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Regional Union Lists—Some Unanswered Questions

THOMAS J. GALVIN
Director of Students and Asst. Prof.
School of Library Science, Simmons College,
Boston, Mass.

IF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS are a reasonably accurate barometer of current cooperative activities among libraries, then we are experiencing a resurgence of interest in the production of union lists of serial publications at local, state, and regional levels. A 1957 study of union lists reported a total of twenty-five published in the United States between 1940 and 1957, of which four-fifths may be considered regional or local in character. It is revealing to contrast the production of twenty lists of less than national scope in an eighteen year period with the seventeen local, state, or regional union list projects already announced or completed during the five and one-half years since the publication of the report cited above. The prospect of a third edition of the Union List of Serials, with accompanying expansion of the scope of New Serial Titles as a continuing supplement, appears in no way to have lessened interest or activity along these lines at other levels.

It is generally agreed that a need exists in most areas of the country for some sort of regional union list, to supplement the Union List of Serials and its companion work. A major limitation of the national lists is that they restrict the number of locations that are shown for a given geographic area. Accordingly, a comparatively small number of libraries in a region such as New England, for example, whose holdings are reported nationally, are heavily burdened by interlibrary loan requests, while other libraries, with strong journal resources, are virtually untapped as sources for loans. The problem is rendered more acute by the fact that public, school, and many special libraries are generally not represented in national union lists. Thus, a few academic and large research libraries are being asked to serve large portions of the public, school, and special library clientele. As demand for such services increases, they become more and more expensive and difficult to provide. Finally, there is the problem of geography. Because only a few libraries within a region participate in national union listing activities, a borrower in, for example, a small special library in western Massachusetts may find that, when an attempt is made to locate a file of a specific periodical, the only recorded source is hundreds of miles away. Often, the borrower's need could be met by a neighboring library, but if the neighboring library's serial holdings are
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not shown in the national union list, there is no way to find this out. The problem is, of course, even more acute in other parts of the country where distances between libraries are far greater than in the East.\textsuperscript{5}

Regional union lists that achieve wide coverage of periodical holdings in a majority of libraries within an area may greatly facilitate interlibrary cooperation and sharing of resources, and thus enhance the quality of an individual library’s response to a request for a serial not owned locally. Recent technological advances, especially those involving the development of photographic and machine methods of information processing and reproduction, have made it reasonable to contemplate such ventures even in a period of high labor costs.

If a problem exists in terms of a need to make serials more widely accessible and if library technology has placed at our disposal the mechanical devices to ameliorate this problem, what is there left to do but to proceed to implement a solution in the form of the development of several score or more local and regional supplements to the national union list? Indeed, this is precisely the process that is going on, as the statistics cited at the beginning of this article suggest.

Reading the reports of some of these projects leaves one, however, with the gnawing suspicion that fundamental decisions of a policy nature have most often been arrived at almost wholly on the basis of expediency, and that the closest we have come to evaluation of the regional union lists that already exist is the “impression” of one, or several, reporting librarians that it has “helped” the participants in the project to provide better service.

At this point, the argument might be extended further to suggest that it is difficult to judge the adequacy of a solution to a problem unless and until one has a fairly clear and precise notion of what the problem is. Specifically, in my own part of the country, New England librarians have felt for some time that a need exists for an approach to serial holdings at the regional level. In the minds of many, however, there is a very genuine question as to exactly what kind of union listing activity would most usefully serve libraries in the area. After listening to, and participating in, a number of discussions of this question, I am forced to conclude that our difficulty in resolving it lies in the fact that we do not know enough about the manner in which serial publications are used in libraries. The lack of a body of fundamental knowledge concerning, for example, the exact nature and extent of our present inability to meet the demands of library users for serial publications forces us to base many decisions that must be made concerning the nature and scope of a regional union list on speculation and on a series of “educated guesses.”

It is perhaps appropriate to begin by reviewing briefly the rationale of a union list. A union list of serials is commonly understood to be a compilation, usually in published form, of the journal holdings of a number of libraries. The major function of such a list is to serve as a location device, by means of which library users seeking a particular serial publication may be directed to the institution which possesses it,
or, as an alternative, an interlibrary loan may be arranged or a photocopy obtained. Customarily, the union list will indicate not only the names of libraries that own a given title, but the specific volumes held by each participating library.

A union list of serials may serve a number of additional bibliographical purposes, beyond that of the location of items for interlibrary loan. It can, if properly constructed, provide valuable information to the acquisitions librarian and the cataloger—it identifies serial publications in terms of correct title, traces changes in title (a perennial problem to the serials cataloger), relates the serial to the organization or agency responsible for its issuance, and indicates what constitutes a full set of a given title. Useful information indeed, yet these functions are not, in themselves, sufficient to justify the expense and effort involved in the compilation of a union list. At best, they are but valuable by-products of an operation that must find its justification in other terms.\(^7\)

Finally, it should be noted that union lists and similar ventures have, in the past, been hailed as a stimulus to interlibrary cooperation in acquisitions. Theoretically, a library, when considering a request for purchase of a journal file, will consult the union list in order to determine if the same title is held by a neighboring library and, if this proves the case, may well decline to purchase a duplicate set. Similarly, a union list may serve as a guide in weeding a journal collection. It has frequently been suggested that cooperation along these lines might even take the form of exchange of partial or complete sets of journals.

On the whole, it is safe to say that little real progress has been made in this direction and that, in most instances, libraries in research-oriented institutions and those serving a scholarly clientele have had a notable lack of success in convincing researchers of the merits of cooperative acquisition. This is not to say that, given a different climate of library operation than presently exists, the concept of division of responsibility for purchase of infrequently-used materials might not find broader acceptance in the scholarly community, but merely to observe, rather sadly, that union-listing activities are, at the moment, difficult to justify in these terms.\(^8\)

There is, of course, the distinct possibility that smaller libraries participating in local and regional union catalogs and union lists may avail themselves to a greater extent of the opportunities that these offer to avoid duplicate purchases of expensive or little-used items than do larger academic and research libraries, where considerations of institutional prestige are often reflected in acquisition policies. If the maxim that "libraries cooperate in acquisitions only out of financial necessity" is correct, the potential value of the union list for this purpose may be far greater at local and regional levels than at the national.

For all practical purposes, a union list is primarily useful in the interlibrary loan operation, and, accordingly, any regional union list of serials must be planned specifically in these terms. Unfortunately, there does not exist, at the present time, any substantial body of recorded fact upon which to base decisions as to the kind of union list that would most ap
appropriately meet this need. The few recent studies of interlibrary loan activity that do exist, while insufficient as a basis for generalization, suggest that some of our fundamental assumptions about interlibrary loans may be subject to question.

These observations find specific illustration if we consider the problem of establishing the scope of a regional union list of serials in terms of the organization of its contents and the range of journals to be included. The resolution of such complex questions usually takes the form of a choice between alternatives. Shall there be a single list, embracing journals in all subject areas, or is there sufficient variation in research needs among the several disciplines so that union listing activities might better be undertaken on a subject-by-subject basis? Examples of both organizational patterns exist. An analysis of the twenty-two local and regional union lists announced in professional journals since 1955 reveals that thirteen include serials in all subject areas, while nine are restricted to a single field or a small group of closely related disciplines. Regrettably, we have little in the way of objective evidence to indicate which of these represents the more useful approach.

The suggestion of a number of union lists, each covering the literature of a single subject, has much to commend it. If, as all available evidence seems to indicate, the assumption is correct that patterns of journal use vary widely from one field to another, and that periodicals are considerably more important as information sources in, for example, the sciences than they are in the humanities, then the division of a union list of serials into a number of distinct parts, by subject, would make it possible to tailor each portion of the list to the needs of its specialized audience. It would also be possible to establish each subject-oriented union list with due consideration for existing bibliographic resources in the field, and thus avoid duplication of effort in cases where adequate controls may already exist. Finally, there is the obvious consideration that many libraries, particularly those whose collections and interests are confined to a single field, might be considerably more willing to participate in, and lend support to, such a project in their own areas of specialization, than to a more general union list offering less possibility of direct return to themselves.

There are, however, strong arguments against any approach to the problem of union listing on a subject-by-subject basis. Such a proposal may run counter to the present trend towards interdisciplinary studies that is becoming increasingly fashionable in scholarly and research circles. It is generally recognized that conventional barriers between subject fields are breaking down and that this trend is having a marked effect on the use of library materials. The chemist whose interests lie in the fields of physical chemistry, or bio-chemistry, for example, may make more frequent use, from a library point of view, of journals in physics or biology, than of the literature of his own discipline. Similar examples might be drawn from other fields, and it is clear that this phenomenon is, by no means, confined to the sciences. Might not the existence of many indi-
vidual union lists of serials, each confined to publications in a specific discipline, only intensify the difficulties of such research?

The subject-by-subject approach in union listing may work a disservice in the general public or academic library. At a time when the library user is increasingly expected or required to locate information on his own, without the assistance of the reference staff, there is much to be said for the advantages of a single unified list in terms of ease of use by the public. Librarians have long been aware of the disadvantages of a fragmented approach to bibliographic control. The point is well illustrated in the instance of government publications, which are frequently overlooked as potential sources of information both by library patrons and even by reference librarians themselves, because they are not generally included in national and trade bibliographies, reader's handbooks, and the like.

Consider still another aspect of the problem of scope of a union list of serials, the question of which journals are to be included. That this is invariably a troublesome matter is made evident by the fact that the exclusion of certain large categories of serials, such as those published by the United States government, has been one of the persistent criticisms of the second edition of the Union List of Serials. Those responsible for the forthcoming third edition of the Union List are seeking to remedy this by adopting a broader definition of the term "serial" for union listing purposes. To this we must add the natural tendency of librarians and bibliographers towards inclusiveness, which suggests that any regional union listing project is likely to aim towards comprehensive coverage of all periodical literature unless strong arguments, supported by documentary evidence, can be advanced against it.

The chief arguments against the "all inclusive" union list are based on utilitarian considerations. From the point of view of interlibrary use of periodicals (if this term may be used to represent either the lending of printed materials, in original or photocopied form, between libraries, or the direction of the patrons of one library to another library where desired materials may be found) the whole of journal literature may be divided into three broad categories. First, there is a comparatively small group of general periodicals, perhaps one or two hundred titles, which are so widely held in general public and academic libraries of any consequence as to present no real problem of location. Possibly most of the titles presently indexed in the Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature might be included in this category. Is there any real point in attempting, in a union list, to provide exhaustive lists of libraries in the area holding these titles? To do so requires an enormous amount of space if the list is to be produced in printed form and, accordingly, increases costs considerably. The possibility exists, of course, that holdings of titles in this group might be recorded selectively in accordance with some formula based on representation of one or two libraries in every geographic area. Regrettably, we know little about the extent of demand for these more commonly-held journals in smaller libraries, and a modest investigation might well upset
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the tidy notion that location of these constitutes no real problem. Similarly, in the absence of any consensus among various segments of the profession as to what constitutes “adequacy” in interlibrary loan service, it is difficult to weigh the merits of showing all holdings of all titles, as an aid to the more rapid location of materials. It would be interesting in this respect to investigate the use of union lists that do employ some principle of selectivity in locating commonly-held titles in order to determine how often the failure to show all locations results in unsatisfactory service to the library patron. Brown notes rather ruefully the frequency with which his own library has received a “volume not available” reply, often after a considerable period of time has elapsed since the original request was submitted. As things stand now, we lack any quantitative understanding of the implications of a decision to limit the number of locations to be shown.

A second group of journals lies at the other extreme of the interlibrary loan spectrum. These are titles of peripheral value, those directed towards more esoteric and specialized interests or written in less well-known foreign languages. From the fragmentary evidence that has been collected thus far in a few small scale studies of interlibrary loan requests, it is evident that there are thousands, perhaps even tens of thousands of such journals that are rarely, if ever, asked for. The point is well illustrated in William Kurth’s recent study of interlibrary loans at the National Library of Medicine which reveals that of the 37,000 serials in that library, only 3,112 titles, a mere eight per cent, were subject to more than one interlibrary loan request a year. Indeed, eighty-eight per cent of the serial titles in the library were subject to no interlibrary loan requests at all during the period studied. Urquhart and Bunn in a 1956 study of the use of serials at the Science Museum Library report that 1200 titles, out of a collection of 18,000, accounted for eighty per cent of total journal use. Bonn’s analysis of photoservice requests during a twelve month period (1960-61) in the Science-Technology Division of the New York Public Library reveals that a mere one hundred serials comprised nearly fifty per cent of the year’s use.

It must, of course, be recognized that decisions concerning the exclusion of a specific group of titles from a union list cannot be made solely on the basis of a quantitative evaluation of need. The prompt location of a single article in a highly specialized and uncommon periodical for a scientist engaged in an important research activity related, let us say, to the national defense effort may represent, in absolute terms, a far more important achievement than obtaining a reprint of an article from the American Journal of Physics for the eleventh grade science class. Nevertheless, it does seem possible that, for the large number of journals that will rarely, if ever, be subject to interlibrary loan requests, inclusion in the national union list of serials may be sufficient. If, for example, the comparatively small number of libraries in the New England area that are at present reporting their holdings to the Union List of Serials and New Serial Titles could be utilized as a resource only for journals in the
category under discussion, the result might be viewed as equitable by all concerned, and we would be spared the expense and effort of including such titles in a regional union list.

A third and final group of journals remains prime candidates for a regional union list of serials. The present lack of data concerning the interlibrary loan operations of libraries makes it impossible to define this category in very specific terms. We do not know, nor can we reasonably estimate, how many titles it might comprise, although it may be assumed that the number is considerably larger than the number of titles in the first group mentioned above and considerably smaller than the number in the second. There is some evidence to suggest a relationship between the titles covered by existing indexing and abstracting services and the titles most frequently asked for in interlibrary loan. A study of interlibrary loan requests at all levels and in all kinds of libraries within an area might reveal that a regional union list of serials, covering a few thousand titles that in all probability account for the bulk of interlibrary loan requests, could, when used in combination with existing national union lists, provide an extremely effective solution to the problem.

Further investigation is also needed to evaluate more precisely the effect of the phenomenon of "aging" on the use of journals, especially in subject areas outside of the sciences. Kurth and Urquhart and Bunn note that requests for older issues of scientific and medical serials are comparatively infrequent, to the point where they suggest that "except for selected items there is little point in a special library keeping an item for more than two or three decades after publication." Brown, however, has pointed out in his study of the use of scientific serials by the research community the inherent danger in making broad generalizations with regard to the "aging" effect, by suggesting that patterns of journal use and usefulness vary substantially among the individual sciences. It seems clear that more evidence is needed here to enable us to make a precise judgment as to the implications of a decision to limit a local or regional union list to showing only holdings of journals published during the last twenty (or forty or sixty) years.

Again in this instance, as with the question of exercising selectivity in the choice of titles to be included, we come up against the larger question that underlies all of these issues: "What constitutes adequacy in interlibrary loan service?" Without a satisfactory standard, acceptable to a broad segment of the profession, how can one determine what the proper place of the regional and local union list ought to be in the general scheme of serials control? What proportion of the total journal needs of a region should a regional union list be expected to meet? Is one hundred per cent coverage of serials at the local or regional level a goal that is not only unreasonable but unnecessary? Is a satisfactory regional union list one that meets perhaps fifty per cent of demand for serials, leaving the remainder to be provided through a national union list? What I am suggesting here is the need to attack simultaneously two fundamental problems: developing a realistic standard of bibliographical control of serials;
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and then proceeding to determine what sort of bibliographical apparatus
is required to achieve such a standard, and what the proper functions
and interrelationships of each segment of this apparatus should be.

I have deliberately left until the last the question of which libraries
should participate in local and regional union lists, although I am fully
aware that this is usually the first decision that must be made by any
group contemplating such a project. This question has been discussed
rather fully in professional literature, and it seems to boil down to a
matter of identifying a so-called point of diminishing return. Under this
type, most public and school libraries, as well as smaller special librar-
ies, are excluded from union lists at all levels because it is assumed that
their holdings are not sufficiently rare to contribute materially to the
total resource, or because their journals are not usually available on
interlibrary loan.21 There are a number of additional strong arguments
in support of selectivity in choosing participants. School and public
libraries often do not retain back files of serials for any appreciable period
of time, and it seems pointless to fill a union list with records of holdings
that will be unavailable in a few months or years after the list is pub-
ished. Moreover, if library cooperation develops only out of enlightened
self-interest, and if Posner's observation that smaller public, school, and
special libraries need "books rather than documents, periodicals or
theses"22 is valid, then it hardly seems reasonable to expect such libraries
to participate in a union list project that they will rarely, if ever, have
to use.23 It must also be borne in mind that smaller libraries
often lack basic access to serials since they do not subscribe to major
indexes, and thus are even less likely to be in a position to utilize a union
list. Finally, in the case of many special libraries, where the library exists
to serve and is wholly financed by a private organization, there is the
added problem of an inability or an unwillingness to make resources
available to others.

The danger in all of this lies, of course, in a tendency to base judg-
ments on impressions rather than on facts, along with a failure to re-
examine long-standing generalizations that may no longer be valid.
Indeed, the very organizational structure of the profession contributes to
a kind of parochialism in this respect, as it allows us all too often to
remain abysmally ignorant of the current realities of service and resources
in other types of libraries. Academic and special librarians, for example,
may be unaware of the implications of recent pressures on public and
school libraries to make available a broader and more sophisticated range
of materials in response to student needs. Students increasingly expect
school, college, and public libraries to be interchangeable with respect to
resources, so that school and public libraries are being compelled to
develop and retain much more substantial journal collections. It may be
anticipated that within a comparatively short time, public and school
libraries generally will be in the position of seeking access for their own
users to the journal holdings of other libraries in precisely the same
manner and degree that academic libraries do today.
Just as the school library and the public library appear to be moving toward the kind of resources and services that have traditionally been the province of the academic library, so too can a similar trend be detected on the part of college and university libraries in the direction of the special library. In an academic community increasingly oriented towards, and financially dependent upon, the research process, graduate students and faculty will no longer tolerate anything short of the kind of efficient, prompt reference service that has long been the hallmark of the special library. If this observation is valid, then it can only lead to a recognition on the part of academic and special libraries of a communality of interest in the rapid location of serials for interlibrary loan. If public, school, academic, and special libraries are becoming more alike in their need for access to serial publications, this may make it desirable to strive at local and regional levels for wider participation by all types of libraries in such cooperative ventures as union lists.

In summary, it is possible to identify three fundamental issues in establishing the scope of a union list of serials: What subjects shall it encompass? What journals shall it include? What libraries are to participate? In suggesting that we lack, at the present time, any sound basis in fact for deciding answers to these questions, I do not mean to ignore the rather substantial body of information about the interlibrary loan process and inter-institutional bibliographical controls that exists in professional literature. It must be recognized, however, that many of our basic concepts in this area date from the 1930’s. The nature of library use has changed substantially in more recent years, especially with respect to the demand for publications of a serial nature. We now have at our disposal, or will shortly have available to us, devices capable of economically circumventing mechanical problems in the compilation of union lists that have hitherto seemed almost insuperable. Accordingly, this would seem an appropriate time for a re-examination of basic principles of serials control.
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STATISTICS COORDINATION

A Statistics Coordinating Project, to establish a national system of standardized library data collection for administrative use and research needs, and appointment of a Project Director, have been announced by David H. Clift, Executive Director of the American Library Association.

Supported by a $48,960 grant from the Council on Library Resources, Inc., Washington, D. C., and an additional grant of $5,000 from the National Science Foundation, and with office space being made available at no cost by the National Library of Medicine, the project began July 1, 1963, and will continue to June 30, 1964. Director of the project is Joel Williams, formerly Chief, Statistical Operations Section, Division of Educational Statistics, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The overall purpose of the project is the coordination of statistics of academic, public, school, and special libraries on the national, regional, state, and local levels in order to eliminate glaring gaps and unnecessary duplication by using the same definitions and terminology relevant to librarianship.

Library Resources & Technical Services
REALIZING THAT MOST of the ALA cataloging tools will need revision as a result of changes expected to appear in the revised ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries, the ALA Editorial Committee has taken steps to initiate work on these various tools. For the filing rules, a Subcommittee on ALA Rules for Filing Catalog Cards was established in September 1962. It is hoped that revised filing rules will be available soon after the completion of the revised Cataloging Rules.

As it is over twenty years since the publication in 1942 of the original ALA filing rules, consideration of the need for a new edition is due in any case. In addition to the revision of the ALA Cataloging Rules, it is necessary to take heed of other new developments in relation to filing rules, for example, (1) new types of entries, such as initialisms (UNESCO); countries with changing governments (Germany (Federal Republic, 1949--)); many more foreign names and words, especially in minor languages; conventional titles; (2) new types of materials, especially non-book materials, such as phonorecords, films, filmstrips; (3) book catalogs, especially those of the Library of Congress and National Union Catalog; (4) trends toward simpler, more alphabetical, filing; (5) application of data processing machines to indexing and cataloging procedures. The Committee is also concerned with the question of whether more than one set of rules is advisable to meet the needs of various sizes and types of libraries.

The work of the Committee so far has been mainly exploratory, investigative, and making contacts. The subject of filing rules has been presented at several Regional Group meetings of technical processes librarians. A bibliography of books and articles on filing and filing rules from 1940 to 1962 has been compiled. Through the generosity of libraries and state agencies all over the country, a collection of some fifty individual filing rules has been accumulated for study and comparative purposes. Some investigation is being carried on of the use of ALA filing rules in foreign countries, and a study is being made of various foreign filing rules.

