proach to many accepted practices is welcome. The seventy-six pages of appendixes add little to the informational value of this work. In fact the community-college profiles of the site-visit locations are so brief they appear bland.

In total, the book is a good survey of current practice. It is an acceptable resource in the field and should be viewed by information practitioners inside and outside of the community college. Many inferences to the profession as a whole can be gained.—*Judith Sessions, Mt. Vernon College, Washington, D.C.*

Boss, Richard W., and Marcum, Deanna B. **"The Library Catalog: COM and On-Line Options."** *Library Technology Reports* (September–October 1980). Chicago: American Library Assn., 1980. 114p. $40 single issue. ISSN 0024-2586.

Because many libraries, large and small alike, are currently planning or implementing COM or online catalogs, a *Library Technology Reports* on the subject seems particularly timely. This survey was conducted in mid-1980 and is fundamentally sound and helpful despite some errors and omissions.

Like most *LTR*s this one includes both general theory/practice sections as well as evaluations of specific vendors and their products. Although to those with considerable expertise, the theoretical sections may appear to contain little new information, they are nonetheless lucid and relevant and have the advantage of being available in a single, well-organized volume. "Characteristics of an Ideal Catalog," "Questions about COM Catalogs," "Elements in the Design of an On-Line Catalog," and "A Possible Course of Action" are of particular interest. The bibliography could be longer but serves as a useful guide to the tip of an emerging iceberg.

Because it reflects the expertise and biases of its authors, the report is slanted toward turnkey systems at the expense of other services provided by commercial vendors and those of bibliographic utilities. As a case in point, the introduction contains a list of advantages of the turnkey approach but fails to suggest shortcomings.

It should also be noted that "Evaluation of COM Catalogs" focuses on a few well-known reports while failing to even cite dozens of other valuable articles. Likewise, "Other On-Line Catalog Planning" overlooks the vital work performed at Ohio State University, University of Illinois, Washington Library Network, et al.

On the practical side, the contention that COM is not economically viable for collections of under 25,000 titles may not ring true to the many smaller libraries that use COM cooperatively for both local catalogs and resource sharing. With the introduction of roll fiche and the enhanced storage of the ROM IV and Dual Track mechanized viewers, the authors' statement that one roll film cannot accommodate more than 100,000 full entries is also refuted. Interestingly, both the Autographics Micromax 800, a pioneering roll-fiche reader, and ROM III are given detailed, positive reviews. (For reviews of other readers and reader-printers consult the March 1980 *LTR*.)

Although the vendor information is generally sound, such statements as "BNA is a relatively new vendor of COM catalogs" (it was one of the first) arouse some suspicion. More troubling is the omission of some vendors, most notably Universal Library Systems of West Vancouver, B.C. Their popular ULISYS system has been used as the basis of an online catalog at Mission College, California, for five years.

In any event this is still a highly recommended guide if used in conjunction with existing literature and information supplied by vendors, utilities, and informed colleagues.—*James R. Dwyer, University of Oregon, Eugene.*

American Library Association. Resources and Technical Services Division. Filing Committee. *ALA Filing Rules.* Chicago: American Library Assn., 1980. 50p. $3.50. LC 80-22186. ISBN 0-8389-3255-X.

United States. Library of Congress. Processing Services. *Library of Congress Filing Rules.* Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1980. 111p. $5.00. LC 80-607944. ISBN 0-8444-0347-4.

Both the American Library Association and the Library of Congress recently issued new filing rules after almost a decade of thoughtful and educated work, especially by John C. Rather and Joseph A. Rosenthal.

The two sets of rules have many similarities, including the same ancestor:

John C. Rather's *Filing Arrangement in the Library of Congress Catalogs* (Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1971). Both depart to some degree from Rather and from each other as well. Both have fewer rules than their own previous editions; in both, exceptions are reduced; options are fewer; and both more nearly approach the concept of file "as-is" instead of the hopeless "as-if" technique now often the case. Their similarities can be illustrated by the "principle" (LC) or "objective" (ALA) that "emphasizes" (LC and ALA) the way "a heading looks" (LC) or "character strings look" (ALA) rather than the way they sound: "The inconvenience of having sometimes to look in two places is outweighed by the fact that no special linguistic knowledge is required to find a numeral or an abbreviation when its printed form is known" (LC, p.4 *and* ALA, p.2).

Both rules tend to ignore punctuation as an organizational factor in filing, a decision that is a major change and a user-oriented improvement. In both cases language is new and more direct. Both have one major set of rules for filing order or the order of characters, with subrules for special cases; and one second set of rules for such things as abbreviations, initial articles, initials, acronyms, romanized letters, and numbers, with the largest emphasis on the special arrangement of numbers. Most numbers, except dates in headings that are arranged chronologically, file before any letters and in number order. Both sets file modified letters using plain English equivalents, and both generally ignore signs and symbols.

