

The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloguing in the
U.S.A.: Its Prosepects in the Early 70's

米国の収書・目録国家計画：70年代初期の展望

Everett T. Moore

エヴェレット・T・ムーア

要 旨

大学・研究図書館は受入図書——特に外国出版物および外国語出版物——の50%以上に対して自館で目録をとることを余儀なくされていた。多くの図書館が同じ図書の目録をとるという無駄な重複が繰り返され、受入図書の急増に伴なって目録作業の遅れがはなはだしくなり始めた。

このような状況の中で制定された1965年の高等教育法、特にその「大学・研究図書館資源の強化」に関する条項は関係者を勇気づけた。同法の施行により、議会図書館は、世界中で出版される学術図書を網羅的に改集し、それらの図書に関する書誌的情報を迅速に提供するために必要な予算を配分されることになった。この計画はNPACと名付けられた。

初年度の1966年には40万ドル、67年には300万ドル、68年には500万ドル、69年には550万ドルの予算が割り当てられた。ジョンソン政権下での70年度予算額は735万6千ドルであったが、ニクソン政権はそれを450万ドルに削減した。

世界中の学術出版物を洩れなくカバーするために、ロンドン、ウィースバーデン、オスロー、ハーグ、パリー、ベルグラード、フローレンス、東京、ウィーンの9都市に目録分担地域センターが開設され、さらに、ナイロビ、リオデジャネイロ、ジャカルタに地域収書オフィスが置かれた。

1969年は9か国の目録分担センターが受け入れた目録情報は222,365エントリー、作成した予備カードは4,793,668枚に及んでいる。東京のセンターは国会図書館から25,426エントリーの目録情報の提供を受け、12,000タイトルの図書を議会図書館に送っている。

NPACのお陰で、アメリカの協力館(89館)が受け入れる図書の70~80%が、議会図書館の提供する目録情報によってカバーされるようになった。この顕著な進歩に感謝しながらも、関係者は現政権による予算削減に神経をとがらせている。

NPACは高等教育法が図書館に与える援助の一つにすぎない。同法は大学・研究図書館の図書購入を直接援助し、図書館員養成のために奨学金を設け、図書館学研究に対しても助成金を支出している。しかしながら、現実に割り当てられる予算額が法でオーソライズされた金額に到達したことは一度もない。しかも、会計年度の初期に予算が配分されない傾向が続いている。

大統領の72年度予算勧告によれば、大学図書館の図書購入助成金は1,500万ドルから500万ドルへ、

Everett T. Moore, Assistant University Librarian, University Research Library, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif., U.S.A.

エヴェレット・T・ムーア：カリフォルニア大学(ロスアンゼルス)研究図書館副館長。

The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloguing in the U.S.A.

図書館員の養成援助は 390 万ドルから 200 万ドルへ削減された。NPAC は幸いにも 661 万ドルから 685 万ドルへと僅かながら増加した。恐らく NPAC が大学・研究図書館に与えている恩恵の重要性が現政権にも認識されたからであろう。

議会図書館が目録情報提供の機械化を計画し、MARC I の名で実験を行ない、その発展として MARC II を実施しているが、この国際的規模をもつ機械化システムを発展させるためには、議会図書館に対して十分な資金が与えられる必要がある。

高等教育の前進のために、大学・研究図書館に対して与えられた連邦政府の援助は感謝に値するが、現在程度の予算配分では、高等教育法の「大学・研究図書館資源の強化」が実現するとは思われない。議会と大統領に対して事の重要性を明らかにするために、関係者は旧に倍する努力を払わねばなるまい。

(I. A.)

In the course of my lectures in Osaka and Tokyo in 1967 on "Academic and Research Libraries," under the auspices of the School of Library and Information Science of Keio University, I spoke of the notable program then being developed in the United States which would establish the Library of Congress as a world-wide acquisitions and cataloguing agent for American libraries. I reported that those of us in academic and research libraries in the United States were much encouraged by the promise of great benefits to come to our libraries under the provisions of the Higher Education Act of 1965—particularly from that section entitled "Strengthening College and Research Library Resources."

