of contents, and introduction are its first four elements. As befits a reference tool, the table of contents is a comprehensive one of seven pages; its complement, the alphabetical index at the back of the volume, is in double columns and covers 12 pages (leaves). Room for expansion by interpolation has been left in both cases.

The main body of the Manual is concerned, of course, with procedures, and its written explanations are accompanied by numerous sample forms. The explanations are in work sequence; that is, the Manual attempts to follow a book from its arrival in the Acquisitions Department to its final placement on the shelves. The Editorial Staff has no fear of repetition of explanations; in fact, it feels that repetition serves to fix procedures firmly in the cataloger’s mind and thus is all to the good. The relationships of various other departments in the Library to the Catalog Department are implicit in the body of the Manual; therefore it was deemed unnecessary to devote separate sections to these relationships. Other departments may well formulate procedural manuals of their own in coming years. The Appendix offers, among other things, a brief bibliography of professional reading matter, much of it available in the Catalog Department itself, and useful lists of abbreviations. The proposal to include a graded list of reference tools useful to catalogers was discarded, because it would further enlarge a Manual which already consists of 262 leaves. We prefer to reserve any future expansion of the Manual for the main body.

The cataloger’s copy of the Manual is in a loose-leaf, large-ring binder which will permit the periodical insertion of additional pages. The numbering and page references are Arabic; should a new page be inserted between present pages 3 and 4, it would take the numbering 3a, a second page would be 3b, etc. The text is double-spaced, and the left-right and top-bottom margins are large enough to allow the addition of some new material.

The Preface to the Manual says: “A manual in loose-leaf form presupposes continuous addition and revision. Suggestions and criticisms are welcome and needed, if such a tool is to keep up with new developments and techniques.” In the spirit of these words a continuing Committee on the Manual has been appointed; to this Committee will come all matters relating to the Manual, and it is this Group’s responsibility to issue notices of changes to be made. Thus the Manual will serve as the authoritative source for policy and practice within the Catalog Department at all times, even though temporary expedients devised by the Library Administration
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may occasionally bypass the Manual; directives will carefully identify these expedients.

Only long experience will give us an indication of the effectiveness of the Manual as a tool of indoctrination and as an aid to catalog department administration.

Project India

ANNE GREENWOOD
Senior Cataloger
University of California at Los Angeles

FOUR TRAYS of cards disappeared from the Public Catalog of the Library of the University of California at Los Angeles on December 18, 1957. Although a reward was offered, nothing was ever heard of them again, and after an uncomfortable year of waiting for their return, it was decided to make a separate project of their replacement. Since other libraries will probably experience similar thefts, it is hoped that future sufferers may find helpful this account of the procedure followed in replacing the cards.

A part-time typist was assigned to do the work under the supervision of a cataloger, and the replacement was begun on October 29, 1958. It was dubbed “Project India” in imitation of UCLA’s more famous project, and because the majority of the stolen cards were about India.

The missing cards had headings which ran from “Independent s” through “Indian cot”. Since four trays were taken and the average tray at that time contained 1,000 cards, a final goal of 4,000 cards and a daily goal of 40 cards was set. Five kinds of cards were included: main cards, subject cards, added entries, titles, and cross references.

It was decided to make the main approach through the shelf list, which includes the holdings of all the branch and departmental libraries, except for those which have only main cards in the Catalog. The shelf list has three kinds of cards: printed LC cards, full typed cards, and brief typed cards. This last type gave trouble from the very start, because a replacement could not be made from it and because it does not trace added entries. Its main card had to be pulled from the Catalog, and if it had been stolen in addition to the subject cards traced on the shelf list, a guess had to be made at the added entries until one was found from which a replacement could be made. This guessing was usually successful, and in only a few cases did the cataloger have to recatalog the book in sheer desperation.

· 318 ·

Library Resources & Technical Services
Each day the typist was given a list of classification numbers to be checked in the shelf list. The shelf list cards with these numbers which showed main entries or tracings within the missing sequence were taken by him from the shelf list after inserting for each one a dummy showing only the call number and the stamped legend “Project India.” A blanket dummy for all the shelf list cards within each classification number would have saved time, but was not used because all the shelf list cards for that number were not returned to the shelf list at the same time. If the shelf list card was a brief typed one, he followed the procedure described in the preceding paragraph. If the shelf list card was a full typed card, the replacements were typed, since it was found that searching the LC catalogs took too much time. If the shelf list card was a printed one, replacements were ordered from the Library of Congress.

The decision to order printed cards whenever possible was made because the limiting factor in this project was the time to be spent on it by the typist. His wages were the biggest expense, and it was found that his output of completed cards was exactly twice as high with printed cards as with typed ones. His six hours a day were spent in typing LC orders, typing call numbers and headings on LC cards after they arrived, typing full cards as replacements for missing typed cards, typing call numbers on shelf list dummies, typing more complete dummies for the Catalog, and pulling cards from the shelf list and Catalog, and he was just able to meet his quota of 40 completed replacement cards a day.

The cataloger’s duties were much less time consuming—all she had to do was to set up the routine, supply the typist with classification numbers, and proofread the completed cards. As it worked out, the typist did most of the work and the cataloger most of the worrying, for finding classification numbers was very complicated indeed, and called for real detective work. It seemed simple at the start, because the classification numbers which covered India, DS 400-500, had about 1,950 cards in the shelf list. The cataloger thought that while the typist was replacing these, she would have time to complete a list of all other possible classification numbers. She didn’t. At the end of four months the project ground to a halt for lack of classification numbers. This could have been avoided if an order had been placed earlier for photostats made by the copyflo method of the 7,000 cards from “Independent s” through “Indian cot” in the Catalog of the Library of the University of California at Berkeley. The making of these photostats was approved in principle at the start of the project, but they were regarded as a supplement to the shelf list, catalogs, and other resources at UCLA.

The first day’s work by the cataloger revealed that the missing cards were abnormal in consisting almost entirely of subject cards. The LC author catalogs listed only three personal names: In der Gand, Indermaur, and Inderwick, which meant the main entries and added entries to be replaced would be almost all for the country of India. A hasty check through the DS 400-500 section of the shelf list, where most of these would fall, showed the proportion of these to be tiny. Title cards beginning with
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the words "Independent," "Index," "India" and "Indian," (the only possibilities suggested by Books in Print and the Cumulative Book Index) were limited by the prohibitions against making title cards if the title is not distinctive or if the title is identical with a subject heading.

The cataloger's first step was to make a list of the subject headings within the missing sequence from the Subject Heading File maintained in the Catalog Department. The classification numbers for each were obtained by consulting Subject Headings Used in the Dictionary Catalogs of the Library of Congress. These classification numbers, which showed there were only four subjects of any bulk: INDEX LibRORUm PROHIBITORUM, INDEX NUMBERS (ECONOMICS), INDEXES, and INDIA, were then listed on a sheet of paper. It would have been more sensible to list each classification number on a separate P-slip with a carbon copy on a card, giving the P-slip to the typist, and keeping the cards in a file arranged by classification number, with a notation to show whether or not the number yielded any missing cards. The numbers on the sheets could not be arranged in any order and were a nuisance. Not until halfway through the project did it occur to the cataloger to make a card record of the classification numbers which did yield cards, and no card record was ever made of suggested classification numbers which did not pan out. The "see" reference cards in the Subject Heading File were then copied by the typist. Changes in subject headings are not noted in the tracings on main cards or shelf list cards, so this file was used continually by the typist, as he was instructed to check each subject heading against it before typing the subject heading on a typed or printed replacement card.

The cataloger next started the typist on the Continuation File in the Catalog Department. The 67 main entry cards which fall within the missing sequence were taken from this file in order that he might make shelf list dummies from them. This was done at the start of the project because additions were continually being made to the holdings, but the Continuation File should have been done after the typist was more experienced, as the typing was much more complicated and checking cards had to be made, showing not only the old holdings but also the recent additions.

By this time, the first tentative routine evolved by the cataloger had been enlarged and changed, and the final written routine was given to the typist. The typist then started on the DS 400-500 section of the shelf list, and a major defect in the cataloger's routine at once showed up, and should have been corrected immediately. Cards already replaced by the typist (from the Continuation File) were replaced by him again in going through the DS 400-500 section of the shelf list. These duplications could have been avoided if the cataloger had instructed him to stamp "Project India" on the verso of each shelf list card that yielded missing cards.

While the typist was thus immersed in the India part of the shelf list, the cataloger started her task of securing the less obvious classification numbers. She first made a list of possible classification numbers given in the index of each LC classification schedule for the country of India, and
for all subjects divided by country. This tentative list was then checked by her against the shelf list file to see if any cards with these numbers showed missing cards among their tracings. If not, the classification numbers were deleted from the list. If a card record of suggested numbers with the final outcome had been kept from the beginning, the same possible numbers would not have been checked over and over again.

Next, the cataloger listed the classification number of every entry within the missing sequence in the LC author catalogs and every one of the missing subject headings in the LC subject catalog, and then checked the shelf list to see if there were any shelf list cards with those numbers that showed missing cards. It was found advisable to check also the classification numbers before and after the ones listed.

