ANGLO-AMERICAN CATALOGING RULES 1908-1978 : A STATE OF THE ART

UPINDER KUMAR TIKKU
Department of Library Science
Panjab University
Chandigarh-160014.

This paper attempts to describe the development of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules in the light of various facts having important bearing on these rules. The salient features and weaknesses of each edition of the Code are highlighted. The Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd edition, published in 1978 and implemented in 1981 has been discussed in detail. Its impact on cataloguing in general and on library automation in particular is the major focus of this study.

1 INTRODUCTION

The twentieth century is often referred to as an age of explosions. The population, cultural, political, economic, nuclear explosions etc. have already influenced the 20th century mankind and its social institutions alike. Among social institutions, perhaps, the library is the most affected entity. Libraries of today are not only inundated by the enormous information being generated but also by the form in which it is being made available. Libraries of today are getting a continuous flow of information, in paper-based or paper-less format — print and non-print material. Also there is an equal demand for the use of information available in the library. As such in this information age, librarians have been forced to devise not only good organizational techniques for their library materials but also retrieving them in the least possible time. Cataloguing is the most basic and perhaps the oldest of the library's organiztion techniques. To make the library catalogue an impersonal tool, both for the cataloguer and the readers, uniform cataloguing is needed. For that purpose, librarians have devised a number of written cataloguing rules or codes. Among them, the

Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules are most widely used all over the world.

In this paper, an attempt has been made to trace out the development of the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, by examining various facts having important bearing on these rules, emphasizing the salient features and weaknesses of each edition of the Code. No attempt, however, is being made to discuss and compare the individual rules because of the nature of this paper. The Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, second edition, (AACR 2), published in 1978 and recently implemented by the libraries, is the major focus of this study.

2 ANGLO—AMERICAN CATALOGUING RULES : A HISTORICAL DEVELOP MENT

21 Anglo-American Code 1908 (AA 1908)

AA 1908 [1], though appeared in 1908 as "the first successful product of British and American cooperation" [2], owes its origin to various 19th century codes. According to Maxwell [3], its roots go at least to Panizzi's 91 rules published in 1841, which Jewett used, in turn, as the foundation for his "thirty four *Rules for Preparing Catalogs* [4] set forth in 1852 as a proposed national code for library cataloging." Henderson [5] obliquely refers to *Condensed Rules for an Author and Title Catalog* [6] issued in 1883 by the ALA Co-operative Committee, supplemented by Cutter's *Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalog* [7] and *ALA Rules — Advance edition* [8] issued in 1902 as its predecessors. Bakewell [9] finds in AA 1908, "the influence of all previous codes, notably the Library of Congress, British Museum, Cutter and Linderfelt's Eclectic Rules, which are

frequently quoted in the text." As such, this code represented the mixture of cataloging traditions — both American and British. Though it was often referred to as "international" but in fact this code was "bilateral" in its compilation [10]

"In 1900 American cataloging practice was still fluid" [11] and at such time, the appearance of this code was welcomed by all. Its use by the majority of libraries in America and England for decades is an ample proof of its popularity. Bakewell [12] points out that though "it is doubtful if many libraries adopted it without amendments" yet it "was probably used as the basis of cataloging in most English-speaking countries for many years." Henderson [13] and Maxwell [14], both agree that this Code set several new trends in the field of cataloguing. The trend towards cooperation in cataloguing, not only national but also international was the most important. The other trends were the continuation of the role of leadership assumed by the Library of Congress (LC) in code revision; and the code's blindfolded emphasis on author and title entries, leaving subject entry "theory" to the mercy of Cutter's Rules.

Despite its being the trend setter, the Code was subjected to heavy criticism both nationally and internationally. The main cause of its criticism was its aim of being specifically designed to meet "the requirements of larger libraries of a scholarly character" [15]. It implied that it was unsuitable for the needs of the small libraries of a popular nature. Needham [16] commented that excessive details called for in the rules as compared with the British MuseumRules, suggest that the compilers of these rules had in mind libraries bigger than the British Museum.

Similarly, according to Bakewell [17], "the rules were pedantic in the extreme; secondly, the arrangement of AA 1908 left a great deal to be desired." In AA 1908, Maxwell [18] observes that, "there is no introductory statement of principles; the related rules are separated and many of the rules are simply enumerations of the types of problems. The rules differentiating societies and institutions are immensely complex and show a lack of understanding of a 'case' code, but with the disadvantage of

enumerating comparatively few cases." Ranganathan [20] condemns AA 1908 because of "its skeleton nature, its mixing up the author entry and the subject entry, lack of unity in many of its rules — a serious drawback in the drafting of a code." In other words, "there was a little room for common sense of flexibility in AA 1908" [21], yet a single code was necessary for cooperative cataloging.

22 ALA Rules, 1941 — The Preliminary Edition [22]

For about twenty years, following the publication and adoption of AA 1908 by the profession, no further efforts for development or revision of the code were made. The American Library Association (ALA) remained a silent spectator whereas LC dominated this period through its sale of printed catalog cards as well as by providing solutions to the problems encountered in the process of cataloging not covered in AA 1908. As such, the libraries were forced to accept either the "unofficial" changes as recommended by LC in the code or to develop their own set of alternate rules, thus marring what was the original aim of the code-uniformity in cataloging.

During 1930's, people started raising their voices for the revision of the code to include the 'unofficial' changes and thus legitimize them. Hanson [23], American Chairman for the AA 1908 code, was perhaps the first to recommend in 1932 those additions, expansions, and improvements in the code that went beyond. In the same year, through their "Summary of Discussion of need for Revision of Catalog Code' [24], New York catalogers, expressed the widespread concern of the librarians. As a result, a Catalog Code Revision Committee was appointed by ALA to "make necessary revisions in the ALA catalog rules with authority to cooperate with the Library Association of Great Britain and with such other national library associations as it may think appropriate" [25]

Pettee [26], seemingly acting as the spokesman of most of the catalogers of 1930's, expressed her feeling that the catalogers wanted "expansions of existing rules and more examples under them, rather than an entire new code." Gjelsness [27], Chairman of the 1941 Catalog

Code Revision Committee, concurred with Pettee and said, "dissatisfaction with the 1908 Code rested not with the inclusions but rather with its omissions. Expansion was needed, rather than change." Martel [28], the consultant from LC, confirmed this view, when on the basis of suggestions received from individuals and groups, he commented that catalogers appeared to want a handbook more than a "mere skeleton of rules with a few examples illustrating."

