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1. 1979 Executive Group Election Results

Completing three-year terms on the CEAL Executive Group were:

Eugene Carvalho (University of Kansas) 1976-1979
Tung King Ng (University of British Columbia) 1976-1979
Weiying Wan (University of Michigan) 1976-1979
Eugene Wu, Chairperson (Harvard University) 1976-1979

To replace the retiring Chairperson, members of the Executive Group elected as the new Chairperson for a three year term Hideo Kaneko, Yale University, who was a member of the Executive Group for the term 1978-1981.

To replace the retiring Executive Group members and the position on the Executive Group to be vacated by Mr. Kaneko on his assumption of the CEAL Chair, the following new members were elected to three-year terms on the CEAL Executive Group:

Anna T. Liang U (University of Toronto) 1979-1982
William S. Wong (University of Illinois) 1979-1982
Joyce Wright (University of Hawaii) 1979-1982
Philip Yampolsky (Columbia University) 1979-1982

II. 1979 CEAL Executive Group Meeting

The CEAL Executive Group convened for its annual meeting on March 28 at 8:00 p.m. at the Los Angeles Hilton Hotel in Los Angeles. The meeting was attended by regular and newly elected members of the Executive Group, as well as by the Chairpersons of CEAL Subcommittees, who had been invited by the Chairperson. The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson, Eugene Wu. He announced the results of the Executive Group election and introduced the Chairperson-elect, Mr. Kaneko, and the new members of the Executive Group. He moved that the vote for the new Chairperson be made unanimous, and the motion was carried.

Concerning the election of members to the CEAL Executive Group and of a new CEAL Chairperson, Mr. Wu stated that he had encountered a number of ambiguities in the existing election procedures and that some revisions were probably needed in the CEAL Procedures relating to the election of the Chairperson and of Executive Group members. He pointed out that, according to the existing CEAL Procedures, (1) the Executive Group was a self-perpetuating body, elected by its own members and not by the general membership of CEAL; and (2) that while the term of the Chairperson was limited to three
years, there was nothing in the Procedures to prevent the Chairperson from succeeding himself indefinitely if repeatedly elected to that position by members of the Executive Group. He also stated that he had been asked by many CEAL members why CEAL officers should not be elected by the entire membership; but to implement such a procedure a nominating subcommittee would probably be required. Mr. Wu suggested that perhaps the Executive Group should appoint a nominating subcommittee every year to prepare a slate of nominees to be submitted to a vote by the entire membership. Referring to the involvement of the entire CEAL membership in the elections, Shizue Matsuda asked whether voting would be done by the individual, or the institutional, members of CEAL.

A question was also raised whether the CEAL Chairperson was officially appointed to that position by the AAS Board of Directors or elected by the CEAL Executive Group. Weiying Wan explained that the Chairmen of CEAL’s predecessor, CALRFE, had been appointed by the AAS Board of Directors, but that subsequent Chairpersons of CEAL had been elected by the CEAL members of the Executive Group, and then appointed as a formality by the AAS Board of Directors. Mr. Wu observed, however, that on his own election as Chairperson of CEAL he had received no formal appointment to this position from the AAS Board.

Discussion then turned to the question of CEAL’s organizational relationship to the AAS: whether CEAL should continue as a Committee of the AAS, even though it consisted of over 90 individual members; or whether it should be reconstituted either as an independent association (such as the Middle East Librarians Association), or as an association within the larger framework of the AAS (on a pattern similar to that of the Association of College and Research Libraries, which functions as a division of the larger American Library Association). Mr. Wu pointed out that while CEAL had a membership large enough for it to become an independent association, there were nevertheless many advantages to its being a part of the AAS. He stated that he would report to the CEAL General Meeting on the need for a review of the CEAL Procedures and recommended to the Chairperson-elect that he appoint a group to study the CEAL Procedures with a view to revising its provisions regarding elections and to exploring the possibility of changing the relationship of CEAL within the AAS.