The cataloger next turned to the Cumulative Book Index and the Title Index of Books in Print for titles within the missing sequence. The author’s name had to be listed for each title, in order that she might check the author’s name in the Public Catalog to see if the book was in the library, and, if so, whether missing cards were among its tracings. This search took so much time and was so unproductive that it was soon abandoned.

By this time, the typist had finished the DS 400-500 section of the shelf list. The branch and departmental libraries, which have their own catalogs, furnished lists of the call numbers shown on the cards in their catalogs within the missing sequence, and the typist worked on these. By the time he had replaced them, the three branch libraries which have only main cards in the Catalog had supplied replacements, and the typist was ready to start the cataloger’s list of classification numbers.

The two liabilities of the shelf list approach to the replacement problem had become evident. Because brief shelf list cards do not show added entries and title tracings, some missing cards in these categories were not replaced because the shelf list seemed to show no tracings within the missing sequence. The other and more important difficulty was inherent in the cataloging practice of making the classification number represent only the first subject heading assigned to a book. Additional subject headings may have no connection with the classification number, and the search for these additional subject headings was arduous, and involved some wild guesses. For instance, since a traveler going to India might first have gone to China or Nepal or Afghanistan and had his book classified under those countries, the entire DS section of the shelf list covering all of Asia and the Middle East was examined.

The entire H-HJ part of the shelf list was examined for cards that would yield INDEX NUMBERS (ECONOMICS) as an additional subject heading. INDETERMINATE SENTENCE, INDEX LIBRORUM PROHIBITORUM, and INDEPENDENT TREASURY were such narrow subjects that it was felt they would not be combined with other subjects and would not be found as additional subject headings. By accident the cataloger discovered additional subject headings in the two trays of cards in the Catalog before and after the stolen trays, and these trays were then checked card by card with happy
results. In the process, a number of title cards were found, most of them dealing with Indians of North or South America. The shelf list approach was also unsuccessful in finding title cards in general, because there is often no correlation with the classification number and with the titles of fiction in particular. The most complete replacement was attained for main and added entries and the least complete for additional subject headings and for titles.

At the beginning of the fifth month the photostats arrived from Berkeley. They proved to be a great help and filled the last gaps. When they had been checked and used, the Project was called to a halt at the end of the fiscal year when it was felt that the small number not yet replaced did not warrant its continuance, and that further missing cards could be spotted by chance during the normal use of the Catalog.

Over a period of 9 months, an average of 6 hours' work a day had produced 3,800 replacement cards in addition to a normal increment of 300 cards for new books. The Project was helped by the making of the photostats and the decision to use printed cards whenever possible. It was hindered by not stamping “Project India” on each shelf list card that yielded missing cards and by not making, until four months after the start, a master file of cards showing the call number of each replacement. If the estimate of 4,000 stolen cards was correct, some 200 cards are still missing; but the only way to replace all cards would be to check every card in the shelf list, and, where the shelf list card was brief, the corresponding main card, and it was decided at the start that this was not economically feasible.

**LAW CLASSIFICATION SCHEDULE**

The Los Angeles County Law Library Class K schedule for the classification and shelf arrangement of law books is used in an ever-increasing number of libraries. A recent survey among recipients of Class K indicates that it is used with or without local adaptations at 12 libraries; it is used in part or as a guide or for comparison or consultation in the development of other classification schemes in 11 libraries; its future use has been decided on or is in prospect in 8 libraries and under study in 3 additional libraries; 6 library schools use it actively for purposes of instruction and 3 libraries for advising other libraries when requested for advice on classification. An additional 5 libraries have indicated that they would have used Class K if it would have been available at the time when their collections were cataloged.

Class K is based on the Benyon Classification Class K (1948) and has been issued by the Los Angeles County Law Library as its own system of classification in editions of 1951, 1956 and 1958.—William B. Stern, Foreign Law Librarian, Los Angeles County Law Library, Los Angeles.
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THE ACTUAL scope of this paper is narrower than the title may indicate. First, it is assumed that the problems caused by author and title do not change with the medium of publication. Therefore, these are not discussed. The phrase "cataloging of microfilm" is used, with due consideration for the introduction of ambiguity in the first part of this article, in preference to the longer more accurate one "the content other than author and title of the catalog card describing a microfilm." These are the elements which demand the new look. In the second place, only microfilm which are "published" are considered, not "copy-to-order" reproductions, although there is doubtless a need for rethinking the handling of the latter, even though few new conclusions might be reached.

The cataloging of microfilm is a relatively new branch of the art. The first article on the subject appeared in 1937. Of the twenty-two articles which have appeared since that date, 1 only six are post-1950 and three of these are in a foreign language. In Germany the cataloging of microfilm has become a problem only since the war. The British and other European librarians have not paid much attention to it, at least not in print. It is the American librarians who have been vocal.

The first reaction of librarians to this new medium was conservative. "Practically all of them had decided to await developments before undertaking the job," reported Albert C. Gerould in 1937 after Stanford had inquired for help with the cataloging of their microfilm. 2 Lacking any other guidance, Stanford decided that they "would endeavor to make as few departures as possible from the accepted rules for cataloging printed books." In this article Gerould gave their rules, three in all, which they had adopted, the first to appear in print.

In 1940 Maurice Tauber made a survey of the cataloging of microfilm up to that time as shown by the cards from twelve libraries. 3 He found that besides the information thought to be required by the quality of the reading machines (e.g., the reduction ratio, the placement of the image, and the size of the film) many details about the film were being placed on the cards in notes, e.g., the type of container, the location of the original, the number of frames to the reel, and the kind of film, e.g., Eastman microfile. Tauber was not satisfied with this policy and suggested...
that most of this information, if recorded, belonged on the container rather than on the card since it was of more use to the librarian who had to choose the correct microfilm reader than it was to the borrower.

Another survey was made in 1947 by Helen Jane Jones and Jeannette Hagen. They presented in this report a table of variations from book cataloging as shown by thirteen libraries. These thirteen libraries did not agree in their practice. The authors concluded, "As to the trends in the cataloging of microfilm, it is difficult to discuss them because of the state of uncertainty which exists. A few of the larger libraries are continuing for the present, the old routine. A number of libraries have not tackled the problem in any systematic way. Others, if they cataloged films in pre-war days, have postponed operations because they plan to re-examine the problems in the light of present-day needs. It is too soon to predict what will happen."

The majority of the other articles add little constructive to the solution of the problem. Most mention cataloging briefly while they prefer to treat the entire problem of the handling of microfilm. By and large they all say the same thing—it poses difficulties.

In 1949 the Library of Congress Rules for Descriptive Cataloging appeared with a total of one page devoted to microfilm. As the second and most authoritative set of rules on microfilm cataloging, these ought to have encouraged a certain amount of uniformity. Whether they have or not can only be determined by another survey, which is not the purpose of this paper. These rules recognize two states of the film; it is either a reproduction or a publication. There has been over the years, as can be seen from the proof sheets, a shift in the way in which the notes are expressed, but no shift in the principles behind the rules.

In 1950 Erich Zimmermann of Hamburg, Germany, published an article which surveyed the whole problem from the standpoint of the German libraries, with comparisons where pertinent with American practices. This was followed in 1953, as the report of a committee which he headed, by a set of rules, complete with ten examples (seven more than the Library of Congress gives us), for the cataloging of microfilm. Although the arrangement of the information differs, the basic concepts are not much different from those of the Library of Congress rules.

Time and time again throughout the literature the principle is enunciated that microfilm is to be handled as much like a book as it can be. This has not been followed with complete consistency. Microfilms in the majority of libraries, according to the surveys, have been handled like microfilms. Those who led the way in the cataloging of this newer medium probably were justified in their approach even if their practice did contradict their theory. Most of the film which they had to catalog, with the exception of the Short Title Catalogue Project, were unique or nearly unique copies. That is, either only the negative or the negative and one or two positives made from the negative for a couple of interested libraries were in existence. Many of the films were reproductions of fragments of works made by a faculty member for his own use and given to
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the library when he had finished with them. Filming was done on an individual basis upon the receipt of a request.

Today the amount of filming done on an individual request basis is probably increasing. But there is also a rapidly-growing movement of publication on microfilm. Examples of this are the filming of theses by University Microfilms, the American Theological Library Association project for the filming of runs of periodicals, and the Manucripta project for the filming of the Vatican Library. In these cases the negative never becomes part of the holdings of any library, but many libraries have copies of the positives. This is publishing, even though the medium is quite different from the methods of publication as commonly conceived. Therefore it is time to re-open the question of the cataloging of microfilm and to see where the principle that microfilm should be cataloged like a book is not yet applied.

Under the present rules, stated and unstated, the cataloging of a single film takes much longer than would the cataloging of the book or manuscript from which it was made. The simplest film may take as long as a more complicated book. This is to be expected from the nature of the material. Since the flow of microfilm into our libraries is increasing and does not show any signs of slackening, it would seem desirable to simplify the cataloging process before the sheer volume of the microfilms forces us to do so. There has been considerable reduction of the amount of information placed on the catalog card with the elimination of the position of the image, the kind of film, etc., but there is still more information than is necessary for the user and which can be eliminated with the application of the above principle consistently. The gathering of this information is what takes so much time.