The Code Revision Committee, not only utilizing these suggestions but also taking into account the various rules developed mainly by LC, built a monumental superstructure upon the slender framework of the eighty-eight page AA Code of 1908, in the course of the next decade [29]. British Code Revision Committee [3] contacted its American counterpart for possible cooperation in 1936 and this correspondence resulted in "substantial agreement in the sections of the tentative rules on which the British Committee had made a definite report" [31]. This cooperation could not go beyond 1939 because of the outbreak of the World War II, and thus the revised rules appeared in 1941, as a sole venture of American Cataloging Code Revision Committee, rather than a joint British-American venture. A cursory glance of this revised code would confirm that it had done exactly what the cataloguers of that time wanted from it. For easy comparison with 1908 Code, the rules were collated. There were 224 rules now for entry and heading (out of a total of 375) occupying 237 pages as compared to 135 (out of 174 rules in total) in 42 pages in AA 1908. This expansion became its cause of criticism. It was labelled as an over-elaborate code and whose use was likely to make cataloging unduly expensive.

23 ALA 1949 (or The "RED" Book) and LC Rules for Descriptive Cataloging (or The "GREEN" Book)

The cold reception given to the ALA Rules — Preliminary edition, forced the ALA to reconsider the revision of the code. While ALA was yet undecided, there appeared Osborn's "Crisis in Cataloging" [34] in late 1941. To

Dunkin [35], "....it gave a name and an atmosphere to a whole era of thinking about cataloging." To Hunter [36], "Osborn convincingly demolished the three schools of catalogers which he described as the 'legalistic', 'perfectionist', and 'bibliographical' practitioners, and thus heralded the beginning of a new era in reappraisal of cataloging codes and practices." Osborn also discussed the philosophy of catalogue codes and brought out its relationship in comparison with the cataloguing situation. He also recommended more cooperation between administrators and cataloguers. Though Osborn did not discuss 1941 Code as such but made one comment about it: "Codification tends to obscure reasons and principles" [37].

As a result, on the last day of 1941, a Committee was established by ALA "to consider the revised ALA Catalog Rules from the standpoint of the library administrator as well as the cataloger, particularly with regard to the question of elaboration and of expense" [38]. As a result of the recommendation of this committee, revision of Part 1 (Entry and Heading) was undertaken whereas the revision of Part 2 (Description of Book) was deferred till LC could complete the revision of its own rules of description.

The ALA Division of Cataloging and Classification undertook the revision of Part 1 — the rules for entry and heading in 1946 instead of the Catalog Code Revision Committee and produced the 1949 Code or the so called "Red Book". In 1949, LC also published its *Rules for Descriptive Cataloging* (the Green Book), which ALA accepted as a substitute for its abondoned Part 2 of the 1941 version. Comparison of the two editions of the code reveals some major differences. One major difference was the reduction in number of rules from 224 to 158 but with numerous sections and subsections attached to each rule, they occupied 249 pages, almost equal to 1941 edition (237 pages).

The revised codes for entry and heading as well as for descriptive cataloging——the red and green rules——were welcomed and criticized alike by the profession. Dunkin [39] praised LC Rules but condemned ALA Rules. He called these codes as "twins by fiat of ALA" in which one (LC Rules) looked ahead, and one (ALA

1949) looked back. Similarly, to Hunter [40], "...while the ALA rules (1949) tended to reflect a traditionalist enumerative complexity, the LC Rules moved towards the increasing demands of catalogers for more simplicity and brevity." Bakewell [41] observed, "....the two codes made strange bedfellows: the flexibility and moves towards simplicity of LC contrasted oddly with the detail and pedantic approach of ALA 1949."

Osborn [42], Shera [43], and Jolley [44] reviewed these codes separately. Though all of them praised LC Rules, they criticized ALA Rules (1949) for its failure to meet the aspirations of the catalogers. To Jolley [45], ALA Rules were a bundle of "overlapping and redundant rules, its ...multiplication of exceptions to rules and even of exceptions to exceptions"were appalling. Despite Beetle's carefully worded statement of her principles as editor [46], she and her committee were accused by Jolley of their failure in ignoring the first principles [47] as well as of neglecting the mandate of ten years discussion of the cataloging rules advocating simplified cataloging practices [48].

Ranganathan [49] looking at it from a different angle, criticized as well as praised it in the same breath:

"....Such a labyrinth of committees deliberating through two decades cannot be expected to produce a natural whole. The same life-element cannot be expected to breathe through every rule. Such a code cannot be expected to be an organic unity with no element of redundancy or inconsistency. And yet, for a committee-made code not charged with the personality of a single author, ALA is a remarkable achievement".

24 AACR 1967 or AACR 1 (The Blue Book) [50]

The next period of almost two decades, preceeding the publication of AACR, 1967 may be called an era of Code Revision Movements in the history of cataloging. Lubetzky's [51] report: *Cataloging rules and principles,* published in 1953, was perhaps the starting point of these movements. This three-parts report, examines the validity of rules; probe into the corporate complex; and finally recommends the design for a code. In essence, in this report Lubetzky "came out strongly against the codification of catalog rules via the elaborate and complex enumeration of innumerable 'cases' and pointed a way towards the possible establishment of a less complex code based upon well defined principles recognizing more generalized 'conditions' [52]. This report was widely welcomed in the professional world. To Jolley [53], it was "the definitive expression of the destructive criticism of a decade" whereas Prevost [54] called it "harbinger of hope".