The Chairperson submitted a financial report on CEAL income and expenditures during his term of office, from 1976 to 1979. He observed that while in the past reports had been made regularly to the AAS Board of Directors, there had been no need for financial reports to CEAL itself until the Bulletin had been placed on a paid subscription basis. He stated that to maintain a level of bare self-sufficiency, the Bulletin needed about 180 paid subscriptions, or $2,200 annually, as well as a reserve to cover such expenses as Xerography and telephone calls; and that without substantial voluntary contributions of time, services, and facilities from various sources, the actual costs of producing the Bulletin would probably amount to as much as $10,000 annually. Mr. Wu also reported on the status of the grant received from the ACLS to support the travel of CEAL representatives to ALA and other national professional library meetings. Funds from this grant will continue to be used for this purpose until they are exhausted.
The Chairperson then called for comments regarding the reports of the CEAL Subcommittees. William S. Wong of the Subcommittee on Publications suggested that the CEAL Bulletin devote some of its issues to special topics of interest, such as automation, under the supervision of an individual subeditor, and that the Subcommittee also issue other publications, such as a series modeled on the Harvard-Yenching Library Reference Notes. It was also suggested that the Subcommittee prepare a statement of general purpose, including guidelines and criteria for contributions to be submitted for publication in the Bulletin.

Karl Lo, Chairperson of the Subcommittee on Automation, stated that a meeting was to be held early the next morning to discuss a trip to Japan by representatives of the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission to investigate special automation technology for Chinese character processing. He noted that the work of the Subcommittee should be more concerned with policy than with technology in this area. Mr. Wu observed that very few East Asian librarians were versed in automation and that as a group they should pay greater attention to what automation might have to offer in this field.

Hideo Kaneko, Chairperson of the Subcommittee on Japanese Materials, described two project proposals that had been approved and funded by the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission: one, by Naomi Fukuda, was to survey patterns of collection development and interlibrary cooperation in Japanese collections in America; the other, by Shizue Matsuda, was to prepare a union listing of Japanese periodicals to which Japanese collections were currently subscribing. Mr. Kaneko also pointed out that in view of his election to the CEAL Chair, a new Chairperson of this Subcommittee would have to be appointed.

Weiying Wan, Chairperson of the Subcommittee on Chinese Materials, announced that an open meeting of the Subcommittee would be held to discuss new opportunities and new problems anticipated because of recent development in the People's Republic of China and in U.S.-China relations.

Thomas Lee, Chairperson of the Subcommittee on Technical Processing, reported that a new ALA committee of 7 members was to be established to replace the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Descriptive Cataloging and on Subject Analysis of African and Asian Materials of the RTSD Cataloging and Classification Section, and that the first meeting of this new committee would be held at the Dallas meeting of the ALA in June. He also reported that a number of the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Technical Processing had been included in the final draft of the AACR II, and that the contributions made by East Asian librarians had been useful in effecting these revisions.

On the adoption of pinyin as the standard romanization of Chinese, it was noted that this question was to be presented at the ALA meeting in Dallas. Mr. Lee stated that he had received a letter of inquiry on the subject of adopting pinyin romanization from the Association francaise de normalization, a subcommittee of the International Standards Organization. Mr. Wu also referred to a letter received by Betty Kingston of the Royal Ontario Museum from the National Library of Peking indicating that library's practices
regarding pinyin romanization and its interest in what North American libraries were doing with regard to the romanization of Chinese. In view of the far-ranging practical difficulties that would be faced by East Asian libraries if pinyin were to be accepted as the standard form of romanization, it was agreed that this question should be the first order of business for the Subcommittee on Technical Processing, and that after surveying the opinions of East Asian librarians and faculty members at various institutions, the Subcommittee should proceed to develop a position on the adoption of pinyin that carefully weighed the pros and cons and took into account the total impact, including the costs, of conversion to this system of romanization.