Uniformity in filing seems to this Committee to be a highly desirable goal, not only uniformity between different libraries but uniformity between library card catalogs and the major book catalogs, trade catalogs, etc.
indexes, and encyclopedic reference tools in constant use by librarians. It is confusing for both librarians and patrons to encounter major differences in arrangement in going from one tool to another. One example of the application of a different rule will illustrate the point: in the Cumulative Book Index a compound name beginning with “San,” e.g., San Francisco, is filed as one word. After one has learned that in both the ALA and LC filing rules “San” is considered a word and not a prefix and therefore San Francisco files as two words, it is aggravating to have to remember that in CBI it is filed as one word. Likewise, although all filing rules specify “word-by-word” filing rather than “letter-by-letter,” it is surprising to find how many encyclopedias and their indexes are arranged “letter-by-letter,” even those where the indexing is done by a librarian. It is fairly safe to assume that in a card catalog the entry for Alexander the Great will be found before the entry for Alexanderson, but in some encyclopedias it will be after Alexanderson. Probably the tools most used by technical processes staffs are the Library of Congress printed book catalogs and the National Union Catalog. While these catalogs basically follow the LC filing rules, it is interesting, and encouraging, to note a definite trend toward simplification in them. The fact that these are published in chronological segments, never completely cumulated into one alphabet, has made it possible to vary the rules and experiment with different arrangements. This, of course, has its pitfalls for the user, who must learn, for example, that beginning with the 1952 catalog the order of entries under place will be different from the order in the 1942 and 1948 catalogs.

Naturally, complete uniformity can never be achieved because of varying size and complexity of catalogs, the inherent differences between a card file and a printed page, the onerous task of refiling a large catalog, etc. However, it is gratifying to report that the Committee has been assured of the interest and cooperation of the Library of Congress, the H. W. Wilson Co., the R. R. Bowker Co., and the Z-39 Subcommittee on Indexing of the American Standards Association.

The application of machines to the production of indexes and book catalogs and to filing is still in early stages of development. Since developments in this field may very well have definite effects on filing, probably in the direction of simplification, the Committee is keeping in touch with projects in this area. One of these is the MEDLARS project of the National Library of Medicine for producing Index Medicus by machine. Another is the study being carried on at the Chicago Undergraduate Division (Navy Pier) of the University of Illinois Library. In this project, flow charts of the ALA filing rules are being prepared, plus statements of rules and procedures for composing “machine sortable filing copy.” This method of translating a filer’s mental processes into actual instructions for composing copy for machine filing is very practical.

The Chairman of this Committee has long felt that there is a very close relationship between cataloging and filing; that the cataloger’s work is not finished until the cards have been successfully filed in the catalog;
that filing should be as mechanical as possible; that the catalogers should provide entries with this goal in mind; that many filing problems are the direct result of form of entry, and if some entries were changed, at least some filing problems would automatically be eliminated. As a result of these assumptions, much of the work of the Committee has been concerned with the relationship between filing and form of entry.

All members of the Filing Committee receive copies of the drafts of the revised Cataloging Rules and study their implications for the filing rules. The Chairman of the Filing Committee attends the meetings of the Catalog Code Revision Committee for liaison between the two committees. At the meeting of the Catalog Code Revision Committee at the ALA Conference in Chicago in July 1963, the Chairman of the Filing Committee pointed out types of entries in the chapter on Headings for Persons that cause serious filing difficulties. These were entries in which some element, either at the beginning or within the name, is to be disregarded in filing. Examples cited were oriental names in which an initial article is to be disregarded, but when an article comes between the parts of a name it is to be regarded (e.g., al-Basha, *Abd al-Rahmàn); and forenames followed by epithets and/or more than one designation, in which the epithet and/or one of the designations are to be disregarded (e.g., William I, the Conqueror, King of England; Leo I, the Great, Saint, Pope). It was recommended (1) that the desired arrangement of names be agreed on, and (2) that entries be established in such form that, as far as possible, the filing could be straightforward, element by element, without disregarding any of the elements, either at the beginning or within the entry. These suggestions were given favorable consideration by the Catalog Code Revision Committee, and the proposed rules will receive further study.

To aid the Catalog Code Revision Committee in its study of direct entry for corporate bodies whose names begin with a place name, the Filing Committee sent a questionnaire to 132 libraries: university and college libraries with over 500,000 volumes, and public and county libraries with over 200,000 volumes. The Code Revision Committee and the Library of Congress were interested in learning to what extent the larger libraries have adopted straight alphabetic filing under place, since the use of straight alphabetic filing disregarding punctuation means that a change of entry from, for example, San Francisco Museum of Art to the direct entry San Francisco Museum of Art would not involve a change in filing nor require alteration of the entry on the cards already in the catalog. It is interesting to note that the 1949 ALA Cataloging Rules, in this instance, took cognizance of the effect of filing rules on form of entry, apparently assuming that the punctuation in an entry would affect its position in the catalog. Under rule 92. General rules (Institutions) A. Names beginning with a proper noun or proper adjective, we find:

To avoid doubt or complications in the order of filing, it has been found expedient to write the names of institutions beginning with the name of a place (city) in the form of entry under place, with subdivision.
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Of the 104 libraries that returned the questionnaire (78.8 percent), in general, 33 use grouped or class arrangements, 44 use alphabetic arrangements regarding punctuation, and 26 (slightly over 25 percent) use straight alphabetical, disregarding punctuation. This last group included 14 university, ten public, and two county libraries. Sixty-nine institutions reported that they would file San Francisco. Museum of Art in the group with the official subdivisions of San Francisco, e.g.

San Francisco. Fire Dept.
San Francisco. Museum of Art
San Francisco. Police Dept.

Eight would file it in the group with titles, societies, etc., e.g.

San Francisco Art Association
San Francisco. Museum of Art
San Francisco stage

Twenty-six would file it in one alphabetical group containing all types of headings, disregarding punctuation, e.g.

San Francisco Art Association
San Francisco. Fire Dept.
San Francisco. Museum of Art
San Francisco. Police Dept.
San Francisco stage
San Francisco. Water Board

The libraries in the last two groups obviously will have little or no difficulty in adopting a new entry rule according to which the entry would be San Francisco Museum of Art rather than San Francisco. Museum of Art, since the two forms would file in the same place.

One facet of the rules for entry of place names that causes a problem in filing, and a serious one in straight alphabetic filing, is the omission of country or state designation after the names of chief cities. When punctuation is the basis for filing, all entries for the chief city will come first. When punctuation is disregarded, the result is that all entries for the chief city are scattered throughout the alphabet under the place name, e.g.

London
London and Londoners
LONDON—ANTIQUITIES
London. Corporation
LONDON IN LITERATURE
London, Ky, Sue Bennett Memorial School
London. National Gallery
London, Ohio. Charters
The replies to the questions regarding this problem revealed that there is considerable dissatisfaction with the omission of the designation after the city. While 95 think the chief city should be filed first in any case, 47 do not. Even more revealing, 60 would like to have the catalog entry include the designation following the place in all cases, while 27 would not. Some use guide cards to keep the different cities separate, some insert the designation in the catalog entries, and some mentally insert it and file, for example, Boston (meaning Boston, Mass.) after Boston, Eng. or Richmond (meaning Richmond, Va.) after Richmond, Ind. The difficulty here is to keep consistent and always remember to insert the designation, either physically or mentally. Have you checked your own catalog recently under some of these places? You might be surprised to find how many inconsistencies have crept in. (Incidentally, in Cutter’s Rules for a Dictionary Catalog the entry was London, Eng.)

The answers to the questions on New York entries also made vividly clear that those entries create a very real filing problem and that there is a great variety of methods of handling it. For some unknown reason, on LC cards when New York is followed by an official or subject subdivision, the designation (City) or (State) is inserted, e.g., New York (City) Board of Education, New York (State) Dept. of Health, NEW YORK (CITY)—DESCRIPTION; but when New York is followed by the name of an institution, only a period is used, e.g., New York. Public Library, New York. Agricultural Experiment Station, Geneva. In the LC printed catalogs of 1942 and 1948 all official entries are filed in one group, while the nonofficial entries, whether for city or state, are interfiled in the last group with other institutions and titles, e.g.

New York (City) Board of Aldermen
New York (City) Citizens Budget Commission

New York (State) Banking Dept.
New York (State) Bureau of Adult Education

New York Academy of Medicine
New York. Agricultural Experiment Station, Geneva
New York. American Stock Exchange
New York and Albany Railroad Company
New York. Botanical Garden
New York. Brooklyn State Hospital
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However, in the LC catalogs from 1952 to date, the entries for institutions have been moved up into the appropriate group of entries for city and state (with the burden of determining the difference between city and state institutions being placed on the filer!), e.g.

New York (City)
New York, American Stock Exchange
New York (City) Board of Aldermen
New York, Botanical Garden
New York (City) Citizens Budget Commission

New York (State)
New York, Agricultural Experiment Station, Geneva
New York (State) Banking Dept.
New York, Brooklyn State Hospital
New York (State) Bureau of Adult Education

New York Academy of Medicine
New York and Albany Railroad Company

Seventy of those who answered the questionnaire said they attempt to bring together in their catalog all entries for each jurisdiction under New York. Forty-five said they insert (City), (State), etc. in all entries as appropriate, 25 interfile entries for institutions without (City) etc. in the heading in the appropriate group.

Inclusion of the designation after city names in all cases would result in a consistency not now possible in the straight alphabetic filing system. With the present different types of entry there are two different results: (1) for those place names that are followed by a designation, all official, institution and subject subdivisions of it are brought together in one group, (2) the subdivisions of those place names that do not include a designation are intermingled with corporate entries, phrase subjects, and titles that begin with the place name (the example for London above illustrates both of these situations).

Likewise, it would be logical to distinguish provinces, states, and countries by a designation. This is the only method that would keep their subdivisions from being scattered throughout the file in straight alphabetic filing. Present entries for these categories vary somewhat in form (in no case is a country so designated; two states are designated—Washington always, New York partially). For example:

Georgia (the state)  Washington, D. C.
Georgia (Colony)  Washington (State)
Georgia (Transcaucasia)  Washington (Ter.)
Georgia, Vt.  Quebec (City)
New Brunswick (the province)  Quebec (Province)
New Brunswick, N. J.  Mexico (the country)
Lebanon (the country)  Mexico (City)
Lebanon, Me.  Mexico (Federal District)
Mexico (State)
However, the entries resulting from the insertion of (State) and (Country) would not always be desirable, and might become quite confusing, as for example in the realm of state universities, where the difference between, say, Colorado (State) University and Colorado State University, Fort Collins, would not be readily apparent. Also, the value of finding a heading like Colorado. University filed as if it were Colorado University would be lost.

A second questionnaire, sent to 494 institutions, including university, college, public, school and special libraries, state library agencies, and library schools, and published in a number of professional journals, dealt with patterns of arrangement for a new edition of the filing code, filing problems not covered or not adequately covered in the 1942 edition, and problem areas and types of entry that present difficulty in filing. Two hundred and eighty-two replies were received from the questionnaires mailed, a return of 57 percent, plus some 32 individual replies from the journal notices.

Votes on the different types of arrangement for the code ran as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrangement</th>
<th>No. of votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A single set of recommended rules together with alternatives relating to certain filing problems</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two, or more, sets of rules in one volume, each set complete, including only the rules appropriate to a particular system of filing</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A single set of rules, including alternative rules where appropriate, without recommending any</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A single set of recommended rules (without alternative rules)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as the second above, but each set of rules published separately</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A topical arrangement of the rules, with an alphabetic index</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An alphabetic arrangement of the rules, with cross references in their alphabetical place</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An alphabetical arrangement, with a supplementary index</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An alphabetical arrangement (with no further specifications in the reply)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were many pleas for simpler rules and a publication that would be easier to use. Several expressed a desire for philosophical guidance on choosing an appropriate system and choosing between alternatives.

Most frequently mentioned as not covered in the present rules were conventional titles (for music and classic and voluminous authors) and non-book materials (phonorecords, films, filmstrips, etc.). Other new types of entries that cause difficulty are initials and initialisms (e.g., U-2
incident, UNESCO), and place names followed by parenthetical designations indicating a change of government (e.g., Germany (Federal Republic, 1949- )).

All terms in parentheses seem to give trouble. This may be because there is such a variety of them, and they are treated in different ways. In most cases the parenthetical term determines the filing position of the heading, e.g., Washington (Battleship), COOKERY (APPLES), Berlin (East Berlin); in some cases it is ignored except in relation to another similar parenthetical term, e.g., Life (Chicago), Life (New York). Many wonder how the parenthetical designations for change in government should be filed in relation to main entries and subject subdivisions under the country, and whether they should be filed chronologically or alphabetically. The LC filing rules covering place names followed by different types of parenthetical designations are quite complex, in general favoring chronological arrangement where changes in government are involved, even when there are no dates in the phrase, e.g.

Massachusetts (Colony)
Massachusetts

Germany [until 1945]
Germany (Territory under Allied occupation, 1945- )
Germany (Democratic Republic, 1949- )
Germany (Federal Republic, 1949- )

The printed National Union Catalog, however, has gradually adopted a simple alphabetical order for all types of parenthetical terms (jurisdictional and chronological) and now groups them following the place without designation, e.g.

Massachusetts
Massachusetts (Colony)

Germany

Germany (Democratic Republic, 1949- )
Germany (Federal Republic, 1949- )
Germany (Territory under Allied occupation, 1945- )

In the straight alphabetic order, these headings would line up as in the following sample:

Massachusetts Abolition Society
MASSACHUSETTS—ANTIQUITIES
Massachusetts (Colony)
Massachusetts fisheries industries today
Massachusetts, General Court

Germany. Constitution
Germany (Democratic Republic, 1949- )
GERMANY—DESCRIPTION AND TRAVEL
Germany (Federal Republic, 1949- )
Germany speaks
Germany (Territory under Allied occupation, 1945–)
Germany. Wehrmacht

Under subject arrangement there were many comments on the problems of filing the multiple types of headings—subdivisions with dash, with comma, with parentheses, and phrase headings. One suggested that phrases would be better in the form of key word followed by a dash, and interfiled with other subject cards.

Example: COOKERY FOR INSTITUTIONS
Better: COOKERY—INSTITUTIONS

As a matter of fact, the difference between phrase headings and subdivisions is often rather nebulous, as is the difference between inverted headings and subdivisions (commas and dashes). If the following headings were filed without regard to punctuation there would be just one place to look for them and there would be no need for references from one group to another (as RADIO ANTENNAS, see RADIO—ANTENNAS).

ANIMALS, LEGENDS AND STORIES OF HORSES—LEGENDS AND STORIES AIR—POLUTION PETROLEUM ENGINEERING PETROLEUM—GEOLOGY RADIO—ANTENNAS ART—DICTIONARIES BUSINESS—STATISTICS

While form divisions do not result in phrases as commonly as subject subdivisions do, the uninitiated looking for an art dictionary or business statistics would easily find ART—DICTIONARIES or BUSINESS—STATISTICS without knowing the exact form of the heading. There are times, however, when the subdivisions of a subject may become lost, if there are only a few subdivisions interfiled with many titles, e.g., ESSAYS—BIBLIOGRAPHY and ESSAYS—STUDY AND TEACHING in a whole drawerful of titles beginning "Essays."

In 1946 Marie Prevost recognized the undesirable situation being created in catalogs by the great variety of subject forms. She wrote “Have we not . . . too many forms, too many alphabets, too much uncertainty? We now have so many possibilities, even with a single specific subject, that we do not know where to look.” Her proposed solution was a uniform system of subject headings consisting of nouns followed by dash subdivisions.

The comments on the questionnaires confirm my own belief, based on experience, that one of the most difficult and confusing problems in filing is that of subdivisions that should be filed chronologically. While this departure from the alphabetical is troublesome in itself, the form of many of the subdivisions makes consistent, accurate filing impossible. I refer
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to the use of names alone, or names followed by dates, for period subdivisions, e.g.

U. S.—HISTORY—COLONIAL PERIOD
U. S.—HISTORY—FRENCH AND INDIAN WAR, 1755-1763
U. S.—HISTORY—REVOLUTION
CHRISTIANITY—EARLY CHURCH
CHRISTIANITY—MIDDLE AGES
CHRISTIANITY—16th CENTURY

If the heading gave dates first, followed by the name of the period, e.g.,
U. S.—HISTORY—1861-1865 (CIVIL WAR), a great burden would be removed from the filers. The divisions ANCIENT, MEDIEVAL, RENAISSANCE and MODERN are also confusing, because sometimes they are arranged chronologically (e.g., MUSIC—HISTORY AND CRITICISM—ANCIENT), and sometimes alphabetically (e.g., ART, ANCIENT).

Filing problems seem to have no limits. There was hardly a rule in the book that did not receive some comment on the questionnaires. Even the basic rule of “word-by-word” filing was questioned. Although this rule certainly has been generally accepted by libraries, I must say that my study of filing problems has led me to the opinion that “letter-by-letter” filing would solve some of the knottier situations, such as initials, elisions, names with prefix, and two-word, hyphenated and one-word spellings of the same term. But the overall results probably would not be as generally desirable as “word-by-word” filing.

Since there is so much interest in simplified filing, I have tried to point out some of the major problem areas, also the results of the straight alphabetical filing system, with indication of the pros and cons, especially in relation to the forms of headings the filer has to cope with. Are the cons really too serious? As has so frequently been said, much depends on how the catalog is used. If the most common approach is to locate a specific entry (and I believe this is generally accepted to be true), then elaborate group arrangements and classification patterns only obstruct the search. When even the section heads of the Descriptive Cataloging Division of the Library of Congress admit their inability now to go directly to a catalog entry they are seeking when they know the form of the heading, surely it is time to reevaluate the filing rules.

WORDS SPELLED IN TWO WAYS, AND HYPHENED AND COMPOUND WORDS

A number of different situations are encountered in trying to interfile words spelled differently. There are American and English, and even foreign, spellings for the same term (e.g., Civilization and Civilisation—American, English and French); there are archaic and old English spellings (e.g., compleat, Scotish); sometimes there are LC subject headings or subject cross references under one of the forms; then there may be personal or corporate names with the same spelling as a common noun referred from (e.g., Armour, Richard Willard, Aluminium Development Association).
It would be helpful if the filing rules could include some principles to guide the choice of spelling, and perhaps sample forms of references or notes to cover the various situations. If anyone has worked out any such principles and forms or compiled a decision list of such words, it would be greatly appreciated if you would make this information available to the Chairman of the Subcommittee on ALA Rules for Filing Catalog Cards: Miss Pauline A. Seely, Denver Public Library, 1357 Broadway, Denver, Colo. 80203.

Regional Groups

DORIS RANSON, Chairman
Council of Regional Groups

ONLY one regional group meeting was held and reported early enough this Fall to make this issue of LRTS. A second, held late last spring, is included—with apologies for its delayed appearance. The transfer of responsibility from outgoing to incoming chairman must be blamed for this.

The Technical Services Division of the Pacific Northwest Library Association met in August. At the program meeting on Book Catalogs, Kenneth S. Allen of the University of Washington Library discussed the possibility of a state-wide catalog in book form for Washington; Ronald Hagler (University of British Columbia School of Librarianship) spoke on the book catalog as an expansion of or supplement to the central card catalog in a university library; Shirley Hake (Idaho State Library) described the experience of a regional library with book catalogs; and Catharine Cline (Timberland, Wash., Library Demonstration) detailed the procedures used in making a book catalog.

The program of the May meeting of the Ontario Resources and Technical Services Group consisted of a panel discussion on Training for Technical Services. The panel, composed of Bertha Bassam, Cora Johnston, Lorna Fraser, and Ronald Hagler and moderated by Margaret Beckman, covered both formal education and in-service training of technical service librarians.
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The importance of archives and manuscript collections is increasing, and hence many libraries that would not ordinarily collect this material now find themselves in the position of having become archive or manuscript depositories. This creates an increasing problem, for the majority of librarians are not equipped to handle this material, and the treatment of archives as simple book units by librarians has resulted in confusion.1 Two institutions on the West Coast that offer on-the-job training are the Bancroft Library, at the University of California, Berkeley, and the University of Washington Archives and Manuscript Collection. The American University, in Washington, D.C., and University of Denver, Denver, Colorado, offer more extensive archive courses as a part of their curricula. In one sense of the word, many institutions which have manuscripts or archive collections offer types of in-service training; but as a whole, none of these varieties of training are uniform.

Theodore R. Schellenberg, Assistant Archivist of the United States and author of Modern Archives; Principles and Techniques, has also conducted courses in archival practice at various places in the United States. One such course offered by Dr. Schellenberg was held in San Francisco in the summer of 1958, and the University of Washington School of Librarianship offered an extensive course taught by him in the summer of 1962. This course was the first ever offered on archival principles by a United States library school.2

However, this type of training is ordinarily unavailable for most librarians. To the librarian who suddenly finds himself inundated with masses of archival material, the situation for its organization can seem almost hopeless. For the most part, he does not know where to turn, and the temptation to leave the accumulating masses uncatalogued is great. His alternative is often to employ book cataloging practices, and here the situation becomes even more chaotic as the librarian soon finds this method inappropriate.

How, then, can bibliographic control over archival material, be assumed if you, as a librarian, suddenly find yourself in the position of

- 26 -

Library Resources & Technical Services
archivist with no prior training to aid you? Basically, this article is intended to aid in setting up a sound archival, or manuscript, program which can grow with the collection program.

