

## Save the national heritage: Revise the Colon Classification

M. P. Satija

Former UGC Emeritus Fellow, Guru Nanak Dev University, Amritsar,  
E-mail: satija\_mp@yahoo.com

The paper presents a case for the revival of Colon Classification (CC). It traces the status of CC in brief and discusses its features. The author brings to light attempts made at providing a base for continuous improvements in the scheme and bringing it back to life. Measures for the revival of CC are suggested.

**Keywords:** Colon Classification; Colon Classification- history; Colon Classification- features; Colon Classification- use; Colon Classification- revival; Comparative classification; Ranganathan S R

### Introduction

The longevity graph of many library general classification systems is a chequered one. Classification history is littered with many dead systems; many such classification systems have suffered the vagaries of time. Some have stumbled, never to rise up while others have risen and walked steadfastly. Some have been drowned in the deluge of knowledge they could not cope with. A classification system has essentially to keep pace with the times, as a classification is essentially social and has to keep its head above in the shifting sands of knowledge and social needs. To be relevant it has to keep itself in constant repair and remain oriented to contemporary academic, social and economic needs. Obviously the life and health of a library classification system depends upon its acceptability and use which in turn depends mostly on:

- a. Time of its arrival on the scene: BC, CC arrived late on the scene
- b. Institutional backup: LCC and DDC have excellent back support
- c. Status of the designer: Dewey, Cutter and Ranganathan were well known and highly respected in the profession.
- d. Body for its governance and machinery for its regular revision: DDC and LCC have dynamic and stable organisations which maintain best machinery for their upkeep.
- e. Extent to which it serves users' needs: Depends what you expect from a classification system. It could be anything from broader shelf arrangement to minute knowledge mapping.

- f. Ease of use by librarians and readers: DDC and LCC are most easy to use.
- g. Use by centralised classification agencies like CIP and MARC: LCC and DDC are used in MARC records.
- h. Its teaching in the library schools: CC is the highly taught classification in India
- i. Now another factor is its online availability: DDC, LC and UDC are now web based in addition to their print versions.

Ironically technical soundness of a classification matters little.

### History of the Colon Classification

The Colon Classification (CC), when published in 1933 was a latecomer on the scene. Until the sixties it was considered the last general classification system for libraries. The Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC), the Universal Decimal Classification (UDC), and the Library of Congress Classification (LCC) had already established themselves in the library world. The CC was received both with wonder and contempt. It was different in structure and methods. And in many ways superior to already existing systems for meeting the challenges of the rising flood of knowledge since the early 20th century. But it did not find ready acceptance in India and abroad. It was considered difficult to understand and apply. Unfortunately the law of free market that a good product will drive out an inferior product does not always apply to classification systems. Forces of inertia keep a bad product perpetuated; librarians are reluctant to reclassify their libraries. Foskett<sup>1</sup>, knowing well that reclassification provokes a hostile reaction, asserts:

Yet experience shows that it can be done, if necessary in stages, without too much expense or upheaval. Experience also shows that authorities appear to be quite happy to spend very large sums of money to provide new and elaborate buildings and to invest very large sum in machines for automation which have to be replaced, at even large sums, in a relatively few years. By comparison the labour and cost of reclassification is small; and it should not be forgotten that here we are dealing with progress of information and knowledge and the provision of these is the prime motive for having a library at all.

In the same vein Ranganathan (1967)<sup>2</sup> noted that we have been classifying for only a little over one hundred years:

It is fortunate that in the United States people began to classify books only in the middle of the nineteenth century. Suppose libraries had been formed and collections classified in the beginning of the Christian Era. Generation after generation would have asked how it would be possible to change the class number since it seemed that they had to continue with the old system. This would mean that we should still be using the classification system of the first century of the Christian Era, and this would not be tolerable. This answer follows the method of *reductio ad absurdum*.

But for Indian libraries the time was propitious, even though the DDC had already been introduced here by the famous American librarian Asa Don Dickinson (1896-1960). A vast virgin field lay open before the CC. Many Indian libraries are still classifying their collections for the first time, and many new academic libraries are being opened every year. We still need many more libraries than we currently have<sup>3</sup>. Why it is that new Indian libraries cannot patronise India's own classification system? As early as 1964, when the CC was in full bloom, Jain<sup>4</sup> noted: "There are in India a few who ridicule or oppose CC, while quite a few are of praise for it and have adopted CC as their scheme of classification."