Professor Byron K. Marshall of the University of Minnesota reported that the AAS North­east Asia Council had just assigned $5,000 from the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission for the purpose of funding travel to major Japanese library collections by scholars at smaller institutions. In this connection he noted that a survey on access to major Japanese collections would be very useful. He proposed that CEAL urge major libraries to work toward uniform policies on fees for outside library users and interlibrary loans, and that libraries requesting funds from the Friendship Commission waive these fees for those wishing to use Japanese materials. He added that the funds granted by the Commission were public funds and that the Japanese publications purchased by libraries receiving these funds should be made freely available for public use. Philip Yampolsky of Columbia University pointed out that while grants might be given to scholars for travel to major Japanese collections, there had been no prior arrangement, nor even any discussion, on how these collections were to accommodate these visiting scholars. Messrs. Kaneko and Wu also noted that most major Japanese collections had no independent authority to determine policies regarding user or interlibrary loan fees, but were constrained to abide by those policies established by their parent university library administrations.

John Haeger, Director of the East Asian Library Program established by the American Council of Learned Societies, the Social Science Research Council, and the Association of Research Libraries, was invited by the Chairperson to address the Executive Group. He explained that the Program was descended from the ACLS Steering Committee for a Study of the Problems of East Asian Libraries, chaired by George Beckmann, and had been created to oversee the implementation of the recommendations of the published report of the Steering Committee; and that in this task he was assisted by an Advisory Committee composed of Eugene Wu, Hideo Kaneko, Patricia Battin, Director of Libraries of Columbia University, Professor Fritz Mote of Princeton University, and Professor Robert Ward of Stanford University. He stated that the mission and priorities of the East Asian Library Program were somewhat fuzzy, in view of the fact that the ACLS Steering Committee report had drawn a number of criticisms and that the report had relied heavily on assumptions that the Library of Congress could deliver certain services. In general, however, he saw the major thrust of the Program being directed toward devising ways to derive maximum benefit from limited available funding, such as in the area of interinstitutional cooperation. In Mr. Haeger’s view, the single highest priority remained in the area of bibliographic control, but with regard to a unified national data base for East Asian Library materials, technology would probably permit a move into an automated mode sooner than was anticipated in the ACLS Steering Committee report. He concluded
by stating that the intent of the Program was to reach a point where it could go out of business, leaving its functions to be carried on by CEAL and the East Asian library community.

In the discussion that followed, it was pointed out that there was no representation on the East Asian Library Program of the interests of smaller institutions and isolated scholars, and that with respect to national bibliographic control, there had apparently been little effort to obtain input on this subject from librarians. Mr. Haeger replied that in his travels to a large number of institutions throughout the country he had solicited comments from several sources but had received little response. Mr. Wu reaffirmed that national bibliographic control was the single highest priority for East Asian libraries, especially for smaller collections. He noted that the Ford Foundation had given a grant to the Center for Research Libraries to conduct a pilot project to verify the cost estimates of Karl Lo's proposal to create an automated register index of East Asian library holdings by inputting romanized entries from microfiche of East Asian library shelf lists; CRL had received sample fiche of shelf lists from four different libraries (LC, Harvard, Michigan, and Chicago), and adjustments to Mr. Lo's proposal would be recommended on the basis of the results of the CRL study.

Richard Howard reported that at the meeting of the AAS China and Inner Asia Council held the previous day, the AAS President, Richard Park, had asked CIAC for a statement of its concerns to be incorporated in an Association statement to the Presidential Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, and that for the library component of this statement, CIAC would like to have a report from CEAL on East Asian library problems and concerns. Mr. Wu stated that he had already prepared a statement on this subject for the Association, and that the ACLS Steering Committee report should also be submitted as supporting documentation.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15 p.m.

III. 1979 CEAL General Meeting

The 1979 General Meeting of the Committee on East Asian Libraries was held in the Sierra Room of the Los Angeles Hilton Hotel during the afternoon and evening of March 29. The Committee Chairperson, Eugene Wu, Librarian, Harvard-Yenching Library, called the meeting to order, presented the agenda, announced the results of the election of CEAL officers, and introduced the new Chairperson-elect, Hideo Kaneko, Curator, East Asian Library, Yale University.