First, this article assumes that archival training is unavailable in the area and that the librarian cannot be spared for even a summer course at Denver or the American University. Here, then, are definitions, suggestions, and a bibliography designed to outline an adaptable program of archive arrangement and maintenance. This is not an attempt at oversimplification, but merely a basic outline. As the archive program becomes more sophisticated, archival techniques may become more refined.

A basic terminology is needed for recognition. First of all, manuscripts and archives fall into the general category of records. Records, in the broad general sense, include three classes: textual or documentary; audio-visual or still pictures, motion pictures, etc.; and cartographic or diagrams, maps, etc. This article does not deal with the cataloging of the last two classes.

Textual, or documentary records, may be further divided as follows: Public records are usually called an archive group, and this material is produced as a result of an activity by a corporate body with a specific goal in mind. This does not necessarily exclude the letters of private individuals but does include the works of a government agency, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority. On the other hand, private records, created for private purposes, are called manuscript collections and do include the letters of private individuals. These manuscript collections are usually designated as historical manuscripts to distinguish them from literary manuscripts. To separate these two groups a little more clearly, let us take an example. If a department of the University of Washington saved its correspondence and business dealings, these records would be public and hence would be termed an archival group. If a professor in a particular department in the University of Washington saved his correspondence over the years, these records would be private and, therefore, termed a manuscript collection.

Within either of these two groups, one will find nomenclature to distinguish each of the sub-groups. Whether the nature of the collection is archival or manuscript, the collection may be composed of letters, documents, minutes of meetings, bills and records, court papers, etc. These items may fall into record items, which are any aggregation of material which lends itself to physical integrity such as one folder or one volume, etc. A cumulation of these record items into a related unit within a specific group is called a series, or a record series. A letter, whether it is one piece or multiple sheets, is termed a piece. (This definition of piece varies from the British usage of the word. British terminology likens “piece” to the U. S. “item.”)

Basically, any library that begins collecting manuscript or archival material must consider two things in arranging this material: (1) How can the arrangement of the material be made to fit the basic needs of the researcher? and (2) How can bibliographic control of this material be most
easily assumed? In considering the research worker, it is necessary to pause for a moment and imagine the type of patron the manuscript or archive collection will serve. As this material is primary source material, it stands to reason that it can seldom serve the casual reader or student—the material does not lend itself to browsing. However, manuscript or archive material does serve the serious student and scholar who approaches it for a specific reason. The nature of the material assumes that the user has already made use of secondary source material, i.e. books or articles, and knows the nature of the archival material he is about to use. Therefore, it can be argued that any patron knows his needs.

Generally, it has been the repository's pleasure to consider its own convenience rather than that of the researcher's in arranging material. Two of the most commonly-used principles of arrangement have been by the rule of provenance (sometimes more akin to original order) or chronological order. There is something to be said for either practice.

The rule of provenance, or the maintenance of records according to their origins or source, is German and comes from the term Provenienzprinzip, which was the principle of grouping public records according to their origins in public administrative bodies. It was first expressed by Heinrich von Sybel after he became Director of the Prussian State Archives in 1874.

The rule of provenance rests on three assumptions: (1) that the main purpose of the user is biographical; (2) that the order given a collection by its creators is the best for its purpose; and (3) that the given order reflects in some significant way the personality of its creator or creators. To a librarian newly turned manuscript curator much is to be said for this principle. If the collection is in some basic order, and the librarian is hesitant about re-arrangement, it is best to follow this rule of provenance and simply inventory the material so that he knows the extent of the collection and can control it.

However, on the other side, the rule of provenance usually means that the librarian was overcome by the hugeness of the collection. This rule of provenance has much more validity with an archival group where the original order shows more to the researcher than an artificial order created by the librarian. And yet any collection reflects the workings of an original arranger and may not suit the library's or the researcher's purpose at all. The rule of provenance does not mean that the collection is in the best of all possible arrangements for maintenance or for the researcher.

The second way in which archive or manuscript collections may be handled is chronological. This is perhaps the simplest of all arrangements in that the entire mass of the collection is in one order. However, there are some very strong reasons against it. First, it affords only one approach to a collection. Letters of an important personage may be scattered through the collection, and the researcher may be misled by not knowing they exist. Correspondents do not reveal themselves easily. And finally, bibliographic control is difficult to achieve over a collection organized in this manner.
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Actually, several criticisms of chronological arrangement may also apply to the rule of provenance. The rule of provenance may also scatter letters of an important person through the collection as well as conceal important correspondents. However, both of these methods are possible to use, and the librarian is the best judge of their validity. A librarian not trained in manuscript or archival practices should always keep in mind the maintenance of the collection. Is it easy to use? Can one find the material he wishes? Both of these practices are quite acceptable archival methods, and rather than experiment, either one is fairly easy to follow.

It should be stressed that under no condition should a librarian break up a collection. By breaking up a collection, I mean that it should not be separated and housed in various areas. To do so violates one of the principle provenances of any collection, and I refer specifically to the practice sometimes followed by unknowing librarians of taking letters and binding them in volumes and treating them as book units. Also, the practice of occasionally binding letters of an important personage in the books by that person has occurred and should be avoided.

A third system of manuscript or archive arrangement that has been used is one that separates incoming correspondence from outgoing correspondence. This system has been used quite successfully at the Bancroft Library and the University of Washington Library Manuscript Department. This divided system, which I shall describe, has several points in its favor. First, it meets the needs of the researcher. Second, it is easy for the librarian to maintain control over the collection. Third, by means of finding aids, it pulls together all of the incoming letters of an important personage while still affording the researcher a chronological look at the span of the collection through the outgoing correspondence. The major difference in this type of arrangement centers around the correspondence series. The correspondence is divided into two groups; the incoming correspondence and the outgoing correspondence. The incoming correspondence is arranged alphabetically by the writer of the letter unless he is acting as agent of another party, in which case the letter should be filed under the name of the party for whom he is writing. The outgoing correspondence is arranged chronologically. This system allows a double approach: through the correspondents and through the chronological time span. The usual approach to a manuscript or archival collection is through the names of people and of organizations. The researcher does not find it difficult to refer to the incoming letter file for a particular reference he might find in the outgoing, or chronological file.

The alphabetical arrangement presents no major problem save for enclosures. These are normally separated from the body of the letter and noted on the letter. The enclosures then are filed according to the form of the enclosure, such as document, court paper, etc. The University of Washington Library Manuscript Department used this form and filed letter enclosures in a separate file alphabetically by sender. Some libraries, however, do not favor separating enclosures and prefer to keep them with the original letter. Again, this is a matter of personal judgment,
and the manuscript librarian must decide which method is most feasible for him since both methods have points in their favor. Another point to be brought out in favor of the divided arrangement is that most of these author entries (at least the more important ones) will appear in the card catalog as added entries. Certainly this type of arrangement also minimizes the sorter’s subjective judgment.

Aside from letters, a manuscript librarian will also find that he is dealing with court papers, minutes, speeches, financial records, etc. These are inherent in almost any collection. Basically, speeches and minutes usually fall into obvious groups which can be arranged by organization or person giving the speech and can then be sub-arranged chronologically. Court papers are best arranged by case number.

Financial and business records usually take up a good part of the collection. Incoming bills should be arranged alphabetically by name of billing party, while outgoing bills should be arranged chronologically. The same division for the correspondence applies here, too. Inventories, journals, ledgers, trial balances, memoranda, etc., should be grouped by subject and arranged chronologically within that group.

The above descriptions have applied principally to large record units, but what about the small manuscript collection of only a few items? Since they are small units of one, two, or twenty items, they should be dealt with according to their intrinsic importance. The Bancroft Library handles these items as follows: each item is placed in an acid-free folder, and the face of the folder is inscribed as to who wrote the letter, to whom addressed, and a brief description of the letter. These folders were then contained in a portfolio, chronologically arranged within each alphabetical division. Hence, all the letters of John Brown would follow those of Henry Adams and would be chronologically arranged.

After the collection has been arranged, the librarian is then presented with a problem of description. An inventory or guide to the collection is mandatory. This usually lists the incoming correspondents, the dates of the letters, and the number of letters. For large collections, only the important people are listed, thus conserving some time. The chronological, or outgoing correspondence is described only by the broad covering dates. The business records and miscellany are usually not described other than noting that this material can be found in certain carton numbers.

After the guide has been prepared, the librarian must indicate the collection in the card catalog. This can best be done by a main entry card that brings out some of the salient points of the collection and the people for whom subject entries and added entries are made. (See Appendix A.) Another method of handling the correspondents is by making analytic cards for the important authors. This latter practice has been criticized in some manuscript libraries as it involves a great deal of cataloging and time. (See Appendix B) When they find their collection growing very rapidly and with great bulk, most libraries do not have the time to spend in this highly-refined cataloging. The Bancroft Library, with its fifty-year
backlog, was faced with the problem of whether or not to make analytics. After much trial and error, it has devised a simple loose-leaf binder with sheets that can be added at will and a process so simple that a clerk can perform it without much supervision. (See Appendix C) The general trend in most manuscript cataloging is away from multiple tracings. The principal manuscript collections favor a simplicity of practices, and the system adopted by the Bancroft Library seems to be one that could be used anywhere with success.

A few additional points should be made concerning arrangement. First, the component parts of the collection, i.e., the letters, etc., should be housed in acid-free folders. Some libraries prefer to place single items in a folder, while other libraries limit the contents to five or ten letters, depending on the expandability of the folder. The folders carry the name of the author, with birth and death dates when available, time span of the enclosed letters, and number of letters. It is thought to be good practice to stamp the collections with a special stamp; usually, each page receives an imprint. This task is one that can be delegated to pages or clerks. The stamp is usually two lines as follows:

James D. Phelan Collection
Bancroft Library

The folders are housed in grey archival boxes, either letter or legal size. Some material, such as financial and business records and court papers, are usually housed in cartons. Again, for small collections, portfolios are quite suitable. Or, material may be wrapped and simply placed on shelves like books. The librarian must again make a judgment as to what is available.

One point that has not been mentioned and should be considered is the problem of classification. Neither Dewey nor Library of Congress system seems quite adequate for archival groups. Some libraries merely devise a numbering system based on shelf-list order. The Bancroft Library has incorporated this system into one originally planned by Hubert Howe Bancroft, the nineteenth-century historian who bought the original collection for his private library to be used in writing his histories. Bancroft's scheme divided his collection into subject areas designated by letter combinations. The present system used by the Bancroft Library is a combination of these two methods. For example, manuscript collections pertaining to Mexico go into the M-M group, followed by a shelf-list number. Thus, the complete classification number for a collection would look like this: M-M. Again, there is no certain way to establish a classification system that is adequate although the Bancroft one has worked well for that Library.

These are a few ideas that may be of help to a new manuscript or archive librarian with no prior training. The basic point in arranging any type of manuscript collection is one of judgment. If the librarian considers the need of the prospective researcher and the ease of main-
taining the collection, the final judgment in arrangement becomes much clearer.

The accompanying bibliography may add further information for the researcher to explore.
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FOOTNOTES

4. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Acid-free folders, designed to safeguard the enclosed material, are a must for any manuscript or archive collection. These folders may be obtained from a number of paper companies. In the West, Crown-Zellerbach, San Francisco, California, has supplied libraries with a very excellent quality folder.
9. Grey archival boxes, in both letter size and legal size, may be obtained from the Fibredex Company of West Virginia. Prices are available on request.
APPENDIX A

116 Correspondence and Papers, 1800-1878.

7 boxes.
Chiefly concerning Stephens' travels in Central America and his discovery of the ruins of Chichen Itza with Frederick Catherwood. Also, concerning construction of the Panama Railroad with William Aspinwall and Stephens' activities as Minister Plenipotentiary to Guatemala in 1838.
Some correspondence of Stephens' father, Benjamin Stephens, included.

1800-1878.

RECTO OF MAIN CARD

I. Catherwood, Frederick
II. Aspinwall, William
III. Stephens, Benjamin

VERSE OF MAIN CARD
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Catherwood, Frederick
101 Letter(s). 1834-1849.

Z-Z (In Stephens, John L. Correspondence
116 and Papers. Box II)
Box II

For further information, see key to arrangement.

ANALYTIC CARD

APPENDIX C

Smith, John David, 1832-1900.
For manuscripts of the above, see Guides to the following collections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walker Family Papers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. of Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Smith-Holmes         |   |   |
| Company Papers       |   |   |
| U. of Washington     |   |   |
| Library              |   |   |

"Library Resources & Technical Services"
When we talk about education for the technical services, it seems to me that there are a few general questions that need to be answered before we can say to what extent and how, cataloguing and classification should be taught in the Library School. I think the first question of great importance is: Is cataloguing a basic subject required by all, or is it only for the use of the few? What do we mean by cataloguing? As I am referring to it, I mean assigning the main entry and the added entries with an adequate description of the physical book, pamphlet, periodical, film, etc., to identify it for use in a particular library. I am not talking about the careful work of typing cards or the reproduction of cards that is definitely a clerical job and not a professional job.

In the library, who is it who is concerned with the correct author entry, title entry, and the subject under which a user is able to find an article or a book? Is it only the people who work under the label "technical services"? The acquisitions department, which certainly comes under that label, needs to know the correct entry. The cataloguer, the reference librarian, the circulation librarian—they all need to know how to enter in order to know how to find. The reference and circulation assistants need to know how to use their own catalogue as well as how to find things in other catalogues, printed or otherwise, and in bibliographies. Furthermore, personnel in both circulation and reference departments prepare booklists and bibliographies for patrons, and these librarians do not belong to the technical services. Bibliographies and lists must be in correct bibliographical form so that the patron may locate the desired publication. Perhaps this is enough to indicate that cataloguing is basic for all librarians. If you accept this, which supports an idea to which I cling rather tenaciously, then it follows that the basic discipline for librarianship is bibliography, and I use the word "bibliography" in its broadest possible sense. It has to do with the making of books; the describing of books; the analyzing, listing, and classifying of books. The librarian who is a true bookman knows books both outside and inside. He knows his subject, and he knows how to describe bibliographical material so that others know exactly what he is talking about.

Our next question must be: How much cataloguing does each librarian need? How much can you cover in a year's course which is very full...
now? If you teach more, you must leave something else out. Based on some thirty years of teaching, it is my opinion that everyone who graduates from an academic course in librarianship for which a professional degree is granted should acquire and should know the basic rules of entry. All librarians should learn these. At library school students should acquire a great respect for accurate bibliographic description. The importance of this increases every year as we come closer to attaining an international agreement on the rules of entry. The chain of communication among libraries is world-wide now. Interlibrary loans have increased greatly, and if we are to avoid difficulties in recognizing entries, librarians must know the basic rules of entry. In the scholarly libraries, where research material and rare material is used, there is need for very detailed description of the physical book. Usually, in the general public library a simple but accurate description suffices. It does seem, therefore, that all students do not need the fullest treatment in regard to the physical description, but all students do need to know the basic rules of entry.

Times are changing and so are needs. Opportunities for service are likewise changing. Today the general public library seems to be in a position to do much more reference work than ever before for business and industry and for the thousands of adult students who are very seriously engaged in continuing their studies in order that they may hold their present positions or better them. The growing demand for specialized adult education calls to the public library for help; it is asked to provide much more than the ordinary service provided by the little lending library. All this requires more specialized, scholarly work in public libraries and indicates the need for librarians to be qualified to do more careful and extensive subject analysis of their material. In turn, this probably means that library schools will have to devote much more time than they presently give to subject analysis; and a greater proportion of the students than ever before will have to become proficient in this work. Special librarians and university librarians realize this need. The library schools realize it also and are endeavouring to improve this aspect of professional education. However, it is not easy to make these adjustments immediately. It is the increased need for adult education, the increased number of scientific and technical publications that are being issued, and the present increasing use of mechanical devices for the retrieval of information that force us to look with great care at the activities we have been doing under the title "technical services". It is not sufficient merely to know how to manipulate a data processing machine; we must understand the subject analysis and the coding that is necessary to get the machine to do the right work when the button is pressed. This is where the professional librarian, the subject specialist, is going to be in more demand than at present.

How should all these principles be presented in a school in one year? It is a lot to cover. But it seems to me that the principles involved in the rules of entry need to be explained and justified, and when a student understands the reasons for them he will remember them. Straight
memory work in cataloguing can lead to complete nonsense and certainly to disaster. We are told that if we really have able students, they can themselves apply the rules using great common sense to adjust the rules to meet the needs of their particular libraries. Apply this to yourself and see what the answer is. I am sure that they can do this more easily if they have had some opportunity to try their hand at doing it where there is someone who can help them and where they can get guidance and assistance until they feel a little more secure. Basic principles and some opportunity for practice are needed for all students, with extra instruction required for those students wishing to delve deeper into bibliographic problems. The professional school lays the foundation, but we all know that it is practice that makes perfect. Therefore, the teaching process in all bibliographical work must be continued in the library, and it is best done under supervision for at least the first year.

I agree with Sir Frank Francis, the Director and Principal Librarian of the British Museum. He says that librarians must be taught basic techniques but they should be taught to be flexible in their approach to problems. He emphasizes the fact also that this means we must have people coming into the profession who have had a sound academic education and who are sufficiently intelligent to go out from the library school and carry out the principles and the procedures of our profession.

CORA JOHNSTON, Technical Services Department
North York Public Library, Willowdale, Ontario

My presentation is from the viewpoint of a cataloguer in a public library with a technical services department.

Any consideration of policies and techniques in the training of cataloguers in any library should be prefaced by consideration of the value of a cataloguer’s work. It has been said that “the catalogue is the key that unlocks the treasures of the library”. If this is true, the makers of the catalogue have a responsibility to those who use it, for the excellence of the catalogue is dependent on the skill of the cataloguer revealed through his ability to indicate to those who consult it, librarians and the public, the resources of the library. Even with automation, the same kinds of skills possessed by a good cataloguer will be required to feed information into the machines.

Good cataloguers, then, are essential; and if the newly-graduated librarian entering cataloguing is to become efficient, we need adequate inservice training. This training involves the catalogue itself, the technical services department, and the new cataloguer. The catalogue must reveal a consistency in entry, in subject work, in descriptive cataloguing, etc. The experienced cataloguer constantly checks her work to achieve this end. The beginner must learn that the cataloguing of a book is not an academic exercise to be done with the help of LC or other agency. Rather, it must be done in relation to the other books in that particular library. It is often easy to find two different classifications for the same
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book, only one of which is desirable in his library. Biography is put in various places in different libraries.

Then, the great problem in every cataloguing department is how to move books through with speed and without any sacrifice of quality in the catalogue. The advent of a new library school graduate means precious time spent in training that can be ill spared from books. But this is not wasted time. Every minute spent on training means that much less time used later to correct mistakes. The more thorough the initial training, the more quickly will the new cataloguer be able to do his share in the desired production of the department. Regarding the new cataloguer himself, we have often heard, “good cataloguers are born, not made”. This is true only to a point. The best cataloguers must have inquiring minds, a desire to enlarge their field of knowledge constantly, a flair for making prompt decisions, and the ability to give attention to detail. But all good librarians are imbued with inquiring minds and the desire for increased knowledge. The other qualities must be cultivated in most persons, and herein lies the great necessity for careful training. We expect good material from the library schools and good teaching in principles and techniques, but the new graduate beginning cataloguing should be aware that library school was only a beginning and that he must continue his professional education. In measure as he does this well, is he valuable in his position. Good training from the very first is the quickest and best way to this desired excellence. I would like to quote from an article in Library Resources and Technical Services, Winter, 1961, by Margaret C. Brown, Chief of the Processing Division, Free Library of Philadelphia. It reads, in part: “In my opinion the most important part of our training in teaching the new catalogers, and sometimes the ones that are not so new, is how to make correct decisions. Admittedly, the life of a cataloger is just one decision after another. Any cataloger must learn to sharpen his perception. He can learn this best under the skillful guidance of an experienced and understanding cataloger”. Insistence on accuracy and care in detail inculcate in the new cataloger these habits of precision. There is another important consideration from the standpoint of training. Satisfaction in the job will come only as the worker feels a sense of achievement, of continued progress in learning to adapt the library-school-learned techniques. Without this feeling there is frustration.

Let us consider the ways in which in-service training may be carried out. First we have the formal orientation through lectures and talks. Many large libraries have quite elaborate programs. New cataloguers should be urged and expected to keep abreast with new developments in all aspects of librarianship, with particular emphasis on new cataloguing techniques such as information retrieval and the revision of cataloguing rules.

In a library with a technical services department, every cataloguer should know the details of each job. I would suggest that the new cataloguer follow the book through the department doing the work of each
step to get the overall picture. He may need to make, or assist in making, a decision regarding any of these routines, professional or clerical.

A staff manual is very important. Deplore this as many may, every catalogue department has its own variations of the cataloguing rules and classification. Decisions have been made in the past, very often in consultation with, or at the request of, circulation or reference librarians, and these must be lived with. Usually they are well-justified. Changes in editions of Dewey have complicated the problem. The seniors in the department automatically remember and follow these rules but, unless they are recorded in the manual, the new staff member will never even think of them and he will make errors. A manual will also eliminate much time spent asking for instruction on details.

