258

Knowl. Org. 24(1997)No.4
Book Reviews

action, as a permanent challenge to re-think and re-consider traditional positions.

3. To conclude: I feel no hesitation to recommend both for reading, if possible in close succession and carefully, some chapters twice. On the surface the benefit is apparent in particular for the reader from business and institutional management. A closer look reveals the topics discussed as paradigms referring to the general challenge which Knowledge Order and Knowledge Management present. What is, by para-digmatic example, shown and what scarcely can be considered and learned intensively enough, are the quests arising for the entire range of indexing, classification and information handling in general. It is not only the rapidly and dynamically changing knowl-edge contexts, purposes and environments which dic-tate fundamental re-adaptations in thought patterns and methodical approaches. Without all the decision support made possible only by advanced KM it will be impossible to attain reasonable, meaningful and – the catchword may be forgiven – sustainable solu-tions. Particular requirements must be met to simu-late complex phenomena and processes, as shines up in some of the contributions. Simulation and its far-reaching conditions and consequences will be, in this reviewer's opinion, the prevailing theme to be studied in the next three years, but not yet ripe for a broad discourse today.

Without underestimating the importance of knowledge-based decision and controlling support, it seems that the prerequisites for a flexible KO and long-term effective and efficient KM are not yet suffi-ciently appreciated. Surface solutions which leave cherished ways of thinking unmolested do not and will not suffice. It may well be learned from the con-tributions given that the most successful solutions in practice have been those which explored most thor-oughly the (meta-)methodical, modelling and organ-izational/structural and communicative/conversa-tional principles. KM is also concerned by the modes for operationalising knowledge acquisition. A closer look into up-to-date knowledge handling proves most advisable. KM will have to perform in new institu-tional and social environments, adopting new atti-tudes and new measures for the contributions, per-formance and remuneration by and of personnel. The domains where KM is applied have already partly taken over the activities of research and exploration: business and societal institutions, even public admini-stration. Their endeavors should be met by support-ing efforts from the new knowledge and order sci-ences. Information sciences should not hesitate to transcend traditional borderlines in the direction of institutional application.

Both books provide excellent support and inter-faces for further extended studies.

Hellmut Löckenhoff

Dr. Hellmut Löckenhoff, Ossietzkystr. 14, D-71522 Back-nang, FRG. Phone +49 7191 62295, Fax 83113

SCOTT, MONA L.: **Conversion Tables. LC-Dewey, Dewey-LC.** Englewood, CO: Libraries Un-limited 1993. VIII, 365 p. ISBN 1-56308-017-6 (Print version), ISBN 1-56308-152-0 (Disk version)

There are two possibilities to establish compatibil-ity between two classification systems: on the one hand by comparing the systems with each other and relating to each other any existing concepts having the same or a similar contents, and then representing the results according to the systematic order of one or the other system. On the other hand, compatibility between two CS can be shown to exist if one corre-lates the results of the classification activities, the so-called classates, of a system A with those of a system B with regard to the contents of a certain document.

This latter possibility is employed by the Conver-sion Tables of Mona L. Scott, prepared by her with the assistance of Christine E. Alvey. These Tables were meant primarily to serve Scott's own needs as she said in her Introduction, that, in her US Bureau of Census Library she "was frequently frustrated by the lack of Library of Congress call numbers on non-LC MARC records available from our cataloging util-ity. My staff had to stop the routing copy cataloging process in order to identify a call number. I began a search for a conversion manual to assist the Catalog-ing Department, and the only one I found was twenty years out of date, incomplete, lacking any subject reference to the list of class numbers, and was limited to class-numbers downloaded from LC MARC records. I decided I would create a cataloging tool that could be a standard reference in any catalog-ing department for daily copy cataloging activities, as well as massive projects of converting from one class system to the other ..."