When cataloging books, the cataloger, in so far as he thinks about it, leaves the physical description of the book for the analytical bibliographer, with the exception of the collation line with the number of pages, the extent to which the book is illustrated, and the height, plus notes concerning any special bibliographical information necessary for the identification of the work. The cataloger's main concern as he approaches the book is to provide the user with enough information to identify the book and to determine the subject content. What the book says is more important than the form which it may take. The most difficult and time-consuming problems for the cataloger are the proper entry and the subject headings; neither has anything to do with the physical appearance of the book.

In 1939 two writers on the problems of microphotography, although they avoided the whole problem of cataloging microfilm by saying, "Let us, as Mark Twain used to say, draw a curtain over this scene," offered a particularly pertinent observation. They said, "They (the catalogers) are describing the film strip itself as well as the book of which it is a reproduction. Would these same catalogers approve the suggestion that every card for a printed book include a description of the kind of paper and font of type?" The answer obviously is "No." Although we have come
a considerable distance from the original tendency to place on the card everything that could be found out about the film, and although we have had much discussion over how much of this information should appear on the card and how much should appear on the box in which the film is housed, we still cling to some aspects of description of the film. If the lack of literature on the subject one way or the other recently is an indication, we are either satisfied with this present state of things or have ceased to give it any thought. The notation whether the microfilm is positive or negative and the recording of the width when it deviates from 35mm are examples of this.

Certain parallels can be drawn between the processes connected with the publication of material in a book and the publication of material on a film that show that microfilm is a form of publication in the same sense that a book is a form of publication. (The aspects pertaining to the microfilm will be mentioned first.) The book which is filmed corresponds to the author's manuscript which the book publisher receives. The place of publication of the book corresponds to the place where the manuscript was written. The publisher of the book is the same as the author who did the writing or the typist who did the typing of the manuscript. The date of publication equals the date that the manuscript was finished. The number of pages of the book corresponds to the number of pages of the manuscript. The place where the filming was done is the same as the place of publication of the book. The filming agency equals the publisher. The date of the filming corresponds to the date of publication. The collation of the film, if it has any, corresponds to the collation of the book. The author and title remain the same throughout both processes. The microfilm is a new edition of the work which previously appeared in book form. This fact helps to point out more clearly the path which should be followed if the principle that microfilms are to be cataloged like books is to be followed with complete consistency.

A clear recognition that publication on microfilm constitutes a new edition is hampered by the presence of the attributes of the original edition. In the usual definition of edition, one element is a change in type setting. Such is not the case here. However, two other factors are to be considered at this point. First, different issues are treated in the catalog for all intents and purposes as different editions. Not always is the relationship between them made clear. Second, here there is a radical change in medium. It is possible to conceal a book's past history when the book is reprinted in book form, but it is impossible to conceal that history when the book is reprinted on microfilm. But should it be denied that a microfilm is a reprinting, when the object of the producer is to sell many copies? Despite the haunting presence of the original, this is a new edition and should be treated as such.

At present we are carefully indicating on the card whether the film is negative or positive, despite Tauber's expressed doubts about such a procedure. However, the user need not know whether the film is positive or negative, for it will not affect his use of it. The place for this
information is on the box or the can in which the film is stored where it will be available should the staff need the information.

Richard W. Hale wants a careful recording of negative and positive. He says, “For the difference between these two kinds of microfilm is equal in importance and parallel in kind to that between the plates from which a book is printed and the book itself, since it is from the negative—often called the master negative—that copies are normally made.”

This is true. However, Hale wants this information on the card, but this would be of value only to the person who wanted a copy made, and he can consult other sources, including the box for the film, for this. The word “Microfilm” is sufficient for the catalog card.

Perhaps the most time-consuming task is the “Collation of the original” note. It is especially difficult when the microfilming has been poorly done and the page numbers have been chopped off. William Jerome Wilson, although he is considering primarily the problem of manuscripts on microfilm, makes several pertinent points which can be applied to all cataloging of microfilm. “Collation is a time-consuming thing to make and in many cases it cannot be determined on the basis of the film alone. . . . Since collation is properly an attribute of the original book, it is perfectly logical to omit it in cataloging a film copy. . . . Film as such has no collation.” The catalog card does not record the pagination of the manuscript from which the book is made and would not even if it appeared in the book along with the pagination of the book.

The problem is complicated by the fact that the microfilm is often obtained in lieu of the book, whereas a book is seldom, if ever, requested in lieu of its manuscript. The scholar who is interested in a particular edition of a work which can only be determined by its collation will not be satisfied with the omission of this information, no matter how strong the logic for it may be. On the other hand, the scholar who is seeking the content and is not concerned with the edition will not bother to look at the collation, except to shy away from a little work on a big subject. He will not miss it if it is not there. The analytical bibliographer would not be bothered by the omission; he would have to look at the work regardless of what the card said about its collation.

A note is now used when the occasion demands indicating that a printed edition of a book is reprinted from another edition. The collation of the older edition is not noted. To meet the needs of the scholar who wants editions distinguished before he looks at them, a note can be added to the effect that this microfilm edition was made from such and such a printed edition. In this way the collation of the original can be eliminated entirely while the edition can still be distinguished if necessary.

The collation of the film might be given in place of the collation of the original. Ignoring for the moment the need for it, what might it be? At present, a description of the film is made only if there is more than one reel and if its width is other than 35mm. The number of reels is as important as the number of volumes. However, the width of the film con-
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cerns the user not at all until he comes to put the film into the reader. Only an habitual user of the film will realize what it means. The box can convey this information if necessary. The thickness of the film is standard and would be too difficult to measure, so that need not be considered. This leaves only the length which can be expressed either in the number of feet or in the number of frames, both of which would be more difficult to determine than the collation of the original already is, unless it were supplied by the filmer. It would not convey much information, for the user would also need to know the position of the image and the number of pages to the frame and even the number of frames to the foot; all of these have been dropped from the card. Therefore, only the number of reels remains by which the user can make certain that he has the whole work, if the call number does not guarantee this.

Of what importance is the place of filming? University Microfilms and the University of Chicago Photoduplication Department, to name only a couple, are producing a large number of films on which their names appear. In the cataloging by the Library of Congress of theses produced by these two filmers, the filmers are recognized as the publishers and appear in the regular imprint position. Should the same procedure be followed for all published microfilm? Even today there are bibliographers who do not consider the publisher of a book of sufficient importance to include it. But catalogers consider the publisher of such importance that it is placed, abbreviated or in full, on all cards. Perhaps the best that can be said now is that the importance of this information for films has not yet appeared. There is certainly a trend developing towards the republication of important out-of-print items on film, although the Xerox process may have some affect on this. In this trend it may become important to know who the filmer is, however it also may be that the nature of the film is such that the filmer will not influence our choice of a film the way the publisher does, at times, our choice of a book.

When in the cataloging of the above-mentioned theses, the filmer is placed in the imprint, the imprint of the original, which is so carefully recorded at all other times in microfilm cataloging, is omitted completely. True the place of publication might be said to appear in the theses note. But this raises the question of whether to keep the imprint of the original or to reject it in favor of the imprint of the filmer or to record both. The imprint of the British edition is not placed on the card for the American edition.

The edition is important when changes have been made in the work. In the discussion of the collation this problem was considered. The use of a note was suggested. There is another possibility. Since the usual method of distinguishing editions is by the date of publication, this date could be placed between the title and the imprint of the film. Since its appearance in brackets might not be sufficiently clear as to what it meant, the word “published in” might be needed to preface the date. All things considered, a note would probably be clearer. Thus it would seem legiti-
mate and possible, since the microfilm is another edition of the same work, to omit the imprint of the original and give the imprint of the film instead.

The problem of establishing just what the title page or title frame is complicates the matter somewhat. Some films have a special frame made up by the filmer which gives author, title, and filmer. Others give only the filmer in the first frame, and the author and title must be determined from the next frame, that is, from the original title page. The brackets which are usually used to indicate material obtained from places other than the title page would not be used in this gathering from the title frame and former title page, until such time as filmers always provide a complete title frame. The cataloger at present has no choice but to search for the information needed for the description. It is to be hoped that all who intend to publish on microfilm will provide a clear and suitable title frame, possibly in the form of a catalog card.

The notation that often appears on the cards giving the location of the original would only be desirable in the case of very important materials and would be required in no cases. Scholars for the most part know where their research and source materials are without referring to the catalog card.

In conclusion, the catalog card would contain the following items as the result of the recognition that a microfilm is a different edition of a work previously appearing in a different form: author, title, place of filming, filmer, and date of filming; in the collation line, the number of reels if more than one; a note saying simply "Microfilm"; and, if necessary, a note relating this work to the work that was used to produce this edition.
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U. S. AND CANADIAN DOCUMENTS

The ALA Reference Services and Resources and Technical Services divisions presented at the Montreal Conference a joint program meeting devoted to Canadian and U. S. documents work. These papers will be published in the Winter issue of LRTS.
A Korean Classified Catalog

J. McRae Elrod
Associate Librarian
Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea

Myne has been the rare and rewarding experience of being an American librarian on the staff of a Korean Library since 1955. Although our Yonsei University Library was the most damaged by the war of any major Korean library, it has been the first to be cataloged and to circulate books during the postwar era. For four years it was Korea’s only circulating university library, and remains one of two.