The CC was designed by S R Ranganathan (1892-1972), the undisputed Father of the Indian Library Science and Movement. He was held in high regards

all over the world for his innovations, foresight and dedication. He was enigmatically prolific, a trend-setter and his authority was unquestionable. Any Indian classification system associated with a lesser name perhaps would have gone unnoticed. However, it is also true that he came to be recognised as great only after the merits of his system were recognised abroad, especially in the UK<sup>5</sup>.

Technically the CC scores high marks because of its intrinsic merit on account of its helpful order at every level and almost infinite hospitality to new subjects. Its theory has been recognised as the general theory of classification, but unfortunately it has virtually no institutional backup. There is no library which works as its laboratory. Ranganathan had the benefit of the Madras University Library during 1924-1944 to test his theories and methods. Even before publication of the first edition, the CC was used to classify the rich and varied collection of the Madras University Library. Lessons learned during this period were incorporated into the first edition, and later ruminations on its theoretical basis were crystallised in the first edition of the *Prolegomena to Library Classification* (1937) which proved to be his *magnum opus* and a classic of the professional literature which has guided and inspired many a genius in our profession.

In 1945, Ranganathan single-handedly classified the entire library of the Banaras Hindu University (BHU), and from 1947 onwards he supervised the reclassification with the CC of the Delhi University library. No doubt, such experiences helped the development of the CC, but these institutional backings were only incidental. There has been no permanent or statutory institution to experiment with and test the use of the CC and to give the needed feedback for its revision. The DRTC library is too small and specialised to work as a laboratory for the CC. Furthermore, there has not been any institution to provide organizational support the way the LC and OCLC do for the DDC, or as the FID had been doing for the UDC (The closed down FID has now been replaced by the UDC Consortium). The CC had not even that support which the Classification Research Group (CRG) had given to the Bibliographic Classification (2<sup>nd</sup> edition) (BC-2) which was being revised under the competent leadership of Jack Mills (1918-2010). In the 1980s and 1990s the discussions in the CRG meetings were mostly devoted to the revision of the BC-2

In the constitution of the Documentation and Training Centre (DRTC) there is no mention of supporting and promoting the CC<sup>6</sup>. As long as Ranganathan was alive, the DRTC faculty worked as a research team on the CC in the guise of the advance documentation work. The results were published in the DRTC Annual Seminars and in the journal *Library Science with a Slant to Documentation* [from 1964 onward]. This work also continued to some extent after Ranganathan's death though the team suddenly felt rudderless, and soon shifted interest to broader areas of library and information science. On whom Ranganathan had pinned high hopes did nothing to perpetuate CC. They had their own priorities. Indeed DRTC has no legal or moral concern to back the CC. The Sarada Ranganathan Endowment for Library Science (SRELS, established in 1963), the legal heir to Ranganathan's material property and legacy, is not in itself a research institution, although it is now the copyright owner of Ranganathan's books, including the CC. However, its backing is not of much consequence towards the acceptance of the CC. The endowment twice did endeavour to revise the CC under the leadership of late Professor A Neelamegham (1924-2014) who had been a towering personality among the DRTC faculty and a favourite of Ranganathan. But the efforts came too late after his retirement from many international assignments abroad. Moreover, that lacked planning and resources; it was too late and too little to be of any consequence<sup>7</sup>.

An analogous and central question is about the formal machinery for revising the CC. Ranganathan was all alone in his task. CC never had any editorial board, nor did he ever associate anyone with it in any way. No one has been acknowledged in the sixth edition. Ranganathan always projected the CC to be a self-perpetuating scheme, which it is not. If he meant the use of devices for creating new isolates and keep the CC working then it is experienced that free use of these devices leads to cumbersome and unwieldy class numbers with loss of uniformity across the libraries. No social institution or man's creation can be self-perpetuating in this sense. Revising a classification scheme is vital: to incorporate new main classes at their logical places, to elaborate topics in light of their literary warrant, to relocate some old topics to more appropriate places, to delete obsolete classes, to replace obsolete terms with current ones, and above all, to attune the classification system with

the contemporary structure of knowledge in harmony with the current perceptions of scholars. For Foskett<sup>1</sup> the objective of revising a classification scheme "is to give library users an opportunity to see a spectrum of the universe of information displayed in an order that makes sense, which enables them to discover how the experts in each field think it best or arrange their information". Revisions are also necessary to incorporate and display new relations among subjects and their combinations. That is to conform the system to the perceived current structure of knowledge. Revisions should incorporate research based innovations in designing classification systems and also on users' approaches to the library classifications, and their expectations from them. Revisions are absolutely necessary to give the scheme an updated terminology and a contemporary outlook.