The first item on the agenda was a presentation of the Library of Congress activities of interest to East Asian librarians. Frank M. McGowan, Director for Acquisitions and Overseas Operations, Processing Services, reported on LC programs for the acquisition of East Asian-language materials. He reviewed recent progress made by LC in developing exchange relationships with the National Library of Beijing and other libraries in the People's Republic of China, and the results of a special arrangement with the National
Central Library in Taipei to procure for LC non-commercial publications in Taiwan. He described the Chinese-Korean NPAC Searching Project, by which a number of academic library participants reported to LC their acquisitions of Chinese-and Korean-language monographs and noted the results of this project in terms of increased LC orders for materials in these languages. He also presented the results of a throughput study of the processing of Chinese and Japanese materials at LC, which indicated that an overall average of 9.2 to 9.4 months elapsed from the time a publication was received until a printed card was ready for distribution, but that materials processed under NPAC priorities required only 5.2 months (for Chinese) and 6.4 months (for Japanese).

Concerning the romanization of LC automated catalog records for non-roman script materials, Mr. McGowan stated that the Library's ultimate goal was to input records in all languages in MARC format and that present plans were to input romanized records in Cyrillic, Greek, and Southern Asian languages. However, catalog records in Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Arabic, Persian, and Hebrew would not be input in romanized form in the automated catalog, but would, for the time being, continue to be produced as 3x5 printed cards and filed in separate card catalogs. Regarding the romanization of Chinese, he pointed out that, following the formal United States recognition of the People's Republic of China early this year, U.S. Government agencies, the Board of Geographic Names, and the news services had adopted the pinyin system of romanization officially promulgated by the government of China. He noted that the British Library had already changed its romanization of Chinese catalog records from the widely used Wade-Giles system to pinyin and that the Australian National Library also intended to make this change. In view of these developments, the Library of Congress was giving the question of conversion from Wade-Giles romanization to pinyin careful study and was interested in the intentions of East Asian libraries in this regard. He stated that this question would also be brought to the ALA at its meeting this June in Dallas.

A report on the status of the LC Chinese Cooperative Catalog was presented by Gloria Hsia, Chief, Catalog Publication Division. She explained that the Catalog had never been intended as a substitute for a national union catalog of Chinese publications and that its continued existence would depend upon the number of subscriptions from outside libraries. The number of subscriptions had recently increased to 58, with 42 paid subscriptions, which was sufficient to ensure its publication at least through 1979. She stated that LC continued to be interested in obtaining feedback from subscribers on how the usefulness of the Catalog might be enhanced and on whether a questionnaire on its utility should be sent out to subscribers.

Reporting on a number of recent developments at LC, Warren Tsuneishi, Director for Area Studies, Research Services, outlined the Library's reorganization of July 1978, by which the major functions of the Library were placed under five separate departments, or services: Congressional Research, Copyright, Processing, Research Services, and the Law Library. Under the Assistant Librarian for Research Services, responsibility for Library activities in this sphere were divided among three Directors, for General Reference, Special Collections, and Area Studies; and under the Director for Area Studies were grouped five divisions, each with responsibility for one of the major geographic or cultural
areas of the world: African and Middle Eastern, Asian, European, Hispanic, as well as the new American Division, the latter division still remaining to be staffed. Mr. Tsuneishi also described briefly the Library’s plans for the occupancy of the new James Madison Memorial Building and the concept of the Library as an encyclopedia, by which specialized reference facilities and services would be available to users in contiguous reading rooms, each devoted to a particular subject or geographic area.

Concerning the future of the Bibliography of Asian Studies, Mr. Tsuneishi stated that this annual publication would continue to be issued through the 1978 volume by the Association for Asian Studies with the assistance of a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities; as to its publication thereafter, the Library of Congress, in its budget request to the Congress for the fiscal year 1981, had asked for authorization to assume responsibility for its production beginning with the 1979 issue, but final decision on this request would not be known for several months. In conclusion he reported that the Library was in the process of reviewing its collection development policies, and that in cooperation with Mr. McGowan and the LC Collections Development Office he had set up an ad hoc committee to develop some specific acquisitions guidelines on a country-by-country basis.