Subsequently, both ALA and LA (Great Britain) formed committees at their respective ends to revise the cataloging rules with a view to produce a second Anglo-American joint code. Lubetzky was appointed the editor of the new code. The framework for the proposed code was published in 1956 entitled: "Statement of objectives and principles of catalog code revision"[55]

Lubetzky prepared in 1958 a tentative draft [56] of the new code, and presented it in an Institute of Catalog Code Revision in that year. In the light of Institute's discussion as well as continued revision by the editor and the Steering Committee, another draft appeared in 1960. Lubetzky's *Code of Cataloging Rules: Author and Title Entry, an Unfinished draft* [57], like the first draft, was also presented in an Institute for discussion in 1960. Lubetzky [58] also presented at this Institute a working paper, "Fundamentals of Cataloging", which highlighted the basic elements of the new code. This Code was mainly an extension of his "Design for a code". However, its chief weakness was omission of rules for nonprint materials and rules for description as well. It would have been another great achievement of the profession if this draft could have been finished, approved, published, and actually put into use. But, alas, it remained a pious wish. To Hornor [59], this draft code "got into the hands of committees, who, one fears, kicked it around until it got lost." In disgust Lubetzky gave up the editorship of the new code.

In 1960, when Lubetzky presented his second draft, another idea — international co-operation in cataloging was gaining momentum. Ranganathan [60],[61] throughout his profes-

sional career had been making an "appeal for international efforts to continue making closer and closer approximations, until an agreed International Catalog Code is reached." That such a Code in reality is possible or not is arguable yet efforts are being made to achieve uniformity in cataloging as much as possible on an international level.

However, the International Conference on Cataloging Principles (ICCP) [62], held at Paris in 1961 was a milestone in international cooperation in the field of cataloging. Chaplin [63] gives the details of the events leading up to the Conference beginning with the 1954 IFLA's formation of the Working Group, whereas Jolley [64] gives his assessment of the Paris Conference. Jolley felt that the Statement of Principles adopted is essentially an outline of the new code; that it represents an international agreement so that all future cataloging development must have an international aura; and lastly, it may be considered on a wide screen, an endorsement of Lubetzky's work. "In this era of the computer and the multimedia library", Gorman [65] feels that ICCP principles containing "many errors of ommission and commission,are vaguely worded, and do not form an adequate basis for author-title cataloging codes." Despite its shortcomings, ICCP influenced a large number of codes which appeared in 1960's [66], as well as resulted in the production of a large number of standard handbooks [67],[68],[69]. Also, Britishers showed a great enthusiasm for Lubetzky's reforms; for the criteria of the Paris Principles and the 1960 Code as the basis for the second Anglo-American Code.But unfortunately, a useless controversy involved the American librarians in early 1960's. The Library of Congress, supported by the Association of Research Libraries raised its objections to the cost of wholesale change to the Catalog Code Revision Committee at the ALA conference at Miami in 1962. As a result, a compromise was reached and it was the starting of the first real hiatus between the American and British Committee on the Anglo-American Code [70]. Morsch [71] while reviewing the relationship between ALA and LC over the years in the matter of cataloging rules revision has rightly concluded that certainly from 1949 onwards "neither body was free to expand or modify any detail of its cataloging rules without the specific approval of the other." Five more years of efforts involving a number of meetings followed the Miami compromise of 1962 and at last AACR appeared in 1967.

Lubetzky [72] provided the first glimpse of the anticipated new code through a preliminary review in 1964. Field [73] has provided a detailed summary of North American text. Similarly, Gorman [74] has dealt with the British text. Downing [75] has provided a general appraisal of it whereas Anderson [76] has highlighted its value as a multinational code. Gorman [77] has made its rule by rule comparison with AA 1908 whereas Ranganathan and Bhattacharya [78],[79],[80],[81] have compared it with Ranganathan's Classified Catalog Code (CCC) [82] from the conflict in authorship point of view. Mangla and Sardana [83] have compared CCC with AACR 1967 from the corporate authorship point of view and have shown the impact of the former on the later in resolving it.

The salient features of AACR 1967 as compared to other codes are: It is based, in accordance with Lubetzky's suggestions, on *conditions of authorship* rather than on *type of work*; arrangement is more logical; rules are consistent and comprehensive; emphasize economy in cataloging; and meet the requirements of the practising catalogers and library education as well. However, it is unfortunate that two separate texts, British and American, had to be produced for want of agreement with respect to 9 rules only between British and American Committees. Further, an examination of the two texts reveals more closeness of the British text than American to the Paris Principles and to Lubetzky's idea. Horner [84] complimented the two texts, thus: "...If it is two cheers for AACR British text, it is only about one and a half cheers for the North American text."

25 Partial Revised Edition or AACR one and a half

LC [85] adopted AACR 1967, soon after its publication for cataloging but within the limits of superimposition. Within six months of its use, ALA's Division of Cataloging and Classification as well as LC approved a number of additions and changes to AACR 1 [86]. LC [87] did not

stop at these revisions only but beyond proposing more and more additions and changes to AACR 1, it undertook the revision of rules for non-print materials especially the Chapters 12 and 14.

The British [88] were alarmed at this continuous arbitrary revision of the rules and they showed that certain "amendments appeared to have the effect of undermining the principles of the original text." Though not against introducing substantial modifications to the principles, the British suggested that these "needed more evidence than that had so far been presented."

Despite Britishers' anxiety about the changes, the piecemeal revision of AACR, 1967 continued. Significant changes introduced were: deletion of rules 98 and 99 in 1972, allowing institutions to be entered as other corporate bodies [89]; the exhaustive revision of rules 3-5 that disallowed the entering of a work under an editor or compilor [90]; and, the extensive revision and publication of revised Chapters 6 [91], 12]92], and 14 [93] in 1974, 1975 and 1976 respectively. AACR' Chapter 6 was revised to bring Anglo-American cataloging into line with ISBD (M) stipulations as regard to the bibliographical description whereas Chapters 12 and 14 were revised to meet the requirements of such observations as that of Chan [94] that Part III of AACR, "especially Chapter 12, 14 and 15 has proved to be inadequate in coping with the proliferation, particularly in the range, of nonbook materials in recent years."