Revision is in fact a double-edged sword that cuts both ways. If you revise (drastically) you die, and if you do not revise you surely die<sup>8</sup>. In this regard the comments of McIlwaine<sup>9</sup>, the first full time editor of the UDC, are very apt and interesting:

Whatever we do, we will get criticism. If you do not revise outdated parts of a classification it is immediately decried as being out of touch with modern developments. If you do revise it, you immediately receive a welter of complaints from long-established users who do not wish to change their classification practices.

For constant revision we need a formal, well-conceived policy and sound machinery. In the case of the CC, the revision policy and process have been opaque. Different editions were published when Ranganathan had time or had any substantial change to incorporate, especially in the notational plane. The new editions were published at an uneven pace: 2nd (1939), 3rd (1950), 4th (1952), 5th (1957), 6th (1960), 6th revised (1963) and 7th (1987). As a result many librarians thought it to be at experimental stages rather than to be a mature and stable system. Different CC editions incorporated varying degrees of changes. Drastic changes always make switching to new editions difficult – Ranganathan's method of osmosis notwithstanding. That is why different libraries are still using different editions, making it difficult to have coordination among them<sup>10</sup>.

Ranganathan always promoted team research<sup>11</sup>. In spite of the contributions of a close group of disciples in the form of the Library Research Circle (Delhi) in

1950s, the DRTC faculty, and Ranganathan's spirited students like Professor P N Kaula, the CC has always been considered as a one man show. Many of the colleagues and students were slavish to him, mostly because of his towering personality and peerless intellect. For many Indian colleagues, he was a czar or a hoary father not to be argued with. Some critics were even considered as enemies.

There never has been a formal editorial board for the CC. Ranganathan once announced in a seminar on classification in the USA<sup>12</sup>:

At the request of Peter Jayasinge of Asia Publishing House [Ranganathan's publisher in the 1960s] a self-perpetuating Ranganathan Colon Classification Board has been formed. Its function is to stay up-to-date and bring out new editions of the Colon Classification, the Basic Versions as well as the fascicules containing the Depth versions for diverse subject areas. It will also bring out new editions of such of the other books of Ranganathan as deserve to be so treated. The board will be an auxiliary of the Sarada Ranganathan Endowment for Library Science (1963).

But nothing has been heard of this board: when and where it was constituted, and with whom? Perhaps it was never born! Ranganathan's students and admirers, who valued the CC and wished to see the CC perpetuated, tried here and there to form such a board. Late Professor P. N. Kaula (1924-2009) recounts that in 1957, with the concurrence of Ranganathan, he approached Dr. Lal C. Verman, then the Director General of the Indian Standards Institution (now renamed, Bureau of Indian Standards), to take up the future revisions of the CC and the Ranganathan Cataloguing Code. But Dr. Verman in turn suggested that they approach the Indian National Scientific Documentation Centre (INSDOC, New Delhi) [Now merged to become NISCAIR], in view of the expertise available there and the professional information services provided by it. Perhaps he was right. Since in those days Ranganathan was associated with INSDOC as chairman of its technical committees, so he himself did not think it appropriate to be involved in pursuing the idea with INSDOC. A committee was appointed in 1960 for this purpose. In the meantime (in 1962) Documentation Research and Training Center (DRTC), Bengaluru was established with Ranganathan as its honorary

director, and he thought, perhaps erroneously, that the DRTC was the right institution for the purpose. So the committee became defunct. One problem with the DRTC is that it does not have the requisite large library to base and test a classification system on literary warrant. All these fruitless efforts made by Ranganathan to establish a permanent governing body for the CC have been documented by Ranganathan in a paper which makes a comparative study of CC with the DDC, UDC and LCC<sup>30</sup> (Appendix I).

The issue was again taken up by Kaula after Ranganathan's death in 1972. He raised it while addressing the staff of the Jawaharlal Nehru University Library, New Delhi. Kaula also mentioned that a committee was appointed to explore the possibility of revising the CC<sup>13</sup>. But again nothing came out of this endeavour too.

In a seminar on "Classification and Knowledge Organization" organized by the Indian ISKO chapter in January 1994, Professor Kaula again voiced his concern for revision of the CC and sought some institutional backing for it. He again suggested INSDOC for the purpose. Mr A. R. Sethi, then the Deputy Librarian, offered the Jawaharlal University Library, New Delhi, to serve as the laboratory in social sciences classification for the CC. Although this suggestion was welcomed, so far it has not been followed up<sup>14</sup>. Nor does there seem any likelihood of this now. In fact no editorial committee was named; the Sarada Ranganathan Endowment has been inflexible to lose its copyright hold. Perhaps they believed, rightly, that such resolutions are never to be taken seriously. These never materialise.