Activities of the Asian Division were summarized by Richard Howard, Acting Chief, of that division, who referred to a number of bibliographic projects recently completed, or under preparation, by members of the division staff, including Chinese periodicals in the Library of Congress, by Han Chu Huang, and A Bibliography of Chinese-English and English-Chinese Dictionaries, by Robert Dunn, both published by the Library of Congress, and "Japanese Government serials publications in the Library of Congress", prepared by Thaddeus Ohta, the manuscript of which had been submitted to the LC Publishing Office for publication. In the area of collection development, he reported that two members of the Division had been on acquisitions trips to the Far East during the past year: Chi Wang, Head of the Chinese and Korean section, who had reviewed the operations of the Library’s blanket order dealers and exchange partners in Taiwan and Hong Kong; and Key P. Yang, Korea area specialist in the same section, who had discussed acquisitions problems with the LC blanket order in Seoul and arranged with book dealers in Tokyo to secure North Korean publications on a regular basis.

The services of the Law Library to the Congress and the public were described by Tao-tai Hsia, Chief, Far Eastern Law Division, who noted briefly the research performed by that division for the Congress on subjects relating to East Asian and Southeast Asian law, and the efforts of the division to acquire all available legal materials from the People’s Republic of China.

Next on the agenda was a report by John Haeger, Director of the East Asian Library Program. Mr. Haeger explained that the Program, assisted by an Advisory Committee of five, was an organization jointly appointed by the American Council of Learned Societies, the Social Science Research Council, and the Association of Research Libraries to oversee the implementation of a series of recommendations that had been made by the ACLS Steering Committee for a Study of the Problems of East Asian Libraries and had been
published in 1977 as a report entitled East Asian Libraries: Problems and Prospects. It had become clear to the Program that the major difficulties in implementing the ACLS Steering Committee recommendations would be funding, and that in the face of continuing financial constraints the basic solution to the problem of maintaining the national capacity for research on East Asia was inter-institutional cooperation: in processing by moving from centralized to cooperative on-line cataloging; in acquisitions by developing union catalog bibliographic controls to permit the selective purchase and sharing of costly but little-used materials; and through national organizations such as the Center for Research Libraries, the proposed national periodicals center and national lending library. To overcome time lags that generally occur in such joint activities, the Program had explored the feasibility of cooperative cataloging in the automated mode and had assessed the technologies available to handle computerized records in East Asian scripts. The conclusion was that the technology does exist and that the problem lies in adapting it to effective library use, and in conjunction with the existing MARC system. As an example of an organization that was working in this direction, Mr. Haeger cited the Research Libraries Group (RLG), which had made substantial commitment of resources, time, and staff for research to develop systems of this kind. He noted that RLG had recently been reconfigured as a potential national system, the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN) to be based at Stanford University, which would utilize the BALLOTS system developed at that institution for its automated data base. He also stated that the Library of Congress had indicated interest in the possibility of cooperating with RLG in this area.

In the discussion that followed this presentation it was noted that the ACLS Steering Committee recommendation to prepare an automated East Asian union listing by romanized title had been temporarily shelved pending a pilot project, to be conducted by the Center for Research Libraries, to test the feasibility and costs of implementing this proposal. Mr. Haeger stated that he was exploring the possibility of obtaining union catalog bibliographic controls not by means of an independent project but as a by-product of automating retrospective and prospective cataloging records. To questions relating to the training of East Asian librarians, he replied that up to that time the Program had concentrated on problems of bibliographic controls, but that he would welcome specific suggestions and proposals on this subject from members of CEAL.

The chair then opened up for general discussion a number of points that had been raised in the annual reports of the CEAL subcommittees. Thomas H. Lee, East Asian Cataloging Librarian, Memorial Library, University of Wisconsin, and chairperson of the Subcommittee on Technical Processing, referred to the results of a questionnaire on romanization that he had distributed to East Asian librarians in December, 1978, to which the response had been almost unanimous in favor of retaining the East Asian scripts on Chinese, Japanese, and Korean catalog records and in opposition to automated records in romanization only. He pointed out, however, that automated records were needed for better access to East Asian materials, and that until records in East Asian scripts could be included in automated data bases, it would be most desirable to supplement manually produced catalog cards with fully romanized records in an automated data base.
Mr. Lee then took up the question of pinyin romanization of Chinese, noting that a number of recent developments had given greater urgency to the question of its adoption by East Asian libraries in place of the Wade-Giles romanization now regarded as standard by American libraries. He concluded with the statement that a preliminary examination of the new Anglo-American cataloging rules revealed that the CEAL subcommittee recommendations had been accorded fair and careful treatment.