However, the most important way of training new cataloguers in any library is the informal, everyday way. This is the careful revision by a senior cataloguer of work carefully assigned. No amount of formal instruction can equal the actual doing. And with the doing, we need most careful revision and clear explanations of the purpose behind each correction. Certainly, this eats up the time of the cataloguer-reviser who sees the uncatalogued books piling up, and, if it is the head of the department who does the revision, it also cuts into the time he must have to plan the work of the department, set policy, and solve problems. This is the great limitation. But there are two things which must never be lost sight of. First, the time spent in revision and explanation now is time saved later, and it advances the time when the new cataloguer can work more or less independently. A new cataloguer’s work, I think, should be revised for a year, for his benefit and for the benefit of the catalogue. Secondly, cataloguing is important and it is an art, not a mere blind subservience to rules which are often contradictory, or of copying LC and other cataloguing. When a library school graduate decides on cataloguing, it should be the responsibility and pleasure of his senior to help him. Training must of necessity be limited by the pressure of work, but it is of prime importance. It is the problem of the division head or head cataloguer to find the magic dividing line.

It has happened that a new cataloguer librarian has received careful training and is just beginning to be a tower of strength in the busy department. Suddenly, he asks, or is asked, to transfer to a position in another department. This is indeed a catastrophe for the technical services department but not for the library, for there is no aspect of the knowledge of a librarian more important in any branch of the work than cataloguing and bibliographic skills and the faculty of decision-making learned in the discipline of cataloguing.

RONALD HAGLER, Assistant Professor, School of Librarianship
The University of British Columbia, Vancouver

In this discussion of training for the technical services, I shall deal largely with areas other than cataloguing. If we list these as acquisitions, gift and exchange work, circulation mechanics, photoduplication in and
by the library, and binding problems, is it not true that formal education in library schools is often justly criticised as skimpy or unprofessional—and that in-service training which is anything like "professional" is usually non-existent? Cataloguing has not suffered as much from these charges. By and large, cataloguing training has been adapted to changing demands, and once on the job, the neophyte professional cataloguer normally has the strong guiding hand of a more or less patient reviser to lean on for a while. Why the difference?

Part of the answer lies in the small proportion of professional content in the work of these "other" technical services. Their day-to-day operation is so largely clerical, and in smaller libraries even dull, routine that it is too easy to forget any professional background is necessary for making sound policies; too easy to forget, in fact, that policies are needed at all, since the paperwork of acquisitions or the orders for photocopies proliferate well enough of their own accord. In the smaller library, again, since a professional librarian need not spend his full time overseeing the clerical aspects of this work, it is often tempting to spend almost no time (if he is more interested in, say, cataloguing), or to spend what time he has on picayune clerical detail (if he does not want to exert his mind to his proper business, policy making). Above all, who is there, even in fairly large libraries, for the recent graduate newly in charge of acquisitions to learn from? The chief clerical? The harried head librarian?

Do we, then, throw back to the library school the whole responsibility of forming in a student the competence to make the required professional decisions? There, of all places, the clerical detail can be put aside for a while, and some sense of the importance of informed policy can be instilled. But how easy is it to do this in the traditional library school curriculum? True competence in handling technical services situations in today's larger—and smaller—libraries demands a detailed knowledge of many fields, some of them new, which are not always considered part of pure librarianship. In my view, librarians are seriously open to the charge of intellectual inbreeding when they fail to take cognisance of the growing importance of extending their knowledge well beyond the complex which constitutes their basic formal training, namely a smattering of cataloguing, reference, administration, and history.

Let us look briefly at some of these other areas of interest—some of them taught in faculties quite separate from library schools—which have repercussions in the work of the technical services.

I think the most important of these is the field of publishing and printing; not just their history, which is an old standby in the curriculum, but their contemporary commercial and technical aspects. How many book selectors or acquisitions librarians are au courant on the nature of paperback publishing, on book price structures, on the changing methods of reprinting worthwhile older titles? Especially in Canada, where almost all the books we buy are imported from a foreign country, it is essential that the librarian have a detailed knowledge of the structure
and workings of the book trade in at least the three big English-speaking countries. Even in the area of cataloguing, a knowledge of publishing practices can be very useful background, and a great practical help. Why have cataloguing practices changed since Jewett in 1853, since Cutter in 1876, since the Joint Code of 1968? The basis for cataloguing is the format and authorship of the published work. What were the problems of entering government documents in 1853? They were almost insignificant. The United States government might have published a few slim volumes a year. Now, the fragmentation of the administrative organizations which publish is in itself enough to antiquate the guidelines laid down a decade and a half ago for the bibliographic organization of their output. Or consider corporate bodies. Why are we still fussing about the distinction between societies and institutions? In Cutter’s day his solution to the problems of their entry was no doubt thoroughly satisfactory. If the clarity of his distinction has become less evident, it is again because publishing bodies and published formats are NOT so simple as they were in 1876. If we want to look intelligently to the future of our codes for entry, we must perceive and plot the present trends of corporate publishing practices.

Effectiveness in descriptive cataloguing, that much-neglected step-child in the family of the technical services, is even more dependent on a knowledge of those changes in typographic design and title-page format which are finally beginning to cause a rethinking of our present principles. In classification, the story is the same, with subject analysis becoming a more complex matter all the time. It is not the direct “scientific” work which is difficult to classify—it is the work which crosses traditional fields of academic learning, and in the process also enters into the area of human controversy or the behavioural sciences. It is precisely this kind of work which has become so very prominent in public library collections within the past decade or two, and which is causing grief among classifiers who still think book titles should read something like A Primer of . . . . . . Again, an awareness of the kinds of books (and “non-books”) which modern authors and publishing are bringing to us will help us foresee the most useful classified order for them, and the kind of terminology which will make them collectively most accessible through our subject headings.

As we investigate the possibilities of photo-reproduction and the obtaining of out-of-print works by means other than the normal book trade, the moral and legal aspects of copyright will bring to all librarians an awareness of those problems of administering these services which are already plaguing our college and university colleagues. It is true that we lack precedent in the interpretation for librarians of Canada’s present copyright law. But librarians, being engaged in the service of literature, must be aware of why such a basic law as copyright exists, so that the implications for the future of what we may do now in photo-reproduction can be understood.

This is a time of study and conferences about information retrieval.
and data processing. When we consider new mechanized means of controlling some of the work of the technical services, we are doing no more than extending the age of the typewriter and the charging machine. It is only if we are personally unfamiliar with the fundamental capabilities of the machine, that we begin to wonder how soon it will take over all reference service. The basic value of any machine is in its more efficient accomplishment of the work that at present keeps some of our clerical assistants busy. This is the "housekeeping" function, a perfectly legitimate one. The "information retrieval" function of machines still rests on weak ground indeed. Intelligent librarians are no more ready today to plunge into mechanization of reference work than they were ten years ago, because they see that the nature of knowledge and of the human thought process makes replacement of the human librarian beyond the scope of present possibility. What we will be able to do is mechanize many more of our repetitive, routine duties; and if we are to do this wisely, we must acquire knowledge of machine techniques as they have been developed outside the normal areas of librarianship.

There is a staggering reliance of librarianship on the business world and its techniques already. Libraries are finding that co-operation means savings. But part of the saving is accomplished by letting commercial organizations do some things, often in the technical services, which can be reduced to routine clerical operations. I think that the strains of learning to live with the business world outside with a view to the production, for example, of book catalogues may be counted among the interesting challenges of the future administrator.

Granted, then, that today's librarians must know many things about which their formal library training gave them little background: Shall we displace our cataloguing and reference courses in library schools in favour of documentation, commercial publishing, business finance, and law? Far from it—the more we branch out from the basic core of librarianship, the more important it is that this core of reference, cataloguing, library management, and subject bibliography be intensively studied as a foundation for further work. Obviously, as long as we are limited to the one-year library school programme, we have about reached the practical limit of fragmentation within this programme.

Common to all of the areas of knowledge about which I have spoken, however, is another characteristic. Each is a rapidly changing field, subject to practical obsolescence of knowledge within months or a year, and to important new developments almost weekly. Here is not the timeless logic of cataloguing theory, but the rush of new inventions and techniques, each to be absorbed and discarded in its turn. This is precisely the kind of knowledge one gains best by keeping up with current professional reading, and by attending workshops, special seminars and conferences, where brief periods can be spent regularly in intensive discussion of the implications of the latest developments, against the background of one's earlier solid foundation of theory from library school and of practical experience.
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Who is responsible for providing these “extra-curricular” sessions, for installing the spirit of continuing education? The library school, yes, but only inasmuch as it can provide some of the facilities for it. But our professional associations also have facilities for encouraging and developing programmes of continuing education, and the associations have far closer contact with those who need such programmes. Administrators, too, must realize how necessary it is to release staff for attendance at such learning sessions; and of course the responsibility ultimately lies with each one of us as professional people to make the best of any opportunity we are given to extend our fields of vision.

LORNA D. FRASER, Assistant Director
York University Library, Toronto, Ontario

The colleges and universities of Ontario, like those in other parts of the country, are about to enter a period of expansion in which problems of unprecedented magnitude must be faced. Within 28 months they must be ready to grant admission to the first shock wave of that staggering statistical projection of student enrolment which indicates that by 1970 there may be at least three times as many students in our institutions of higher learning as there are today. All of us, whether we are associated with universities or not, are aware in general terms of the approaching situation, and acquainted to some extent with the measures that will be taken to meet it. We are perhaps not all familiar, however, with a recent “source document” known as the “Deutsch Report” which sets forth the facts and figures of the impending emergency in higher education, together with important recommendations for immediate action, on the basis of which the expansion of facilities at the university level is being planned. This report, entitled “Post-Secondary Education in Ontario, 1962-1970”, was prepared by The Committee of Presidents of Provincially-Assisted Universities for submission to the province’s Advisory Committee on University Affairs. Revised in January, 1963, it was printed for public distribution only a month or so ago.

Among its many recommendations, the Committee urges in particular that in the next seven years the various existing institutions must be prepared to expand at rates that will increase their enrolments anywhere from twice to thirty-six times their present size, and that in addition new institutions be established. It also demands that, in order to obtain qualified teaching staff in the numbers that will be needed by all institutions, a crash programme aimed at doubling the size of our graduate schools be undertaken without delay. The emergency facing our universities is not regarded as one of short duration. Looking beyond 1970, the Committee observes that “we face an unremitting expansion, of spasmodic intensity, with no contraction in sight in the foreseeable future, and with major crises just three and four years ahead”.

To the Committee, and certainly to the members of our profession, the provision of adequate library resources for our colleges and univer-
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sities is a crisis of major proportions. In a few short years we must develop our collections both in quantity and quality by acquiring a far greater number of volumes and titles than has been possible in the past, accumulating not only the materials needed for courses now given, but as well those for courses that will be added to the curriculum next year, five years from now, or even in ten years' time. In addition, we must possess immediately, or have access to, the materials for research needed by our graduate students and faculty. We must also be able to record and organize our collections for use according to methods that not only will be satisfactory to the reader, but also will permit the rapid handling of floods of material in all forms and all languages for many years to come. And, finally, we must be able to provide facilities for using our collections to greatest advantage, drawing upon all the resources—bibliographical, architectural, technological, and human—that are available now and will become available in the future.

The challenge before us is both demanding and exciting. According to the D.B.S., a larger percentage of the graduating classes of our library schools are now seeking careers in academic libraries than in any other single type of library, and as long as the academic field offers a stimulating and rewarding experience this trend can be expected to continue. But it is essential for the welfare of our universities and colleges that the development and operation of their libraries are in the hands of knowledgeable, competent, and well-trained librarians. Because time is against us and the job to be done is so complex, the libraries no longer can afford to mould the average new graduate through prolonged in-service training programmes and years of accumulated experience into the kind of librarian upon whose well-informed mind, vision, sound judgment, decisiveness, and leadership the success of our endeavors depend. Certainly, the libraries themselves must always undertake by various means to develop the potentialities of their staff members and to train them for specific responsibilities, but the time has come when it is necessary—as well as proper—to expect the members of our library staffs to be much better qualified than many of them are now. The accomplishments of our profession, both in reaching and in practice, have been notable, and the salaries now being paid, especially to beginning librarians, compare favourably with, and in some cases surpass, those in other professions. The fight for recognition of our professional training and status has been necessary, commendable and beneficial to us all, but it is my sincere conviction that social changes affecting our libraries now and in the future must force us into recognizing a new stage in our professional development where, as a result of higher standards of professional education, superior qualifications and abilities, together with experience, constitute the only justifiable grounds upon which salary negotiations should be made, promotions secured, and new graduates considered for employment.

In the light of our topic today it is appropriate to note in the Deutsch Report that "professional training in some fields should be examined
carefully to see if the educational requirements are realistic in terms of the work to be done by the professional practitioner. But any reappraisal of our formal training must be based on a clear understanding of the truly professional content of our work. Much progress has been made already in distinguishing between professional and non-professional work, but a great deal more can still be done, and must be done, if we are to avoid the dangers of over-education on the one hand and under-education on the other.

Because I fear that we are under-educated for much of the work that must be done in academic libraries in the immediate future, I should like to make the following general observations with reference to the technical services in particular.

I believe, first of all, that academic librarians could perform their jobs in better perspective if they could have some experience of the content and discipline of a particular subject at the post-graduate level. The subject knowledge gained thereby would, of course, be of great value, but even if there should be no immediate application for their subject knowledge, librarians will have acquired at least an understanding of the demands of scholarship and research, which I feel is essential if communications between library staff and faculty are to be improved.

Technical services librarians also need to know much more than they now do about bibliography, publishing, and the book trade. Traditionally, college and university libraries have relied heavily upon faculty recommendations for developing their collections, but it is already clear that the heavy teaching and committee loads borne by our faculty members leave them little time for this collaboration. It is inevitable then that librarians must assume a greater share of responsibility for acquiring the materials that will be needed in such quantities in all subjects. While librarians cannot be expert in many subject fields, it is essential for the work of selecting, ordering, cataloguing and recording that they be thoroughly familiar with a wide range of bibliographical sources. The complexities of publishing, particularly of serials, government publications, and technical reports, should be studied in detail, and the best methods of controlling these difficult materials mastered. A sound knowledge of the book trade, domestic and foreign, is essential in academic libraries, and the success of our acquisition programmes depend on the librarian's ability to secure both current and out-of-print publications rapidly and economically. All academic libraries, whether old or new, need highly-trained acquisitions librarians, and we must look to our professional schools to produce them.

The basic academic background necessary for all technical services work consists of sound bibliographical training, some degree of subject specialization and facility in languages. We often speak of the "pendulum" in librarianship, because so often we have swung away from one approach only to return to it many years later. The time has arrived, I believe, when technical services librarians should swing back to a greater knowledge of the preservation of their stock-in-trade, that is, to a first-hand
knowledge of the techniques of binding, repairing, and all the other ways of protecting library materials and making them serviceable. This knowledge is essential in acquisitions and cataloguing, as well as in the specific field of processing, and I feel that in our attempts to distinguish between professional and clerical duties we have lost sight of what a librarian should know about these matters, whether he actually does them or not.

Finally, if our technical services librarians are to be trained as planners for the future, they must learn about the future—what its needs are likely to be and what new developments are likely to take place to meet those needs. Jesse Shera, speaking last autumn on “The Propædeutic of the New Librarianship” at the University of Minnesota Library School’s Institute on Information Retrieval Today, said that “however sound our theory, however impeccable and valid our research, however bright and shining our technology, these will avail us nothing if they are not absorbed into the professional education of those in whose hands the future must inevitably rest”. We know enough about the future to realize that many aspects of the librarian’s work will be transformed by technology. Let us then be well trained to understand and apply whatever may help us to further the purposes for which our libraries exist.

All that I have said so far appears to place the entire burden of training upon our professional schools. As we and the new graduates of whom I have been speaking grow older, we will feel the need to refresh ourselves and to extend our professional knowledge beyond what we have learned in our jobs, by professional reading or by attending conferences and discussion groups. The opportunity to attend formal courses, whether held under the aegis of our professional schools or of our professional organizations, is essential if we are to maintain the high standards of performance that our profession should require.

A member of my family has recently been called to the bar of Ontario after a rigorous training which is acknowledged to be the best in North America. I am convinced that if training for librarianship were even half as demanding as training for the law, our libraries would be staffed by better-qualified librarians than we have now. Perhaps our professional staffs would not be quite as large as we now think we are going to need, because fewer applicants could qualify for admittance to our schools; but perhaps, too, if our librarians were more highly trained, our estimates of the number needed could be revised. It is my view—and if it is a controversial one, so much the better for our discussion today—that we librarians need to study harder and to work harder if we are to justify the trust that is placed in us as a professional group, and if we are to walk both with pride and humility in the years ahead.
Difficulties in Procurement of U. S. Scientific and Technical Publications in Pakistan

A. M. ABDUL HUQ, Librarian
East Pakistan Agricultural University
Mymensingh, Pakistan

English is still the official language in Pakistan and is going to remain here as the most important foreign language, especially in teaching and application of both pure and applied sciences.

The need for scientific and technical publications in English is obvious. It is estimated that nearly 3,000 new titles are published annually in Pakistan (one title per 32,000 population) about a third of which are textbooks up to high school level. It is doubtful if 2% of the total annual publications can be classed as scientific and technical. It is a widely-known fact that the partition of the Indian sub-continent left Pakistan with practically no share in the scientific and technical literature resources, as the scientific and technological institutions and their libraries which had been built up from the common resources of the country, went to India because of their location. This vacuum can be filled only over decades with concerted efforts. Thus on the procurement of recent as well as age-old research materials from abroad depends the instructional and research programme in science and technology in the country.

There are a number of barriers to the inflow of books, and the imposition of import licensing is one of the complex ones. Last year and this year the import policy on books, especially with regard to universities and other educational institutions, has been liberalised but still it acts as an impediment. As of now, there are two licensing procedures: One is Open General Licence, and the other is under Informational Media Guarantee Programme (IMG) for U. S. books. It is under the latter that the bulk of the import is made.

The IMG Programme since its inception has undergone a number of breaks for technical difficulties. The dealers within the country are not satisfied with its working nor are their U. S. counterparts, and much less the librarians. Yet this is about the only media for getting U. S. books. There are over 900 publishers in the U.S.A. and, according to Literary Market Place, over 100 of them are active scientific and technical publishers. Besides, there are several hundred publisher-dealers, wholesalers, and jobbers in the U.S.A. Against this distribution channel just about
are listed as qualified exporters in the U. S. under IMG in the latest available list (this list is under constant revision), and all acquisitions must be made through them. Thus a good many publishers, especially university presses, learned societies, and scientific institutions are left out of the qualified list of exporters and as such it is almost impossible to get their publications under IMG. One may try to get such publications through an accredited agent who may be a qualified exporter, but there is no guarantee that he will be able to obtain materials from all publishers, and besides he may get too small a discount to justify his trying to obtain the books. There are additional and insurmountable difficulties also. By the time a U. S. exporter is approached, his allocations may have been used up, which is quite often the case with most exporters. To quote one U. S. wholesale book distributor, “The cut back on IMG Funds [for Pakistan for fiscal 1964] has been so great, that no Investor has been given what he applied for, and this not alone includes the export sales representatives of American publishers, but the publishers who have their own export departments. We had a phone call last week from a publisher who has $2,000 worth of orders for Pakistan which they cannot ship, as they could not get a contract to cover. They wanted to turn the business over to us, but we told them we did not have any IMG funds left.” One leading Pakistani bookseller writes, “This year the size of the IMG Programme has been cut from $4,000,000 to $9,000,000” whereas the need for U. S. literature has grown with the establishment and expansion of educational institutions. He further writes, “With U. S. congress hesitation to Foreign Aid Programmes, the future of this Programme is uncertain in Pakistan.” This is an alarming situation. The writer of this article recently approached 19 of the firms on the approved list of exporters but has not been successful in placing orders with any of them, as no one has any more funds left under IMG. Incidentally, even 19 of the firms together do not represent the publishers whose books were planned to be ordered. Such difficulties under IMG which do not appear on the surface can only be overcome if officials concerned in both the U. S. and Pakistan Government jointly review the situation in the light of the need of U. S. literature in Pakistan and modify the programme accordingly.

The situation on direct import of books being what it is, it would have been a relief if local book trade could adequately meet library needs on satisfactory terms and if their services were found to be quicker and better. According to a recent survey “most of the imported books by booksellers are texts which have been recommended or prescribed by the colleges and universities because these have a much higher probability of sale to students. It must be admitted that with a very limited book-market in the country, it is not easy for an honest bookseller dealing in foreign books to remain in business keeping up with the rules, regulations, and changes in import licensing, running parcels and papers through the customs, State Bank, Post Office and finally satisfying the Income-tax People. Yet, the booktrade leaves much to be desired and indeed there is a lot that could be done.”
Sufficiently large numbers of titles are published abroad by learned societies, scientific institutions, and university presses which offer little or no discount and as such the local dealer may not respond to such requests unless these form part of a large order and special rates are agreed upon for such publications. Besides, all dealers are not resourceful enough to develop contacts with all sources, and some prefer to deal only with those publishers or dealers with whom they have long-established relations. Practically no bookseller in Pakistan handles out-of-print books. These factors and lack of confidence in the local booksellers make the librarian enter into the hazardous task of direct import.

It is generally claimed that the cost of books imported by the institutions is more than they would have paid in local market. This is not necessarily true. Even if no discount is taken into account, the importing library pays the foreign firm the prices of books at the bank rates, whereas the local bookdealer will charge approved rates for books which are much higher than bank rate and as such the differential will be in favor of the importing library and not the local dealer.

Some local booksellers bring out occasional lists of books available from their stocks. While this is a laudable service, it is not possible to use such lists to much advantage since they lack in important buying information. Invariably, the lists omit any imprint information. For the omission of the name of the publisher no solid argument can be advanced. The name of the publisher, specially in scientific publications, tells as much about the authority of the book as the author. One may argue that it works to ensure sale from the stock since lack of detailed information will leave no alternative to the prospective buyer but to turn to the source of the list for the books needed. Even if this is true, the dealer would not know the many potential customers he might have failed to attract by not giving sufficient bibliographic information.