Jones had raised his concern in May 1966 in a letter to the editor of the *Library Association Record*. Projecting the scientific value of the CC and the need for its perpetuation, he wrote<sup>15</sup>:

Would it not therefore be a good idea if in full consultation with Dr. Ranganathan, a Permanent International Committee were established consisting of men and women well-versed in either practical or theoretical classification (and preferably in both) with the purpose of revising and republishing the Colon scheme, whenever the committee considered this desirable?

Ranganathan has endorsed this proposal in his *Prolegomena* and elsewhere<sup>30</sup>, and in his heart of heart he wished (now)erstwhile FID to step in to take the CC in its fold for further research and

maintenance<sup>16</sup>. It was too much to expect from the FID which was beleaguered to maintain its own UDC. Such a proposal was only silently mooted without submitting that to any forum or organisation. It is difficult to say what made Ranganathan leave the CC a virtual orphan without any heir to bring new editions after his death. Otherwise so tenderly careful about the profession at large and its organizations, Ranganathan left the CC to an uncertain fate.

Even his professional heir and Secretary of the Sarada Ranganathan Endowment, late Professor M.A. Gopinath (1940-2012), was alone in his colossal task. In the seventh edition of the CC (1987), the first after Ranganathan's death, there is no sign of any collective work, or outside help. Gopinath was without the benefit of the cooperation and expertise of the individuals and organizations that are sincerely eager to see the Colon alive and thriving<sup>17</sup>. An editorial board is a must for any library classification system to survive. Commenting on the revision of the Library of Congress Classification (LCC), Curwen<sup>18</sup> summed up: "Autocratic, cumbersome, detailed, illogical, pragmatic, practical: it works for the Library of Congress and will probably continue to do so, with a guaranteed built-in mechanism for revision, for as long as book shelving classification is needed, it would seem". Ranganathan himself considers it a very important factor for adopting a classification scheme in a library. Fully cognisant of his failures to find any institutional support for the CC he awarded nil marks to his CC while giving full marks to the DDC, UDC and LCC<sup>30</sup>.

### Features of the Colon Classification

According to Comaromi<sup>19</sup>, the Editor of the DDC20, a library classification is expected to perform three generic functions:

1. Organization of ideas i.e. filiation sequence representing the structure and map of knowledge (the cognitive function).
2. Organization of document surrogates for information retrieval (the bibliographic function).
3. Arrangement of documents on shelves (the library function for document display and browsing). The DDC till sixteenth edition fell in this last category<sup>20</sup>

Comaromi further asserted that all these functions are conjoined so much so that a classification which performs a higher function well will perform any lower function equally well, but not the vice-versa. A bibliographic classification will certainly be good at

shelf arrangement too, but a shelf classification may not be good at mapping or information retrieval.

The CC has a modern structure and also provides a good shelf arrangement. It is eminently suitable for information retrieval both in manual and online environments. It has a very sound theoretical foundation based upon normative principles, canons, principles and postulates and on the modes of growth of knowledge. Ranganathan is credited with making classification an objective science. But sound theory alone is not sufficient. Melvil Dewey knew it very well when in 1931 he wrote that the existence of the DDC depends on constant sales of new editions and that the practical needs of users must always be a major consideration<sup>18</sup>. It is something which was rehashed by Mr. Benjamin A Custer<sup>20</sup> the editor of the DDC from editions 16 to 19. Melvil Dewey sacrificed theory on the altar of pragmatism. It paid dividends to the DDC in terms of popularity.

The extent to which the CC serves library and information centres is controversial. For some, it is too theoretical, for others it is very practical. In the West many erroneously consider it a classification designed for Indian subjects -- especially the Indology classics; while many Indian librarians consider it as a theoretical and experimental classification due to its frequent revisions in 1950s. Accordingly, its acceptability by the users is mixed. To many librarians the CC is intellectually stimulating. The pattern woven by it on the shelves is logical, pedagogical and aesthetical-- famously termed as APUPA pattern. But many are put off by its too highly mixed notation and are bogged down by its devices, facet and phase analysis and raft of rules for number synthesis. The majority of the librarians of Ranganathan's generation and the one following him never learned or understood it easily. Some had personal apathy with the system and its creator. Indeed the system appeared complex because of its details, frightening notation and jargon, as well as its number-building methods.