Hideo Kaneko, chairperson of the Subcommittee on Japanese Materials, summarized the activities growing out of a Workshop for Japanese Collections Librarians in American Research Libraries, held in Washington, D. C. last August under the sponsorship of the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission and coordinated by the Office of Management Studies, Association of Research Libraries. One such activity was a survey of large, medium, and small sized Japanese collections in America currently being conducted by Naomi Fukuda, formerly Assistant Librarian, Asia Library, University of Michigan, to investigate existing patterns of collection development and interlibrary cooperation, and to explore possible means of making such cooperation among Japanese collections more effective. Another project was being conducted by Shizue Matsuda, Librarian for East Asian Studies, Indiana University Library, to survey the Japanese serials to which Japanese collections in the U.S. were currently subscribing, with a view to possible cooperative acquisitions and resource sharing in this area of publication. Both of these projects were funded by the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission.

Tao-tai Hsia, chairperson of the Subcommittee on Liaison with Chinese Libraries, reported on the LC-led delegation of American librarians to the People's Republic of China, which was to consist of three members each from LC, the AAS Committee on East Asian Libraries, the American Library Association, and the Association of Research Libraries. He announced that the Chinese authorities, and specifically the Bureau of Cultural Relics, were prepared to receive the delegation in September, 1979. Finally, Karl Lo, Head, East Asian Library, University of Washington, commented on his report on the Subcommittee on Automation. On the subject of computer applications to East Asian library problems, he questioned whether, in view of the differing approaches and interests of the parent institutions of East Asian collections represented in CEAL, it was desirable, or even possible, for CEAL to develop a unified position of its own with respect to the uses of automation in East Asian libraries.

As the first speaker of the evening session, Ray Boylan, Assistant Director of the Center for Research Libraries, reported on recent activities of the Center relating to East Asian materials. He explained that these materials, as with the rest of the Center's collections, were designed to supplement holdings of other libraries. East Asian materials in CRL numbered some 40,000 bibliographic volumes and 14,000 reels of microfilm, and included films of clippings from mainland China newspapers, monitored Chinese radio broadcasts, archives of the China files in the British Foreign Office and the U.S. State Department, and missionary publications. There were also files of Japanese newspapers, government publications, and scientific and technical periodicals. Mr. Boylan referred to CRL's comprehensive collections of materials on India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka obtained through the PL480 Program, the microfilms prepared through the South Asia Microform Project, and the growing collections of South Asian archival materials. He
then described the Center's plans to develop for the East Asian field the same kind of comprehensive program as it had for its South Asian collections, and stated that to achieve this goal the Center would require guidance from its member institutions on what types of materials should be acquired to best serve the needs of East Asian collections. In conclusion, he noted that the long-term concern of the Center was to work toward a federally supported national periodical center and a national lending library which would take over the functions and services currently being performed by CRL.

The chair then called upon Karl Lo as the first speaker in a panel discussion on library automation. Mr. Lo began with an introduction to the subject of Chinese character processing systems. He observed that although there were a number of such systems in operation in Japan and Taiwan, and while there were also companies in the United States which produced these systems, there was still no application of Chinese character processing systems in any American library. The reason for this was, in his opinion, that libraries in the U.S. were awaiting the development of a perfect system. He maintained that the computer technology of today had already attained a level far beyond what could be utilized effectively by libraries for Chinese character processing and argued that rather than await further technological improvements, librarians in America should seek to evaluate and utilize effectively the technology that already existed. Specifically, he suggested that CEAL should, first of all, work to develop critical expertise in two areas: keyboard design, and the sorting and merging of sequential orders of Chinese characters. Thereafter would follow the selection of appropriate hardware and the adoption of software to interface with such existing bibliographic systems as MARC, BALLOTS, and OCLC. He predicted that the development of a system would require only a few years and that although the cost would be high, the result would make it cost effective.