These piecemeal revisions of AACR 1 brought it into a paradoxical situation——Where neither could one claim it to be still the same old rules nor could it be rechristened as something wholly new. Daily [95] has rightly given these stray revisions a collective name: "AACR One and a Half".

26 AACR, 1978 or AACR 2

The second edition of AACR appeared at last in late 1978, as a result of the efforts and work of the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR set up by ALA and others in 1974 along with its two editors viz., Paul Winkler and Michael Gorman. Kelm [96] has traced out its historical development, whereas Gorman——the joint editor for 2nd edition [97] has made a detailed prepublication review of these rules. In another paper, Gorman [98] has highlighted the influence of Paris Principles as well as the impact of computer technology in shaping this 2nd edition of AACR.

From an examination of all these documents as well as the facts already stated in this paper, one concludes that 2nd edition of AACR is the result of the culmination of several factors, which appeared in 1970's and thus necessitated the production of revised edition of cataloging rules. Piecemeal revision of AACR; development of International Standard Bibliographical Description; LC's interest in "desuperimposition" i.e., allowing the change in headings established under Pre-AACR rules; and the use of computers in libraries made imperative to revise the existing rules in order to take care of these developments.

AACR 2 claims to have the following salient features as compared to AACR 1:

1   Structure of AACR 2 is more logical and coherent than AACR 1. Unlike AACR 1 division of rules into three parts, it has only two parts viz., Bibliographic description; and choice and form of headings (i.e., access points). The overall structure of AACR 2 is designed to recognize the multiple-use bibliographic record and is commensurate with the modern view of descriptive cataloging. Rules are not biased towards any particular physical object such as book but deals with work whose manifestations are the physical objects, and all the access points generated relate to the work. Chapters as well as rules within them follow a logical pattern.

2   AACR 2 unlike AACR 1 provides three levels of biblioraphic description viz., minimum; medium or standard; and detailed or maximum, keeping in view the different requirements of details in cataloging entries of different libraries for all kinds of materials.

3   AACR 2 provides a number of optional rules to meet different approaches to solve a problem.

4   AACR 2 incorporates fully the dictum of ISBD as to the description of items in an entry for a work.

5   AACR 2 deemphasizes the basic and more than a century old concept of "main entry" in a catalog and concentrates on the rules for the formulation of access points (headings).

6   Rules for choice and form of personal and corporate authorship have been thoroughly revised in AACR 2, thus reducing rather removing completely the flaws in AACR 1. The change is significant in rules for corporate authorship and Verona's [90] lucid analysis of the problem of corporate entry has rightly been acknowledged as the basis for this radicalism.

7   AACR 2, as opposed to the book oriented rules approach in AACR 1, offers an integrated and equal approach to all library materials.

8   AACR 2 is certainly a multinational code representing the views of not only "Anglo-American-Canadian" community but also of all other English-speaking world and is an example of library cooperation – if not international at least at multinational level.

9   AACR 2 makes itself more amenable to library automation than its predecessors.

3   "CRISIS IN CATALOGING" 2: AACR 2'S IMPLEMENTATION

Despite the belief of its creators that it is "a comprehensive statement of the best cataloging practice of the Anglo-American conditions at this time, ...well organized, lucidly presented, and well suited for use as a practical cataloging tool in the tradition of Panizzi, Cutter and Lubetzky" [100] yet what to talk of its implementation, its publication only has electrified the whole library world. During the last five years more and more people have talked about AACR 2 and its implications especially the future of the card catalog. From all this one could make out that basically there are two issues involved and rest are their manifestations. They are:

1   LC's plan to abandon its policy of "superimposition" and thus freeze its card catalogs (ie., separating the Post-AACR 2 automated catalogs from the Pre-AACR 2 manually operated card catalogs).

2   AACR 2 and its effect on library automation.

31   LC's Desuperimposition and Freezing of its Catalog

LC adopted in 1967 the policy of "superimposition" i.e., of not revising the heading already in LC catalog regardless of revisions required by the adoption of AACR 1967. This created some confusion not only among readers but even among the professionals. The problem was acute for the participating libraries in the LC's Shared Cataloging Program. LC recognized this problem as far back as 1969 when Spalding [101] revealed LC plans to close their catalogs by the end of 1970 and with that superimposition would also go. Ranganathan [102] applauded it :

> "The most pleasing news on catalogue rules heard until now is the one about Mr. Sumner Spalding's announcement ... about the possibility of the Library of Congress closing its catalogues at the end of 1970 ... I hope that this is not done merely to nibble at the few points now dividing the American and British practices. This is an historic and brave step forward which should be taken fully forward."

Unfortunately, this historic decision had to wait for a decade to be made effective. The abandonment of the policy of "superimposition" not only would ensure the complete adoption of the new cataloging rules but also would not be a cause of difficulties for the participants of the Shared Cataloging Program. "Ever becoming ever new" is also what Canon of Context expects from a library catalog as well as catalog code [103].

LC's decision to freeze its catalogs with the adoption of the AACR 2 in January 1981, gave perhaps the biggest jolt to the profession in its history. Though this idea was floating around for a considerable time, yet it was not taken seriously because of the faith of the library people that perhaps technology, if not men, would find an answer to it or with the passage of time, the problem would go away. Nothing such happened and LC on January 2, 1981 adopted AACR 2 and closed its catalog. This inevitable decision has forced library directors

to decide whether or not they should also close their catalogs with the adoption of AACR 2 and fall in line with LC. Dougherty [104], on the basis of an informal survey carried by Association of Research Library stated that "the majority of respondents see no alternative to closing card catalogs and adopting AACR 2 in concert with the Library of Congress." On the other hand, Hewitt and Gleim [105] while pleading the case for not closing the catalog with the adoption of AACR 2 have doubted," the role of AACR 2 as a catalyst for closing card catalogs and moving to computer-based catalogs before a library is fully prepared" for such a change.