Perhaps the destruction of its catalog was a blessing in disguise. In many ways it is easier to catalog than to recatalog, and recataloging is necessary for most Korean libraries since former cataloging was done under the Japanese and now Korea is free to use her own alphabet in constructing her catalogs for Oriental books.

The great advantage which Korean librarians have over library workers in any other Oriental country is Korea’s outstanding alphabet. For library purposes it is vastly superior to either Chinese characters or the Japanese syllabary. It even has some points to recommend it over the Roman alphabet, being more phonetic and more compactly written, and certainly more beautiful. And what is even more wonderful, there is an established method of writing both Chinese and Japanese in the Korean alphabet, much as we Romanize Russian and Greek entries for our catalogs. Each Chinese character has a one-syllable pronunciation and one spelling in the Korean alphabet. Most Chinese, Japanese, and Korean authors have a three-character Chinese name. Most Japanese books as well as Chinese books have their titles written in Chinese characters. Thus it is an easy matter to adopt the unit card system and, using the Korean alphabet, make main and added entries for all of the Oriental books in the collection. This we have done. The reason that this had not been done by Korean libraries earlier was that the Japanese discouraged the use of the Korean alphabet.

Similarly, little difficulty was encountered in making main and added entries for Occidental books. The cataloging rules of America and Europe are in substantial agreement and could be adopted here without alteration.

We then had two catalogs, one in the Roman alphabet and one in Hankul, but still no subject approach to the collection. Several possibilities occurred to us: first, the filing of English subject headings in the Roman catalog and the filing of Korean subject headings in the Hankul catalog thus creating two dictionary catalogs; or, second, the filing of sub-
ject cards for all of the books in the collection in one separate alphabetic subject catalog using Korean subject headings; or, third, the filing of subject cards for all of the books in the collection in one classified subject catalog using the same classification system as is used for the books but classifying more closely and providing an index in card form.

Although the dictionary catalog has found almost universal acceptance in America, we found only one instance of it in Korea; and that one includes books only in the English language. After experimentation, we found that the language barrier made the assigning of correct subject headings in English almost impossible for most Korean librarians. The correct classification number for an English book could be assigned with comparative ease, but the choice of a foreign word from a list where context is no guide to the exact nuance of the word proved to be impossible for most. The greatest difficulty which confronted our two-dictionary-catalog plan, however, was the absence of a list of subject headings in the Korean language. The construction of such a list seemed a Herculean task which must be undertaken, then, but not by us. Because instruction in Korean had not been allowed for many years under the Japanese, there are many words, particularly in the scientific fields, which had no established Korean equivalents. There was no generally-accepted Korean word, for example, for so simple a thing as a screwdriver. This is not surprising. A lesser people than the Koreans might have lost their language altogether under the same situation.

Also arguing against the two-dictionary-catalog plan was the fact that one would have to consult two catalogs to determine the complete holdings of the library on any one subject. The one Korean subject catalog would have provided a unified subject approach, but it would have been almost impossible to assign Korean subject headings to advanced scientific works in English.

Then there was published Shera and Egan's *The Classified Catalog* (Chicago, American Library Association, 1956). This seemed the ideal answer to our problem. We immediately launched into the conversion of our public shelf list into a classified catalog. This involved the introduction of more than one card for many works and, above all, the construction of indexes in both English and Korean for filing in the Roman and Hangul catalogs. *Sears List of Subject Headings, Subject Headings Used in the Dictionary Catalogs of the Library of Congress*, the Relative Index to *Dewey Decimal Classification*, and *Readers' Guide* all provided terms for the English index. The Korean index was a little more complicated. First, one worker took a list of subjects in Chinese gathered from several indexes and transposed them into Korean. Then a student good in English read them to me, and I responded with the proper classification number which he in turn wrote down. These cards were then placed in shelf list order to be transferred to the public catalog as needed. Additional specific index cards are made as books being processed require them.

We have received recent encouragement in our classified catalog in the coming to Korea of Dr. Jannette E. Newhall of Boston University Li-
library, the site of one of the classified catalogs used as an example by Shera and Egan. Dr. Newhall spent her sabbatical leave at Ewha University aiding library development there.

All Korean libraries, we feel, do not necessarily have to arrive at the same answer in determining which is the best form of the subject catalog for their own use. A university, faced as we were with the absence of a list of subject headings in Korean and whose patrons are accustomed to the classified arrangement because of previous experience with a public shelf list, might, as we did, select the classified catalog. A college or high school library with open shelves and a fairly large number of western books might decide to construct two dictionary catalogs. A list of subject headings is now being translated by Mr. Jaechul Lee, Yonsei University Library Reference Librarian, as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Library Science at Yonsei; he has been advised in this project by Mrs. Pong Soon Lee of Ewha. We decided upon two dictionary catalogs for our medical branch library where Korean books are very few and Korean subject headings can be established as we go. A middle school or public library with few western books might prefer the one Korean subject catalog.

We have found the classified catalog highly satisfactory. By including individual biographies in both the alphabetic catalogs and the classified catalog we can answer both, “Do you have a biography of so-and-so?” and “What biographies do you have?” We also depart from Shera and Egan by including cards in the classified catalog for fiction in all languages. We find that these cards are heavily used and certainly worth the extra space they occupy.

For the classification system we selected Dewey with expansions in Oriental subjects taken from local schemes or worked out by ourselves. We were the first library to classify and shelve all books together. The usual solution had been to use Dewey for English books, a Korean system for Korean books, and a Japanese system for Japanese books. This resulted in unfortunate fragmentation; sometimes the same book in three translations would have three completely unrelated numbers.

The problem of author arrangement for Oriental books was also easily solved when it was discovered that, because of the compact method of writing Korean, the complete author’s name could be written in the same space as a Cutter number for an Occidental book. For the shelf, shelf list, and classified catalog arrangement we imagine an extended alphabet beginning with the Korean alphabet and ending with the Roman alphabet. It is not possible to have author numbers based on Korean surnames because there are very few surnames in Korea, and sometimes as many as half the authors in one class number will have the same surname. For libraries which prefer author numbers, however, we have worked out a system whereby the entire surname (never more than one syllable which takes as much space to write as one Roman letter) is written followed by numbers representing the given names. In Korea one cannot refer to “first, middle, and last” names since, as in other Oriental countries, the surname is first,
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followed by the given names—a much better arrangement for library purposes than the western one since names need not be inverted for catalog entry.

We hope that our catalogs serve our readers well. They seem to. Our circulation is greater, particularly in western books, than that of any other similar institution in Korea, and some of our practices are now spreading to other libraries.

President’s Report, 1959-1960

The following is based upon the President’s Report made to the Membership, June 23, 1960, at the Montreal Conference of the American Library Association.

It is my privilege to report upon the overall work of the Resources and Technical Services Division for the year 1959-1960.

You may like to have recalled to you something of the organization of the Resources and Technical Services Division. In addition to a President and Vice President, your Executive Secretary, and your Board, there are 51 Sections and Committees working for you. Last year, Past-President Bernice Field estimated that about 275 people were engaged in this work. The Board of Directors, in addition to your officers, is made up of the Section Chairmen: Acquisitions, Cataloging and Classification—which at the Montreal meeting celebrated its 60th anniversary—Copying Methods, and Serials. There is also the Chairman of the Council of Regional Groups whose work reaches into your states and into many of your communities, two Directors at Large, five Councillors, and your Editor. All the offices, except those of the Executive Secretary and the Editor, are elective and so you have an opportunity to influence the direction you wish the Division to take. You are also urged to call to the attention of any of your officers matters which you think should be considered.

Most of the business of the Division is conducted through the agency of the Executive Secretary. The Division’s business is done largely by mail; but both at Midwinter and at the Annual Conference intensive work is done by the various groups and the Directors. Occasionally, some of the committees are able to meet during the year; but the expanse of our country and the limited budget which the Division has prevent this occurring as often as might be desired.

Among the division-wide considerations of the year were the type of statistics which the American Library Association might be expected
to recommend libraries keep for the Office of Education, a statement of the work of the Division in relationship to the Goals of the Association, the clarification of the part which the Division should be expected to play in the Association's publishing program, the Division's budget, a request that the Division consider having a section for Circulation Librarians, the appointment of RTSD committee members and representatives, and the plans made by Vice President Melvin Voigt, the Cleveland Conference Chairman. As you will remember, among the objects of the Division are responsibilities for activities related to acquisition, identification, cataloging, classification, and preservation of library materials in all types of institutions, and to work for the development and coordination of the country's library resources.

Acquisitions Section

The Acquisitions Section, Dorothy Keller, Chairman, had the same sort of active year which kept the old Acquisitions Round Table a lively and productive organization.

Frank Schick, Chairman of the Foreign Desiderata Publications Committee, who arranged the overflow and enthusiastic meetings in Washington, ran into some problems there with the plans which had been hoped for in relationship to the listing of French, Italian, and Spanish out-of-print items for American libraries. But during the year, he was able to resurrect the project and with the cooperation of the R. R. Bowker Company, lists of foreign out-of-print titles were distributed to American and foreign dealers specializing in such publications.