Now, the results look as follows: In two columns per page, one will find next to each other in Pt. 1 the notations of the Library of Congress Classification (LCC) and the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) as well as a "descriptor", which, apparently, is the verbal equivalent of the notation of the LCC only. In Pt. 2 the notations start with the DDC, followed by the LCC and again the same descriptor from the LCC as in Pt. 1. When checking the class descriptions of a notation in the DDC I noticed that there exist essen-

Knowl. Org. 24(1997)No.4
Book Reviews

259

tial deviations in meaning as clearly shown by the following example:

LC	Dewey	Desriptor
BD646-648	117	Structure of matter and form

At position DDC 117 one will find, however, only "Structure", although with the indication, in small print below this number, "including matter, form order. Class relation of space and matter in 114".

The LCC number BD646-648 stands for a range from – through. Now if one goes to Pt. 2 and looks under DDC 117 one will also find a correlation to BD652 with the Descriptor "Matter and Motion/Force" and the same again under DDC 116 with relation to BD652, although the DDC Tables (Ed. 20 – it is assumed that this edition was used) say at this position "Change – including becoming, cycles, evolution, motion, process".

From this it can be seen that the conceptual identification of the chosen numbers poses problems.

These examples relate to single notations. Most of the correlated numbers are, however, combined ones, especially in the DDC, which, by its policy of tables and schedules, allows for combinations, e.g. of general concepts with geographic ones, whereas the LCC precombines in every class the general concept with a geographic one in its notation, so that most of the LCC numbers in these Conversion Tables are such precombinations. Here are some examples:

LC	Dewey	Descriptor
AM10-101	069.09	Museums, Collecting. History, by place
AM11-13	069.0973	United States

If in some cases there are several possibilities in the DDC to class a certain contents, this is expressed by two numbers, separated by a slash, as e.g.:

LC	Dewey	Descriptor
AM200-401	790.132/069.5	Collectors/Collecting
AM221	790.13209/069.509	History of collecting
AM301-396	790.13209/069.509	Collecting by place
AM303-311	790.132/069.5(0971)	United States

Here it also becomes evident that two identical DDC numbers may be correlated to two different LCC numbers. In some cases this may be due to an error, as e.g. in:

Dewey	LC	Descriptor
012	Z8001-8999	Personal bibliography
012	Z5301-5319	Biography

(The correct DDC number for Biography is 920.)

Regarding the use of these Tables, M.L. Scott said in her introduction: "... is a resource to be used for the conversion of entire libraries, but it will be most frequently used to convert individual MARC records from bibliographic utilities that include only one classification number. For example, a record concerning a census of India may contain only a Dewey class number when an LC number is needed. These tables will provide that number without the necessity for extensive examination of the LC tables ..."

Unfortunately no subject index is provided giving access to the descriptors of the volume. With respect to the frequent use in the LCC of precombinations with geographic concepts and their indication of relationship to their broader concepts, this might have caused difficulties. One can therefore only hope that the officials of the LCC will sometime reconsider their present practice and introduce geographic auxiliaries for unambiguous identification and easier recognizability in the notation of a combination case.

These Conversion Tables may also be used in studying the weaknesses of the systems in question. It seems to me that they might be helpful in identifying areas for revision.

The Conversion Tables contain of course only those numbers for which a literary warrant exists, so that, as a result, most of the existing numbers of the schedules are not included. One may assume that with the steady growth of classed literature this may change in a distant future to perhaps cover eventually the entire schedules.

For all those who would like to study these Tables with regard to their scientific value, a warning must be expressed: in each case the schedules of the systems need to be rechecked for correctness of the numbers chosen. These Conversion Tables ought to be regarded as a pragmatic tool for the cases mentioned by Ms. Scott. But they show very clearly that not only the classification systems used contain numerous weaknesses, but also that their use leads to many diverging results. Perhaps some of these might have been avoided if the Tables had been carefully checked before printing and presentation to the public.

Ingetraut Dahlberg

Dr. Ingetraut Dahlberg, Woogstr. 36a, D-60431 Frankfurt

FOSKETT, A. C.: **The Subject Access to Information**, 5th Ed. London: The Library Association Publishing, 1996. XV, 456 p. ISBN 1-85604-048-8

Since the mid-1990s we have seen the revision of two most outstanding books devoted exclusively to classification. They are : a revision of Sayers/Maltby's **Manual** by Rita Marcella and Roger Newton (1994), and now of A.C. Foskett's classic by the author himself. The book under review was first published in 1969 and has since been regularly revised (2nd ed.