No doubt, a few large libraries in USA and other developed countries have changed over smoothly to automated catalogs in 1981 along with LC but certainly there are many libraries in these countries which are not and will not be ready for a considerable length of time for such a change in terms of budget, bibliographic, and systems planning. For developing countries, what to speak of closing their catalogs, even the change over to new set of rules is a nightmare. Not only the cost but lack of advanced technological means are the major obstacles for them.

As such, the library profession has been put into a dilemma — should or should not the catalogs be closed following LC ? Hewitt and Gleim [106], "believe the integration of AACR 2 into the existing catalogs is a reasonable and legitimate approach....Continuing present card catalogs, while at the same time planning for their eventual replacement by COM or online, may be the best alternative."

Ranganathan [107] had visualized such a problem to be faced by the profession one day and as such had provided a solution for it in the light of his Canon of Context and Principle of Osmosis. He suggests the division of the library material as well as the corresponding catalog cards into two sequences viz., New Collections and Old Collections, from the choosen date of changeover. Reference librarians must bring the reader's attention to such an arrangement. Depending upon the use of the material from the old collections, the materials as well as the corresponding catalog cards be transferred to the New collection sequence. Initially for a few months there may be a "high-pressure absorp-

tion" but in about five years this absorption will come to almost a vanishing point. "By that time, all the live books" would have been transferred by the "Osmotic Pressure of Use" from the Old collection to the New Collection. The 'dead books' will for ever remain in the Old collections without any harm to any reader." This method has two main advantages: no extra cost is involved in changing over to new set of rules; and secondly there is no need of freezing the existing catalogue. However, this method require the rearrangement of material and space in the library which may be little time consuming especially in a large library. Inspite of this and only this disadvantage, this method is worth trying.

32 AACR 2 and Automation

Though AACR 2 aims "to take development in library automation into account" [108] yet an examination of it will reveal that it has not been fully successful at this front. In fact, Gorman [109] had admitted that "AACR 2 could not take the effects of library automation fully into account because those effects have yet to be assessed and understood." Susan Martin has provided a helpful review of AACR 2 from the point of view of automation. Some of her observations are worth examining [110].

(1) Size of machine readable data-base : Present day machine readable data bases are quite vast e.g., OCLC data base contains approximately 8 million records and its size is increasing rapidly. In view of this Gorman [111] suggests changes in record must take place quickly to avoid massive changes in future. Similarly Leiter [112] urged immediate adoption of AACR 2 because "making changes in library practices is like buying real estate — its always cheaper now than it will be later." Though logical yet these statements do not accommodate the reality. In fact, we already must cope with massive changes but we don't have yet a computer which could make these changes smoothly and inexpensive. Martin also suggests that instead of changing the large files with every new system developed, it is better to wait for a worth while system to develop.

(2) Physical form of the catalog: It is claimed that rules in AACR 1 were formed to produce catalog entries suitable to book and card catalog

but not to other newer forms such as COM, ONLINE systems. Apparently AACR 2 is designed to accomodate these new forms. With the relative flexibility permitted by data-element labeling and by the present day sophisticated programming languages, it is, however, difficult to perceive the meaning of this claim.

(3) Multi-level bibliographic description and optional rules: AACR 2 not only provides three different levels of description for libraries to choose one from but a number of rules have been provided to satisfy different approaches to a problem. Since the existence of shared cataloging, large data bases and regional networks depends upon uniformity in rules and description, it will require a careful examination of these options and levels by the promoters of such programmes.

(4) Concept of main entry : It is assumed that main entry ceases to exist in a machine cataloging system as each entry in itself is complete one. Wth this background, the radical revision of uniform titles, and establishment of personal and corporate names are among the features yet to be tested in practice. What presumed benefits from these changes will accrue to the users as well the staff, many librarians are doubtful about it.

(5) Author collection : It is claimed that machine can relate easily and speedily, the separate identities of a single author. This type of work could be done accurately if we maintain a sophisticated authority control system — a very expensive entity.

(6) Filing sequence : Like any other code, AACR 2 for forms of names include special characters, uniform titles, parenthetical expressions etc. As such, its implications on filing sequence is of grave concern. A considerable human manipulations as well as programming may be required if computer based filing is to be used for indexing access points and displaying entries in a logical sequence.

(7) Superimposition — dead or still alive : Gorman [113] has noted with concern the latest LC's apparent movement towards streamlined procedures — a reminiscent of superimposition e.g., continuing to use Great Britain instead of United Kingdom. There appears to be no justification for it except LC finds it difficult to break its long intimate friendship with superimposition. Had not we suffered a lot because of it in the past? If we should leave this habit of sticking to the past, we must adopt the new code in its entirety with proper planning.

4 AACR 2 – POST IMPLEMENTATION SCENE

As is evident from the preceding analysis, perhaps there is no document other than AACR 2 which in the history of librarianship has been a subject of such an intense discussion among the professionals — before and even more after its publication. The main cause of pre-publication attention was the belief that this new code would be a panacea of all the ills facing the cataloging today, whereas its impact on library operations and services because of the closing of the card catalogs and their replacement by new machine operated catalogs especially when library budgets are shrinking more rapidly is the major cause of post-publication discussion.

A careful analysis of some recent publications reveals that perhaps too much was expected from this Code — which was nothing but a first serious attempt in recent times to codify in one set of rules, diversified cataloging traditions and practices of the world. The apparent failure of the Code to deliver the desired results started a chain of controversies. Gorman, feeling sore over these unending controversies, expressed his anguish as [114] :

> AACR 2 was intended as both a summation of the best of traditional cataloging practice and a plateau from which we could survey the future. Instead, a whole generation of librarians seems to have become hooked on controversy and pettifogging argument, while bulging-veined reactionaries lunge at shadows and wave banners with strange devices.