A committee which has had Council's permission to speak for the American Library Association, the Fair Trade Practices Committee, James Henderson, Chairman, was at work endeavoring to establish ways in which differences between libraries and the book trade could be adjusted. The Canons of this Committee are worthy of your consideration if you are faced with dealer and acquisition problems. They can be read in the 1960 edition of the American Library Annual.

An exciting idea has come from the Acquisitions Policy and Research Committee, Felix Reichmann, Chairman. This is a National Book-Code Number System, which would help increase bibliographic controls for new publications in libraries and other information centers. The codes would show the year of copyright, the publisher, and a serial number. Cumulated over the years, it is thought that this system would be of great help to booksellers as well as to libraries. You will probably be hearing much more of this idea in the months ahead, especially if the committee can secure foundation support for its investigations. The Policy Committee also encouraged increased study of mechanization in acquisitions work, to determine which operations lend themselves to mechanization and which do not. It considered procurement procedures from underdeveloped countries, that is, countries where the book trade organization is not strong. Better library school course training for acquisition work is being urged by the Committee which points out that libraries do not accept
catalogers or reference librarians with as little specialized training as they do for work in procurement.

Interesting work continues to be done by the Committee on Cost of Library Materials, William Kurth, Chairman. When for most things in America there are cost indexes, it has been surprising that so few cost factors were generally known as the price indexes of publications. The work on economic indicators which the Committee has done since it was established in 1957 has been a great help in budget preparation and in justifying expenditures. Price averages and index numbers were computed for 1953, 1956, and 1958, as well as for the base period, 1947-1949. At least 18 people were involved in preparing the tables. You can examine them in Library Resources and Technical Services, Summer 1959, Spring 1960, and in the Library Journal for January 1, 1960. The indexes will appear in the 1961 American Library Annual and in other professional journals. Its work is being continued. Subject fields covered so far have been for American publications in Art, Literature, Music, History, Business, Economics, Education, Science, Technology, Law, Medicine and Biography. Agriculture is in progress.

The Reprinting Committee, Joseph Brewer, Chairman, continued, under its better known name of the Reprinting Expediting Service, to issue its Bulletin which brings to the attention of publishers titles which libraries would like to see reissued and tells libraries about those which have already appeared. Special aid to the Committee has come from G. K. Hall Co. of Boston and The New York Public Library.

Cataloging and Classification Section

Much of the intense and well-disciplined spirit of the Cataloging and Classification Section, the oldest of the groups in what is now the Division, has been adopted by the other Sections and the Division's Committees. Richard Angell had the good fortune to be Chairman of CCS in this sixtieth anniversary year; more than 300 attending the celebration banquet which it held to celebrate this distinguished occasion. Mary Herrick, as at the Fiftieth anniversary dinner, was toastmistress.

The Section's Cataloging Policy and Research Committee, Katharine Ball, Chairman, held four active meetings at Midwinter. A statement prepared by Miss Ball on their work with Cataloging in Source follows this Section report. At Midwinter they considered the reports on the Interdivisional Book Catalogs Committee, on the Manual for the Dewey Classification, on the Council of Library Resources sponsored Project "Targets for Research," and a report being done for the U. S. Office of Education concerning the development of an information service on research media other than books. In April, the Committee met in Philadelphia.

The Far Eastern Materials Committee, Charles Hamilton, Chairman, considered problems of entry characteristic of Far Eastern materials. The Chairman of the Catalog Code Revision Committee, Wyllis Wright, reports on the Preliminary Meeting of the International Cata-
loguing Conference, in London, July 1959, where plans for a conference in Paris, 1961, were laid. Work was also done in connection with the Second Institute on Catalog Code Revision held at McGill University, June 13-17, 1960, at which more than 250 librarians participated. The draft of the Code, commentary, and working papers were prepared and distributed prior to the Institute. Additional copies of the Code and commentary may be purchased through the ALA Publications Office.

Richard Angell, Chairman of the Cataloging and Classification Section writes:

A considerable part of the activities of the Cataloging and Classification Section can be summed up in the events of the Montreal Conference. The Institute on Catalog Code Revision was held at McGill University the week of June 13, 1960. The Institute was jointly sponsored by CCS, the Cataloging Section of the Canadian Library Association, and McGill University. By means of a grant from the Council on Library Resources, it was possible to invite to the Institute the members of the International Federation of Library Associations’ Organizing Committee for the International Conference on Cataloging Principles to be held in Paris in September or October of 1961. The members are Hugh Chaplin of the British Museum, Executive Secretary, and Mme. Nadejda Lavrova of the All Union Book Chamber of the Soviet Union, Paul Poindron of the French Ministry of Education, and Dr. Ludwig Sickmann of the Bibliothekar Lehrinstitut, Cologne. The Executive Committee of the Section initiated actions which will enable the Association to comply with Mr. Chaplin’s request that the matter of the United States delegation to the Paris conference be taken up with other national library associations and that measures be taken to secure expressions of views in this country on the positions advocated in the working papers for the conference which will be distributed later. The Library of Congress and the International Relations Committee have concurred in the recommendations that the Section will be making. In further pursuit of the international aspects of catalog code revision, the Section’s Executive and Code Revision Steering Committees, with the concurrence of the Library of Congress, are recommending that the production of an Anglo-American code be a formally declared objective of the ALA and the British Library Association in the code revision work now proceeding in both countries.

A development in which the Section takes great satisfaction is the completion of steps calculated to confirm the close collaboration that has existed between the Cataloging and Classification Section and the Cataloguing Section of the Canadian Library Association. Both Sections have voted to name a member to maintain liaison with the other by attending meetings of its Executive Committee as circumstances permit, receiving and transmitting minutes, and the like. The Section regards this action as a most appropriate expression of the close rapport between the two Sections, on which CCS feels the success of the jointly planned and executed events of the Montreal conference were based. These were, in addition to the Institute, the joint program meeting, with Dr. W. Kaye Lamb, National Librarian of Canada as principal speaker, and the Section’s 60th Anniversary Dinner.
Cataloging in Source

This report, prepared by Katharine Ball, Chairman of the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee, was read at the membership meeting of the Montreal Conference:

The experiment in Cataloging in Source was made possible by a grant from the Council on Library Resources, Inc., to the Library of Congress. Over 1200 publications were cataloged and classified from proof sent by the publishers to the Library of Congress, and this cataloging information was printed in the publications when they appeared.

The experiment had two parts: One was concerned with the financial and technical problems involved and the practicability of the proposal from the viewpoints of the publishers and the Library of Congress. The other was concerned with the actual use which libraries and other consumers might make of the catalog entries appearing in the publications they acquired.

The full report of the project has now been published, and in it the Librarian of Congress and the Director of the Processing Department have rejected the program. The results of the first part of the experiment show that it is impossible for the Library of Congress to carry out a continuing program of the inclusive nature originally envisaged. It shows the refusal of some publishers to participate and the objections of others to added costs, delays in tight publishing schedules, and problems in design caused by the Cataloging in Source entry. It also shows a high incidence of inaccuracy in certain details of the cataloging, such as title transcription, imprint date, and collation. These errors were caused by changes in the work between the time it was cataloged from proof and the appearance of the finished product. On the positive side, it quotes the comments of publishers who were enthusiastic about the project, pleased with the results, had no problems of timing, expense or design, and hoped it would continue. For example, it has been brought to the attention of the Committee that the Library of the Department of the Interior is providing cataloging information for printing in the publications of the U. S. Bureau of Mines, at the request of the Bureau. The Report also shows a very high degree of accuracy in such details of the cataloging as entries, subject headings, and classification.

On the second aspect of the experiment, the Consumer Reaction Survey reported enthusiastic response from librarians to the prospect of finding the cataloging information in the book. This response was not only from catalogers, but from acquisition and public service librarians, who foresaw many uses for the information. One difficulty in balancing the two parts of the report is that, while the Library of Congress had the actual experience of working out routines for cataloging over 1200 books and dealing with more than 150 publishers, a very small number of the books cataloged were received in any one Library and some of the libraries had received none when the survey team visited them. Their opinions, therefore, were largely based on projections, which are apt to be less convincing than factual statistics of time, expense, and errors.

The Cataloging Policy and Research Committee was asked by the Librarian of Congress to act as an advisory board to the Consumer Reaction Survey. In this capacity, the Committee participated in every phase of
this operation except the actual interviews and the reports of the individual members of the team. It advised in the selection of the survey team, the compilation of the questionnaire, the publicity, and the final report of the Director. On the basis of the results of the Survey it recommended to the Librarian of Congress that the program should be fully implemented, a recommendation which he was unable to accept.

The Cataloging Policy and Research Committee considered that its function as an advisory group to the Cataloging and Classification Section laid upon it the obligation to make further recommendations to the Section on the results of the project as a whole. There are several obvious facts that emerge from this experiment:

1. Libraries want and need cataloging information in the book.
2. The details in which a high degree of error was found in the experiment (i.e., title transcription, imprint date, and collation) can be readily ascertained from the book itself, and are therefore of minor importance.
3. The details in which very few errors were present (i.e., entries, classification and subject headings) are the most difficult to establish from the book itself, and are therefore of major importance.
4. The type of entry which presents the greatest difficulty is that for corporate bodies, especially government headings.