For some years, I pointed out, our university libraries had been compelled to provide original cataloguing for more than fifty per cent of our new acquisitions, particularly those from foreign countries and in foreign languages. This was because the Library of Congress had been extremely limited in its funds for acquisition of such materials, and had not been able therefore to provide catalogue copy for many of the books that are of vital importance to other research libraries. These libraries had necessarily been doing their own cataloguing of such materials, and this had resulted in much wasteful duplication of effort across the country. Many university libraries, having to add large numbers of books in many new fields of interest, had fallen seriously behind in this cataloguing of new acquisitions. Linguistically capable cataloguers in various

fields had been hard to find, and most library budgets were not adequate to provide for the kind of expert and highly specialized cataloguing that was required.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 authorized the allocation of funds to the Library of Congress "for the purpose of (1) acquiring, so far as possible, all library materials currently published throughout the world which are of value to scholarship; and (2) providing catalogue information for those materials promptly after receipt, and distributing bibliographic information by printed cards and by other means to use for exchange and other purposes such of these materials as are not needed for its own collections. The program called for improvements in the system of cataloguing in the Library of Congress, particularly through the addition to its staff of linguistically competent specialists in acquisitions and cataloguing. It was expected that definite progress could be made under its provisions toward the automation of bibliographic information, through such programs as MARC (Machine Readable Cataloguing). Under the provisions for development of the Library of Congress's resources, the Library was expected to double its rate of accessions, primarily in foreign language publications, so that catalogue copy could be provided for a much broader spread of library resources in many languages and in many subject areas.

This federal legislation, with the promise it held for the strengthening of our research libraries, was considered to be one of the most

important of all modern library developments in its recognition of the vital place of libraries in the nation's educational life.¹⁾

Our hope was not misplaced, for the results of this legislation have been widely felt in our university and research libraries in the years since 1967 when the program was just getting under way. It had been estimated that as of 1964 the seventy-four major libraries belonging to the Association of Research Libraries spent \$ 18 million annually on cataloguing. These libraries, therefore, working through their Association, and in consultation with officials of the Library of Congress, had drafted legislation for the United States Congress for Title II-C of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for this new *centralized* program for acquisitions and cataloguing.

The initial appropriation of funds by Congress, in 1966, for the program was a modest one, \$ 400,000. \$ 3 million was appropriated in 1967, \$ 5 million in 1968, and \$ 5.5 million in 1969. In 1970, although President Lyndon B. Johnson's budget had included an amount of \$ 7,356,000 for the program, the new administration of President Richard M. Nixon reduced the amount to \$ 4.5 million in its revised budget. This was the first evidendence that the program might not receive as strong support from this administration as it had from the former. Actually, the program had never received the full amounts of funding which had been authorized by the Congressional committees concerned. Now, therefore, even before the program had an opportunity to develop its full potentialities, it was necessary to begin some retrenchment in its undertakings.

Nevertheless, it is important to recognize what has been accomplished in the first four years of the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloguing (NPAC), the official name given to the Library of Congress's program. Mr. Herman Liebaers, Director of the Bibliothèque Royale Albert Ier and President of the International Federation of Libraries (IFLA), has described it as "the most ambitious national project for acquisitions and cataloguing ever known."²⁾ Its aim has been to cover all books

of value to scholarship published throughout the world. Arrangements have been made for collecting bibliographical data through regional shared-cataloguing offices in nine countries, situated in London, Wiesbaden, Oslo, The Hague, Paris, Belgrade, Florence, Tokyo, and Vienna and also through regional acquisitions offices in Nairobi (covering Ethiopia, French Territory of the Afars and Issas, Kenya, Malagasy Republic, Malawi, Mauritius, Réunion, Seychelles, Somali Republic, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia), Rio de Janeiro, and Djakarta.

The Library of Congress cooperates with the agencies responsible for the national bibliographies published in 22 countries in the sharing of cataloguing information. The National Diet Library of Japan, for example, supplies advance cataloguing information for current Japanese publications based on the entries appearing in the weekly bibliography *Nōhon Shūhō*. In 1969, in the shared cataloguing center in Tokyo, 25,426 bibliography entries were received, 12,000 titles were sent to the Library of Congress comprising more than 15,000 pieces. 803,787 preliminary catalogue cards were produced by this center—second only to the number of cards produced by the center in London (1,110,730). In 1969 a total of 222,365 bibliography entries were received and 4,793,668 preliminary cards were produced by the shared cataloguing centers in nine countries.³⁾

In the four years from 1966 to 1969, the NPAC employed about 400 people in various parts of the world, though by 1969 the limited funds available necessitated some reduction in this number. Despite the shortage of language and subject specialist librarians, the Library was able to recruit and train a good number of them to cover the many languages involved.