During the last four years, the publication of a number of documents claiming to be supplement or complement to AACR 2 has confounded further the already confused situation. Of these, the three documents which deserve our utmost attention are :

(i) LC' Rule interpretations for AACR 2 [115]

(ii) Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR' *Revisions* [116] ; and

(iii) Gorman, M : *The Concise AACR 2 [117]* ;

The *first* publication is significant not because it has come from LC but because of the role LC plays in influencing the functioning of a large number of libraries in USA. Any new development at LC is an indicator of change for American libraries. As such, any interpretation of the rules by LC is bound to be accepted and implemented by American Libraries, thereby creating parallel set of rules to AACR 2. It may not be out of place to mention that it is not only LC which is having problem in interpreting the rules but British Library (BL) too is feeling the pinch. Though it is claimed that AACR 2 has resolved the differences existing in North American and British Cataloguing practices but in actuality this is not so. The most glaring example of this difference, perhaps due to different interpretations of the rules, is found nowhere else but on the verso of the title page of AACR 2. AACR 2 with British imprint carries the BLCIP data and renders it as :

"Anglo-American Cataloguing rules"whereas, the American imprint with LC' CIP data records it :

"Anglo-American cataloguing rules".

Though Shinebourne [118] has questioned the BLCIP data as to "Why is 'Cataloguing' capitalized and 'rules' not ?" but so far no body has questioned the LC' CIP data as to why "cataloguing" and "rules" are not both capitalized. This paradoxical situation certainly warrants an explanation from the creaters of AACR 2.

The second publication, i.e. Revisions is of importance here, too as it makes the various changes in the rules official i.e., binding on the users. Though the number of such revisions is small, i.e., nineteen only but is a sure pointer of forthcoming more revisions. In other words, have not we already started making a AACR 3 to replace AACR 2. Perhaps, its too early to say so.

The Concise AACR 2, the *third* publication, is another one which will affect, if not already, the fate of AACR 2. Ironically, the author and publisher of this book are those who produced

AACR 2 viz., Michael Gorman and American Library Association respectively. To justify its creation, it is said that :

....its (i.e., *AACR 2)* very thoroughness limits its usefulness where the material to be catalogued is less complicated or where only the operative principles of the Code must be grasped. ...cataloguers will recognize that most of their questions can be answered by a simpler version of the *Rules. The Concise AACR 2* was designed for that purpose. It emphasizes essential principles, dropping separate treatment by medium and the less frequently used rules. In many cases it simplifies the wording of rules while often giving additional explanation. *The Concise AACR 2* should be consulted first when problems occur ... (and) if it cannot provide the answer the complete version may be used [119].

Though creators of AACR 2 must be commended for their objectivity in admitting these inbuilt weaknesses of the rules yet the above statement needs a very thorough and careful examination not by the cataloguers alone but by the profession as a whole as it will affect us all alike. To me, some implications of this statement are :

(i) To achieve thoroughness, AACR 2 endeavoured to cover "...all the bibliographic situations catalogers are likely to encounter" [120]. The aim behind this exercise was to increase its usefulness to all types of libraries irrespective of their size, types of material etc. Contrary to expectations, it became not only too detailed and complex but incomprehensible for many also. To ensure its increasing rather than diminishing usefulness for its users, a slimmer but simpler and easily comprehensible substitute was inevitable.

(ii) Most of the public and academic (college and school) libraries in USA and elsewhere are similar in size and often their acquired "material to be cataloged is less complicated". As such, perhaps they need a concise but simpler version of the rules. To them, AACR 2 contains much more rules than they need especially so when most of the complicated "bibliographic situations" listed therein may never be encountered by them. Perhaps, that is why such users are

coaxed to "....recognize that most of their questions can be answered by a simpler version of the Rules." In other words, it has been realized that AACR 2 has failed to meet the demands of the small libraries and it requires appropriate surgery to cut it down to a size and shape, which can satisfactorily meet such small libraries' cataloging needs.

(iii) The complete version of AACR 2 is also considered to have limited use for teachers and students of cataloging because teaching of cataloging is regarded to comprise only of teaching of "operative principles" of the code by the teachers to the students and whom they have to grasp. If cataloging could be learnt by grasping the "operative principles" of the Code only, then there would have been no dearth of instant catalogers in the field. Furthermore, its an undeniable fact that most of us after graduation from Library Schools have not either learnt or got the chance to learn further than what we had already studied about the subject in Library Schools. As such, if we are ever put into a situation where to catalog the material more in depth knowledge than just mere grasp of "operative principles" of the code would be required, than either faulty processing or complete failure of the professional is assured. Who is to be held responsible for such a situation — certainly not the teachers of cataloging but the preachers of teaching cataloging which ends with grasping of "operative principles" of the code by the students.

Also if AACR 2, having 620 pages is considered a formidable work for teaching then *The Concise AACR 2* with 176 pages is not less formidable either.

(iv) The most serious implications of the statement is the prescription of *The Concise AACR 2* as a prerequisite to use AACR 2. In other words, once again we have "Twins by fiat of ALA" in which one *(The Concise AACR 2)* emphasizes brevity and simplicity and one (AACR 2) thoroughness and complexity. The appearance of this publication, i.e., *The Concise AACR 2* confirms the observation of Simonton that ".... The Anglo-American cataloguing world has not yet been able to produce a code capable of being applied without benefit of a considerable body of supplementary commentary" [121].

This story of post-implementation scene is not complete unless we know how the libraries have fared with AACR 2 during the first two years of its implementation. The summer 1981 issue of *Bookmark* — "AACR 2 and New York Library" has thrown some light on this aspect. Some authors have praised AACR 2 and others have criticised it. Similarly, the impact of AACR 2 on various aspects of library operations and services such as staff training and familiarization with new rules and catalogs, filing procedures, inter-library loan effectiveness have also been described. Finally, Jones have summed up this experience as :

> AACR 2 has made us ponder our service function, the nature of the card catalog, and the problems of managing change. Perhaps it hasn't been such a bad exercise after all [122].

CONCLUSION

"The history of cataloging is exceptional in that it is endlessly repetitive. Each generation rethinks and reformulates the same basic problems, reframing them in new context and restating them in new terminology" [123]. AACR 2 is certainly another example of this hard fact of history. Its progressive implementation is going to bring a definite change — a radical one in the field. Probably, this radicalism will bring in 1980's, with due apology to Osborn, a second "crisis in cataloging", the uproar of which we have already started to experience.