On the basis of these facts, the following proposal has been presented to the Executive Committee of the Cataloging and Classification Section and to the Board of Directors of the Resources and Technical Services Division and has received their endorsement. The Cataloging Policy and Research Committee now wishes to present this proposal to the Section membership for its endorsement:

That the Library of Congress be urged to consider an alternative plan to provide a limited program of Cataloging in Source, which could be developed in the following way:

1. The cooperation of all interested publishers be sought, but the program not be considered in terms of all publishers nor of all titles of the cooperating publishers.
2. The assistance and cooperation of federal agencies which maintain publishing programs be sought extensively, and legislation be recommended which would require participation of federal agencies in such a program and would provide the necessary appropriations to support the program.
3. The cataloging information supplied for Cataloging in Source be restricted to those elements of cataloging data not immediately obvious in the item being cataloged.

The Section endorsed the recommendations, and the CCS will start immediately implementing them.

Copying Methods Section

Last year, the Copying Methods Section, Charles LaHood, Chairman, was in an anomalous position, but the ALA Committee on Organization recognized that its work was closely associated with the Resources and Technical Services Division. As a result, the Section has had its RTSD identity confirmed and has been contributing to the areas in which we
specialize. Its function is “To promote the usefulness of photocopying and other duplication processes in library resources and technical services; to publicize new developments and their application, and to evolve suitable guides for library use in copying methods.”

Two special committees were established. One, on Library Standards for Microfilm, is collecting standard specifications and other guides applicable to microphotography. It hopes to publish them and to encourage libraries to adhere to these standards.

The second committee, on Standardized Photographic Order forms, is designing an order form for library photoduplication which will meet the problems of record-keeping and bibliographic control.

**Serials Section**

The Serials Section, whose precursor round table published the much-followed *Serial Slants*, had Mary Kahler as Chairman. The Section performed many useful functions during the year.

It intimately concerned itself with the problem of serial format and with complaints which have come to its attention. For instance, some technical journals perforate their pages. Other publishers have been approached concerning their reluctance to accept “till forbid” orders. A joint Committee with the Acquisitions Section to Compile an International List of Subscription Agents was established. Another committee was considering the baffling problem of the publications of international organizations, which, because of the different places in which many of them meet and because they do not necessarily meet with prescribed regularity, present serious problems.

The Serials Policy and Research Committee has considered preparation of a list of American Annuals and is studying the possibility of a “Serials Use” study which would measure the efficacy of catalogs and other records as approaches to serial publications.

**Council of Regional Groups**

Edith Scott completed her third year as Chairman of the Council of Regional Groups, in which 28 regional organizations participate. In general, the groups are interested in all the aspects of RTSD work. As a source of local opinion, they aid and strengthen RTSD. Benjamin Custer, Editor of the Dewey Decimal Classification, has found the Council members helpful in giving their opinions on matters in which he sought aid. The Council met at Montreal to consider program planning. Bernice Field acted as Chairman in the absence of Miss Scott.

**Committees**

A number of Committees work directly under the authority of the Board of Directors.

The Division’s Conference Program Committee, in the course of months, arranged for a program of Government Documents, at Montreal, with the aid of the Acquisitions Section’s Public Documents Commit-
The Nominating Committee was headed by Mary Herrick and the Elections Committee by Esther Murbach. The Publications Committee, Helen Welch, Chairman, ended its final year with excellent effect. In the March 1960 issue of the University of Illinois Library School’s Occasional Papers it published its survey of publications covering the fields of the Division’s responsibilities. The Regional Processing Committee, William Lowry, Chairman, distributed questionnaires to help define the nature of the Committee’s work. There had been difficulty in the differentiation between regional centers and the integrated systems.

The Resources Committee, Ralph Ellsworth, Chairman, which last year did such accomplished work for the National Union Catalog, was busy this year on Micro-Publishing Projects. It is trying to persuade publishers of microprojects to turn to the Committee for advice and coordination and to persuade librarians to seek advice before signing up for any projects. During the year, the Committee brought to completion the publication of the 1952-1955 segment of the National Union Catalog and authorized the Library of Congress to determine the market demand for a subject index to the Catalog. The Committee is seeking a foundation grant to make an analysis of the “Nature of the full bibliographic cycle.”

The Joint Committee on Government Publications—Association of Law Libraries, Association of Research Libraries, and the American Library Association—has had the ALA-RTSD represented by William Pullen as Chairman. The Joint Committee has decided to continue the Documents Expediting Service for the time being because of continued subscriber interest. The School Library Technical Services Committee, Mary Louise Mann, Chairman, prepared the first draft of a manual on centralized technical processes. The manuscript is now being evaluated, and by October it should be ready to present to the American Library Association’s publishing department for consideration. The RTSD member on the ALA Membership Committee has been Claribel Sommerville. Miss Sommerville prepared an attractive brochure indicating the advantages of membership in the Division.

The Bookbinding Committee, Arnold Trotier, Chairman, spent a year of intensive work on the development of a proposal for establishing performance records for library binding. The Committee, mindful that American libraries spend upwards of $7,000,000 a year for library binding, believes that specifications must be designed to facilitate securing the best appropriate binding at minimum cost. In order to launch a study on binding requirements, the Committee approached the Council on Library Resources for a grant which would enable it to make such an investigation with representatives from the Special Library Association. The Committee also considered an Institute at the 1961 Cleveland Conference of the American Library Association which would acquaint those who attend with the development of new binding standards, demonstrations, and discussions of binding done according to the Specifications for
Lesser Used Materials, and ways in which library binders and industry representatives believe libraries could keep down binding costs. New equipment and supplies for simple binding and repair work, done within libraries, would be exhibited.

The Organization Committee, chaired by RTSD Past President Bernice Field, had an active year in which the functions of all Division and Section Committees were reviewed. In the third year of the Division, such a review had seemed appropriate, especially since the functions of some committees no longer appeared to be clear, and some overlapping had developed. The Committee recommended that the Public Documents Committee become a Division Committee. The RTSD Board and the Acquisitions Section Executive Board and its membership approved of this action. At the Montreal Conference, it thus was transferred to Division status. The functions of the Regional Processing Committee were expanded, those of the Acquisitions Section’s Research Committee and the Cataloging Policy and Research Committee and the Serial Policy and Research Committee were amended to make them responsible for keeping informed on “research in progress,” in their areas of responsibility.

Other committees which were reviewed were the Editorial Committee of the Serials Section, the Interdivisional Committee on Book Catalogs, the Bookbinding Committee, the Interlibrary Cooperation Committee, the Resources Committee, the Bylaws Committees, the Acquisitions Section’s Information and Reprinting Committees, the Copying Methods Section and its committees on Library Standards for Microfilm and Standardized Photographic Order Forms, the Resources Committee’s Sub-committee on Micropublishing Projects, the new International Organizations Publications Committee of the Serials Section. The Publications Committee, having fulfilled its need, was abolished on the basis of the Organization Committee’s recommendation, and the Public Documents Committee was under study as an interdivisional Committee with the Reference Services Division.

RTSD Bylaws were much in the mind of your Board during the year. The Bylaws Committee, Bella Shachtman, Chairman, and her associates, with the aid of a number of people within RTSD, including Werner Ellinger and Benjamin Custer, the authority on the Association’s Constitution and Bylaws, did intensive work on the Division’s new Bylaws. Their rewriting of the Bylaws appeared in the Spring 1960 issue of Library Resources and Technical Services. So successful was the Committee, that the membership unanimously approved their acceptance at the Montreal Conference.

The Division’s journal, Library Resources and Technical Services, which goes to all members, is a source of pride to all of us. Its informative and thoughtful nature depends upon the many contributors and advisers but most of all its continuing and growing importance derives from the work of the Editor, Esther Piercy, and the Managing Editor, Carlyle Frarey. As in every year, efforts have been directed toward making the
publication more attractive and easier to read, and the desire has been to fill each issue with articles from which the membership would benefit. At the Montreal Conference, Miss Piercy indicated that she likes to have comments on LRTS, whether they are favorable or critical. She and her associates, she said, want to give the RTSD members "the kind of magazine you want and deserve."—John Fall, President.

Report of the RTSD Executive Secretary 1959-1960*

A significant item of business at this meeting of the membership is to be the presentation of bylaws for the Division. For three and a half years we have been operating under provisional bylaws. To the credit of your officers, no disasters resulted. And now you are to be asked to approve bylaws which have received the sanction of both the ALA Committee on Constitution and Bylaws and the RTSD Board of Directors. I hope you have all read them carefully, for they show clearly that this is a membership organization and that you, the members, are represented by the elected officers and are entitled to full reporting on the activities that are undertaken in your behalf.

I am fully conscious of Article VII, Section 2 of the bylaws which spells out the duties of the officers. Perhaps you noticed that under the Executive Secretary emphasis is given to reporting annually to the membership. Such is the explanation for my presence at this time, lest anyone believes I am prompted by vainglory to appear before you each year. No doubt there are many of you who really like to know what is going on at the Headquarters office. I always try to make clear that the significant contributions of the Division to the profession are made by the committees, and your President and section chairmen report on these; Headquarters' activities are largely those of keeping the wheels turning and now and then providing ideas or stimulus that result in a significant achievement.