However, charges of complexity are a bit overblown. The famous J. Mills (1918-2010)<sup>21</sup>, in the early 1950s, wrote that "once the basic rules and disciplines of Colon are grasped (not a difficult matter), the scheme becomes extremely easy to apply - easier than Bliss [BC-1], because [being] more purely logical and leaving few decisions to the classifier." In the same vein Langridge<sup>22</sup>, a famous member of CRG and an ardent admirer of

Ranganathan, challenged all those who projected CC as a complicated system. Having taught classification for a long time, this author can vouch for that students are more at ease with Colon number-building than with the DDC; they feel a sense of achievement on building a complicated class number.

It is also true that Ranganathan never fully understood the value of simplicity of notation to gain acceptance from the users. He used to cite an airplane engine analogy that a passenger need not worry about the complexity of the airplane engine. That analogy may distantly be true in a closed-access library. For online information retrieval or for arrangement of entries in a bibliography, the complexity of notation is not a hindrance. Perhaps it is an inevitable price for coextensive class numbers, for a logical sequence, for hospitality, and for high recall and precision ratios, as Ranganathan maintained. The CC is at a disadvantage because of its non-use by any centralised classification/cataloguing agency. The only solace is that the CC class numbers are given in the bibliographic entries of the Indian National Bibliography, which otherwise is arranged by DDC numbers.

Marketing and public relations of the CC are extremely poor. Many mediocre systems are popular and thriving because of their marketing networks and techniques. Colon has been under attack both at home and abroad from motivated critics. But nothing effective has been done to counter the attacks of its detractors and attend to the genuine difficulties of its users. The CC has been projected as India's *de facto* national classification system, yet nothing substantial has been done to promote its honour. There is no forum for CC users, and there is nobody to whom one can turn to in case of difficulties. Those who were supposed to promote CC and take care of its users never responded to queries from the users despite their repeated requests. Their callous attitude did considerable harm to its progress and popularity. Books explaining the system are no better than student guides to help them pass examinations, and these books ignore the practical difficulties of librarians. Accuracy of some of such books is doubtful. There is no official manual to apply the CC; notes and instructions in the schedules are not adequate to ensure intended interpretations and uniformity of its application. Inter-classifier consistency is very much deficient despite claims to the contrary.

### **The extent of the use of Colon Classification**

No serious and wide ranging study of the use of the CC in computerised information retrieval or organising the Web has been made, yet by all accounts a faceted classification is eminently suitable for such applications. Also, no exact and authentic figures are available on the extent of use of the CC in libraries for shelf arrangement. Ranganathan<sup>23</sup>, in a seminar at Rutgers University, described the extent of the CC use as follows:

The Colon Classification is in use in the universities of ten constituent states of India. Almost all the public libraries and the college libraries in the state of Madras and Maharashtra use it. It is also in use in some public libraries in other states. Some of the legislative libraries and libraries of government departments are also using it.

Indeed it was an exaggerated claim.

Dahlberg<sup>24</sup> quotes late Dr. Gopinath on the issue as follows: "The CC sixth edition has been used in about 2500 libraries in India, mostly in public libraries, but also in nearly 20 universities, 2000 special and 1000 college libraries."

However, according to the ILA Directory (1951) of the Indian Library Association, out of the 363 libraries listed therein, only 31 (8.5%) libraries used the CC. The majority (55%) of these 31 libraries were academic. According to the IASLIC Directory (1962) of the Indian Association of Special Libraries and Information Centres, which listed 173 libraries, only 23 (13.3%) were using the CC. The use of the CC even ranked behind the use of the DDC and UDC in Indian libraries. A Delhi library directory (1973) shows the use of the system in 10.5% of the Delhi libraries. According to Dr. Pushpa Dhyani's doctoral research survey of Delhi and Rajasthan libraries, the use of CC is up to 24% of the libraries, the majority being academic<sup>25</sup>.

Till recently the CC was being taught in all the Indian library schools at every level. Abroad, especially in the UK and Europe, its theoretical principles have been taught as a model of faceted classification, however, this place is being taken over by the BC-2, which is admittedly based upon theories of Ranganathan<sup>26,27</sup>. The DDC, UDC, and numerous specialised systems have also employed Ranganathan theories and techniques in their revisions. Numerous

specialised classifications have been designed on the Ranganathan model by the CRG members and others<sup>28</sup>. But regretfully the CC has not adopted the organizational and marketing techniques of these successful systems.