REFERENCES

[1] American Library Association. Catalog Rules: Author and Title Entries. American ed. Chicago: 1908.

[2] Margaret F. Maxwell. The Genesis of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. Libri 27 (1977), 239-240.

[3] Ibid., p.238.

[4] Charles C. Jewett.Smithsonian Report on the Construction of Catalogues of Libraries, and of a General Catalogue and their Publication by means of separate, stereotyped titles, with rules and examples. Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1852.

[5] Kathryn L. Henderson. Treated with a degree of uniformity and common sense: Descriptive cataloging in the United States, 1876-1975. Library Trends 24 (July 1976), 229.

[6] American Library Association, Cooperation Committee. Condensed rules for author and title catalog. Library Journal 8 (Sept/Oct 1883), 251-254.

[7] Charles A. Cutter. Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalog (U.S. Bureau of Education, Public Libraries in the United States of America, Part 2) Washington: Govt. Print. Off., 1876.

[8] American Library Association. Cooperation Committee. ALA Rules — Advance Edition: Condensed rules for an author and title catalog (revised by the Advisory Catalog Committee, 1902). Washington: Govt. Print. Off., Library Division, 1902.

[9] K G B Bakewell. A Manual of Cataloguing Practice Oxford, Pergmon, 1972, p.31.

[10] John Horner. Cataloguing. London: Assoc. of Assis. Librarians, 1970, p.66.

[11] Terry M. Heisey. Early Catalog Code Development in the United States, 1876-1908. The Journal of Library History, 11(1976), 225.

[12] Bakewell, op.cit., p.31.

[13] Henderson, op.cit., p.231.

[14] Maxwell, op.cit., p.240.

[15] AA Code 1908, op.cit., p.viii.

[16] C.D. Needham. Organizing Knowledge in Libraries. London: Andre Deutsch, 1964, p.16.

[17] Bakewell, op.cit.

[18] Maxwell, op.cit.,

[19] Horner, op.cit., p.67.

[20] S R Ranganathan. Classified Catalogue Code. New Delhi: Asia, 1964. p.17.

[21] Bakewell, op.cit., p.32.

[22] American Library Association. Catalog Code Revision Committee. A L A Catalog Rules: Author and title entries. Preliminary American Edition. Chicago: American Library Association, 1941.

[23] J C M Hanson. Revision of ALA Cataloging Rules. Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook, 3(1932), 7-19.

[24] Catalogers' and Classifiers' Yearbook, 3(1932), 20-29.

[25] ALA 1941, op.cit., p.viii.

[26] Library Journal. 61 (Apr.15, 1936), 306-308.

[27] ALA 1941, op.cit., p.viii.

[28] ALA. Catalog Section. Proceedings, Oct 17 and 19 1933, Chicago. Unpublished, p.15.

[29] ALA 1941, op.cit., p.ix-x.

[30] J W Acomb. Communication to the Secretary ALA, August 22, 1936. Unpublished.

[31] ALA 1941, op.cit., p.xii.

[32] American Library Association. Division of Cataloging and Classification. ALA Cataloging Rules for Author and Title entries. 2nd ed. Chicago: ALA, 1949.

[33] Library of Congress. Rules for Descriptive Cataloging in the Library of Congress. Washington, 1949.

[34] A D Osborn. The crisis in cataloging. Library Quarterly, 11 (Oct 1941), 393-411.

[35] Paul S Dunkin. Criticism of Current Cataloging Practice. In Ruth F Strout, ed. Toward a Better Cataloging Code. Chicago: Univ of Chicago,1957, p.36.

[36] Eric J Hunter. Cataloging: A Guidebook. London: Clive Bingley, 1974, p.71.

[37] Osborn, op.cit.

[38] ALA. Committee on the Use of ALA Catalog Code Memo to the Members. Jan 16, 1942. Unpublished

[39] Dunkin, op.cit., p.38.

[40] Hunter, op.cit., p.73.

[41] Bakewell, op.cit., p.35.

[42] A D Osborn. ALA Rules for Author and Title entries. Library Journal. 74 (July 1949), 1012-13.
———— Review of the LC 1949 Code. Library Journal. 75 (1950), 763-764.

[43] J H Shera. Review of the 1949 Code. Library Quarterly. 20 (Apr 1950), 147-150.

[44] L Jolley. Some Recent Developments in Cataloguing in the USA. Journal of Documentation, 6(June 1950), 70-82.

[45] ———— The Principles of Cataloguing. New York: Philosophical Library. 1961, p.3.

[46] ALA 1949, op.cit., p.xx.

[47] Jolley, op.cit., p.76.

[48] Ibid., p.77.

[49] S R Rangarathan. Heading and Canons: Comparative study of five catalogue codes. London: G Blunt, 1955, p.17.

[50] American Library Association. Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. North American Text. Chicago, ALA, 1967.

[51] S Lubetzky. Cataloging Rules and Principles. Washington: Library of Congress, 1953.

[52] Hunter, op.cit., p.74.

[53] L Jolley. Review of Seymour Lubetzky's Cataloging Rules and Principles. Journal of Documentation. 10 (June 1954), p.78.

[54] Marie L. Prevost. Lubetzky Report. Harbinger of Hope. Journal of Cataloging and Classification. 9 (Apr 1954), 73-76.

[55] ALA. Committee of Catalog Code Revision. Catalog Code Revision. Journal of Cataloging and Classification. 12 (1956), 103-107.

[56] S Lubetzky. Code of Cataloging Rules: Bibliographic Entry and Description, A Partial and Tentative Draft. N.P., 1958.

[57] Fundamentals of Cataloging. Institute of Catalog Code Revision, McGill University, 1960. Working paper.

[58] Ibid.

[59] Horner, op.cit., p.79.

[60] Ranganathan, op.cit., p.263.

