Administrative Organization of Australian University Libraries. Ed. by F. D. O. Fielding. (Library Association of Australia, University and College Libraries Section. News Sheet, Supplement, No. 1). Adelaide, 1966. various pagings.

The detailed analysis of the libraries of fourteen universities of Australia in 1966, as reflected in the charts and statistical data presented in this report, shows a striking growth since 1961, when it was the reviewer's privilege to work with the librarians of that country. Mr. Fielding, librarian at the University of Queensland, has done a meticulous job in identifying various aspects of the organizations and operations of university libraries of the country, including such matters as library committees, personnel, selection and acquisition activities, cataloging and classification, housing and loan of materials, departmental libraries, size of collections, and other aspects of the individual institutions. Organization charts of each library are included.

The usefulness of such a compilation to librarians of the country, as well as to students and others interested in library development, is quite apparent. The editor is modest about the likely helpfulness of the report, and suggests that "it may prove possible to revise this booklet from time to time." This should certainly be done. American librarians and students in library schools might find this document most illuminating in respect to the various aspects of Australian university libraries. The cooperation in completion of the extensive questionnaires distributed by Mr. Fielding is in itself an indication of the excellent spirit of the librarians of the country to improve library service to students, faculty members, and researchers generally.—Maurice F. Tauber, Columbia University.

Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules. Prepared by the American Library Association, the Library of Congress, the Library Association, and the Canadian Library

Book Reviews

Association. North American Text. Chicago: ALA, 1967. xxi, 339p. index. \$8.50 (66-29239).

Reviewing the new code as an isolated document might, in one sense, result in a fairer review. The new code is after all a marked improvement over its predecessor. The basic differences between the two are well known in the profession and have been widely discussed. It is useful to have the rules for descriptive cataloging included in the same volume as those for main entry, even though these rules are substantially unchanged. There are some problems in treating rules for choice of entry separately from those for form of entry, but the approach is basically sound. The index is not as good as it might be (Festschriften, for example, are not indexed adequately, and technical reports appear not at all), but the work is physically attractive.

Inevitably, however, reviewing the new code as an isolated document would be less useful than a consideration of that code in the context in which it appears.

To begin with, it seems a pity that we have such an anomalous title page: this is the "North American Text" of an Anglo-American code. Abstractly, it would seem better to have a real Anglo-American code even if this had been at the cost of North American acceptance of the British version in its entirety.

It seems a further pity that these new cataloging rules deviate from the principles accepted nearly unanimously at the international level at the Paris Conference. This is particularly true since those principles were largely an American product, and since the Americans voted for their acceptance. It is perhaps exceptionally true in that their acceptance involved basic changes for some other countries and relatively minor ones for us. Shades of the League of Nations!

But then what have we done? Having embraced in printed form a code in which the deviations from the Paris principles seem almost completely intended to minimize problems occasioned in large research

62 /