The load in the RTSD office is increasing as the sections develop programs and as our membership grows. On December 31, 1959, we had 5,165 members—the largest of the type-of-activity divisions in the ALA. As of May 31, 1960, we already have 4,901 members as compared to 4,630 by May 31, 1959. Delighted as I am at this development, the increase at the end of 1959 has, regretfully, caused me considerable embarrassment. One of my responsibilities is to serve as Circulation Manager of Library Resources and Technical Services, and in this capacity I authorize its press run. In 1959 we had a shortage of the Winter issue with a press run

* Presented at the RTSD Business meeting, Montreal, June 23, 1960.

Volume 4, Number 4, Fall 1960
of 5400, and so it was increased to 5800 in 1960. No doubt the current ALA membership drive is showing results, for which we are pleased, but my “questimate” was too low and again the number one issue of volume 4 is out-of-print. The number of subscriptions is close to 400, including our half dozen or so exchanges. No doubt you are aware of the notable increase in the number of advertisements appearing in the most recent issues. We are indebted to the diligence of David Turiel, the Advertising Manager, for this financial assistance, which helps to decrease the subsidy we require from ALA general funds.

Correspondence continues to be our most time-consuming activity. Communication within an organization as diversified as RTSD would be very difficult were it not for the “carbon chain.” By sending carbons of each letter to all people concerned, one letter serves to inform several individuals of the matter at hand.

One of the important functions of executive secretaries is to serve as an expert in the division’s specific field of responsibility. All Headquarters correspondence dealing with the interests of RTSD is sent to my office for handling. Each letter requires a reply even if it is only a referral to someone more knowledgeable about the particular topic than I am. Perhaps you would be interested to know the subjects about which I receive the most frequent inquiries. One is for special classifications. As a result of our Classification Committee’s cooperation with the Special Libraries Association’s Committee on Special Classifications, I feel free to refer many of these to the SLA Loan Collection, and, for those not covered in the collection, I refer the inquiry to the knowledgeable and ever-helpful Chairman of the Classification Committee, Mrs. Phyllis Richmond. For the frequent questions about how to organize or catalog a collection or small library, my reply includes a brief mimeographed bibliography on “Organizing a Library: Cataloging and Classification” which was revised last fall by Sarah Vann, the incoming CCS chairman. We continue to receive inquiries about centralized processing for both public libraries and schools. The manuals being prepared by the Regional Processing Committee and the School Library Technical Services Committee will be invaluable aids in replying to these inquiries.

Another frequent question concerns the cost of cataloging. If anyone can supply me with a pat answer to this one, I’d surely appreciate it. Inquiries about library binding specifications and card cataloging reproduction are now referred to the Library Technology Project. This is just a sampling of the most often repeated questions that come to my office.

One of our activities that was rather time-consuming last fall was assisting the International Relations Office by preparing the itinerary of two Indian Documents Librarians who were here visiting libraries on a Rockefeller Foundation Grant. Messrs. Sachdeva and Surender-Nath were in this country for nine months, and we made the arrangements for their tour of the various libraries in this country. One other time-consuming activity in addition to our routine operation has been preparation for the Institute on Catalog Code Revision at McGill University. Al-
though Headquarters' assistance was only a small part of the time and effort of all concerned, we were involved in its publicity, in seeking funds to bring the IFLA delegates to America and issuing invitations to them, in handling United States reservations, and in duplicating and distributing the working papers.

Besides these unusual tasks, our regular work involves preparation for both the midwinter meeting and the annual conference—schedules, agenda for meetings, notices; and afterward, preparation and distribution of minutes. The extent of this operation can best be described by saying that we are working on conferences all year long—the follow-up from one is never completed before we start our preparation for the next one.

As sponsor for the ASA Sectional Committee on Photographic Reproduction of Documents, PH5, we find ourselves again involved in duplication and distribution of minutes and other materials such as proposed and approved standards and calls to meetings. For the affiliated Regional Groups we receive and file minutes of their meetings and have been collecting affiliation dues as well as keeping records of the officers in order to compile for listing in the ALA Membership Directory the officers of the affiliated groups.

The Executive Secretaries are expected to do a certain amount of traveling to represent ALA at state and regional meetings and to keep in touch with our members at the local level. We are frequently asked to speak at meetings or to act in an advisory capacity. This past year I had the pleasure of attending the Mountain Plains Library Association meeting in Colorado Springs where I spoke at the regional group meeting, and the New York Library Association meeting in New York where a Technical Services Section was established. I attended a meeting of the Steering Committee of the Catalog Code Revision Committee in Washington, D. C., for planning the Institute on Catalog Code Revision, and I made two trips as a consultant on centralized processing. One was to the Nevada State Library in Carson City and the other to the Michigan State Library in Lansing. I also had the privilege of attending the Institute on the Role of Classification in the Modern American Library at Allerton Park in Monticello, Illinois.

As I mentioned previously, the work in our office is increasing, and several times we have found it necessary to request clerical assistance. We are asking for more clerical assistance next year in order to do some of the routine chores such as weeding our files and keeping the office membership records up-to-date, neither of which we have been able to do this past year. When I say "we" I am not using the editorial "we;" I am including the invaluable and loyal service of my secretary, Mrs. Genevieve Leher.

We try to give as much assistance as possible both to the membership and to the officers. It has been a pleasure working this year with our present division and section officers and I am looking forward to another busy and eventful year with those who are assuming new duties at this conference.—Orcena Mahoney, Executive Secretary.
THE EIGHTEEN Group meetings included in this report, my last for the Council of Regional Groups, are especially interesting to me. The basic problem discussed in the Groups has not changed, but there is increased emphasis on a new and three-pronged attack. National and international cooperation, centralization, and mechanization seem to hold the answer to that old question of securing maximum efficiency at minimum cost.

The Chicago Regional Group heard a distinguished panel (Arnold H. Trotter, Helen Welch, William H. Huff, and Lucien White, all from the University of Illinois, and Arnold S. Wajenberg, University of Chicago) on “The Ideal Organization of Technical Services, from the Specialist’s Point of View.” The need of the public service departments is more promptness in all areas. The ideal organization differs according to type of library and can be achieved only if certain outside services are ideal also; e.g., U.S.B.E. regional depositories, reliable jobbers, cataloging-in-source, and more librarians trained for acquisitions. The merger of acquisitions and cataloging would expedite the flow of current materials and permit better utilization of staff skills. The self-contained serials department was described as allowing maximum coordination of acquisitions, records, cataloging, and information services. The Florida Catalogers’ Round Table also stressed the over-all approach: “ Floridiana in the P. K. Yonge Library of Florida History” (Margaret Chapman) and three papers on “Florida Materials—Acquisition, Cataloging and Servicing,” by Marian A. Youngs and Frances Apperson (University of Florida) and James H. Renz (Miami Public).

On the international level, Wyllis E. Wright (Chairman, Catalog Code Revision Committee) described the “International Cataloging Conference Planning Meeting in London, July 1959” for the New York group. Paul S. Dunkin (Rutgers Graduate School of Library Service) gave papers on the Draft Edition of the revised Code of Cataloging Rules at the New Jersey and Philadelphia Area group meetings. To acquire microfilm copies of historical documents in Portugal, Gwendolyn Cobb (Historian, Fresno State College) not only personally filmed the materials, but processed
them as well. Her “Adventures in Microfilming in Portugal” for the Northern California group was followed by a colored slide presentation of libraries in the USSR by Glen Maynard (University of California Radiation Laboratory) who visited Russia last year. The Northern Ohio group also saw European libraries on the slides of Lucille B. Emch (University of Toledo). Donald C. Cook (Columbia) told the New York group of “The ALA European Tour.”

The Farmington Plan as “The Cream of the Crop” was questioned by John G. Veenstra (Purdue) at the Ohio Valley group’s meeting. Points raised were: (1) individual book selection by a book ambassador in the more important countries vs. mass collection, (2) centralization of receipts in LC or MILC vs. scattering throughout the U. S., and (3) problems involved in reporting promptly to NUC. The compilation, editing, and publishing of New Serial Titles and the Union List of Serials was the topic of Mary E. Kahler (Library of Congress) for the Michigan group. The College and Reference Sections of the Michigan Library Association joined the Group for the afternoon session. The Group plans a joint meeting with the Northern Ohio group in the Spring of 1961.

Cooperation in the storage of library materials is a certainty, according to Arthur T. Hamlin (University of Cincinnati), who spoke to the Ohio Valley group on “Storage Libraries.” The alternatives he gave were to “sink in a sea of printed material or else vegetate with totally inadequate resources.”

“Regional and Centralized Processing” was the major topic for the Texas Regional Group meeting. William Lowry (Cleveland-Garvin Multi-County, Oklahoma) had prepared a preliminary report on the work of the RTSD Committee on Regional Processing. The Georgia group’s biennial meeting heard Virginia Drewry’s experiences as a member of the Cataloging-in-Source Consumer Reaction Survey team. Miss Drewry expressed the hope that some bibliographical standardization might be salvaged from the experiment.

