

Book Reviews

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

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

libraries because of their historical accumulations under older rules (please note: not necessarily under the older ALA rules), we then discover that our national library is not going to follow even what we have finally come up with. Instead, it will follow a policy of keeping to the old rules for any entry already established, and applying the new only for entries new to its particular catalogs; a policy for which it has coined the term "superimposition."

Meanwhile, back at the ranch, that same national library which, together with the Association of Research Libraries, exerted the major influence to make the new really the old, has courageously embarked upon a truly noteworthy and trailblazing effort to provide cataloging on a national scale in machine readable form. The preface to the new code tells us explicitly, however, that, while the code makers did not ignore machine (i.e., computer) considerations, they did nothing about them. A similar statement is to be found in the new filing rules of the ALA, and is certainly implicit in the new edition of the Library of Congress subject headings.

Lubetzky's original effort toward clarity of principle has vanished, leaving behind significant traces of his mighty intellect in particular rules, but shattering the grand conception. Perhaps we should have accepted Lubetzky's original and then exiled him, as the Athenians did Solon, for ten years during which we could make no changes.

We have managed, then, after our thirty-five years of effort, to put together a new code which is better than what we had by a considerable factor. So much for achievement. But . . .

We have muffed our chance for a code based clearly on principle, we have missed the boat on international cooperation (significantly, just as the Library of Congress begins a magnificent program of international cooperation in shared cataloging), we have allowed the problems of a relatively few large existing libraries to take precedence over the emerging needs of many more libraries which will be the large existing libraries of the future, and we have ignored the new technology which we know represents what we must use in the future.

But we discharged our responsibility to those existing large collections (many of which did not follow the old rules anyway); we did not upset too many applecarts; we have kept faith, not with Cutter and the giants, but with the catalog embroiderers of the twenties and thirties.

And so, with a crash, to earth. We can live with the new code and even with the way in which the Library of Congress is applying it. We have to. But, inevitably, we will have to change—perhaps back toward Lubetzky and forward to the computer simultaneously. It might be a good idea to start the work now. It has taken since 1941 to get to this point. Perhaps if we begin again right away we may finish our next code by 1983.

And yet—one is tempted to soften the harshness of the above by asking if anything more was really politically possible at this time. In any case, it is just as certain that if we have not done quite what we should, it is not something we can blame on the Library of Congress, or the committees, or the Association of Research Libraries, or ALA, or any other organization—but only on all of us, the profession as a whole. We have to live with it. Unfortunately, so does our public—and our and their successors.—*Theodore C. Hines, Columbia University.*

Classification for Medical Literature. By Eileen R. Cunningham. Revised and Enlarged by Eleanor G. Steinke and Mary Louise Gladish. 5th ed. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1967. 267p. \$6 (67-17562).

Eileen R. Cunningham produced the first edition of her classification system shortly after 1929 when she became librarian of the Vanderbilt University medical school library, now the medical division of the Joint University Libraries in Nashville. The system was designed to conform to the sequence of the medical curriculum, and was divided into four main parts: biologic sciences, organic systems of the body, pathologic and clinical subjects, and paramedical works of interest in medical collections. The system's major features are its close relationships between complementary subjects,