Some differences, of course, do exist. The LC rules are more complex, retaining some of the hierarchical arrangements currently found. The hierarchical concept is also present in subarrangements, thus continuing many present difficulties for filers and library patrons. LC's position is that, in larger files, the hierarchical structure makes catalog use easier. (What about smaller files?) The ALA rules eliminate almost all of these arrangements. The LC rules still retain the differentiations, among others, of persons, places, things, and titles. This differentiation in particular is absent in the ALA rules. Subscript and superscript numbers are treated differently in the two rules, with the two sorts of numbers being treated differently in the LC rules themselves.

The differences are less important than the similarities. The rules have appeared in new editions at the same time, with the same emphasis on revision. Clearly, cooperation existed in their development, and whichever set of rules is used, library catalogs will be much more alike than they are now. Libraries using the ALA rules as the basic ones could turn to the LC rules as a source for solutions to more complex problems. The relationship is somewhat similar to that between the concise *AACR2* (available in 1981) and the full *AACR2*.

The ALA rules are neatly and clearly printed. They are also carefully edited; typographical errors seem to be absent. Some questions may arise with clarity, for example, in discussing commas and periods in numbers. The LC rules are produced from typescript that contains a few problems such as the left margin on page 9. Special characters, signs and symbols, some accent marks, key signatures, and subscript and superscript numbers need to be more carefully done, if only for appearance. In the LC rules, one of the principles, as stated on page 5, is to use "no-order" filing for title main and added entries that are similar or the same as other titles, without providing or considering other information. Why, then, in the examples on page 20, is "Journal of education (Easton, Pa.)" included as a uniform title, and why is the journal title differentiated by a place of publication?

Pre-*AACR2* cataloging rules resulted in entries based on artificial language or on language not found on the pieces being cataloged. These entries were partially responsible for complex filing rules deemed necessary to organize these entries in "logical" order. Logical for whom? Librarians, of course. These entries helped produce the maze that most library catalogs are today, with separate files for different types of entries. When entries are difficult to generate and difficult to file, they are also difficult to locate in catalogs.

The main purpose of *AACR2* is to create entries that are in real language, language that will be known by and sought for by library users. Both sets of new filing rules will place these entries where users are more likely to look in catalogs. These rules are far more natural than previous editions. Using

them will make filing easier, a minor point, and make the cards, and consequently library materials, easier to locate. And that is the major point to both of these new codes of filing rules.—*Neal L. Edgar, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio.*

Archivists and Machine-Readable Records. Proceedings of the Conference on Archival Management of Machine-Readable Records, February 7–10, 1979, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Ed. by Carolyn L. Geda; Erik W. Austin; and Francis X. Blouin. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 1980. 248p. ISBN 0-931828-19-8.

Somewhat belatedly, the archival profession has come to accept the fact that machine-readable records represent unparalleled opportunities, both in practical terms related to the control of archival records and as data for scholarly research. Trained in conventional disciplines employing traditional research methodology, archivists often have been unable to exploit the advantages of automated records or to mitigate effectively the problems they present. Professional awareness and comprehension of the subject have been so slight that a recent issue of the *American Archivist* was devoted in its entirety to "Archivists, Archives, and Computers: A Starting Point." In an effort to provide clear definition of the issues and direction for the future, the Conference on Archival Management of Machine-Readable Records was held in early 1979, under the auspices of the University of Michigan. The present volume, published by the Society of American Archivists, is composed primarily of papers read at that conference.

Divided into thematic chapters, *Archivists and Machine-Readable Records* contain papers concerned with research opportunities of and archival programs for automated records, management and dissemination of machine-readable data for social research, recent developments in computer technology, and the ramifications of automated records upon the rights of confidentiality and privacy. Summary papers also are included, one dealing with implications of automated records for conventional archival procedures and the other with the needs and opportunities for training archivists to be conversant with machine-readable records. Although some of the papers apply to archives in general, for example, those treating privacy legislation, software prospects, and computer-based storage technology, the majority concentrate upon social-science data or various aspects of machine-readable records at the state and national levels. Even so, most of the papers are based on principles sufficiently broad to justify a careful reading by the profession at large.

As with any endeavor of this sort, the quality of the papers varies, but in the main they are well thought out, intelligible to those without expertise in the field of automated records, and mercifully free of computer jargon. In addition, each chapter is prefaced by a useful introduction that serves as a summary of the relevant papers. While *Archivists and Machine-Readable Records* does not answer all the questions it raises and leaves others largely unexplored, for example, the physical preservation of automated records, this is a good primer and deserves a wide audience.—*Sam Streit, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.*