in institutional obsolescence." He deplored the "devastating schism" which has arisen between librarians and documentalists; two years later in an editorial in the same journal he continued the same theme—"the latter still equate librarianship with inactive storage, and the librarians still persist in their insistance that documentalists are mere bibliographic amateurs who clothe traditional library processes in an esoteric and incomprehensible jargon. Unfortunately, there is just enough truth in these two points of view to give each some validity. . . . Yet both documentalist and librarian are seeking a common goal . . . Some way must be found to unite the peculiar strengths of each into a single cohesive force."

To this view I unreservedly subscribe. Regrettably, the schism seems to be widening, rather than narrowing. The persistence of the documentalist in defining his craft as something separate from librarianship may be interpreted as a reaction of outrage in the face of the reluctance of traditional librarianship to reassess, *in depth,* the principles and techniques of our calling. We typically go around muttering pitiful platitudes to the effect that "it's all right in theory but it won't work in practice" with an air of sanctimonious solemnity. I have the strong feeling, reinforced by the intellectual thrust of books such as those here under review, that we librarians would be well advised to have the vision and the good grace to find ways of admitting some of the lesser documentalist heresies into the body of library canonical doctrine.—*Frank B. Rogers, National Library of Medicine.*

IBM Circulation Control

IBM Circulation Control at Brooklyn College Library. By Henry Birnbaum. White Plains, N. Y.: International Business Machines Corporation, 1960. 32 pp., Free.

Compromise between the desirable and the economically feasible has dominated circulation control records of libraries for three quarters of a century. The application of modern technology (simple as it was) to the problem a little more than three decades ago merely increased the variety of experiments in compromise.

These first applications (Dickman and Gaylord) merely mechanized the recording of borrower identification on the book card systems of the day. The second type of application utilized IBM equipment to create punched call cards, thereby eliminating the established book cards, but maintaining a reference file essentially equivalent to the former book card files.

The third type of application of technology (Photocharging) abandoned the classed reference file and maintained the records of loans in transaction sequence. The key to this file, and to those of the numerous adaptations of it, was the prenumbered transaction card. Later adaptations utilized IBM punched transaction cards to further mechanize the clearance of the record of books returned. With this type of system the compromise moved far to the side of economic feasibility.

The transaction card systems appealed primarily to public libraries, but Brooklyn College adopted and used one modification for some time. As indicated by the author, who is chief circulation librarian it was found that too much had been sacrificed particularly in collegiate libraries. It was necessary to provide answers to the question, "Where is the book I need?" The Brooklyn answer was an ingenious combination of the second and third approaches to mechanization. By combining the IBM call card and the IBM transaction card, automation is carried further than with call cards alone, and more information is provided than by transaction cards alone.

Yet there are still compromises between the desirable and the expedient. By maintaining the file in sequence by the numerical portion of the Cutter number, the amount of key-punching is reduced and a numerical collator, rather than the more expensive alphabetic model, will suffice for filing, but the limitation to one thousand combinations means that the file loses convenience of consultation. If there are 10,000 volumes on loan at one time, an average of ten call cards will be grouped without further arrangement under each punched number. It is reasonable to assume that hand sorting through fifty cards would not be unusual.

Another compromise with the desirable is that the circulation file contains cards, not only for all books on loan, but also for books not yet due which have already been returned. The file is of value for reference only after the shelves and all possible way stations for newly returned books have been checked.

Despite these limitations, the Brooklyn College system is probably the most effective mechanized system devised for a medium sized university or college library situation. It is certainly not the ultimate, and newer technological developments will in time reduce the compromises between expediency and desirability. Perhaps the ultimate system can achieve the advantages of the former book card systems, using simpler procedures and requiring the borrower to write nothing. —*Ralph H. Parker, University of Missouri Library.*

Cataloging-in-Source

The Cataloging-in-Source Experiment; a Report to the Librarian of Congress by the Director of the Processing Department. Washington, Library of Congress, 1960. xxiv, 199 p.

This well-organized, well-written document will surely earn a permanent place on the shelves of most libraries throughout the country and undoubtedly in a good many of the large foreign libraries. It makes one wish that it had been printed instead of duplicated by offset lithography, as it may very well stand for a good many years as the record of the second major, unsucessful attempt to print full cataloging information in books. This is not a progress report, but the final statement by the Library of Congress on an experiment which led to the conclusion that Cataloging-in-Source should not be continued—at least as presently conceived.

L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, describes the experiment in the preface in this way: "The immediate purpose of the experiment was to test once more, under modern conditions, the feasibility of a proposal which was first advanced, and tested, during the 1870's and 1880's. The present-day phase of the proposal, denominated as "Cataloging-in-Source," envisaged the printing by publishers in their current publications of facsimiles of Library of Congress cards. This would be made possible by having the Library of Congress catalog these titles in advance of publication from page proofs and data sheets supplied by the publishers." After stating that the experiment proved that it is possible for the Library of Congress to catalog *some* books from page proofs before they are published, that it is possible for a *selected* number of publishers to print catalog entries in a considerable number of their publications, and that a representative group of libraries would welcome having cataloging information printed in the books, Mr. Mumford goes on to say: "The underlying purpose of the experiment, however, was to ascertain whether a permanent, full-scale program of Cataloging-in-Source could be justified in terms of financing, technical considerations, and utility. As regards this, the answer must be a regretful negative." The two basic problems tested were: (1) the financial and technical problems and the practicability of the proposal from the viewpoint of the Library of Congress and the publishers, and (2) what actual use could libraries and other consumers make of the catalog entries appearing in the publications.

Among the reasons given for the decision, the major determining factors were: (1) the very high cost to both the publishers and the Library of Congress, (2) the disruptions of publishing schedules, (3) the high degree of unreliability of catalog entries based on texts not in their final form, and (4) the difficulty libraries would have in using this unreliable information and adapting it to their individual requirements. The criticisms to Cataloging-in-Source that are reported are very interesting to note. Some of the major ones are: (1) entry of a book under the original author when published as the original author's work but largely rewritten by an editor, (2) entry under the first named author when the editors consider a later-named author as being principally responsible, (3) the publishers' strong objections to real name entries for pseudonymous works (and none were printed in the books that way), (4) the authors' objection to the use of their birthdates in the headings, (5) even the