

considers the mass of boresome printed materials which he must have had to comb through to come up with the significant items in this extremely important but, to most of us, terribly boring phase of library buildings, too much thanks would be impossible. The editors again have selected the best man for the subject, one who is patient, tireless, and yet enthusiastic. Again, one hardly knows who to criticize for the misleading title, but it is inconceivable that Louis Kaplan thought he was writing on shelving and then turned out such a fine section on storage.

The third part (52 pages) of the book on storage warehouses is by Jerrold Orne, and, for a change, it is on storage warehouses, which he covers both extensively and intensively. The readers of *CRL* saw a large portion of this study in the November 1960 issue of this journal under the title, "Storage and Deposit Libraries."

Because of this fact, comments here will be more limited than on the other two parts. Orne's use and treatment of the literature in order to reveal the current state of the

art have already been evaluated by most of us. Actually, this reviewer thinks he did his customarily fine and scholarly job, but his proposal as to how the problem of storage ought to be approached basically is much better substantiated and appears much more logical when read in its fuller form. Oddly enough, although Orne seems to have been able to adapt himself to the *handbuch* method even better than Ellsworth and Kaplan, he takes off further in flight in the recommendation not only for areas of needed research but in proposing possible solutions. He does this, however, in the section of his part where this is permissible, for each of the three have a section which deals with "targets [or directions] for research." The Council on Library Resources, it seems to me, should be quite pleased with the sections all three authors have under this "Targets . . ." heading. Kaplan's suggestions are most sound; Orne's are, as already stated, even more sweeping than we had expected; and, of course, in Ellsworth the profession has one of its truly great imaginations.—*William H. Jesse, University of Tennessee Libraries.*

Comment

Classification and Indexing

We are by now so accustomed to Mortimer Taube's ill-informed and splenetic outbursts that we usually ignore them. The farrago of misrepresentations and nonsense statements masquerading as a review of Vickery's *Classification and Indexing in Science* is such an extreme example, however, that it calls for a mild corrective.

I will try to keep this short, but to explain all the points I have marked would require many pages. First of all, I must say that not only are we in Europe aware of the value of American intellectual contributions, but that the whole point of Vickery's work is to increase our awareness; naturally, we also hope that his book will have a two-way effect.

It is clear that Mr. Taube neither under-

stands nor intends to understand the "facet analysis" type of classification; no doubt he thinks he is the only one entitled to coin new terms. He writes of the "general lack of impact of Ranganathan's work on librarianship, outside of India." Ranganathan's work is known and appreciated all over the world. He has visited the U.S.A. several times, and during the last two years has—in his late sixties—visited the U.S.A., U.K., Brazil, France, Germany, Poland, Russia, and Japan; at least four of these countries by invitation. Where has Mr. Taube been during this time? Mr. Ranganathan is a vice-president of both IFLA and FID, and a member of the editorial boards of *Libri* and of *American Documentation*. These are only a few examples of his "lack of impact."

To discredit an opponent ascribe to him a ridiculous statement that he did not make. Mr. Taube does this very well. Mr. Vickery

does *not* admit (p. 421) that his chapter "defies comprehension." He does *not* "sum up as follows: . . ." What he does is to make the statement quoted by Mr. Taube and then give a summarized version which is perfectly clear to anyone who knows anything about recent work on classification. Mr. Vickery does *not* add "that the whole problem demands further study." What he says is: "As well as the scheduled terms whose relations are indicated by the categories to which they belong, a number of specifically relational terms—*phase relations*—are also needed, which demand further study." He does *not* claim that chain indexing "solves both the problem of multiple place classification systems and permutations of indexing terms." It is certainly one method of doing this, but we are all too well aware that it is not a final solution. Taube says its utility "remains doubtful" but offers no reasons or evidence.

These are a few examples of categorical statements that simply cannot be substantiated. Several others could be given. The Classification Research Group, unlike Mortimer Taube, realises only too well that it has not discovered the ultimate truths about classification and indexing. Its work has had useful results in several countries, at a cost

probably not exceeding one week's cost of one literature searching machine (one of the cheaper ones). We do not expect to be treated with any special reverence; in fact, much of our most useful work has resulted from informed criticism. This is true of any school of thought. Surely we are entitled to expect a reviewer in a scholarly journal to pay attention to the facts and not to use his space simply as a chance for parading his own ignorant bombast?—*D. J. Foskett, Institute of Education, University of London.*

Dr. Taube replied as follows:

Mr. Foskett has lost his temper and has failed to reply to the major points in the review. It remains the case that Ranganathan, who is certainly an outstanding figure in world librarianship, has had little impact on practical library operations outside of India, and it also remains the case that Vickery's book and the work of the Classification Research Group in England represent "an anti-scientific obscurantism which is defending tradition against scientific and logical advance."—*Mortimer Taube, Documentation Incorporated.*

Official Gazetteers Listed

The New York Public Library has issued a list of the official gazettes which have been microfilmed during the first six months of a special project. The list is arranged by country, gives the dates covered, the number of feet of film and the price. Thus far, the project covers one hundred and thirty-five national, provincial, and municipal jurisdictions. The gazettes have been assembled and filmed in such a way that independent sections such as proceedings of legislative bodies, patents and trade marks, trade bulletins, subsidiary legislative documents, and departmental reports may be purchased in many instances. The gazette project at The New York Public Library was suggested by the Association of Research Libraries. Requests for the list of films now available and other inquiries should be addressed to the Photographic Service Division, The New York Public Library, 5th Avenue and 42nd Street, New York 18, New York.