### Suggestions for resuscitating and revitalizing the system

If the trend continues, the future generations may know of the CC beauties and ingenuities only through Mills' BC-2, and the CC may become a mere name. Thus, the future of the CC is predictably bleak, and it is a foreboding to us all to rise to the occasion. The CC needs to be resuscitated, as it is a precious national heritage and can be an important force for the management of libraries and organising the World Wide Web. A revitalised CC can be a symbol and evidence of India's intellectual power. Accordingly, some suggestions to revive it are, that:

- 1 A Colon Classification association be formed by those who want to save a national heritage.
- 2 Some institutional support be sought for the system; some national library organization or institution must be responsible for the upkeep and propagation of the CC. Government of India must step in and form a broad-based editorial board to revive and modernise the CC. In the Sixth IASLIC conference held at Trivandrum in December 1965 it was recommended in the proceedings that "An Editorial board on the lines of Decimal Classification, Universal Decimal and Library of Congress Editorial Boards be constituted to ensure continuity and up-to-dateness of the Colon Classification"<sup>29</sup>. In the Indian ISKO seminar (1994), "Professor Kaula advocated that still more people should cooperate in the revision work of CC. Prof. Gopinath had agreed to the proposal of having a wide based editorial board<sup>14</sup>.
- 3 A new revised edition be brought out, updating and correcting the errors of the CC-7 (1987). The CC-6 and CC-7 should be merged and system be bit simplified and standardised.
- 4 A CC website be created and a bulletin and blog be started to keep in touch with the CC users, researchers and enthusiasts.
- 5 A directory of CC users be compiled. The IASLIC Conference (1965) had also recommended a survey of the CC users<sup>29</sup>.
- 6 The potential of the CC's use in online systems be studied, and the CC be brought out in a web based version.
- 7 Occasional conferences and refresher courses on the CC, faceted classifications and subject indexing be organized regularly.
- 8 An official manual on the use of the CC schedules (on the lines of the DDC manual) be prepared and published. This will be a device "Whereby the CC classificationists and classifiers can understand each other"<sup>4</sup>.
- 9 The above named organization would keep a watch on the correct use of the CC and help raise the level of teaching the system. It would also work as a clearinghouse for CC literature and publicising innovations.
- 10 Public relations of the CC with the library professionals and users be spruced up; librarians and the public at large should be educated about the high and peerless qualities of the CC.

We are left with no other option but to act. In perpetuating the Colon Classification, the Indian Library profession has much at stake.

### References

- 1 Foskett DJ, Classifications and information languages: Thoughts on revising a bibliographical classification scheme, *International Forum for Information and Documentation*, 14 (1) (1989) 3-7.
- 2 Ranganathan SR, *A Descriptive Account of Colon Classification*, (Asia; Bombay), 1967.
- 3 National Knowledge Commission, *Libraries: Gateways to knowledge-A Roadmap for Revitalization*, New Delhi, 2007. Available at: [http://knowledgecommissionarchive.nic.in/downloads/documents/NKC\\_Library.pdf](http://knowledgecommissionarchive.nic.in/downloads/documents/NKC_Library.pdf) (Accessed on 14 November 2015)
- 4 Jain HC, Colon Classification: A review article, *Library Association Record*, 66(8) (1964) 348.
- 5 Wells AJ, Our debt to India, In *Library Science in India*, Chandrasekharan K, Ed, (ILA; New Delhi) (1953) p. 55-63.
- 6 Ranganathan SR, DRTC and its role in documentation. Paper A, *DRTC Annual Seminar*, 3 (1965) 3-25.
- 7 Satija MP and Singh J, Colon Classification: a requiem, *DESIDOC Journal of Library & Information Technology*, 33 (4) (2013) 265-276.
- 8 Satija MP, *The theory and practice of the Dewey Decimal Classification*, (Chandos; Oxford; UK) (2013) p. 35.
- 9 McIlwaine IC, UDC centenary: The present state and future prospects, *Knowledge Organization*, 22 (2) (1995) 64-69.
- 10 Singh S and Satija MP, Indian classification systems: An analysis, *Library Science with a Slant to Documentation*, 35 (3) (1998) 165-178.
- 11 Satija MP, Ranganathan and team research, *Herald of Library Science*, 32 (1-2) (1993) 84-94.
- 12 Ranganathan SR, *A Descriptive Account of Colon Classification*, (Asia; Bombay) (1967) p. 24.