**Periodicals and Other Serials**

The development of new knowledge in the last half century is believed to have outstripped the rate of development of all the preceding centuries and as a natural corollary the number of scientific journals has multiplied to such an extent that no one exactly knows how many there are throughout the world and far less know what they are. The 1952 edition of the World List of Scientific Periodicals lists 50,000 items. The 1963 edition of Ulrich’s Periodicals Directory lists about 20,000 titles, an increase of 3,000 titles over the 1959 edition. In this vast and steadily expanding sea of periodical literature, the special librarian must chart his course for acquisition of periodicals, aiming towards complete sets of periodicals which are of potential value to the clientele since they constitute the ideal resources of his library. While this is the kind of need for back and current literature, how shocking it must have been for the Scientific Commission of Pakistan (1960) to have to observe:
... Everywhere there was acute shortage of books, periodicals and scientific journals and the libraries, which are the very life of an institution, were out of date and poor. In all universities, without exception, important scientific journals had not been imported for the scientific libraries since 1954-55.

This situation has been created out of the difficulties in subscribing to foreign journals. Now, the procedure for import of journals is the same as that of books. In practice, it is even worse. Under the IMG there is only one U. S. subscription agent listed as approved exporter and naturally he cannot be expected to meet all the requirements of any one library, not to speak of all. Hence, generous consideration should be given to ease the import of journals and their backfiles.

Non-Serial Publications

Non-serial publications are described as "both the blessings and the curse of the librarian and the technical man" because such literatures have limited coverages in bibliographies, these are not easily available and unfortunately a vast number of them are either for "limited" or "internal" use and are unpublished materials. The potential value of technical reports and separates and the extraordinary increase in their volume make their acquisition, even though it must be of a selective nature, obligatory for any library of considerable size. Needless to say, it would be futile to attempt to procure this type of material through trade channels. Constant check over various bibliographies and probable fragmentary sources and direct and quick approach to the appropriate source may make acquisition of such material possible. Perhaps the U. S. Federal Reserve Bank in collaboration with the State Bank of Pakistan could arrange issuance of some sort of coupons of small denominations which could be bought in Pakistani currency so that the materials referred to above might be procured at ease and speed.

Among the developing nations, Pakistan is making great strides in becoming developed. In this difficult journey, she needs the literature resources of developed countries like the U.S.A. In the interest of seeing Pakistan developed, U.S.A. should help this young nation in making her literature available with least inconvenience.

IFLA PARIS CONFERENCE

The full report of the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles has been published by its Organizing Committee and printed by the Universities Press in Belfast. It is available, at £3.30 from the Organizing Committee, c/o National Central Library, Malet Place, London, W.C.1, or (at $9) from the Publishing Department, American Library Association, 50 East Huron St., Chicago 11, Illinois.

Library Resources & Technical Services
The American Standards Association Committee Z39 has completed its work on a revised system of transliteration for modern Russian letters, and an official ASA Draft standard is now being prepared for general distribution. The extreme pressures caused by enormous increases in speed of communication and in the production of new information have enforced a rigorous examination of the various systems in use. In fact, the problem is not new; it has been with us for decades. What is new is the importance of the problem and the imperative need for its rational resolution.

Committee Z39 is sponsored by the Council of National Library Associations and is the Sectional Committee of the American Standards Association (ASA) on Library work and Documentation. Z39 serves ASA as its advisory group in these areas on national standards as they are developed and on international standards as they are proposed through the International Organization for Standardization. Two years ago Z39 was revitalized through a joint grant from NSF and CLR, and the various subcommittees were established.

Until recently, there was no central agency qualified for and able to take a national position on matters of transliteration. In our democratic way of life, it was possible for the American Library Association and the Library of Congress to develop and promote one system while the U. S. Board on Geographic Names chose another. At the same time in other English speaking countries, the British Standards Institution introduced its own system, not followed by the Permanent Committee on Geographic Names, and also different in some ways from an authorized system of the International Organization for Standardization.

It is out of the welter of systems thus briefly indicated that Z39 Subcommittee 5 on Transliteration extracted the elements of a proposal for a system which may be more universally acceptable for the wider range of purposes now to be served.

Beginning in 1939 a draft proposal for an international system for the transliteration of Cyrillic characters was produced by ISA (International Federation of National Standards Associations), the immediate predeces-
The work of Z39's Subcommittee 5 on Transliteration began in earnest at this point. The results of that work are now available for wider distribution and trial use. The table for Transliteration of Modern Russian letters is a slightly modified and simplified version of the British system. Both the British Standards Institution and ASA Sectional Committee Z39 are agreed on publication of this version of the table. Z39 Subcommittee 5 on Transliteration is continuing work on a transliteration system for other languages which use Cyrillic letters. The notes to be included in any standard of Transliteration also are under study, but this part of the work is not so urgent. The new joint (BSI and ASA Sectional Committee Z39) Table for Modern Russian has already been adopted by major indexing and abstracting agencies; it may be presumed that time will demonstrate its usefulness to the entire community of using scholars.

(Editor’s note: It was ascertained through correspondence that the Library of Congress has decided that, because of the great amount of revision necessary, it must continue in its cataloging to use the transliteration published in the ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title Entries. Chicago, American Library Association, 1949, p. 246.)

The L.C. and ALA system differs in letters number.
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### Draft Table for Modern Russian Letters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>BSI</th>
<th>BSI-ASA/SC-Z39</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>BSI</th>
<th>BSI-ASA/SC-Z39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>А а</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>р р</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Б б</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>С с</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>В в</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>Т т</td>
<td>т</td>
<td>t (footnote (1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Г г</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>У у</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Д д</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>Ф ф</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Е е</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Х х</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>kh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ж ж</td>
<td>zh</td>
<td>zh</td>
<td>Ц ц</td>
<td>ts</td>
<td>ts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>З з</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>Ч ч</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>И и</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Э э</td>
<td>sh</td>
<td>sh (footnote (2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Й й</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>Э э</td>
<td>shch</td>
<td>shch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>К к</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>Ъ Ъ</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Л л</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>Ы Ы</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y (footnote (3))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>М м</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Ь Ь</td>
<td>Ь</td>
<td>Ь</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Н н</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Э э</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>ē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>О о</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Ю ю</td>
<td>yu</td>
<td>yu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>П п</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Я я</td>
<td>ya</td>
<td>ya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Footnotes**

(1) Use т- when Т (No. 19) is followed by С (No. 18)

(2) Use ш- when Э (No. 25) is followed by Ч (No. 24)

(3) Ы (with a bar) may be used optionally when followed by Б (No. 1) or У (No. 20)
A T T E M P T I N G T O T R A C E the historical development of a current dynamic idea is in trouble almost before it begins. In the field of history one must be exact. In the field of contemporary history, since it is continually in the making, it is difficult, if not impossible, to be exact. A dynamic idea exploding and developing cannot be properly assessed. One faces an almost insurmountable task in assembling facts while the facts are going in all directions, on all dimensions. Centralized processing is one such explosive idea, and in attempting to present valid historical facts about its beginnings, growth and development, one realizes that such information is out of date at the time it is written. Such is the case with the facts I am about to present. I have chosen to date the historical development of processing centers from 1851 to the present, choosing an open entry to indicate the fact of the daily continuum of this development.

Centralized processing may be considered to be those steps whereby library materials for several independent libraries, either by contract or informal agreement, are ordered, cataloged, and physically prepared for use by library patrons, these operations being performed in one location with billing, packing, and distribution to these same libraries.

Ten years ago, centralized processing, or a processing center as here defined, was an oddity. Library literature did not begin to use a heading that suggests centralization or cooperation in cataloging by independent, politically separate units until 1958, obviously because there was very little written on the subject. It is true, however, that Jewett in 1851 proposed that librarians in the United States organize with the Smithsonian as its center to engage in definite cooperative enterprise, including cataloging. And there is much in the literature before 1955 about cooperative cataloging, but not as it relates to processing centers as we know them. To be sure, in 1955 the heading Cataloging, Centralized was used as was Technical Processes, again not as we have expanded its

* Revision of a paper presented at a meeting of the Cataloging and Classification Section, ALA-RTSD, in Chicago, July 15, 1963.
meaning today. Technical Services does not appear as a heading until 1957. In 1961 Technical Processes ceased to be used, and we find the headings of Technical Services, Cooperative; and Technical Services, Centralized. This record of change in the literature clearly indicates the dynamic aspect of cooperation and centralization in cataloging spearheaded primarily by catalogers possessing a great deal of foresight. It also indicates the necessity for a clarification of terms. This record further points up that catalogers are continually attempting to keep their work in tune with our rapidly-expanding library world.

As I have previously stated, it is difficult to record history as it is happening and to find the exact dates of beginnings of this or that processing center. I tried searching in the literature for this information, but except for facts and figures on some of the larger processing centers, not too much seems to have been written. I searched the files of the Michigan State Library for facts and information about those centers on which nothing had appeared in the literature and was not too successful. Therefore, I did not find as much information as I had hoped. I have appended a chart which lists the establishment dates of those centers I did find, and other information about centers whose establishment date I could not find. The list shows that great progress in the development of such centers is taking place throughout the country. This is not to say, however, that large university, municipal, or county libraries did not have within their own institutions a mechanism of centralization; many have been in existence for a decade or more. These centralized mechanisms have been the prototype, and in many cases the pattern, for the processing centers as we know them today. But why did these new centers appear so quickly? Certainly catalogers and administrators had seen the necessity for, and dreamed of, centralized mechanisms for many years, indeed, many decades, but what forceful ingredient was lacking in many instances to make their dreams a reality? What element was needed to trigger their quantitative beginning and still sustains their phenomenal growth? Money.

Painful Growth

Adoption of new concepts and technical development is almost always accompanied by some pain. The growth of these processing centers is not without such pain. In many cases new processing centers grope and stumble and are shaky on their legs as they attempt to do their part to give better library service quickly and efficiently. Criticism of these centers appears here and there, at meetings and in the literature. Charges of “over-simplification,” “sloppy work,” “too many machines,” “sacrificing book content,” “no observance of form,” etc., are leveled at the work going on in processing centers, but these remarks are for the most part the death rattle of a corpse that should have been interred long ago. I don’t think anyone is more aware of the problems and shortcomings of a new processing center than those who have had the gumption to begin one. I don’t think anyone is more aware of the painful moments of doubt.
and anxiety than those who try to give service from a processing center. *Public Library Service; A Guide to Evaluation, with Minimum Standards*, ALA, 1956, states that the quality of library service is dependent upon how well cataloging, classifying, etc., are done and that the nature of the work in its turn depends upon requirements for service. This is a fertile statement. Those who have spearheaded the cooperative moment of centralized processing have attempted to adapt, and continue to adapt, good management techniques to expedite the flow of materials so that the qualitative and quantitative demand for library service can be met. The cataloging mechanism of a library, or library system, must always be sensitive to these changes in demands for service and accommodate its work to them. Processing centers are not unaware of problems yet to be solved on meeting the requirements of service for their given clientele.

*Are Processing Centers Necessary?*

Poignant questions have been asked concerning the existence of processing centers. Some ask—"Why are they necessary?" "Catalogers have always done a good job. Why join a processing center? We may have a backlog but we're not too far behind!" In the *ALA Bulletin*, June 1963, Dan Lacy in an article "Book Distribution" makes the statement that there are more than 20,000 titles published in the United States every year. This increased output, particularly in the field of non-fiction, makes necessary a further centralizing and cooperation in getting these books on the shelves as immediately as possible for patron use. Catalogers in many small and medium-sized libraries who are members of processing centers could not possibly handle the increased number of titles now purchased by their libraries. I would guess that many processing centers are purchasing as many as five to seven thousand new titles each year in addition to handling a work loan of replacement titles. An interesting fact supported in conversations with many heads of processing centers indicates that a member library's book budget increases after working with a given processing center because of the ease with which new titles may be ordered. This is due to many other factors which time does not permit to be mentioned here. However, a processing center must continually assess and expedite book flow as the libraries participating in the center purchase new and old titles. Three years ago it was suggested in *State Plans Under Library Services Act, Supplement 2*, that the primary reason behind the centralized cataloging activities were costs, staff shortages, and the urgency to prepare large quantity of book and non-book materials as rapidly as possible. This is much truer today than it was three years ago.

*Library Services Act, 1956*

The Library Services Act of 1956 provided the funds enabling the application of the thinking of the large municipal and county libraries to a cooperative movement among independent libraries. The money appropriated by this act allowed many library agencies to put plans into
operation that had long been dreams. State appropriations, as in New York, often stimulated by Federal Grants and more generous local support, have also helped to expedite their growth. An extensive report of the Library Services Branch of the U. S. Office of Education, State Plans under the Library Services Act, Supplement to 1960, says that “Centralized processing has been one form of cooperation that has been given great emphasis by the Library Services Act.” It goes on to say, “Although centralized processing activities are still very important within single library systems, this new development is the processing of library materials for groups of separate libraries.” The report indicates that by the end of the second year of the Library Services Act, which was passed in 1956, the following states started either new or expanded centralized processing centers: Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oregon, South Dakota, Vermont and Washington. States with one or more centralized processing centers jumped in number from 17 to 21 in 1959. At the time of this report in 1960, it was estimated that there were over 30 processing centers under the Library Services Act, serving more than 500 libraries in the United States. Today I would estimate that this number has doubled and that the number of libraries contracting or agreeing to accept centralized processing has trebled or even quadrupled, if one includes in the count those libraries contracting with commercial firms. The list of processing centers compiled is not intended to be exhaustive because many libraries that cooperate with others in processing, as I indicated previously, have simply not recorded the fact in the literature. The list includes 46 library processing centers and two commercial firms engaged in processing. There are more commercial firms who offer processing, but to the knowledge of the writer it is not the complete service as previously defined. However, I am sure of one fact, and it is this, there is much more going on in this area—many facts which I have been unable to obtain.

Patterns Varied

There is no single pattern for these processing centers. They have come into being because of many unusual local factors. Further, I think, this adaptation to the local situation is a tribute to the imagination of administrators and catalogers. No matter where one goes one finds a different technique. From my own experience at the Wayne County Public Library in Michigan, and at the Michigan State Library, I would say that the peculiarities of each institution seem to make this mandatory. Differences in organizational pattern, budget, personalities, and over-all institutional goals almost enforce this. Hypothetically, you might say that Center X, composed of small and medium-sized township libraries and small village libraries politically and geographically contiguous, came together originally to discuss only cooperative book purchasing and after engaging in cooperative book purchasing, found that they should go further and enlarge the center to do its processing as well at a very
slight increase in cost. Center Y, on the other hand, may have come into being because a large county or city library and several medium-sized city libraries, politically but not geographically contiguous, found that they were processing a great number of duplicate titles and because of certain enforced budget cuts found that they could preserve their book funds by cooperatively processing materials.

One finds, however, that there are some general principles for standardization which are becoming increasingly necessary if processing centers are to grow, develop, and become a financially sound entity. This necessary standardization, or what I like to call “nationalization of procedures” does not destroy any of the basic principles of good cataloging techniques. Good cataloging, classification, and book handling always standardize those things which can be standardized, eliminating vast amounts of wasted duplication of effort. For my part, this work of standardization of procedures is one of the most exciting and challenging in library work today. It makes those who supervise processing centers become good managers—it makes them see the total library picture.

*Catalog Card As A Book Pocket*

An example of the necessity of standardization within a processing mechanism occurred while I was a member of the staff at Wayne County Library. I was totally immersed in an experiment with Walter Kaiser, the County Librarian, and other staff members, in using the entry in the weekly record of *Publishers' Weekly* as a format and source for cataloging in order to produce the best possible unit card. (See *Library Journal*, January 15, 1963.) This unit card would serve as a catalog card, book card, shelf list card, and book pocket. At that time there may have been other libraries who were developing a similar idea, but to our knowledge the Wayne County Library was the first. In discussing the catalog card as a book pocket then, the one idea uppermost in my mind was that the public at last would have before them almost continually the most important information about a book, in each book that they had borrowed from the library. This constant exposure to the catalog card would afford the patrons the opportunity to become aware of what the information on a catalog card meant. The average patron would begin at last to know what our major tool was. It would bring the patron into closer contact with the world of the cataloger and in a sense familiarize the patron with what libraries were all about. It would destroy the “mystique” of the cataloger and make it more meaningful, because, after all, the cataloger works to make a book accessible and available to the library patron.

It was found, after a year or so, that patrons began to know more about subject headings, began to understand the bibliographic information on the catalog card, and began to find their own way among the cards and shelves. At the charging desk, whenever the librarian had a question about the catalog, he (or she) need only open any book and explain the organization of the material on the catalog card to the patron. This discouraged any further development of pointers and siters on the
staff—they could no longer just sit and point at the catalog since the catalog was brought to them in capsule form. Children began to know what the catalog was all about. The confusion of page number with classification number and volume size began to cease.

I mention this experience purely to indicate the unforeseen directions in which centralized processing can lead. The reason for the experiment was to expedite book flow and an attempt to eliminate a duplicate operation of pocket printing and of coordinating the printing of pockets with printing of catalog cards; in a word, to eliminate waste of valuable staff time. I know that other people engaged in processing centers have found that they are led in many different directions and are able to give better library service because of the ventures in these directions. Many have realized the great waste of staff time in silly procedures which have arisen from custom and have no direct bearing on making the book more quickly accessible. Many further realize the great disproportion of money budgeted for staff engaged in perpetuating these “silly customs.” Many have begun to appreciate the fact that outmoded procedures are a happy hunting ground for saving time and money.

Basically, this is what processing centers are about, and historically they have grown from a casual, informal agreement of libraries and librarians—administrators, catalogers, clerks, et al.—working together in selection, ordering, cataloging, book handling, etc., to produce this great cooperative movement we see today. One can only look forward to the future when the 20,000 or more books published in the United States, plus the thousands published outside of the United States, are more quickly available to library patrons at the time of publication.

I could not have hoped to give you any more exact history than this survey. The list does give a glimpse of what is going on. I can only throw up my arms in delightful despair and say of processing centers, “You can’t keep up with them!”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>No. Participating Libraries</th>
<th>Basis for Participation</th>
<th>Book Ordering</th>
<th>Card Reproduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama Public Library Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anoka Co. L., Minneapolis, Minn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State Library Processing Center, LSA, Sacramento</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Informal agreement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Public Library, Miles City, Montana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Addressograph, Bookamatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Purchasing &amp; Processing Proj., Weld County, Colorado</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>16 sch. systems</td>
<td>Informal agreement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Multilith, LC, Flexowriter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 sch. libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton-Essex Co. Lib., Plattsburgh, N. Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 pub. libraries</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>LC, Multilith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Xerox, Multilith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawfordsville P. L., Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeline Fairbanks Memorial Library, Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Luden Reg. Lib., Fort Luden, Tenn., Lenoir City, Tenn.</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>6 (county)</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>LC, Multilith, Addressograph, Ecta-Lith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four County Library System, N. Y., Georgia Division of Library Services</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Date Established</td>
<td>No. Participating Libraries</td>
<td>Basis for Participation</td>
<td>Book Ordering</td>
<td>Card Reproduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Traverse Federation Proc. Center, Traverse City P. L.,</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>LC; Typed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traverse City, Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Falls Public Library, Montana</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho State Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky Library Extension Division</td>
<td>Jan. 1959</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Multilith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Service Center of Eastern Ohio, Barnesville</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Typed Addressograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Service Center of Missouri, Jefferson City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid York Library System, New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey County Library, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada State L. Coop. Proc. Center, Carson City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico State Library Ext. Service, Cent. Proc. Proj., Santa Fe</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Incorporation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Addressograph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara Library System, N. Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Multilith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coastal Reg. Lib., Tillamook, Oregon</td>
<td>July 1, 1958</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clatsop &amp; Tillamook Counties plus bookmobile demonstration</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wilson Multilith; Typed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Country Library System, Watertown, N. Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Montana Federation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wilson Multilith; Typed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State Library Statewide Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Multilith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando Public Library Processing Center, Orlando, Florida</td>
<td>Jan. 1962</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Multilith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer L. System, Rochester, N. Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Multilith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center</td>
<td>Date Established</td>
<td>No. Participating Libraries</td>
<td>Basis for Participation</td>
<td>Book Ordering</td>
<td>Card Reproduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester P. L. (N. Y.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Adirondack Library System, N. Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois Regional Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Maryland Regional Lib. Assn., Leonards</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elliott Addressing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Tier Library System, N. Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Missouri L. Service, Inc., Bolivar</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Contract, Incorporation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Multilith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Wisconsin Library</td>
<td>April, 1959</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proc. Center, Fennimore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Xerox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Lib. Cataloging Center, Columbus, Ohio, L. S. CEO</td>
<td>Jan. 1960</td>
<td>30 (card sets only to 20)</td>
<td>Informal agreement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Multilith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see LRTS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Hudson Valley Federation, N. Y.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watertown Regional Library Service Center, Watertown, N. Y.</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Multilith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westchester Library System, Westchester, N. Y.</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Xerox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia State Library Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multilith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alanar Book Proc. Center, P. O. Box 291, Williamsport, Pa.</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1000 (approx.)</td>
<td>Business agreement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl J. Liebel, Inc., 1236 South Hatcher Ave., LaPuente, Calif.</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business agreement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Multilith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Comparison of the Operation of Various Processing Centers*

ELIZABETH ADCOCK, Librarian
Weld County Library
Greeley, Colorado

ALTHOUGH all processing centers have many basic points in common, they are probably most definitely divided by their type of legal organization. Therefore, I have used this diversity in selecting representative centers.

