Studies in Creative Partnership examines the uses to which federal aid generated by the period of the Great Depression was put in the public libraries of seven major American cities: Baltimore, Cleveland, Chicago, New York, Milwaukee, Minneapolis, and San Francisco. The federal agencies responsible for the sudden infusion of hundreds of newly employed workers into these civic libraries were all created from President Roosevelt's New Deal legislation: the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA); the Civil Works Administration (CWA); and the most well known of the agencies, the Works Progress Administration (WPA). Established in 1935, the WPA provided funds for library personnel to maintain and repair buildings, bind and mend books, serve in clerical and other paraprofessional posts, and provide support for large-scale bibliographical projects, such as union catalogs, which would probably not have been undertaken without additional help.

Unlike Edward B. Stanford's monograph, Library Extension under the W.P.A., which analyzed the national distribution of funds and examined their use at the state level, this anthology concentrates its attention at the grass-roots level of government. Its contributors have scrutinized local records to determine what the various projects were and to evaluate their utility and long-term success. As might be expected, the results were uneven. Chicago, for example, forged ahead with the production of major catalogs and bibliographies, while San Francisco, under a rather lackluster librarian, hired workers to perform as clerks, bookbinders, and typists. Libraries also showed variety in the ways in which WPA workers were integrated with the permanent staff; employee unrest characterized Baltimore's Enoch Pratt Free Library, while the New York Public Library's use of additional personnel appears to have gone smoothly. No doubt because of the paucity of records, this anthology heavily stresses the institutional response to the WPA program; little presumably remains attesting to reactions of the federally paid employees to their new work environment. As Fay Blake poignantly observes, "For San Francisco Public Library the Works Project Administration provided a steady, if unspectacular, source of assistance and support. For the people whose livelihood the Agency ensured it meant more."

This anthology is helpful in broadening our knowledge of early programs of federal assistance in the seven libraries selected for study, but the relationship of these forms of grants activity to the larger issues soon to occupy the nation's public libraries in their search for federal aid is largely untouched. This lack of connection somewhat limits the book as a source for an understanding of the role of public libraries on the public policy agenda.—R. Kathleen Molz, Columbia University, New York City.


Closing the Catalog is more than a frank and comprehensive evaluation of the pros and cons of closing a catalog. This record of two Library and Information Technology Association (LITA) institutes offers an engaging philosophical discussion of the purposes of a library catalog and the future of bibliographic access. In addition to very practical treatises on closing the catalog at the New York Public Library, the New York State Library, the University of Toronto, and LC, this volume contains articles on such topics as the process of planning for the bibliographic future; the impact of closing on library organization and on reference services; past and present research that could affect library catalog design; and opening the catalog, i.e., making the catalog more relevant, sensitive, and timely for the library user. Although some would argue that the topic of this work makes it automatically out of date, the content of the presentations would belie any such claim.

If there is one message that this work emphasizes, it is that the adoption of AACR2 by itself is insufficient reason for closing a catalog. Despite dire consequences—loss of continuity, indefinite creation
Methods, practices, concepts and theories of the best minds of business... access to facts, figures and theories in the fields of management science, economics, finance, banking and law... labor relations, personnel policies, real estate and insurance... government, taxes, taxation and regulations... advertising, marketing, telecommunications and data processing... such information and more is available and accessible in a matter of minutes! The source is the online-accessible database called
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Call toll-free . . . 800/626-2823 . . . or return the coupon for complete information about this continually updated storehouse of information for business. If you want to learn more about online, request our free and informative booklet, *Getting Acquainted With Online*.
of two catalogs, premature use of technology and professionals, and a "new era of dependence on LC"—Paul Fasana, who gave the keynote address, elects for closing the catalog because of AACR2 and LC's response to AACR2. Seymour Lubetzky contends that "a scarred catalog is vastly preferable to a dismembered one." Joseph A. Rosenthal discusses the process of planning itself, and its benefits and drawbacks. In planning for the bibliographic future, he argues persuasively that staff should be widely involved, but at the same time he indicates that it is important to be speedy and forceful, and to include statistical verification when presenting a case. Frederick Kilgour notes, "to be sure, implementation of AACR2 will not produce economic catastrophe but, on the other hand, it will not improve the economics of libraries." Edward Shaw views the closing of the catalog as a symbol of the end of one epoch and the beginning of another. Peter Paulson points out that opportunities to exploit new technology are the soundest reason for closing a catalog. Allen Hogden and Valentine DeBruin provide detailed case histories of closings at the New York Public Library and the University of Toronto. Susan L. Miller gives a thorough description of the Library Control System (LCS), which, with its enhancements, is becoming Ohio State University's online catalog. Michael Gorman speaks of the card catalog as the "Bibliographic Maginot Line," and maintains that mechanization and standardization are the only future course for cataloging. Carole Weiss believes the most significant reason for closing is the "desirability of taking advantage of new computer technology to provide better information retrieval." She and Pauline Atherton both summarize F. W. Lancaster's findings on catalog use studies. Atherton provides an excellent comparison of the advantages and disadvantages of card catalogs, COM, and online catalogs, plus an extensive bibliography of catalog use studies. Hugh Atkinson presents his theories on the effects the death of the catalog will have on library organization. He foresees smaller units that will participate in technical service and public service functions simultaneously. Lucia Rather, after describing the history of LC's decision on closing, offers three scenarios: (1) if a library needs to close its catalog and has plans for a viable alternative, the catalog should be closed preferably at the time AACR2 is adopted; (2) if a library feels the need to close and has no ready alternative, the catalog should be closed with the adoption of AACR2 and a temporary new card catalog begun; (3) if a library has no other need to close its existing card catalog (space is not a problem, filing staff is adequate, etc.), the card catalog should not be closed simply to accommodate new rules. She notes that "the most important step to be taken is to begin to plan for change." John G. Lorenz' presentation follows Rather's and describes ARL's program to study the costs of closing. (The King Research Program has since been finished and its conclusions published.)