Special libraries were not neglected by the Groups. The Ohio Valley group heard Olga Buth (Ohio State University) on the “Bibliographical Control of Music Collections.” “Acquisitions in the Special Library” was described by Marie Koutecky (Standard Oil Company) for the Northern California group. At the New England meeting, Hannah D. French (Wellesley) discussed the reference tools made by the librarian in “Servicing Special Collections.” From her viewpoint, bringing special materials to the public is a joint responsibility of the cataloger and reference librarian. Problems of undergraduate use of special collection for seminars and research papers were also considered.

While the New Jersey (Ben Grimm, Montclair Public, speaker) and Oklahoma (Irene M. Hansen, Kansas S.T.C., Emporia, speaker) groups concentrated on the use of the card catalog, the Southern California and Chicago groups investigated automatic information retrieval. C. Dake Gull (General Electric Co.) supplemented his talk to the Chicago group with a motion picture and slides. Joseph Becker (Western Data Process-
ing Center, U.C.L.A.) was the speaker for the Southern California group.

Robert Kingery (New York Public) in speaking to the Potomac Technical Processing Librarians on "New Library Technology and the Technical Processes" predicted that the future for libraries will be even more technical and expensive, but machines eventually will handle most of the clerical work. His mention of the New York Public Library's practice of using separate post office box mailing addresses for its various departments as a means of presorting the 22,000 periodicals currently received would have been of interest to questioners in the Northern California group's "Dear Abby" session on everyday problems including the question of "Who sorts the second-class mail?".

Having seen a future made free from drudgery by machines, the Potomac group devoted its afternoon session to personnel. Harold Sylvester (Professor of Personnel Administration, University of Maryland,) presented "Sylvester's Theory of Employee Relations"; or, "How to Keep the Employee Happy." Margaret Brown (Free Library of Philadelphia) spoke on "In-Service Training and the Use of Non-Professional Personnel." Formal training at the Free Library of Philadelphia for those not in cataloging includes an annual lecture on the kinds of catalogs, the type of information in each, and the catalog limitations. The objective of the informal training given those in cataloging is to simplify decision-making where it can be simplified and provide in the complex of decision-making the opportunity to think. Assignments are specific, and appropriate explicit procedures are in written form. John Rather (U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare) in speaking on the "Cataloger's Career" indicated that catalogers tend to have had more training than the average librarian, tend to prefer college and university libraries, and, although they are mobile, tend more to keep in the same specialization of cataloging. Mr. Rather's findings may be verified informally by scanning the New York Technical Services Librarians' Constitution, Officers, List of Members, issued in April. The retrospective listing of officers, beginning with Margaret Mann, President 1923-24, is studded with some of the most distinguished names in the library world. More recent officers are now as far west as Denver and Los Angeles, but are still in cataloging!

The Ohio Valley group's consideration of personnel moved farther back. In her paper, "Making Cataloging a More Appealing Professional Interest," Maysel O. Baker (Indiana University, L. S. Division) cited the results of the recruitment program at the Library of Congress and the Nebraska plan as promising new hope for the future. Margaret Sullivan (Purdue) then spoke on "Orientation and In-Service Training of Technical Service Staff." Her survey of the literature led to the conclusion that the size of the library and its staff are of paramount importance in determining the training techniques to be used.

I share your pleasure in the election of William H. Kurth (National Library of Medicine) as Chairman of the Council of Regional Groups, and look forward to increased strength and growth in the Groups.
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Carlyle Frarey makes several statements in his The Processing Services of the Dallas Public Library which might well be written in bold type preferably in a manual for administrators of public libraries. Two such statements follow:

"It is apparent . . . that a basic ingredient of good library service is the procurement and organization of the library materials themselves without which the most dedicated library staff cannot function, and for want of which the most perfect library building in the world is virtually useless." (p. 2)

"An essential . . . in effective, dynamic library administration is to insure that both public and processing services are maintained and operated at the same relative level of dynamism and efficiency." (p. 3)

Because the present administration of the Dallas Public Library believed that the processing functions and the public service functions in that library were not operating "at the same relative level of dynamism and efficiency," Mr. Frarey was employed as a technical services consultant to conduct a survey of processing operations in the Dallas Public Library. He made the survey in the summer of 1959. This volume is his report.

Reviewers of surveys bear perhaps a different kind of responsibility than do reviewers of other types of "professional literature," inasmuch as the review may reach a wider audience than does the survey itself. In the case of Mr. Frarey's study of the processing services of the Dallas Public Library this would be unfortunate. The Dallas Public Library has obtained a thorough and constructive analysis of its processing activities; it is to be congratulated for making this analysis widely available to the profession.

Although a survey must, by definition, be a detailed analysis of a local situation, a good survey is not for local consumption alone. There is a larger application.

First of all, the methodology of a surveyor is of interest to those administrators who are responsible for doing a certain amount of self-surveying every week of the year. Few libraries can afford the services of an outside observer, and, when they can employ such a person, he can only analyze the situation as it is at the time he views it. This fact, as Mr. Frarey is not the first to point out, must be borne in mind in studying the surveyor's comments and recommendations. Any responsible administrator must regularly review and evaluate his own operation—after the surveyor has gone or before he arrives. In doing so he might well adopt some of Mr. Frarey's methods.

While on the subject of methodology, it should be mentioned that Mr. Frarey attempted "to secure some general impressions about catalog use." This was done by means of questionnaires distributed to readers and to staff members. Because Mr. Frarey is well aware of the deficiencies of other studies of this kind, his methods and results will be of particular interest to those who have undertaken similar studies of catalog use.

But what of Mr. Frarey's findings and conclusions? Some of his recommendations relate to proposed changes
in overall administrative organization and general policy questions, and with none of these recommendations could the reviewer disagree. The changes recommended are overdue in Dallas as they probably are in many libraries across the country.

However, other suggestions relate to procedural details and some of these do seem open to question. For example, while this reviewer admits that subject departmentalization based on the Dewey Decimal Classification schedules is not completely satisfactory, the problems inherent in such an arrangement are not likely to be solved by adopting a policy which would permit the same book to be classified in more than one place. A new set of problems is altogether likely to develop if this proposal is acted upon.

Also, the consultant goes along, albeit reluctantly, with the recording of location of copies on the catalog cards. He admits he would not have recommended this procedure if the project had not already been under way and, in fact, nearly completed at the time of the survey. However, this practice is being continued for current acquisitions, and this seems highly inadvisable. One of the advantages of departmentalization based on classification schedules is that it makes unnecessary location notations on the catalog cards.

There are other procedural details which the consultant finds understandable in the light of the local situation, but which readers of the survey may not view with the same degree of tolerance. However, these questions are not "the heart of the matter," and they in no way detract from the soundness of Mr. Frarey's basic recommendations.

Finally, the recital of the problems in the Dallas Public Library has a familiar ring. It is clear from this study as from others, that there are a few serious and basic problems in the administration of public libraries today which would seem to require concerted action on the part of the library profession acting through its professional organizations. There is need to educate local governmental authorities regarding such matters as binding practices, fiscal records, and procurement procedures as these areas relate to library operations. This has probably not been done in the past because we had first to put our own house in order and also because it takes time and staff to demonstrate to local authorities that their requirements sometimes cost more money than they save. For example, the Dallas Public Library is required to obtain bids on its commercial binding; but, when the disadvantages of this system were pointed out, the counterproposal made was that the library establish its own bindery!

The library profession many years ago undertook a program to insure the education of library trustees. Is it not time that we initiated a similar program for those in responsible positions in our local city governments? This is not a point made by Mr. Frarey, but some of his findings could be used in support of such a proposal.


Imagine the ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries, ALA Filing Rules, ALA Glossary of Library Terms, LC Rules for Descriptive Cataloging, Akers, Mann, and Shera and Egan's The Classified Catalog, all un-
Only Part 3 (Class Index Entry) is specially written for the classified catalog, and even it does contain some suggested modifications of the rules for the dictionary catalog. Shera and Egan's book, which is completely devoted to the classified catalog, might seem to be the more complex of the two, but it is really the more elementary. Ranganathan's Part 3 takes up where the appendix of Shera and Egan's book leaves off—choice of class index entries and rendering of class index headings by means of chain procedure. In fact, one would do well to read Shera and Egan before undertaking Ranganathan since he tends to assume some background on the part of the reader. The authors of the two books are in basic agreement, but in this writer's opinion one would produce a better bibliographic tool by following Ranganathan's suggestion of having a class index heading for every sought link in the chain procedure instead of following Shera and Egan's suggestion of making one or more for each class number—the end result of the chain procedure. Even in a dictionary catalog the end result would be a more complete analysis and a more satisfactory tool.

Because the size and comprehensiveness of the book could overwhelm the average reader, it might be well to reiterate the value of such a book. No matter what scheme of classification or cataloging code is used, one can learn a great deal about the reasoning and theory underlying bibliographic organization by reading parts of this book. No matter what words are used to explain or state cataloging rules, a great deal can be learned from an understanding of Ranganathan's terminology and organization of rules. Such a book serves a fundamental purpose for anyone who is responsible for writing a manual of procedures for a cataloging department, a syllabus for a cataloging course, or a national or international cataloging code.—Pauline Atherton, Assistant Professor, Department of Library Science, Chicago Teachers College.
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