For this presentation I have chosen three types of centers. The first is operated completely by a state library or commission; the second is operated within the framework of a public library system; and the third is a center operated by an association of libraries formed primarily for the purpose of establishing a processing center. I shall attempt to cover the same basic procedures for each and then draw some comparisons.

The state operated center selected is the North Carolina State Library Processing Center. Information on its operation has been taken from the manual of development and procedures issued in June, 1961, and from correspondence with Elizabeth Hughey, the State Librarian.

Impetus for establishing the Center came from the North Carolina State Library staff in its desire to develop services needed by the public libraries in the state. From the beginning the organization was shaped and guided by the wishes of the participating librarians. A separate corporation was considered, but the state-operated program was preferred almost unanimously. Determining factors included state benefits available to employees, guidance and supervision of the State Library, quarters in the State Library building, and benefits of state contract prices for equipment and supplies.

The financial set-up was worked out with the state budget bureau to purchase equipment for the center, using LSA funds. Grants to pay processing costs are made to participating libraries on the basis of rural population.

All public libraries in the state were invited to participate, and thirty-four libraries representing forty-four counties applied at the beginning. Each library agreed to provide a card catalog cabinet and to keep cards filed accurately, to spend approximately one-fourth of its book budget

*Revision of a paper presented at a meeting of the Cataloging and Classification Section, ALA-RTSD, July 15, 1963, in Chicago.
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Each quarter to maintain an even flow through the Center; to pay a service fee of seventy-five cents per volume processed; and to accept the manner and style of processing, cataloging, and classifying as determined by the Center.

In 1960 when the North Carolina Center was started, it was placed in the basement of the State Library in Raleigh where it is still operating. A new state library building has been approved by the 1968 legislature, which will provide more adequate quarters.

The North Carolina State Processing Center states as its purpose the furnishing of “a service which receives book orders from participating libraries, consolidates them and then orders, classifies, catalogs, and processes the books; and prepares catalog and shelf-list cards.” No non-book materials are being processed by the Center, and libraries are specifically requested not to send orders for state and federal government documents because of the requirements of advance payment. A list of accepted sources for ordering was established at the beginning; and although this list has been expanded several times, participating libraries are asked to order only titles found in this manner. The list is inclusive enough to refute any charges that the Center is dictating book selection, and the use of certain sources with accompanying notation on the order card greatly increases pre-cataloging possibilities.

The Center furnishes a specially-designed multiple-order form to its members, with each library assigned an identification number to use on the order blanks. A jobber is normally not indicated by the participating library unless prebinding is involved. Indication is also made on the order slip if a title is “pre-pub” giving the expected date of publication.

Cataloging policies were established when the Center was begun, and only a few changes have been made. The Dewey classification numbers are used as found in Library of Congress proofsheets, the ALA Booklist, Standard catalogs and the National Union Catalog, but are simplified or shortened to conform to the latest Abridged Edition of the Dewey Decimal Classification. Library of Congress subject headings are used, but they, too, may be modified for smaller collections. It was decided to omit Cutter numbers, using instead the first initial of the author’s surname below Dewey numbers and no marking on fiction. Classification decisions included the choice of B for individual biographies, with the biographee’s name below, and 920 for collective biographies with the author’s initial. Picture books and materials for ages eight and under are labeled E unless the material justifies a Dewey classification in which case the J is used. Books for ages nine through 13 are labeled with a J for fiction and a J above the Dewey number for non-fiction. Everything for age 14 and over is handled as an adult title, with books suitable for young people having a bar added to the label. Added entry cards are made for illustrators, translators, joint authors, and editors only when they are of importance. An interesting local note is the lettering of all books about North Carolina with an NC on the spine.

The only important change in the cataloging policies has been the
transfer from the original use of the author's established name to that of
title-page entry. This was done after an affirmative vote by the participat-
ing librarians and after H. W. Wilson had announced its extensive
changes. Complete sets of catalog cards are furnished, and additional unit
cards may be requested for special headings which an individual library
may wish to use. Multiple sets of cards are also available for branch cata-
logs.

The books are completely processed except for property stamping and
the addition of accession numbers or copy numbers. Two book cards of
different colors are supplied with each book, and date-dues are also
furnished. Plastic jackets are used on all but prebound, reference, or
library editions. Self-stick labels, upon which the call number is typed in
large type, are used under plastic jackets, and an electric stylus is used
on the others. Mystery, western, and science fiction labels are added.

Shipments of books are made at least once a week with each library
receiving books as often as a package is ready, or at least once every other
week. All shipments are by mail with the library materials rate being
used.

The Center's equipment includes a Xerox, a Multigraph Multilith
offset duplicator, one bulletin-type typewriter, two electric and two man-
ual typewriters, scales, adding machine, a label pasteh, electric paper
cutter, and the usual desks, trucks, catalog cases, files, etc.

Orders are placed in groups with a purchase order number for each.
Two duplicates of the order slips are kept on file arranged by jobber and
order number. Invoices are separate for each purchase order, and they
are checked against these duplicate slips as soon as received. The dis-
counted price is entered on each of the two slips. One of these slips is
mailed with the completed book, and one is sent with the statement at
the end of the month. Statements to the libraries include the total number
of books, total processing fee, total cost of books, and the grand total due.
The processing fee per book is seventy-five cents.

Statistics kept by the Center include number of books received,
volumes processed, titles cataloged (adult fiction and non-fiction, juvenile
fiction and non-fiction), number of cards multilithed, and number of sets
used, and the number of typed sets used. In its first year of operation the
North Carolina Center processed 62,921 books at a cost of eighty-seven
cents per volume. Books processed have increased by 10,000 volumes per
year, and the cost has been reduced to seventy-one cents. The staff consists
of two professional librarians and nine clerical assistants to serve the 49
participating libraries.

For my second center I have chosen the one operated by the West-
chester Library System in New York. My information was furnished by
Rudi Weiss, Chief of Technical Services for the system.

The Westchester Library System is a cooperative library system which
any public or free association library in the county may join if it meets
the standards of the New York State library laws. A library joining the
System may also sign a contract for the provision of central processing by
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the system's technical services department. Since the System itself is supported by the state, the Processing Center is included in this budget. Appropriations to the System are based on the number of libraries included, the area served, the population, and the per-capita expenditure on the local level for library materials. Since the census figures are used as a basis, budgets are fixed for ten years unless more libraries make use of the services of the Center. Participating libraries must agree to submit orders on certain forms and within certain time limits and to accept the manner and style of processing and cataloging as determined by the System after discussion with the libraries.

The Processing Center for the Westchester System is located in the Sprain Brook Branch of the Yonkers Public Library. Although the space is apparently adequate here, there are disadvantages in being separated from the rest of the personnel and facilities of the System headquarters. For example, the Union Catalog maintained by the Center for the system is accessible to the Headquarters only by telephone or a special trip.

Since the Westchester System's Center is comparatively new, it is processing only new books and those titles on specified replacement lists prepared by the System. Special multiple-order forms are furnished by the Center, and each form must carry the proper name of the individual library. Books may be ordered only within a specified time after appearing in a specified source. For example, adult titles reviewed in Kirkus must be ordered within three weeks from the date of issue, and titles ordered from System lists are subject to an order deadline date on the list. As a further guide in book selection, the consultants for the system have all the books included on their lists available at monthly staff meetings. Approximately 5,000 books yearly are shown, and almost all will have review slips with them.

Complete cataloging is done for each title, and the books are completely prepared for the shelves except for accessioning. Plastikleer jackets are included. Books are distributed to the libraries once or twice a week by the System’s delivery truck. No set schedule has been established yet.

Equipment for the Westchester Center includes some not ordinarily found because of the fact that it is part of a System. Its Multilith is also used for public relations work; therefore an electric stapler, a collator, and a folding machine are valuable. Three electric typewriters, a pasting machine, a Kimbal Midget marking machine for labels, and a seal-on iron for labels are other special items.

The financial set-up differs in the System Center in two other ways: First, as was indicated before, the budget comes from state money, and there is no processing charge to participating libraries. Second, although the Center places the orders, the dealer bills the individual libraries, sending the books and invoices to the Center. The Center checks the invoices for accuracy, and the shipment for correctness of title, binding, edition, volume, quantity, and price. If there are discrepancies, a note is made in duplicate, one to be sent to the dealer, one to the library with
the invoice. Since the individual library pays the dealer, no billing by the Center is necessary at all.

Detailed statistics are kept by the Westchester System, including the number of books cataloged (fiction and non-fiction); the book cards typed and multilithed; the author, heading and reference masters typed and multilithed; the copies, sets, and cards sent for each title. Detailed work statistics are also kept for the time spent by each staff member in technical work, lists, book preparation, the union catalog, etc.

As in any new endeavor, the size of staff has varied, but it now numbers 23 1/2 staff members, 4 1/2 professional and 17 clerical. They are anticipating processing 6,000 books a month during 1963. One interesting note is their solution to the problem of establishing a book of procedures during the beginning months of a new operation. This has been done by noting each procedure on a card and filing it by key word for quick reference. In this way changes may be made quickly and efficiently by circulating a new card among the staff and then filing it in place of the outmoded one.

For the third Center, representing those created by an association of independent libraries, I have selected the Library Service Center of Eastern Ohio at Barnesville. My information has been secured from the article on the Center in the Winter, 1961, Library Resources and Technical Services, from numerous conversations with its former Administrator, Mary Eckford Klippert, and from correspondence with Martin Howard, the present Director.

The Eastern Ohio Center was established as the result of librarian interest which was great enough to promote a survey of the possibilities, the advantages, and the cost of such an operation. Federal Aid funds were granted by the Ohio State Library for the initial capital investment, with over half of the money to be repaid as the Center became self-supporting.

Twelve libraries were original members of the Center, and each signed a two-year contract agreeing to commit not less than seventy-five per cent of its book purchases through the Center. Representatives of these libraries met to establish an organization and to elect a Board of Directors. As in a local library, the Board hires an Administrator, and the Administrator selects the rest of the staff.

The Library Service Center of Eastern Ohio was located in Barnesville because of availability of clerical personnel and satisfactory shipping facilities. A warehouse-type building was selected, making the Center completely separated from an established library. The Directors and Administrator felt that any disadvantages would be offset by the freedom from pressure from any one participating library to receive special privileges resulting from proximity.

The Center was established to process books, and only a few films and records have been added. However, any book may be ordered at any time. Orders are correlated and mailed once a week. The jobber is selected by the Center, but again juvenile pre-binders may be specified.
Several years ago the Eastern Ohio Center set up what might be termed a modified Greenaway plan to enable their participating librarians to see new titles before purchasing. Originally six publishers sent books to the Center, but there are now ten participating. The Center buys the books at a jobber’s discount, and resells them to libraries at the regular discount in order to cover the costs of those titles not chosen by any library. As the truck makes its deliveries of processed books, it also is able to display the newest titles to the librarians.

As in the North Carolina Center, cataloging and classification decisions were made by the original members. Libraries joining the Center later were required to accept the established procedures. Dewey classification is used, and Sears subject headings. Title-page entry was chosen, and the usual designations of J and E were defined. Certain decisions were made in the literature and history fields, such as combining English and American poetry and drama in the 820's, and placing all travel books in the history number. Complete sets of catalog cards are furnished for each title. LC proofsheets are used with the combination of Xerox and Multilith copying methods. This necessitates some changing of subject headings from LC to Sears, and the typing in of Dewey numbers, J, E, and so forth. The physical preparation of the books includes plastic jackets, pockets, book cards, labels, one property stamp, and picture labels for mysteries, westerns, and science fiction.

Delivery is on a regular bi-weekly schedule with mail shipments being made to libraries too distant to be reached in a reasonable driving time. Accompanying each shipment is a delivery slip giving the number of books included. This is signed by the receiving library after checking the count.

In addition to the Xerox and Multilith equipment mentioned before, the Eastern Ohio Center uses a pasting machine, large paper cutter, typewriters, a calculator, and has its own motor vehicle. Factory-type equipment, particularly in tables, work benches, and book trucks, was selected, and it has proved practical and economical.

The original estimate of the cost of processing was seventy-five cents per book, with an estimated volume of 40,000 books. Although the cost dropped two cents below this at one time, the charge is currently seventy-five cents per book for public libraries and one dollar per book for schools. In case of reference sets and encyclopedias, the cost is seventy-five cents per volume up to five dollars per set. The libraries are billed monthly for the books they have received, and the statement showing cost of books and processing charge is supported by a copy of each original order slip.

The statistics prepared each month by the Center were selected as those which would indicate needed changes in procedures. In the beginning they included the number of books on hand the first of each month, the number ordered, the number of titles ordered, the number received, the number delivered to members, the number on hand at the end of the month, the number ordered during the month for which cards were on hand, and the number received for which an official card was in the file.
At present only the number of copies and titles ordered and the number delivered are counted.

At present the staff of the Center is made up of eight full-time and one part-time employees. This staff processed 55,550 books in 1962 at a cost of seventy and three tenths cents per volume.

A number of similarities may be found in the operation of these three centers:

1. All process books completely but handle few non-book materials.
2. All order books, but only books selected by the participating libraries.
3. All furnish completed sets of catalog cards.
4. All provide some type of delivery service.
5. All make use of special equipment for reproducing their own catalog cards and other varied materials.

A comparison of all the centers now in operation would show many more variations, the most obvious being that a number do not order books at all. There are also centers that furnish only catalog cards, others that process only to the extent of a book pocket and card. Some include non-book materials, while others will accept older or gift materials for processing. A wide range is found in the charges per volume for processing, but comparisons are not valid unless the operations included are examined in detail. The organizational pattern will also affect the charge, for a state-affiliated center may receive housing, utilities, or other less-easily identified types of support, while an independent center must charge enough to cover all costs. However, there does appear to be some consistency in that the cost goes down as the volume of business goes up.

Mary Lee Bundy has provided an excellent picture of the total program in her publication of May, 1962, entitled Public Library Processing Centers: A Report of a Nationwide Survey. As she points out, new centers are being established so rapidly, that any survey is out-of-date as soon as it is made. She located forty-five centers with at least five more in the discussion stage. Her survey is based on thirty-seven returns from centers in nineteen states. I recommend her report to you for a broad overview of the entire proceedings.

In conclusion I should like to speak on a more personal note. This subject has been of very real interest to me because of our Library's involvement. As a proud parent of a center, I like to discuss our offspring, but even beyond that I feel I should mention it, if only to show that a center need not be big to be useful.

The Weld County Library started purchasing and processing books for fourteen of the small school and public libraries in its area in 1955, when there were no manuals and few guidelines. From this developed the Northern Colorado Processing Center which is now in its second year of operation. The Center is located in the Weld County Library, but it is a separate entity involving four libraries plus all the libraries formerly served by the Weld County's centralized processing. The four libraries, in three counties, have each agreed to a certain minimum number of
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books to be processed annually. The fee has been set at eighty cents per
volume and is paid in advance, quarterly.

The general pattern of operation is much like that of Eastern Ohio’s
center except on a much smaller scale. A Multilith machine is used with
all masters being typed on an electric typewriter. Metal masters are used
for imprinting book pockets for each library. Entries in Publishers’ Week-
ly and the Book Publishing Record are used for pre-cataloging in addition
to the Standard catalogs, Book Review Digest, etc., for older titles.

The administration is directed by a board of the participating head librarians who hire a half-time professional administrator. The clerical
help varies from one to one-and-a-half-time persons according to the work
load. Only 5,817 books were processed in 1962, but 4,609 have been de-
ivered in the first six months of 1963. A regional library with two
medium and nine small public libraries is planning to come into the cen-
ter under a state demonstration grant which we hope will lead to
permanent membership. Another municipal library from the Denver
suburban area is also considering membership.

As one librarian being served by a processing center, I believe the
advantages far outweigh the disadvantages. If you cannot join one already
in existence, I urge you to talk with your neighbors or your state agency
and see what can be done to add another processing center to the growing
list of successful operations.

MEDICAL LITERATURE RESOURCES

The New York Academy of Medicine has recently received a grant of
$74,000 from the Health Research Council of the City of New York for a two-year
study of the adequacy of medical literature resources in the Greater New York
Area, and to examine possible applications of data processing equipment to
make these resources available.

In conjunction with the program of the new Medical Library Center of New
York, and especially its new Union Catalog of Medical Periodicals, compiled
under the direction of Jacqueline Felter, the Academy’s study will survey library
holdings and the present use, mis-use, and non-use of all types of biomedical
literature by physicians, students, librarians, and other researchers. Special
efforts will be made to discover inadequacies of subject coverage and ways in
which to fulfill the needs of the medical community.

Gertrude L. Annan, Librarian of the New York Academy of Medicine and
Erich Meyerhoff, Director of the Medical Library Center of New York, are the
principal investigators of the project. Lee Ash, Assistant Professor at the
Graduate School of Library Service, Drexel Institute of Technology, and con-
sultant for acquisitions at the Harvard Medical Library, will serve as consultant
and study director.
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THE MOVING FORCE behind the establishment of the Book Processing Center in Orlando was Verna Nistendirk, Director of Library Extension of the Florida State Library. Cooperative planning, or sharing of resources and activities such as joint purchasing and processing of materials, was provided for in 1956 in the Florida Plan for the further Extension of Library Service to Rural Areas, which was required for participation in the Library Services Act program.

In the words of Miss Nistendirk, "By 1961-62, with twenty-three counties in the rural development grant program and many others interested in it, means of establishing a centralized processing center were investigated. It was impossible to establish such a center at the State Library. Legal limitations prevented the incorporation of interested libraries or librarians to establish a separate entity for the purpose of processing books at cost. The Public Library in Orlando was willing to discuss the program because of its own need for expansion."

As in all operations, months of investigation and planning preceded the actual opening of the Center in January, 1962. We investigated the operation of Centers in other parts of the country. Evelyn Mullen from the Office of Education gave us help in the early stages of planning. At the ALA Midwinter meeting in 1961 and at the ALA Conference in Cleveland in 1961 we talked with a number of librarians who shared with us their experience and knowledge in this area and gave us helpful advice.

A portion of a meeting for county and regional librarians in the grant program, held at the Florida State Library in Tallahassee, March 8-10, 1961, was devoted to discussing the proposal for establishing the Center and considering problems in connection with policies for ordering, classification, cataloging, and processing to be adopted by the Center. In April, a follow-up meeting was held during the Florida Library Association meeting in Miami Beach.

Selling the idea of the Processing Center to the Orlando Library Board was not accomplished overnight. After all, it was no small undertaking, and it is natural that the Board took the stand that they did not want to go into the project purely because of an altruistic attitude toward libraries in Florida without consideration for the welfare of the Orlando Public Library.

* Revision of a paper presented at a meeting of the Cataloging and Classification Section, ALA-RTSD, in Chicago, July 15, 1963.
Library. They decided to participate since there was a need for the service and the library could both provide and benefit from it.

The legal basis for the operation consists of four contracts: (1) between the Florida State Library and Albertson Public Library to establish the Center, with the State Library providing $17,500 the first year and $5,000 the second year for equipment and supplies, which at the end of five years become the property of the Albertson Public Library, providing the Center continues to operate for that length of time; (2) between Albertson Public Library and the State Library for operation of the Center; (3) between the State Library and each of the participating libraries, in which the former agrees to underwrite the cost of cataloging and processing *those books chargeable to Rural Service* at the rate of 65¢ per volume the first year and less per volume the second year* (The funds provided by the State Library are Rural Library Development Funds made available to the State by the Federal Government under the Library Services Act.); and (4) between the participating libraries and the Albertson Public Library for actual participation in the Center.

A tentative budget for the Center was set up based on an annual output of 40,000 books at 75¢ a volume. This included salaries, rent, utilities, insurance, postage and mailing, and supplies. The equipment and some of the supplies were to be provided by Federal funds from the State Library.

By December 18, applications from three libraries—Suwannee River Regional Library, Central Florida Regional Library, and Martin County Public Library—had been accepted.

Meanwhile, the State Library had paid the expenses of Margaret Johnson, head of our Technical Processes Department, to visit the processing centers at Barnesville in East Ohio and the North Carolina State Library. Later, she visited Almar Processing Center and Bro-Dart Books as the guest of Bro-Dart Industries. During our vacation, we visited the University of Chicago Library and the Wayne County Public Library in Detroit. Mrs. Johnson did an excellent job of organizing the Center and setting up the routines. She deserves much credit for a task well done. Her ideas and opinions on the selection of furniture and equipment, as well as supplies, were followed.

In December a store building in the College Park area of Orlando was rented. It was smaller than we had originally planned, but for the first year it was considered adequate. Its desirable features were good lighting, air conditioning, good location, easy access by delivery trucks, and—no small item—lower rent than originally budgeted.

The Center began operation on January 15, 1962. Four staff members from our Technical Processes department were moved to the Center—the Cataloger-Administrator, an order clerk, a typist, and a processing clerk. In addition, a machine operator-typist and a part-time packer-

* In the case of the Albertson Public Library, the rate for *those books chargeable to Rural Service* is 75¢ per volume for both years, because there would be hidden costs to the Library in establishing and operating the Center that could not be accurately figured. Furthermore, there was a risk that the Center might lose money.
processing clerk were employed. From December 16, when the move was made into the building, until January 15, only Orlando Public Library books were processed. By that time, applications had been received from nine county and regional libraries in addition to those already mentioned—Bay County Public Library, Collier County Public Library, Monroe County Public Library, Santa Fe Regional Library, St. Lucie-Okeechobee Regional Library, and Volusia County Public Libraries. The newly-organized Clay County Public Library joined later. The Extension Department of the State Library assumed the responsibility for securing the participants. This was not easily or quickly accomplished. Some newly-organized libraries with boards inexperienced in library operations and procedures agreed to join the Center only after an educational campaign on the local level. Board members sometimes felt that volunteer workers or desk clerks could process books in their spare time.

