

Bibliographical Problems from New Countries in Africa

This is a brief presentation of the problems (bibliographical) that are present or will occur due to the changing nomenclature of African States, cities and their organs of government.

THE RAPID POLITICAL developments and changes in African countries are having an effect on bibliography that will be of concern to the research scholar as he moves from retrospective to current bibliography and finds countries and their materials being variously recorded. At the national level the scholar will find the former colonial areas represented by one or more names as they progress from the control of the metropolitan powers. Some of these variations are well known and have been in common usage long enough to present no problems. German East Africa and Tanganyika, Portuguese East Africa and Mozambique, Tripoli and Libya, even the Gold Coast and Ghana are well known. Newer are the two Congos, that are now distinguished by their respective capitals and were, of course, previously the Congo Free State, later Belgian Congo, and the Middle Congo. One of the real problem areas is, and will be, the Rhodesias, especially since Southern Rhodesia's choice of new name is identical with the commonly used subject heading entry for material on this area of former British Africa. In subject bibliographies the terms "northern" and "southern" in the Rhodesias and Nyasaland, as well as "Central African Federation," "Zambia," "Rhodesia," and

"Malawi" all may be used to refer to areas as well as political divisions, depending on the period covered in the bibliography and the date it was printed. The short-lived amalgamation of Egypt and Syria created the term United Arab Republic. Egypt continues to use this in its official publications thereby continuing two names under which subject material and official publications may be expected to be found listed. The same problem occurs with Tanzania; in retrospective bibliographies the two names Tanganyika and Zanzibar are used, and material on the separate areas of these two countries will probably continue to be recorded under the two names while the official name Tanzania will also be used. Material on Basutoland, Bechuanaland, and Swaziland can be found listed under their former designation of "High Commission Territories" as well as each colony having its separate designation, and now material is appearing under Bechuanaland's new name, Botswana, and Basutoland's new designation as Lesotho. The French territories have undergone numerous variations and amalgamations, and while some of the established names such as Chad, Ivory Coast, Dahomey, Niger, and Gabon are still used, the Middle Congo, French Equatorial, French Soudan, French Guinea, French West Africa, an Ubangui-Chari have either disappeared or are now represented by new names. These

Miss Herrick is Assistant Director for Bibliographic Organization, Boston University Libraries.

changes are also occurring at the local level, and new city names are appearing in many areas. For example, Kinshasa is the new name for the former Belgian Congo's capital, Leopoldville.

The adoption of the name Mali by the former French Soudan is an interesting example of African nationalism influencing the choice of a name that historically represented an area whose boundaries were not the same as the modern country. This could create confusion if some designation were not adopted to distinguish the two. (The Library of Congress is using "Mali Empire" for the ancient area and "Mali" for the new country.) The brief period of the Mali Federation when the Soudan and Sénégal were united will also have to be noted and distinguished.

Among these bibliographical problems the accolade for utter confusion is probably won by the Cameroons, variously British, French, German; Northern, Southern, East, and West; protectorates, colonies, and republics. We now have the Cameroun as an independent republic, an amalgamation of the former French area, including the British Southern Cameroons. Nigeria now has the British Northern Cameroons and the former area designation, British, is no more. The genealogy of the Cameroons presents the scholar with a bibliographic labyrinth as he attempts to locate publications and subject materials.

In these bibliographical problems occasioned by political changes there are authoritative sources available for verification of names, but this is not as true for the many conflicting tribal designations of African peoples. To the present there is no generally accepted standard list. This is an area in which Africanists could contribute substantially to bibliography if they would clarify and standardize the names of the various peoples of Africa.

Inasmuch as scholars using research li-

braries encounter materials for the most part in the Library of Congress Classification, it may be useful to mention how African material is arranged and how the LC is providing inner structuring for these new countries. Just as any African bibliography is out of date as soon as it is published, so any classification scheme lags behind the quick-moving events in the political scene today. The rapidity with which the changes can be noted will depend on the number of the bibliographers available in an institution or in a bibliographic service organization.