The history and present status of the University of Toronto Library Automation System (UTLAS) was outlined by Henry Hsing, head, Non-Roman Languages Section, Bibliographic Processing Department, University of Toronto Library, who described the dual procedure maintained by that library for the cataloging of materials in non-roman script languages. For Chinese, Japanese, and Korean materials, a complete set of cards with vernacular scripts were produced manually for the East Asian Library card catalog, as well as one card each for the Main Library shelf list and official catalog; in addition, fully romanized records were input in the machine readable database. For all other non-roman languages, only one main entry card in the vernacular for each title was made for the main author-title catalog; all other records of these non-roman language materials were computer produced in romanization only. Mr. Hsing stated that MARC-derived on-line cataloging of Western language materials began at the University of Toronto Library in May 1974, and original on-line cataloging of non-roman language materials began in April 1975. Cataloging was done by non-professionals trained in cataloging, romanization, typing, and inputting operations who, after assembling the bibliographic information, coded and keyed the records directly at the terminals; their work was then revised by professional cataloger librarians. The total connect time for new titles cataloged in 1977/78 averaged 7.17 minutes per record for both roman and non-roman, and the computer cost per new record created, exclusive of line charge and storage cost, was $1.39; storage cost per record handled was $0.28.
The third speaker on the panel, Warren Tsuneishi, discussed developments in automation at the Library of Congress as they related to the comments of the preceding speakers. On the subject of a dual system for cataloging East Asian materials, such as that employed at the University of Toronto, he pointed out that in its processing of East Asian serial publications, LC had been using a dual system for some time: not only did the Library continue to produce 3x5 printed cards in the manual mode with information in East Asian scripts, but since 1973 it had also been inputting records for East Asian serials in romanized form only in the MARC-S database. These records were retrievable from the database by language of publication, so that, for example, a printout could be obtained listing all of the approximately 3,000 Japanese-language MARC-S records. He noted, however, that once the Library had completely automated its catalogs, the added staff time required cataloging East Asian materials would make a dual system too expensive to maintain.

Concerning LC capability to process East Asian language materials by computer, Mr. Tsuneishi stated that by 1980, in addition to materials in all roman script languages, the Library expected to input in the MARC system romanized records of materials in non-roman scripts, such as Cyrillic, South Asian languages, as well as Thai and Burmese. However, the prospects for including such non-roman scripts as Arabic, Persian, Hebrew, and the East Asian languages were uncertain. Although the LC Automated Systems Office had assigned a member of its staff to assess the technical feasibility of inputting non-roman scripts, the problem of financial feasibility was seen as being even more critical. In an American library environment, non-roman script records constituted only a small percent of the whole, and the expense involved in the automated processing of this small volume of records would probably be so high as to be considered not cost effective. He also reported that the Library of Congress had contracted with the Xerox Electro-Optical Systems to devise techniques to capture by electronic means in high density optical disc storage all of the retrospective LC catalog card records produced since 1901, including records in all non-roman scripts. With a single access point, presumably the LC card number, these records could be called up one by one to be further treated for access by author and title, but here again, he observed, the staff costs would be considerable.

As panel discussant, Nelson Chou, East Asian Librarian, Rutgers University Library, indicated that while he was encouraged by the reports of Messrs. Hsing and Tsuneishi on progress in the development of computer applications to East Asian catalog records, he did not share Mr. Lo's optimism regarding the possibilities of interfacing Chinese character processing systems with existing library bibliographic systems such as MARC or OCLC. He also questioned whether automated processing of East Asian materials could ever be made cost effective, and whether local automation priorities among research libraries might not require greater emphasis upon book circulation systems or the retrieval of information from texts, rather than upon the cataloging of materials.

The chair then took up the question of the Procedures under which the business of CEAL was conducted. He noted that the Procedures had first been drawn up and adopted in 1967, and had been amended in 1976 to enlarge membership in the CEAL Executive Group and to extend the term of the Chairperson. At a meeting of the Executive Group the preceding
evening it had been agreed that there was a need to review and clarify imprecisions and ambiguities in the language of the Procedures relating to the nomination and election of CEAL officers. After some discussion it was decided that the new chairperson of CEAL would set up an ad hoc group to study the Procedures with a view to possible revision.