When the Center opened, part of the furniture and equipment ordered, including the offset press, had been received. Shelving, books, and tables from the library were used. Later, all the shelving, work tables, and other needed equipment arrived. Executive model IBM typewriters were purchased for typing masters for the A. B. Dick offset press. It was decided not to invest in Xerox equipment for making masters from LC proof sheets until the report from the Library Technology Project on reproducing catalog cards was available.

A blow came when Mrs. Johnson was forced to resign to accompany her Air Force husband to Hawaii. It was difficult to fill her position with a well-qualified person. Fortunately, Kathleen Reich, who had been Head of our Technical Processes department from 1955 to 1957, and was then Head of the Cataloging department at Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas, wanted to come back to Florida and was willing to take the position. However, she could not come immediately, and the Center would be without an administrator for an entire month.

February 28 had been Mrs. Johnson's last day. Robert Hamilton, Librarian of the Martin County Public Library, spent that entire day at the Center with her, and arrangements were made for him to fly up two days a week. When Mrs. Johnson left, there were enough books pre-cataloged to keep the typists busy for two or three weeks. The staff was exceptionally good, and was able to carry on with only two days of professional help and a little help from us with revision. However, a backlog developed, and the lack of a full-time professional librarian was apparent.

If we had chosen to look only on the surface when we reported on the Processing Center at the Florida Library Association meeting in March, 1962, the picture would really have been black and gloomy. However, the knowledge that with good planning, organization, and hard work all would turn out well caused us to see the light shining through and made us hopeful and optimistic. Mrs. Reich, the new Administrator of the Center, had just arrived. She was faced with many problems, but she was equal to the task before her. She deserves recognition and commendation for the success of the Center. At the end of March when she took over,
5,150 books had been processed, and 22,091 ordered. The books had been pouring in during March, and they continued to arrive in great numbers, causing an alarming amount of backlog.

In order to speed up production, changes were made:

1. A cataloger, an additional typist, and three part-time people were employed, making the total number equal to ten full-time staff members.
2. Larger quarters were rented. Fortunately, an adjoining store was vacant, and an opening was made between the two areas.
3. A larger air-conditioner was purchased. Additional items of furniture and equipment were secured—shelving, filing cabinets, typewriters, as well as desks and tables for the new staff members.
4. Since many of the county libraries were new or were establishing new branches within the systems, a small percentage of the titles processed were current. Consequently, LC proofsheets were far from 100% useful, and additional volumes of LC catalogs were purchased with furniture funds that had originally been earmarked for a Xerox camera and equipment for photographing masters from LC proofsheets.

All of these changes improved working conditions tremendously and contributed to the success of the project the first year. During the last eight months of the fiscal year, 34,750 books were processed. The original budget for 12 months was based on an output of 40,000 volumes; during the fiscal year, which covered a period of 10 1/2 months, 39,900 books were done.

A condensed financial statement for the fiscal year—January 15, 1962 to November 1, 1962—is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributions from the State Library for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>furniture, equipment, and supplies</td>
<td>$17,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book processing receipts</td>
<td>29,925.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$47,425.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, payroll taxes, health and life</td>
<td>$20,275.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insurance, and pensions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>129.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>829.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>1,985.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal and Accounting Costs</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Bookkeeping Services</td>
<td>2,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contractual Services</td>
<td>977.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitor Services</td>
<td>209.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library, Office, and Other Materials and</td>
<td>7,197.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage and Freight</td>
<td>472.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Repairs</td>
<td>259.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books, Library of Congress Catalogs, and</td>
<td>2,709.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and Fixtures</td>
<td>10,319.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>$48,134.96</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This reveals the excess of expenditures over revenue to be $709.96, which we expect to be absorbed during the current year.

Deducting the cost of furniture and equipment and the LC catalogs from the total amount of expenditures, the actual processing cost amounted to $35,347.64, or 88.59¢ per volume. For a first year operation, we consider this acceptable. Even though it actually cost 88.59¢ per volume for processing, it cost the participating libraries only 57¢ or less, depending upon the rural population of the particular county. This was possible, because, as mentioned previously, the State Library was underwriting the cost of cataloging and processing those books chargeable to rural service at the rate of 65¢ per volume the first year and less for the second year. The rural-urban portion of the budget in local libraries was used to determine the portion of books chargeable to rural service. In county and regional libraries with an overall county-wide budget, the percentage of rural population was applied to the total budget to determine the rural portion. In library systems based on contractual arrangements between municipal libraries and counties, that percentage of the budget which was appropriated for rural service was used. An entirely rural county, such as Clay County, received 65¢ for each book. A county considered 50% rural, such as Bay, received 38¢ per book. The amount paid by the State Library for book processing for each library was: Bay County, 33¢; Central Florida Region, 30¢; Clay County, 65¢; Collier County, 65¢; Martin County, 65¢; Monroe County, 19¢; Orange County, 12¢; St. Lucie-Okeechobee Region, 26¢; Santa Fe Region, 26¢; Suwannee Region, 65¢; Volusia County, 40¢. During the current year, 1962-63, the grants to individual libraries for processing are slightly less; however, they are higher than was anticipated, because the State Library is paying 50¢ per volume for the rural portion instead of the 25¢ originally designated in the first year's contract.

At the beginning of the new fiscal year, November 1, 1962, there was a backlog of unprocessed books, but that has now been eliminated. All books in the Center at any one time are in process or waiting for LC proof sheets. The books move through quite rapidly due partly to the fact that pre-cataloging is done. Catalog cards in addition to those needed for a title already ordered and being processed are printed and filed in the over-run file for future use. The value of the over-run file is recognized; however, the Administrator is being more selective in determining the exact number of cards to be printed, because such factors as cost of supplies, salary costs, and space must be considered in justifying the continuation of the practice.* By the end of the year, the procedures now followed at the Center were well established. Briefly stated, they are:

Orders on multiple-copy order forms are sent to the Center by indi-

* Editor's note: This whole problem of over-running and stocking catalog cards is largely ignored in the literature on centralized processing centers, but it is one which may end by making or breaking the whole operation. We need much more thought and study and publicity on this point.
vidual libraries. There are separated and the orders (on white slips) are sent to publishers, prebinders, or jobbers. Pink and green slips are kept in an outstanding order file, which is arranged by date and, within the date, by library. (This is necessary because neither the Center nor the Orlando Public Library is permitted legally to bill the libraries for books as well as processing and each library is billed individually by the dealer.) Yellow slips are arranged alphabetically by title and serve as work slips. They are searched in the over-run file in event a title has been cataloged previously—in which case the necessary cards are pulled immediately, and the number of copies to be sent to each library is noted on the back of the official card. If the title is not in the over-run file, the proof-sheet file is searched and if matching proof-sheets are found, they are pulled and given to the Administrator for precataloging. The remaining yellow slips are filed and held for proof-sheets or original cataloging.

On arrival, the pre-cataloged books are sent to processing immediately. Others are placed on shelves to be held for LC proof sheets before being cataloged or are cataloged almost immediately.

Unit cards on typed masters are printed four-up on a #350W A. B. Dick offset press. Three Executive model IBM typewriters are used for typing the masters and added entries. In preparations, typed labels and plastic jackets are used on all books with dust jackets; others are hand-lettered or labeled with a category sticker. The yellow work slip is destroyed when the books are packed for delivery, the green slip remains in the book, and the pink slip is used for the official count and for billing.

At the beginning of the 1962-63 fiscal year, two new libraries, Pensacola-Santa Rosa and Indian River County, joined, making a total of 13 county and regional libraries which include a total of 23 counties.

The budget for 1962-63 was increased. It was based on the processing of 68,000 to 70,000 books. We set a goal of 1500 books a week, realizing that it would not be possible to reach it every week, but that it is always good to aim high. Only during the last few months have we reached the goal, but, as last year, we are not discouraged.

Our major problem this year is that the orders have come in too slowly. We urged participating libraries to space orders at regular intervals, but that has not been done. We are sure circumstances beyond their control caused other libraries, as well as ours, to be slow ordering at the beginning of the year. The fact that State Aid funds were not received until February has caused a decided increase in the size of book orders since March.

Even though only 29,028 books (an average of 4,828 books per month) were processed during the first six months of 1962-63, for May the total was 7,665, and for June, 6,886. This indicates that our second year will be more successful than the first. However, we feel that we can improve on our efficiency and are continually questioning our procedures and methods. The fact that the participating libraries are satisfied with the service is most gratifying. It obliterates all remembrances of the frustrations, difficulties, and hardships encountered, and leaves only pleasant memories of the beginning of a worthwhile cooperative venture.
Current Issues in South African Cataloguing Practice*

Reuben Musiker, Deputy Librarian
Rhodes University
Grahamstown, South Africa

The most important developments in South African cataloguing practice during the past five years have been related to the International Conference on Cataloguing Principles held in Paris in 1961. The events at the Conference have since been recorded in South African Libraries and elsewhere. Although these Principles have received universal approval, their ultimate success must depend on developments springing up from them; for example, in the case of corporate authorship, their success would depend on the production of a list of internationally recommended names of corporate bodies following national usage. In their present form these Principles cannot readily be employed as a working tool, but they are, nevertheless, in the nature of a broad draft code.

It is partly for this reason that librarians in South Africa and abroad are keenly awaiting the appearance of the new Joint Anglo-American Code, which is being prepared by the American Library Association and its British counterpart. Despite local and peculiar problems which exist, and which cannot readily be solved by overseas codes, a new Joint code following the Principles approved at the 1961 International Conference will almost certainly suffice for the needs of South African cataloguers, especially as a survey which the author conducted in 1961 showed that three quarters of South Africa's major libraries were using the Joint Anglo-American Code, and almost all the remainder the American Library Association one. The needs of Afrikaans-speaking cataloguers have been met to some considerable extent by the textbooks of P. C. Coetzee and others.

The problem of personal names with prefixes is among the controversial issues facing South African librarians at the present time. This was one of the few issues at the 1961 International Conference where views were divided to such an extent that it was left to individual countries to formulate their national viewpoints before final recommendations were to be made. The problem was fully expounded at the international level by F. Ascarelli while S. I. Malan has dealt with the problem from the South African point of view. Two schools of thought exist in South Africa. That which favours entry of South African names under prefix

* Substance of an address delivered to the Annual Conference of the South African Library Association, September 24th, 1963.
has the support of seventy-nine per cent of South Africa’s major libraries, included in the author’s 1961 survey as well as twelve important local bibliographical sources. The opposing school of thought favouring entry of names under the part following the prefix has the support of the Suid-Afrikaanse Akademie vir Wetenskap en Kuns (South Africa’s leading authority on Afrikaans linguistic matters), the State Library, and a few bibliographical sources. It is based on a historical approach and purports to take into consideration the demands of mechanization. The standpoint of the National Committee on Cataloguing in this matter has been that, while it does not wish to refute the recommendations of the Akademie, it nevertheless wishes to adopt and implement internationally-recommended practice wherever possible and for this purpose it regards all South African names as having European origins. Clearly, individual library practices will persist, but at a time when so much stress is laid on uniformity and on international co-operation in librarianship, this cause will almost certainly be borne in mind when a decision is reached.

Since its inception in 1960, the National Committee on Cataloguing has been reasonably active. It has, for example, taken the lead in such matters as deciding on a uniform form of name for the Republic of South Africa for cataloguing purposes, formulating South African viewpoints in the preliminary work for the 1961 International Conference, promoting research into such problems as bilingualism in cataloguing, the cataloguing of names in Bantu and other non-Western languages (e.g. Malay), the demands of mechanization, and the discussion of cataloguing problems submitted by individual libraries. There can be no doubt that the Committee serves a useful purpose, and its future seems assured.

One major issue of particular importance in South Africa is bilingualism. Bilingualism had long ago perturbed George Bernard Shaw when he wrote:

... masses of our population are bilingual. They have an official speech as part of their company manners which they do not use at home or in conversation with their equals. Sometimes they had better not.

This is not the kind of bilingualism which preoccupies South African cataloguers. Their concern is the expensive and complicated matter of two official national languages, viz. English and Afrikaans. A survey of preferences for the two official languages in South African library catalogues has recently been published. It was found that more than half the libraries included had adopted a bilingual approach to their catalogues, while many others at least showed an awareness of the demands made by bilingualism upon the catalogue. As duplication of entries in both official languages is too costly a method for individual libraries to follow, it seems that the idea of the preferred language will have to continue, for as was pointed out in the survey, the needs and preferences of readers have to be considered. Nevertheless, certain facts emerged very clearly from the study, of which the following two examples are of special interest. First, classified catalogues, with duplicate subject indexes in both official languages, appear to be more suitable for bilingual purposes than
dictionary catalogues, a finding strongly supported by a Canadian study and by practice in the National Libraries of Canada and Switzerland and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, to mention a few notable examples. Second, all additions to the title-page, collation, and annotation are most often made in the language of the publication itself, a practice confirmed by the National Library of Canada. As far as corporate authorship is concerned, the lists anticipated by the 1961 International Conference of uniform headings for the names of principal corporate bodies in each country, of important international organizations and of the names of states and other territorial authorities will greatly facilitate the implementation of bilingualism in cataloguing.

A problem even closer to the hearts of many administrators is one of cataloguing costs. Here we already have an outstanding study of its kind by E. A. Brett performed at the Johannesburg Public Library. It is pleasing to note the deserved prominence which this study has been accorded in the recently-published Five Years Work in Librarianship, 1956-1960. Further studies of this kind are needed, as it is precisely this type of investigation which has enabled librarians to plead for increased budgets, to improve cataloguing techniques, and to think twice before accepting a gift.

Considering the relatively-small size of South Africa's libraries, the plea advanced by Miss C. Sommerville for simplification in the design of new codes is in accord with the needs of our libraries. The 1961 International Conference paved the way for simplification, and the new joint Code promises to follow this trend. South African librarians are also observing the progress of the Small Libraries Project of the American Library Association with keen interest, as there are strong indications that simplification is a wise theme to pursue generally.
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**SLA SPECIAL CLASSIFICATIONS CENTER**

The National Science Foundation has recently awarded a grant of $13,838 to the Special Libraries Association to support expansion of the services and holdings of the SLA Special Classifications Center maintained at the School of Library Science, Western Reserve University, Cleveland 6, Ohio. Barbara Denison has been appointed Director of the Center, which had formerly been called the SLA Loan Collection of Classification Schemes and Subject Heading Lists.

The current collection totals approximately 850 classification schemes and subject heading lists in more than 400 special subject areas; all these items may be borrowed or copies may be purchased at cost by librarians and others who wish assistance in organizing material in specific subject fields. The collection was started in 1924 and since 1955 has been housed and serviced by the Library School of Western Reserve University, under the supervision of Jesse H. Shera. During this eight-year period the collection has grown rapidly, and, through the cooperation and joint efforts of the Association’s Special Classifications Committee, the Library School, the Classification Research Study Group, ALA’s Classification Committee, American Association of Law Libraries, Aslib, and UNESCO, many new schemes and lists have been collected, cataloged, and made available to users.

The one-year grant will enable the Center to broaden the scope of the collection still further, purchase published schemes and lists, increase the number of duplicate copies, initiate studies, offer consultation, promote contributions and use, and compile an up-to-date list of holdings for publication. As the first paid, part-time Director, Miss Denison will be able to devote more time to improving and expanding the Center’s activities and collection than was heretofore possible.
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*Library Resources & Technical Services*
COPYING METHODS NOTES

[Editor's note: This inaugurates a new feature. Mr. Ballou has agreed to prepare for each issue a discussion or review or history of some phase of copying methods or related work or of some piece of equipment. He has long combined his knowledge of libraries and of photographic and other copying procedures and is recognized as a leader in adapting the latter to serve the former.]

The Microfiche

HUBBARD W. BALLOU, Head
Photographic Services
Columbia University Libraries
New York, N. Y.

What with numerous advertisements in current issues of library journals, a national meeting on the subject in September, an international meeting in October, and a report on the subject forthcoming, the microfiche has suddenly pushed itself to the top of the pile. A “fiche” is a small card, slip, or memo. Therefore, if we use the untranslated term, “microfiche”, we have a suitable name for the sheet version of microfilm, which can be modified (e.g. opaque microfiche) to include the registered trade-name products: Microcard and Microprint.

Microphotographs in sheet form are by no means new. The early experiments by Dancer in 1839 were on daguerreotype plates which were silver-plated copper sheets. By 1853 the art of photography had advanced so far that he was using glass plates. Photographic film did not appear until 1888, and roll film was at first reserved for amateur use. In 1906, when Goldschmidt and Otlet suggested the microphotographic book, they were thinking of microfilm in sheet form. Activity in microfilming was dormant for the next twenty-five years; and when it revived in the early 30’s, the ribbon format was used almost exclusively. There were a number of studies in this country in the late 30’s and early 40’s pointing out advantages of the sheet over the ribbon for certain applications. Experimentation with the microfiche was more active in
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Europe than in America during the period following World War II, but a number of projects did appear in the U. S. (e.g. Luther Unitized Acetate, Micro-Research Card, etc.) during the 50's.

What were the reasons for the lull in interest in microfilm between 1906 and 1930; and why did the roll get such a head start in this country, and keep its lead so long? As often happens, a few visionary workers were ahead of the trend. They saw the problem and an answer to it, but in 1906 there was not present the combination of a pressing need and the perfected techniques for its solution. By 1930 libraries had begun to fill up, and much of what they had was rapidly beginning to disintegrate. In the mean time the cinematographic industry had poured a lot of money into the development of equipment (cameras, processors, printers, etc.) which could be adapted to the new task. Very soon new films were developed designed for document copying, without space-wasting perforations along the edges of the film.

The earliest projects which were large enough to give the newly-developed medium the necessary push past starting inertia were those where the ribbon format did not involve enough inconvenience to be discouraging. A low level of reference activity is expected with large files of inactive government records (e.g. N. R. A. and A. A. A.), and films of the daily flow of checks through a bank. In libraries the first big jobs were newspaper files, a field where reference is often made to units composed of many pages.

The micro-image has to be inexpensive in order to rise above the inconveniences accompanying its use. That means that the steps in its production must be mechanized as much as possible, but the mechanization has to be of very high precision. Working at reduction ratios of between 10X and 20X, it does not take a mechanical intolerance of many thousandths of an inch to produce illegible copies in the camera, scratched film in the processor, and blurred images in the printer. A ribbon of film moves in one direction only until it is put on the reading device, and then its only other motion is backing up. A rectangular sheet has to move in two dimensions, presenting greater problems in the camera and subsequent stages. Roll film stretching from one reel to the other is manageable unless it comes loose. A sheet with an area of fifteen or more square inches can (and will) flop around unless it is anchored by complicated mechanisms.

As a result, ribbon microfilm established itself in this country; and we had to resort to many dodges in order to give it the flexibility and ease of manipulation of the sheet. Single frames were cut out and mounted in windows in aperture cards. Short strips were slipped into acetate jackets. Roll film was cut up, and the strips mounted side by side (resulting in a composite microfiche) in order to produce Microcards and Microprint. For materials consisting of one to a hundred pages, these unitized microforms served admirably. When published in editions, the opaque versions printed on paper were economical enough to give them an edge over film. The appearance, about 1954, of the Xerox Copyflo designed to produce
enlargements from ribbon film very inexpensively when used on large scale production, continued the emphasis on the roll form.

In Europe there appear to have been a number of factors that encouraged the use of the microfiche. Microphotography was established primarily in libraries and secondarily in commercial applications. Mechanized processing was not so general. Less costly labor made handicraft techniques practical. Small cameras producing a single sheet bearing multiple step-and-repeat exposures, the film to be processed by hand and read on small inexpensive readers: these were the results.

In this country we would have accepted the small readers, and did when they came out with adapters for roll film. We might have used the cameras for low production applications, if the sheet had been in general acceptance. The bottleneck was the processing stage, incurring expense at either of two points. Large step-and-repeat cameras (precise, complicated, and expensive) making a series of individual multiple exposure units on a roll of wide film were needed if the processing and printing was to be done on roll equipment. Custom-made cameras of this type had to be designed at great expense by the Microcard Corporation and Micro Photo Incorporated. The other extreme was to redesign the very expensive continuous sheet processing equipment such as is used for X-ray film, so that it would work with the smaller microfiche. As far as I know, no one has done this successfully yet. The compromise version involving the stripping up of ribbon film has been used by a number of producers, particularly in their early formative stages. This produces excellent results, but is not labor saving.

Why then do we find a resurgence of interest in the fiche, with NASA, AEC and Thomas Register choosing this format, and a number of other projects hovering on the sidelines waiting to jump in? In the case of the sheet vs. the ribbon, it is due to changes in the packaging in which our information now comes to us. We do not feel that we have time to read monographs. We want short, up-to-date reports and articles. These can be distributed, stored, and used very efficiently in the sheet format. But why microfiche rather than micropaper, as they are both sheets? The micro-opaque, because it depends on the reflection of its image, requires a slightly more complicated reading device, and produces an image that is often optically inferior to that resulting from transparent film. Another reason can be found in hard-copy output. There has not appeared so far a successful reader-printer for the micro-opaque. There are a number of suitable machines for microfilm, if the film has been standardized in its production stages for use on them. Finally, we must recognize, even though we do not applaud them, those projects which depend on the "gimmick" value of the microfiche. When used to help launch suitable microfiche programs, the novelty of the format can be of help. When novelty is the only excuse for a project, its inception will only hurt the total cause when it falls flat.