- 13 Kaula PN, Editors preface to M. F. Jones: Colon, revise or die, *Herald of Library Science*, 15 (3- 4) (1976) 345-346.
- 14 Singh S and Prasad KN, Indian ISKO Chapter: Seminar on classification and knowledge representation, *Knowledge Organization*, 21 (1) (1994) 38.
- 15 Jones MF, Colon, revise or die, *Library Association Record*, 68(5) (1966) 186.
- 16 Ranganathan SR, *Prolegomena to library classification*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edn, (Asia; Bombay) (1967) p. 583-590.
- 17 Satija MP, Editor's Introduction to *Colon Classification*, 7<sup>th</sup> edn, (Sterling; New Delhi) (1993).
- 18 Curwen AG; Revision of classification schemes: Policies and practice, *Journal of Librarianship*, 10 (1) (1978) 19-38.
- 19 Comaromi JP, Comparison of major classification schemes. In A. Nitecki and T. Fell (Eds.), *Proceedings: International Conference on Library Classification and its Functions*, (University of Alberta; Edmonton, Canada) (1989).
- 20 Custer BA, Mr Phillips. *Library Association Record*, 62 (1960) 406-407.
- 21 Mills J, The Bliss and Colon Classifications. *Library Association Record*, 53 (5) (1951) 146-153.
- 22 Langridge DW, The unique value of Colon Classification, In Rajagopalan TS (Ed) *Ranganathan's Philosophy: Assessment, Impact and Relevance*, (Vikas; New Delhi) (1985) p. 600-601.
- 23 Ranganathan SR, *A Descriptive Account of Colon Classification*, (Asia; Bombay) (1967) p. 25.
- 24 Dahlberg I, Major developments in classification, *Advances in Librarianship* 7, (Academic Press; New York) (1977).
- 25 Satija MP, Use of Colon Classification. *International Classification*, 13 (2) (1986) 88-92.
- 26 Bury S, Ranganathan's theories embedded in both Colon Classification and second edition of Bliss Bibliographic Classification, *Herald of Library Science*, 25 (1) (1986) 1-13.
- 27 Williamson N, Subject analysis systems. In P. Johnson (Ed.) *Guide to Technical Services Resources*, (ALA; Chicago) (1994).
- 28 Vickery BC, *Faceted classification: A guide to construction and use of special schemes*, (ASLIB; London) (1960) p. 70.
- 29 Recommendations of the 6<sup>th</sup> (1965) IASLIC Conference, Trivandrum, *IASLIC Bulletin*, 11 (1) (1966) 50.
- 30 Ranganathan, SR. Choice of scheme for classification. *Lib. Sci. with a slant to Documentation*, 5(1) (March 1968), 1-69.

## Appendix I

A catalogue of Ranganathan's efforts for formulating a governing body for his CC. Extracted from his paper: Ranganathan SR. Choice of scheme for classification. *Library Science with a Slant to Documentation*, 5(1) (1968) 1-69.

### 7.5 Colon Classification

With regard to a permanent organisation for future development, CC is in the same plight as BC. Here is an account of the past attempts and of the future hopes in this matter.

#### 7.5.1 Madras Library Association

In 1939, the Madras Library Association started its annual Memoirs. The intension was to give an Annexure in each annual volume giving an account of the additions and changes made in CC during the year. It was also intended that librarians should be invited to state in its pages the problems they had come across during the year. World War II started; and the Memoirs had to be discontinued after three issues. In 1945, I had to leave Madras to work in North India. Thus ended the first attempt.

#### 7.5.2 University of Delhi

In 1947, I joined the University of Delhi. Sir Maurice Gwyer, its then Vice-Chancellor, had great ambitions for that University. He wanted that it should be the home of all All-India Learned Bodies. In particular, he was keen that it should develop Library Science in full measure. For this purpose, he told me that he was endeavouring to establish a Regius Professorship in Library Science in the University. He was soliciting help for this from some of the Indian princes and business magnates. But when these things were only in the stage of negotiation, the absorption of the Indian States into the Indian Union was set on foot. Therefore, no further progress was possible. Sir Maurice had told me quite often that one of the functions of the Department of Library Science with the Regius Professor at its head would be to have full charge of the future development of CC.

#### 7.5.3 Insdoc

In 1950, Sir S S Bhatnagar, Sir K S Krishnan, and myself promoted the establishment of the Insdoc. Sir S S Bhatnagar was the Director-General of the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR); Sir K S Krishnan took administrative charge of the Insdoc; and I became the Chairman of the Technical Committees. In 1951, the first two proposed that the Insdoc should take charge of the future development of CC. It was an attractive proposition. However, we thought that we should wait and see, as much would depend upon the Head of the Insdoc. Therefore, this proposal was not pursued. This appears to have been for good. For, recent events show that CC has fallen out of favour with the Insdoc even as DC had fallen out of favour with the Library of Congress about 67 years ago (See Sec 72). It is hoped that this will be temporary.

#### 7.5.4 Indian Standards Institution

In 1952 an idea was developed that the Indian Standards Institution might take charge and sponsor the development of CC This was suggested on the analogy of the British Standards Institution having charge of UDC. However, this idea was not pursued seriously.