[61] ————. International Catalogue Code. Annals of Library Science. 6 (Mar 1959), 13-20.

[62] International Conference on Cataloging Principles, Paris, 1961. Report. London, 1963.

[63] A H Chaplin. International Conference on Cataloging Principles: Organization. Journal of Documentation, 19 (June 1963) 41-46.

[64] L Jolley ICCP: Thought after Paris. Journal of Documentation, 19 (June 1963) 47-62.

[65] M Gorman. Changes in Cataloging Codes: Rules for Entry and Heading. Library Trends, 25 (Jan 1977) 595.

[66] A H Chaplin. Cataloging Principles: Five Years after the Paris Conference. Unesco Bulletin for Libraries. 21 (May/June 1967) 140-145.

[67] ————. Names of Persons. IFLA, 1967.

[68] Suzanne Honore. International List of Approved forms of Catalog Entries for the Names of States. Paris: IFLA, 1964.

[69] Oger Pierrot. International List of Uniform Headings for Annonymous Classics, Paris: IFLA, 1964.

[70] Paul Dunkin. Catalog Code Revision. LRTS. 7(Spring 1963) 207.

[71] Lucile M Morsch. An Incubus and Hindrance. LRTS. 11 (Fall 1967) 409-414.

[72] S Lubetzky. Catalog Code Revision 1964. Library Journal. 89 (1964) 4863-4865.

[73] F Bernice Field. The New Catalog Code.... Lib Res Tech Serv., 10 (1966) 421-436.

[74] M Gorman. AA-1967: The New Cataloguing Rules. Library Assoc. Rec 70 (1968) 27-32.

[75] J C Downing. Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (1967): An Appraisal. Educ Libr Bull 35 (Summer 1969) 37-51.

[76] D Anderson. Future of AACR in the Light of UBC Lib Res Tech Serv 20 (Winter 1976) 3-15.

[77] M Gorman. A Study of the Rules for Entry and Heading in AACR, 1967. British Text. London Library Association, 1968.

[78] S R Ranganathan and G Bhattacharya. Conflict of Authorship. Lib Science Documentation 6 (March 1969) 39-51.

[79] Ibid. 6 (June 1969) 116-129.

[80] Ibid 7 (June 1970) 115-178.

[81] Ibid 8 (June 1971) 171-180.

[82] Ranganathan, op.cit.

[83] P B Mangla and J L Sardana. Corporate Author: A Comparative Study of Rules in CCC and AACR, 1967. IASLIC Bull 13 (June 1968) 149-163.

[84] Horner, op.cit., p 87.

[85] Application of the AACR at the Library of Congress. Cataloging Service Bull 79 (Jan 1967) 1.

[86] Cataloging Rules — Additions and Changes. Cataloging Service Bull 81 (Sept 1967) 1-2.

[87] William J Welsh. The Processing Department of the Library of Congress in 1968. Lib Res Tech Serv 13 (Spring 1969) 175-197.

[88] Danger —— Code Erosion? Catalogue and Index. 14 (Apr 1969) 1.

[89] Cataloging Rules —— Additions and Changes. Cataloging Service Bull 104 (May 1972) 4.

[90] ——. Ibid. 112 (1975) 1.

[91] ALA. AACR, 1967: North American Text: Chapter 6: Rules for Description. Chicago: ALA, 1974.

[92] ALA. AACR, 1967: North American Text: Chapter 12: Audiovisual Media... Chicago: ALA, 1975.

[93] ALA. AACR, 1967: North American Text: Chapter 14: Sound Recordings. Chicago: ALA, 1976.

[94] L M Chan. Years' Work in Cataloging and Classification 1973. Lib Res Tech Serv. 18 (Spring 1974) 109.

[95] J E Daily. Phrased in Interview, August, 1979.

[96] Caron R Kelm. The Historical Development of the Second Edition of the AACR. Lib Res Tech Serv. 22 (Winter 1978) 22-33.

[97] M Gorman. The Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. Second Edition. Lib Res Tech Serv. 22 (Summer 1978) 209-226.

[98] ——. Changes in Cataloging Codes : Rules for Entry and Heading. Library Trends. 26 (Jan 1977) 587-601.

[99] Eva Verona. Corporate Headings....London. IFLA, 1975.

[100] Gorman, op.cit.

[101] Catalogue and Index. 16 (1969) 1.

[102] Ibid. 18 (1970), 13.

[103] Ranganathan, op.cit. p.51.

[104] R M Dougherty. Closing the Card Catalog. In Freezing Card Catalogs. Washington: Assoc. of Research Libraries, 1978, p.2.

[105] Joe A Hewitt and David E Gleim. Adopting AACR 2: The Case for not closing the Catalog. American Libraries. 10 (March 1979).

[106] Ibid.

[107] Ranganathan, op.cit., p 71-73.

[108] Gorman, op.cit., p.210.

[109] Ibid.

[110] Susan Martin. An Odd Couple — AACR 2 and Automation. American Libraries. 9 (December 1978) 689-691.

[111] Gorman, op.cit.

[112] Joe Leiter. American Libraries. 9 (1978) 450a.

[113] M Gorman. American Libraries. 9 (Nov 1978) 626b.

[114] ————. New Rules for New Systems. American Libraries. 13 (April 1982) 241.

[115] Library of Congress. Rule Interpretations for AACR 2. Cataloging Service Bulletin. 6 (1979) 8-26.

[116] Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR. Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. 2nd edition: Revisions. Chicago: ALA, 1982.

[117] M Gorman. The Concise AACR 2. Chicago: ALA, 1981.

[118] J A Shinebourne. A Critique of AACR. Libri. 29 (1979) 231.

[119] Advertisement. Library Resources and Technical Services. 25 (July/September 1981) 344.

[120] Ibid.

[121] Wesley Simonton. AACR 2: Antecedents, Assumptions, Implementation: Advances in Librarianship. 10 (1980) 34.

[122] [Quoted]. American Libraries. 13 (January 1982) 99b.

[123] Editorial. Australian Library Journal. 23 (April 1974) 89.