What is being done to encourage the intelligent use of the microfiche? Standardization is the first subject that comes to mind, and the laurels here
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should go to the Microcard Corporation. They launched a study of the necessary factors which should be considered if the AEC should change its production from Microcard to microfiche. The resulting proposal so interested the National Microfilm Association that they felt the time was ripe for a meeting open to a larger audience. Consequently they set up a two-day conference in Washington on September 4th and 5th of this year. Some twenty organizations sent a total of fifty representatives to this meeting. They considered a full agenda that covered aspects ranging from a survey of the sizes of materials that are commonly microfilmed, down to such minute points as the acceptable limits of curling and bowing that would be allowed in the finished product.

Behind all the proposals suggested one can sense a desire going further than immediate compatibility of sizes and formats. The microfiche must be made so that the fiche suitable for one project can be read on the reader made by another producer. It must also be geared to future automation. The final acceptance of the microfiche will depend on this. Try a little experiment. Tie a knot in the middle of a piece of string. With your eyes closed you can easily find the knot by running the string through your fingers. Now try, with your eyes closed, to jab the point of your pencil consistently onto an assigned position on a sheet of paper. Every application of microphotography must include the element of information storage, and the application will succeed in proportion to the ease with which we can retrieve that stored information.

On October 14th to 19th there is being held in Cologne, Germany, the First International Congress on Reprography. Concomitant with this meeting are two others. On the 15th there will be an informal meeting of the Microfiche Foundation in Cologne. On the 21st to 23rd there will be a meeting in Leverkusen of the International Organization for Standardization Subcommittee on Documentary Reproduction. The microfiche will be under consideration at all of these, and there will be representation from this country by a number of individuals who were at the Washington meeting. It is hoped that with such an auspicious regard for standardization, the microfiche will be directed in its development along those paths which will encourage its intelligent application.

What is being done to inform librarians about the microfiche? A major share of the early work on microfiche was done in the Netherlands. It is there that the Microfiche Foundation is located: 101 Doelenstraat, Delft. Its president is Dr. L. J. van der Wolk, who has written some of the most persuasive articles on the subject. In March of this year the foundation began publishing its Microfiche Foundation Newsletter. Three issues have appeared so far, reporting information collected about all applications of the microfiche that are known to the foundation.
Realizing the need for a clear picture of the microfiche, the Council on Library Resources, through the Library Technology Project of the ALA, has commissioned a study by William Hawken on this subject. It will be out soon, and judging by the excellence of the two previous reports that Mr. Hawken has done, this one will be well worth waiting for.

It is still too early to make sound judgements on the future of the sheet and ribbon forms, but my crystal ball tells me not to sell roll film short. There are still many applications where the roll has advantages over the sheet. There is a lot of information stored on ribbon, both 16 and 35 mm, that is no longer available elsewhere. A good deal of this is in formats that will not allow compatibility between ribbon and sheet. Considering the neck-and-neck race that we are running with crumbling and mutilated records, I am sure that there is room for all methods of preserving them, and no excuse for rivalry between forms.
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Forrest F. Carhart, Jr., formerly Assistant Director of the Library Technology Project of the ALA, has been named Director, and David R. Hoffman, formerly Editor of the Wisconsin Library Bulletin, as Head of the Project’s Technical Information Service. Frazer G. Poole, former Director, accepted a position as Librarian of the University of Illinois, Undergraduate Division, Chicago.

The staff of the Library Technology Project has gathered a comprehensive collection of equipment and supply catalogs and a library of technical literature. It has made contacts with suppliers, manufacturers, testing laboratories, and research and development organizations. From these sources, the Technical Information Service assists librarians in answering questions they may have as to which supplies, equipment, or systems will best suit their needs. LTP also furnishes information on what to buy and where to buy it. The service currently answers more than 1,000 inquiries per year from libraries and librarians.

Librarians should send inquiries to the Technical Information Service, Library Technology Project, ALA, 50 East Huron St., Chicago 11, Ill.
REVIEWS

(Editor's note: Reviews published in this magazine have a deliberately-chosen viewpoint. That is, reviewers are asked to consider publications primarily on the basis of their meaning and contribution to the areas of our interest: the building of library collections and the absorption, care, and control of the materials comprising the collections.)


This extremely important report is, unfortunately, also an extremely complex one, and even after several careful readings, parts of it are still bewildering. Some of the difficulty in understanding it lies in the fact that it is based on a detailed scientific analysis of the problem such as librarians are unaccustomed to dealing with; but much of the difficulty lies in the poor organization of the report. There are so many side issues, a number of which are already being pursued further, raised that are obviously worth consideration, that Cleverdon neglects the clear and detailed presentation of the main findings; and the reader also finds himself sidetracked by these, or other, interesting diversions.

Undoubtedly this report will be widely summarized both by Cleverdon and his associates and by those who are evaluating it. Then the results may be clarified by concentration upon one aspect of the investigation at a time. At present there is only the report itself and an excellent, but brief, summary in Current Research and Development in Scientific Documentation (# 11; p. 70-1). In any case, the complexity of the matter and the wide range of issues covered make it essential for a reviewer to indicate what he feels are the main findings and the conclusions that can be drawn from them. What one person finds interesting or provocative, however, may not be to all, and it must be emphasized that there are numerous other issues raised that other readers will probably feel are much more essential. The best course is to read the entire report, if you can muster up the time and effort that are required.

This investigation was carried out to test the comparative efficiency—not of the physical form but of the characteristics and performance of the descriptor languages—of the Universal Decimal Classification, Alphabetical Subject, Facet, and Uniterm systems. Some 18,000 documents dealing with aeronautical subjects were indexed, in three sub-programs of 6,000 documents each, under all four systems with variations being made in several factors, such as the experience of the indexing staff and the time spent in indexing a document. After the indexes were constructed, experts in the subject field supplied 1,500 questions based on specific documents which had been indexed in the project, and more than 7,000 searches were then made to test both the comparative efficiency of the indexing systems and the effects of the variables.

The most commendable aspect of the investigation was the detail of the methods and procedures used. This was a scientific experiment conducted with the best controls possible and the results were, in most cases, subjected to a detailed statistical analysis to test their validity. All too seldom are investigations into library problems conducted and the results analyzed in this
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way. Perhaps the publicity which this report receives will encourage other investigators to use similar techniques.

The actual procedures have been outlined in full detail elsewhere, including the preliminary and interim reports by Cleverdon (reviewed in the Winter 1962 issue of *Library Resources & Technical Services*), and need not be detailed here. One minor objection to the test procedure was that in the main program the searcher had before him the number of the document on which the question was based and the search stopped when that document was retrieved. It would probably have been better to have done as was done in a supplementary test carried out in Western Reserve University's metallurgical index where "the searcher did not know when or whether the source document had been retrieved. This meant the search was continued until no further reasonable programmes could be devised..." (p. 67)

The results of the investigation, in all their complexity and variation, are given in 49 tables in the report, but the following seem to be the more significant ones. In the searches carried out by the project staff the results, with a standard error of about 2.6% were that Uniterm was successful 82.0% of the time, Alphabetical Subject 81.5%, Universal Decimal Classification 75.6%, and Facet 73.8%. These somewhat discouraging figures indicate, as Cleverdon states, and as one must agree on the basis of these figures and his other analyses, that "no system which has been investigated has shown itself to be so markedly superior as to justify its use in all conditions." (p. 92) The report then discusses the types of situations in which each of the systems might be most useful, but this is largely a restatement of current practices. Cleverdon's own 'predilection' would be for the use of a special facet classification designed for the purposes of an organization in conjunction with a large computer and a high speed

out to produce printed indexes for general distribution. American librarians, who are generally unaccustomed to facet classification, will probably not agree with this, but it is a suggestion which deserves further consideration. While there is little evidence presented in the report to substantiate this, it should be pointed out that the basic test program revealed that the fixed order and chain index, along with the unsatisfactory system of notation, were the main weaknesses of the Facet system. In a regrouping of the notations for 3,000 documents the fixed order was ignored and "free coordination of the terms in any order which the indexer considered reasonable and possibly useful for retrieval" (p. 59) was thus permitted. Then 400 searches were made with 85% success; this was higher, of course, than had been attained in the main test with any of the systems, although there was less statistical validity to the results.

Grouping all of the search results by the time spent in indexing produced the following results: 2 minutes 72.9% success in retrieval; 4 minutes—80.2%; 8 minutes—76.4%; 12 minutes—82.7%; and 16 minutes—84.3%; but there is no indication of what the standard error is for these figures other than that it is less than 5%. Cleverdon's conclusion is that "four minutes [in a real life situation estimated to be 6½ to 7 minutes] gave results by all systems which are only slightly inferior to the indexing times of 12 minutes and 16 minutes. . . . With a collection of documents such as used by the project it appears that there would be no justification in spending more than 4 minutes indexing." (p. 83-4) One is inclined to agree with this conclusion, or at any rate to welcome it as a reasonable procedure, but the questions used in the testing may have been based largely on the title of a document and perhaps at the 4 minute indexing time the indexing also tended to be based on the title.
There was no difference in the results attributable to the different indexers, but this in itself was significant in pointing up, what Cleverdon says has been disputed but what many American librarians have previously maintained, that scientific and technical documents can be indexed as well by a person who has no detailed subject knowledge of a field as by one who does.

One of the more interesting analyses of the investigation is that dealing with the reasons for the failures in retrieving the specific document upon which a question was based. In the case of the project staff personal failures, due largely, one assumes, to the complexity of the operation, accounted for 51% of the failures, and of these 36% occurred in the indexing and 15% in the searching. In all, 60% of the failures were directly traceable to the indexing, and only a small part to the question (17%), the searching (17%), or the indexing system (6%). This indicates clearly that the major difficulty in this whole process lies in the problems associated in placing a document into a classification system.

Finally, while the main emphasis of the investigation was on the recall of the desired document, another equally important factor in any retrieval operation is the relevance ratio (the proportion of useful to non-useful documents located in a search). In this investigation some supplementary tests of relevance were carried out and while these do not, as Cleverdon carefully points out, have the statistical validity of the other results, they do provide, for probably the first time, some figures on the working level of information retrieval systems. In the report itself the statement is made that “The general working level of I.R. systems appears to be in the general area of 60-90% recall and 10-25% of relevance.” (p. 89) That these figures are not at all precise can be seen by contrasting this with the statement in the summary of this report in Current Research and Development in Scientific Documentation (# 11, p. 70) that “indications are that information retrieval systems generally are operating at a recall ratio of 70 to 90 percent, with relevancy in the range of 8 to 20 percent.”

Cleverdon’s main conclusion is one which many librarians were already convinced of. “It is not the alternatives of classified or alphabetical arrangement, of post-co-ordinate or pre-co-ordinate indexing (much less the alternatives of manual or mechanical searching) which make any real difference in performance but the power of the descriptor language, allied to the standard of indexing.” (p. 105) It is nice to have our convictions confirmed by a scientific investigation.

The general reaction one has on reading this report is that the present level of performance is not good enough. There is a clearly demonstrated need for significant improvement in the indexing of documents in information retrieval systems; improvements not in the indexing systems themselves so much as in the ancillary aids and in the ability of indexers to place material into the system. How this can be accomplished is another problem. Cleverdon suggests that syntactic indexing (“The use of headings which display the relationship between the various elements, as distinct from those which merely show the existence of several attributes relevant to the subject indexed.” p. 103) and weighted indexing (“The provision with the indexing term of an indication of the relative importance of the term in the context of the document indexed.” p. 103) might offer some hope of improvement; and in the continuation of this project he will investigate these and other possible solutions to the problem. One hopes that other investigators as well will devote their attention to this vital matter, even if it should turn out, as
may be the case, that it is not capable of solution and that something approaching 90% recall and 25% relevancy is the best that can be attained in any system.—Norman D. Stevens, Associate Librarian for Public Services, Rutgers—The State University.


This book is a concise and practical guide to classification in general and to the UDC specifically. It represents the combined efforts of Mr. John Mills and the national UDC office in Great Britain, the British Standards Institution. In Section One, "Guide to the Use of the UDC," Mr. Mills has emphasized two topics of interest to all doing subject analysis: (1) single index entry file with duplicate entry/or multiple entry and (2) the citation order (or facet formula) of terms or notation in the index entry. In his discussion of these topics he uses the UDC to illustrate problems which may arise. A reader who may not be familiar with the UDC will still benefit from Mr. Mills' discussion of the classified catalogue, practical classification, multiple entry, and other related topics. Parts 1-4 and 7-9 of Section One apply generally to all schemes for organizing file materials. In a short forty-eight pages he has covered many theoretical aspects of classification and the classified catalogue.

In defining the various aspects of the problem of subject analysis, he has clarified the difference between a compound subject and a complex subject, between facet and subfacet. Unfortunately, he has not differentiated between facets (Whole thing, Materials, Properties, and Processes) and subfacets (Kinds, Parts, Operation, and Agents) in his discussion of the standard facet formula for citation order (4.46, p. 14). This makes for confusion rather than clarification in Part 5-45 when he explains the UDC's mixing of facets in the schedules. Section One ends with a list of readings on classification in general and on several aspects of the UDC, its revision, development special applications. A complete survey of existing editions and extensions of the UDC is included.

Section two presents an outline of the UDC schedule. An example showing a subdivision of the main table, a synopsis of the main divisions, and a very abridged form of the Main Table give an overview of its general plan. The Auxiliary Tables giving distinctive symbols for aggregation, relation, language, form and presentation, place, race, time, alphabetical and numeric, point of view, and special symbols are included in full. These tables illustrate one of the UDC's strongest features, namely, the ability to designate complex subjects in terms of their component features. An example of a Full Schedule for 543- Analytical Chemistry (1958 revision) completes Section Two. As Section Two was included to supplement the first section, it would have been extremely useful to see the index entries to the 543 table in the full UDC schedules. Although Mills placed great emphasis on the alphabetic subject index in his general discussion, no example of such an index appears in Section Two.

Section Three is a list of some 600 UDC users. The list is arranged in helpful order, by subject and then by countries, according to UDC main numbers and auxiliaries of Place. By its very organization, the list also illustrates the application of UDC to a file of information. It can serve to initiate national and international exchanges between those with similar interests. For example, organizations (librarians and journal indexes) in ten countries are using the UDC for nu-
clear physics. Those considering various schemes for organizing a collection on nuclear physics would do well to contact some of the UDC users mentioned. This list serves as a fine example of a much needed universal classified directory of classification users, UDC, DC, LC, Bliss, and so on.

An abundance of cross references throughout the guide scarcely makes up for the lack of an index. This manual should serve as an extremely useful text for all interested in the organization of information.—Pauline Atherton, American Institute of Physics Library, New York.

PROPOSED AMERICAN STANDARD FOR PERIODICAL TITLE ABBREVIATIONS

The American Standards Association Sectional Committee Z3g on Library Work and Documentation, a group of which ALA is a member, represented through RTSD, now has in process a proposed new standard for periodical title abbreviations. It is primarily aimed at bibliographic citation and at use by the indexing and abstracting services, but it should have a wider interest among librarians.

In its present draft form, the standard consists of 16 basic rules plus the abbreviations for approximately 2,500 words commonly used in titles of periodicals. It will not be available for general distribution until it is approved by ASA as an American Standard.

The proposed standard has been produced by Z3g’s Sub-Committee on Periodical Title Abbreviations, under the chairmanship of James Wood, Librarian of Chemical Abstracts Service. The Sub-Committee had existed for some time, but active work began with Mr. Wood’s appointment as Chairman April 3, 1959.

At a meeting of the Sub-Committee in March, 1961, the members agreed that some changes toward more standardized practices were possible, but that they would not accept any recommendations incompatible with the current usages of indexing and abstracting services (e.g. they would not accept author and title entry).

By March 27, 1962, a preliminary 19-point draft had been circulated among the members of the Sub-Committee. This draft was based in part on the International Code for the Abbreviation of Titles of Periodicals (ISO Recommendation R4) and in part on various rules for periodical title abbreviations used by the U. S. Dept. of Agriculture Library, the National Library of Medicine, Biological Abstracts, and Chemical Abstracts. On this date the Sub-Committee discussed and re-wrote the draft, which at this stage was the text only, without the list of specific terms.
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Work continued on the word list, based initially on lists furnished by Index Medicus, Biological Abstracts, The Bibliography of Agriculture, and Chemical Abstracts. By November 2, 1962, the Sub-Committee was able to submit the complete draft to Z39 at the latter’s Fall meeting.

After editing the draft to make it conform to the ASA requirements, Z39 sent the draft to its members together with a ballot on February 15, 1963. By the time of its Spring meeting on April 5, 1963, Z39 reported that it had received 17 votes, all affirmative.

Since the RTSD Representative to Z39 can vote only on instructions from the RTSD Board of Directors, copies of the proposed standard were sent to the members of the Board. At its meeting of July 14, 1963, at the Chicago Conference, the Board voted that its representative should send in an affirmative vote to Z39. It should be noted that this does not constitute an agreement by RTSD to conform to the standard in its own activities unless it should take further action to do so.

For the future, when and if the Chairman of Z39 believes that he has sufficient approval of the proposed standard from the members of Z39, he will submit the draft together with the vote and comments to the sponsor of Z39, The Council of National Library Associations. This group, if satisfied, will submit the draft to ASA. Here, the draft will pass through the Miscellaneous Standards Board to the Board of Review. The latter body can approve the draft as an American Standard and publish it. Any of these bodies can refuse approval if there is a substantial objection by a group important in the subject area of the proposed standard.

The members of the sub-committee which produced the proposed standard were:

Margaret S. Bryant, U. S. Department of Agriculture Library; Mildred P. Clark, Winthrop Laboratories; Ann Farren, Associate Bibliographer, Biological Abstracts, University of Pennsylvania; Eloise Givens, Librarian, Sterling-Winthrop Research Institute; E. J. Hoffmann, Cataloging Branch, Technical Information Service Extension, U. S. Atomic Energy Commission; Margaret Kinney, Kingsbridge V. A. Medical Library; Harold Oatfield, Chas. Pfizer & Co., Inc.; John Sherrod, Chief, Science and Technology Division, Library of Congress; Elizabeth Sullivan, Pepsi-Cola Company; Seymour I. Taine, Chief, Index Division, National Library of Medicine, Department of Health, Education and Welfare; and James L. Wood, Librarian, Chemical Abstracts Service, Ohio State University, Chairman.—Laura Cummings, RTSD Representative to ASA Sectional Committee Z39.
NOMINEES, 1963/64

Resources and Technical Services Division

For Vice-president (President-elect):
  Jane Ganfield, Purdue University Libraries, Lafayette, Ind.
  Edith Scott, University of Oklahoma Library, Norman, Okla.

For Director-at-large:—three-year term:
  Sam W. Hitt, University of Missouri Library, Columbia, Mo.
  Ray O. Hummel, Jr., Virginia State Library, Richmond, Va.

Acquisitions Section

For Vice-chairman (Chairman-elect):
  George N. Hartje, St. Louis Public Library, St. Louis, Mo.

For Member-at-large:—three-year term:
  Peter J. de la Garza, Columbus Memorial Library, Pan American Union, Washington, D. C.
  Howard A. Sullivan, Wayne State University Library, Detroit, Mich.

Cataloging and Classification Section

For Vice-chairman (Chairman-elect):
  C. Donald Cook, Columbia University Libraries, New York, N. Y.
  Ian W. Thom, Princeton University Library, Princeton, N. J.

For Members-at-large (three-year term) (One to be elected from each bracket)
  Virginia Drewry, State Department of Education, Atlanta, Ga.
  Paul Berrisford, University of Minnesota Library, Minneapolis, Minn.
  Joseph H. Treyz, The University Library, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, Calif.

Copying Methods Section

For Vice-chairman (Chairman-elect):
  Fraser G. Poole, University of Illinois, Undergraduate Division Library, Chicago

For Secretary:
  Paul L. Berry, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.
  Dorothy J. Comins, University Libraries, Wayne State University, Detroit, Mich.
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NEW REVIEWING MAGAZINE

CHOICE: Books for College Libraries, a monthly book-selection magazine, arranged according to subjects in the liberal arts college curriculum, is scheduled to begin publication late Winter, 1964. The publication is sponsored by the Association of College and Research Libraries of the American Library Association and is underwritten by a grant from the Council on Library Resources, Inc. Subscription price is $20.00 per year.

Richard K. Gardner, former Librarian of Marietta College, Ohio, is Editor, and Virginia Clark, former Reference Librarian of Kenyon College, Assistant Editor for Reviewing, Mary E. Poole, previously with A.L.A. Booklist, is Assistant Editor for Production, Subscriptions, and Advertising.

According to Mr. Gardner, new books and quality paperback books will be reviewed succinctly, and as close to publication date as possible, by professors engaged in undergraduate instruction or librarians who are subject specialists. Of the approximately 12,000 titles published annually, CHOICE will review pro or con some 3,000 considered of greatest interest to undergraduate college and junior college libraries with a book budget up to $30,000 a year. It is anticipated that the magazine will also interest public and larger high school libraries.

CHOICE will exclude legal or medical works, home economics, construction, secretarial skills, sermons and religious devotions, but will cover fiction of quality and material basic to the liberal arts curriculum.

The magazine's selections will be used, after a two-year evaluation, to update the Shaw List of Books for College Libraries.
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