The final item on the agenda was a consideration of priorities for East Asian libraries. The chair began by referring to the general statement of needs put forth in the 1977 recommendations of the ACLS Steering Committee for a Study of the Problems of East Asian Libraries, which had enumerated among its priorities national programs for collection development, access, and training of librarians, but had clearly assigned first priority to projects designed to create effective national bibliographic controls for East Asian collections. Questions were raised concerning the significance of automation in this scheme of priorities, and the extent to which priorities established by CEAL would be relevant to decisions or practices adopted by the parent libraries of East Asian collections that were represented in CEAL. No consensus emerged with respect to either of these questions, but the meeting concluded with general agreement that it would be necessary for CEAL as a group to develop a series of authoritative responses to questions concerning its own objectives and priorities in the field of East Asian librarianship.

IV. Association for Asian Studies grant to CEAL

The Chairperson of CEAL has been informed by L.A. Peter Gosling, Secretary-Treasurer of the Association for Asian Studies, that the Executive Committee of the Association has awarded the Committee on East Asian Libraries the sum of $500.00 toward the costs of publishing the CEAL Bulletin.

V. CEAL Subcommittees: Current Composition (1979-80)

(* indicates Chairperson)

Subcommittee on Automation: Nelson Chou (Rutgers), Henry Hsing (Toronto), Karl Lo (Washington)*, Emiko Moffitt (Hoover), Warren Tsuneishi (LC).

Subcommittee on CEAL Procedures: Eugene Carvalho (Kansas), Richard Howard (LC), Miwa Kai (Columbia), Lillian Lee (Swarthmore), T. H. Tsien (Chicago), Eugene Wu (Harvard)*.

Subcommittee on Chinese Materials: C. P. Chen (UC - Berkeley), Antony Marr (Yale), Weiyiying Wan (Michigan)*, Chester Wang (Wisconsin).

Subcommittee on Japanese Materials: Toshiyuki Aoki (Harvard), Teruko Chin (Washington), Tsuneharu Gonnami (British Columbia), Masato Matsui (Hawaii), Robert Sewell (Illinois), Frank Shulman (Maryland), Eiji Yutani (UC - Berkeley)*.
Subcommittee on Korean Materials: Eugene Choi (Columbia), Yoon-whan Choe (Washington), Sungha Kim (Harvard), Hesung Koh (HRAF), Joyce Wright (Hawaii), Key P. Yang (LC)*.

Subcommittee on Liaison with Chinese Libraries: Tao-tai Hsia (LC)*, T. H. Tsien (Chicago), Anna U (Toronto), P. K. Yu (ARL CCRM).

Subcommittee on Library Access: Ryoko Toyama (Oregon), Frances Wang (Claremont), William Wong (Illinois), Philip Yampolsky (Columbia)*.

Subcommittee on National Union Catalog: Gloria Hsia (LC), Jack Jacoby (Columbia), Thomas Kuo (Pittsburgh), John Lai (Harvard)*, Karl Lo (Washington), Shizue Matsuda (Indiana), Hisao Matsumoto (LC).

Subcommittee on Publications: Eugene Carvalho (Kansas), Richard Howard (LC), Sungha Kim (Harvard), William Wong (Illinois).

Subcommittee on Resources and Development: Hideo Kaneko (Yale)*, T. H. Tsien (Chicago), Warren Tsuneishi (LC), Eugene Wu (Harvard).

Subcommittee on Technical Processing: Effie Chen (Princeton), Lawrence Chen (LC), Yoon-whan Choe (Washington), Boksoon Hahn (Yale), Ayako Hayashi (LC), Paul Ho (Pittsburgh), Henry Hsing (Toronto), Hisayuki Ishimatsu (Chicago), Thomas Lee (Wisconsin)*, Arthur Miyazaki (Cal-Berkeley), Ryoko Toyama (Oregon).