There is no one place for African material *per se* in the Library of Congress Classification, for it is a classification of knowledge by subjects, not by area. The major designations for African history and politics are in the D schedules for history and in the J schedules for political administration and government. DT is the special class for African history and it is here that the majority of the new developments are noted. The development of African history in the LC subject schedule follows the usual pattern starting with generalia for the whole continent. The first large divisions reflect the former colonial partitions of the continent, so after Egypt, North Africa, and the Barbary States are provided for, the user comes to areas for British West Africa, French Equatorial, French West, Portuguese West, etc. Within these areas each colony was given a number or range of numbers for material on its history. Although sovereignty in some cases changed, it was not always reflected in this classification, as Tanganyika is still listed under German Africa with the designation "former" inserted. Important changes have, however, been made, reflecting the need for more space to record the rapidly expanding materials on the different countries. The LC has now assigned tables for use under each former colony (a device for

geographic and political expansion that can be adopted by an institution without undue costs in revising earlier records). So for example, Gabon, which under French West Africa had been given only DT546.1 now has a range of thirteen numbers providing for the several aspects of that country's history, antiquities, descriptive works, ethnographic works, biography, etc. Even the short-lived Central African Federation has been provided for, and especially interesting is a device that is being used for amalgamations such as that of Tanganyika and Zanzibar. Tanganyikan material already had a number range from DT436 to DT449 with not all the numbers within the range being currently used (this is one of LC's methods to allow for further expansions). Recently DT448 was assigned for material on Tanganyika for 1961-1965 and DT448.2 was assigned to cover 1965-date, to be used for Tanzania and to include publications on both Tanganyika and Zanzibar. Material on Zanzibar alone may continue to be recorded with other publications on that area.

In addition there is another large area in which these changes in nomenclature may be troublesome. In serial subject bibliographies such as a publication on Comparative Agriculture, Conservation of Natural Resources, Juvenile Delinquency, Electric Power Development, Public Health, and the like, where the arrangement is usually in sections with geographical subdivisions, the research worker unfamiliar with Africa who wishes to trace his topic over a period of years through several areas for a comparative study will need to be guided both from the colonial names to the new and from the new back to the former names.

Complex as these problems of subject bibliography may be, and as frustrating as the changing nomenclature of governments may be, the larger difficulties

lie in the field of official governmental publications. There the bibliographer has not only to watch and revise the names of countries, but also to watch for and to catch the frequent changes of names of departments and ministries. Again, the Rhodesias are a prime example of the complexities that have occurred through political changes. In each of the colonies of Northern and Southern Rhodesia material was published from their various governmental departments. At the inception of the Central African Federation, many of these publications were taken over by the newly created federal ministries that assumed the functions of the heretofore separate departments. With the breakup of the Federation, Southern Rhodesian and Northern Rhodesian departments resumed publication, sometimes with the same names, sometimes not.

Countless other small problems—the introduction of “Federal” into national names as the Federal Republic of the Cameroon, the same term applied and then dropped with Ministries, the change from departments to Ministries, the use of “Division” as synonymous with “Department,” the joining of two or more services into a ministry, then their separation, re-designations—all plague the careful bibliographer and all must be recorded, linked when necessary, and distinguished from services with similar names, but not necessarily having had similar responsibilities or having issued similar reports. Government publications being of paramount importance, especially in the developing countries, it is of primary concern to the bibliographer to keep his records accurate and up-to-date. As they move from one institution to another in their research scholars will find that institutions' records may vary in reflecting these changes, for this is an unprecedented situation. It is almost impossible to keep abreast of it (in our own experi-

ence, for example, in one day's mail from Zambia every document that came required revision of bibliographical entry). This is mentioned only to remind scholars, as they probably already know, that these changes make an African literature search today almost a guessing game. The guides to African documentation published by the Library of Congress have been of important assistance especially in the linking of varying departmental designations, and one of the most useful general references sources for national names and dates of political change is volume II of the *Europa Yearbook*. Otherwise current newspapers are the best source for catching official changes of national names, and every shipment of government documents from Africa is eagerly scanned to see what has happened or will be happening next.

This condition can be expected to exist for several years as more interior services are developed in these countries. Some services now carried practically as governmental functions will be separated into semi-autonomous, extra-governmental agencies, or become completely autonomous, while new services and new departments will be added, and ministries that now include two or more major functions will split as the work load grows and be redesignated. This will mean in the future that accurate and exhaustive research will be dependent on careful historical notes in bibliographies that will draw attention to these many changes involving names and services of governments and will distinguish the interrelationships of varying departmental designations.

■ ■