It has been estimated that by the processing of about 200,000 books received annually from many parts of the world, some 70 to 80 per cent of the needs of participating American libraries are now being met through the NPAC's centralized cataloguing system—this compared with the less than 50 per cent of

The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloguing in the U.S.A.

the needs which the Library of Congress was able to provide before establishment of the program.

Librarians of the eighty-nine university and research libraries which now cooperate with the Library of Congress in the NPAC are of course pleased with the results of the program in this short initial period, for they have been enabled to reproduce for their own catalogues the sets of printed cards received from the Library of Congress and thus to provide full catalogue information for many thousands of books for which they could not have provided original cataloguing. But these librarians are nonetheless becoming apprehensive at the reductions in recent years in the federal government's funding for the several programs of support for libraries authorized under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloguing of Materials by the Library of Congress is, we should remember, only one of a number of programs in support of libraries provided under the Higher Education Act of 1965. The act provided also for direct aid to college and university libraries in the acquisition of library materials, for money for scholarships and fellowships for library training, and for research in librarianship. All of these programs have been affected by the progressive reductions in funding over the past several years. As noted earlier, appropriations for programs included in the Higher Education Act have never equalled the amounts authorized. As Edmon Low has observed, in his article on "Federal Legislation Affecting College and University Libraries,"⁴⁾ a practice developed during the Johnson administration, as war expenses mounted and domestic programs were restricted, whereby budget recommendations by the President and appropriations by the Congress did not provide funding of programs up to the amounts authorized in the acts of Congress. Another trend he has noted is the tendency to delay appropriations until long after the fiscal year has begun, and in the meantime to continue to operate at the

same rate of expenditure in effect at the previous year. Thus President Nixon did not sign the appropriation for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1969-70 until March 9, 1970, when the year was already two-thirds past.

It has been made clear that the present administration does not intend to provide as strong support for education in general as previous administration have. There is evidence that support for libraries does not stand in as strong a position relatively as that for other educational programs. Reduction of funds for books and other materials for college and university libraries has been greater proportionately than for funding for other aspects of library activity. As Mr. Low points out, in the HEW appropriation bill for 1969-70 (which we have noted was not signed until March of 1970) appropriations for the Library Services and Construction Act (for aid to public libraries) were reduced by the President by 15 per cent, but those for college and University libraries were reduced by 53 per cent. Similar reductions for the 1970-71 budget were announced, in the President's 1971-72 budget requests, he has recommended even greater reductions, and this time they are applied to programs for school library resources and instructional materials, for public library services and construction, and for interlibrary cooperation, as well as for college and university library resources, library training, and library research.

Librarians recall the statements made early in the present administration by representatives of the Executive branch that books and libraries would have a low priority in this administration. In partial justification for this position, representatives of the administration point out that reduction in federal funding for these functions are in keeping with the administration's objective of withdrawing massive support by the federal government for many services and returning more of the responsibility to state and local governments.

Relatively speaking, the prospects for continued support of the National Program for

Acquisitions and Cataloguing are better than for other library programs—and, particularly, better than for the other programs authorized by the Higher Education Act. The President's budget recommendation for 1972 calls for cutting the amounts for college and university library resources from \$15 million to \$5 million, and for library training from \$3.9 million to \$2 million; but recommends increasing the amount for library research from 2.1 million to \$3 million. An increase in support for "LC acquisition and cataloguing" (NPAC) from \$6,613,500 to \$6,853,000 is recommended, and it has been announced by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that this program will now be budgeted for directly by the Library of Congress, rather than through the transfer of funds from the HEW's Office of Education.⁵⁾ The implications of this cannot be fully known yet, but recognition of the continuing importance of the program would appear to be all to the good. Presumably the program is now recognized as one to which the federal government should give strong support because of its benefits to university and research libraries throughout the country.