Two articles by Sanford Berman and Maurice Freedman are perhaps the most interesting because they both challenge the assumptions of the previous presentations and argue for more creative cataloging that meets local needs. Their concern is
that libraries will run, as Freedman puts it, "lemming-like to follow the de facto national library's practices or support their bibliographic utility's practices . . ." Like most of the authors, they argue strongly for rigorous authority control as an essential element of good cataloging.

In his closing remarks S. Michael Maliconico is equally critical of the rush to close. He also questions the benefits libraries will derive from AACR2 when machine searching is capable of rendering moot many of the questions of choice and form of entry. Perhaps AACR2's most lasting benefit will be as a catalyst to change.

This work is a provocative one, well worth its cost. This brief review necessarily telescopes much of the commentary by these cataloging experts, and this reviewer strongly urges that libraries purchase this title and librarians read it.—Frederick C. Lynden, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.


The Making of a Code gathers papers presented at the International Conference on AACR2 held March 11–14, 1979, in Tallahassee, Florida. Objectives of the conference were: (1) to provide librarians with an opportunity for dialogue with the individuals directly responsible for the revision of AACR; (2) to provide an opportunity for individuals to discuss the various rule changes and thus gain a better insight into the theory behind the rules; (3) to provide an opportunity for individuals to exchange ideas about the code to increase their understanding of the impact of the code on library operations and user expectations; and (4) to explore avenues for implementation. The majority of the papers, particularly in part 2, "Description," part 3, "Access Points," and part 4, "Looking beyond the Rules," do not provide new insights into the interpretation of use of the code or even the background of the code development for the most part. A notable exception is "Examining the 'Main' in Main Entry Headings" by Elizabeth L. Tate, who addresses the fundamental concept of the role of the main entry in cataloging, tracing the development of the main entry (as reflected in an author-unit-entry) over the past 130 years. Tate investigates three questions: (1) Is the author-unit-entry more efficient than the title-unit-entry as far as the user is concerned or vice versa? (2) Is either method demonstrably more or less costly? (3) Is either type of cataloging more or less suitable for international exchange of cataloging data? Although she can answer only the last question with any degree of certainty (the title-unit-entry appears to be more amenable to effective international exchange of bibliographic data in her opinion), she touches on questions of catalog use studies, work-flow analyses, and other studies as part of her examination of the still unsettled controversy.

It is in part 1, "Generalities," however, that the most interesting presentations appear. In "The Fundamentals of Bibliographic Cataloging and AACR2," Seymour Lubetzky points out that the attempts of the authors of AACR2 to reconcile widely divergent opinions and objectives has resulted in a "compromise unsusceptible to a coherent ideology based on the requirements of a sound catalog designed to serve the users of the library." Despite praise for the craftsmanship of the new code, Lubetzky identifies three decisions made during its development that have compromised the integrity of AACR: first, a compromise on the issue of main entry that blurs the primary objective of the catalog as first set forward by Panizzi; second, the abandonment of the principle of corporate authorship; and third, the resulting inadequacy of the treatment of serials in AACR2. Lubetzky reminds us of Panizzi's critics, who looked at a catalog primarily as a finding list rather than as a device that could also in its structure reflect the relationships of works and editions to one another, thus providing the catalog user with more information than simply that needed for identification of a specific item. The collocating function of a catalog that in-