#### 7.5.5 Madras University

In 1956, at the suggestion of my wife Sarada, and with the concurrence of my son R Yogeswar, an Endowment of Rs. 100,000 was given to the University of Madras for use in establishing the Sarada Ranganathan Professorship of Library Science. With the aid of the University Grants Commission and the other resources of the University, a Department of Library Science was established in the University in 1961 with the Sarada Ranganathan Professor at its head. At the request of the Vice-Chancellor as to what all could be done by the Professor and the Department, I gave a memorandum of suggestions. One suggestion was that the Department should take charge of the future development of CC. This would be appropriate as during its first 20 years, CC developed in the Madras University Library. But, the University has not yet taken up this matter.

#### 7.5.6 Asia Publishing House

About 1962, the subject of the future development of CC came up for discussion between the Asia Publishing House and myself. We considered the possibility of persuading either the Indian Standards Institution or the Union Ministry of Education to take over the future development of CC. But Peter Jayasinghe of the Asia Publishing House said in effect "Is it wise to give this academic work to a Department of the Government? After all, you will have to yourself find out your successor to take charge of CC. He in his turn will have to find out his successor. The Asia Publishing House will always be guided by your decision and that of your successors in this matter. Can you not leave it in our hands?"

#### 7.5.7 Sarada Ranganathan Endowment for Library Science

In 1961, the Sarada Ranganathan Endowment for Library Science was established. Its funds are vested in the Treasurer for Charitable Endowments, India. Its affairs are managed by a self-perpetuating Board of Trustees. To provide a source of income for this Endowment, the copyright of all my books including the Colon classification and of some other books in the Ranganathan Series in Library Science has been assigned to this Endowment. This made Peter Jayasinghe to make another proposal.

He suggested the formation of a self-perpetuating Ranganathan Colon Classification Board. The Board would have a panel of probable authors from whom it will choose the editor and the reviser for my respective books including the Colon classification. All these books would continue to appear as volumes in the Ranganathan Series in Library Science. The Board would be an auxiliary of the Endowment. This proposal has not yet taken a final shape.

#### **7.5.8 Documentation Research and Training Centre**

In 1962, the Documentation Research and Training Centre (DRTC) was established in Bangalore with me as the first Honorary Professor. Since then, the development of CC is being informally looked after by DRTC. From 1964, the DRTC and the Sarada Ranganathan Endowment for Library Science are jointly sponsoring the quarterly Library science with a slant to documentation. The DRTC is also having its Annual Seminar and its Proceedings are published every year since 1963. These two periodicals contain the current developments in CC. Between themselves, these two periodicals have so far published 73 articles and depth schedules for diverse subjects. There are also 25 unpublished depth schedules for other subjects, worked out by the students and some visiting research workers of DRTC. The DRTC is fortunate in having a band of competent, devoted, and enthusiastic permanent staff for teaching and research and also a circle of research workers informally attached to it: All the articles and depth schedules are directly or indirectly due to them. This informal development has prompted a new hope for the future. At the instance of the far-seeing Professor P C Mahalanobis, the Indian Statistical Institute founded the DRTC and has been generously maintaining it. It is a small residential institution. It works in the spirit of the All Souls College of Oxford and the Institute for Fundamental Research in Princeton. According to the Chairman of the FID/CR (= Classification Research Committee of the International Federation for Documentation): "It is well known, however, that the Documentation Research and Training Centre (DRTC), which was founded at Bangalore in 1962, has become not only an Asiatic but a world center for classification research. Many significant research reports have been issued by this institute, partly in the quarterly Library science with a slant to documentation since 1964, and partly in the Proceedings of the Annual DRTC Seminar since 1963" (19).

#### **7.5.9 A Call for an International Organisation**

M F Jones of UK has suggested the need for an international organisation to maintain CC up-to-date. The following are his words:

"New particles of knowledge may conceivably arise; new methods of combining these particles may also occur; and changes in the notation may become necessary; here are three good reasons for continuing to revise the Colon scheme (as its founder has already done on five separate occasions). Furthermore, the "depth" schedules have not reached edition one yet, let alone revision.

"Would it not therefore be a good idea if, in full consultation with Dr Ranganathan, a permanent International Committee is established, consisting of men and women well versed in either practical or theoretical classification (and preferably in both) with the purpose of revising and re-publishing the Colon scheme whenever the Committee considered this desirable? Provided the Committee's concern was not lavishly to worship Dr Ranganathan, no harm would be done; and the original product of one man's mind over 33 years could be developed into whatever may be its logical conclusions" (21).