As for the amount for which the program is to be funded during the coming year, it must be considered quite inadequate for the needs that face the research libraries of the country. The Library of Congress, projecting the development of the program over the next five years, had estimated that the planned expansion of its functions would require funding of \$11 million in 1972, and that this should increase to \$15 million in 1975. This would enable the Library to extend its collecting and cataloguing activities to countries not now covered, and would strengthen and speed up service in countries whose publications are already included.

Since, also, the Library of Congress has been experimenting through the MARC I project with the development of machine-readable cataloguing copy, it is important that it be enabled to utilize the MARC II project, as it becomes operational, as a means for making centrally recorded bibliographical data available

on tapes for use by computers in various countries. In this context, therefore, it is vital that the Library be provided with adequate funds for the development of an automated system on an international scale.

Such an observer as Herman Liebaers, viewing the National Program both from a European angle and in the context of his Presidency of IFLA, writes of the possibility of extending the shared cataloguing program of the Library of Congress to other countries, particularly developing ones.⁶⁾ But he points out that the program is a complicated one making highly technical demands on its users which cannot easily be fulfilled in developing countries. He reports that the National and University Libraries Section and the Committee on Mechanization recommended that the IFLA Board request Unesco to draw up a contract providing for: "(a) a first study, to investigate the general conditions for the application of the Shared Catalogue Programme to countries other than the United States of America; to be followed by (b) a second study to examine the use of the Shared Cataloguing Programme in developing countries; and (c) on completion of the first study a conference of experts from all interested countries to examine the different conditions in the various countries." He cites the need, particularly in Europe, "to approach problems from a less nationalist point of view, and to set up multinational centers whose responsibilities may vary but which should be of sufficient stature to enter into a valid dialogue with the United States."

It is particularly regrettable, then, that the United States government should fail to recognize the importance of full support for the National Program at this vital stage in its development. But the program continues, and, although it falls short of its full potentialities, its service to the university and research libraries of the country has already been invaluable. It proves, says Mr. Liebaers, that "there already exists adequate compatibility to ensure effective, world-wide cooperation."

Mr. Liebaers has spoken of the program as "an exceptionally bold venture, even for the

The National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloguing in the U.S.A.

United States." We are gratified that the federal government has been as sensitive as it has to the needs of research libraries in furthering higher education, but we are impatient to see the program supported by a level of appropriations that will fulfill the objectives that of part of the Higher Education Act which the Congress calls "Strengthening College and Research Library Resources." We shall have to redouble our efforts to make clear to the Congress and the President that failure to support the Library of Congress's shared cataloguing program would reduce the capability of every research library in the country to fulfill its obligations to learning and research.

- 1) *Proceedings of the Academic and Research Libraries Workshops*, November 20-22, 1967, Osaka, December 18-20, 1967, Tokyo. School of Library and Information Science, Keio University, Tokyo, 1968. p. 93-95.
- 2) Liebaers, Herman, "Shared Cataloguing." *Unesco Bulletin for Libraries*, 24: 62-72, March-April 1970; 24: 126-138, May-June 1970.
- 3) U. S. Library of Congress. *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress for the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1969*. Washington, Library

of Congress, 1970.

- 4) Low, Edmon. "Federal Legislation Affecting College and University Libraries." *Library Trends*, 19: 200-211, October 1970.
- 5) *Washington Newsletter*, American Library Association, vol. 23, no. 1, February 3, 1971.
- 6) Liebaers, *op. cit.*

Additional References

- Cronin, John W. "The Library of Congress National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloguing." *Libri*, 16: 2, 1966, p. 113-17.
- . "The Library of Congress: Its Role in Cooperative and Centralized Cataloguing." *Library Trends*, 16, July 1967, p. 85-96.
- Lorenz, John G. "International Implications of the Shared Cataloging Program; Planning for Bibliographic Control." *Libri*, 17: 4, 1967, p. 276-84.
- Mumford, L. Quincy. "International Cooperation in Shared Cataloguing." *Unesco Bulletin for Libraries*, 22: 1, Jan.-Feb., 1968, p. 9-12.
- Skipper, James E. "Future Implications for Title II-C, Higher Education Act of 1965." *Library Resources and Technical Services*, 11, Winter 1967, p. 46-9.
- Vosper, Robert. "International Implication of the Shared Cataloguing Program: Planning for Resource Development." *Libri*, 17: 4, 1967, p. 285-93.