Greetings to all readers of Library Resources & Technical Services. This is actually the second issue of the journal produced under my editorship, and it now seems appropriate to make a statement about its direction. First of all, the journal is in fine shape, due in large part to my predecessor, Jennifer Younger, under whose direction LRTS has maintained the high quality and high standards for which it is known. She deserves my thanks and the thanks of all members of the association for her excellent leadership. Thanks also to all who have served on the editorial board and have contributed to the journal’s success.

The primary goal for the coming years is for the journal to continue to be a vital part of the professional lives of all members of ALCTS and, indeed, of all practicing professionals. LRTS must remain at the heart of the intellectual and practical challenges that we all will face in the future. Towards that end, I see some particular goals the journal should strive to achieve. LRTS has a history of publishing empirical research into the operations and functions of libraries; these kinds of studies have been—and should continue to be—an integral part of the journal’s contents. I invite all who are inquiring into operations to consider communicating the fruits of their work through LRTS. That said, I do not think we should define “research” too narrowly. I would also invite contributions of a critical, thoughtful, and interpretive nature. There is great potential for LRTS to be a major source of critical scholarship on questions related to information resources, access, and organization. Thus the journal will be open to many forms of inquiry and many questions; each form will be assessed according to the criteria applicable to it and the highest standards of evaluation will continue to be applied.

I also offer to work with potential contributors to the journal. A goal we all share is the communication of the highest quality work possible; it is the job of the editor and the editorial board to help realize that goal. I invite contributions and inquiries that advance our profession. I also invite comments from readers. Feel free to share your views of LRTS and its contents with me. I can be reached at buddj@missouri.edu. This is the ALCTS journal. Together we can continue to maintain its excellence.

To the Editor:

The special issue of LRTS titled “What in the World . . . Cataloging on an International Scale” was both interesting and informative. I am writing to correct an imprecise statement in one of the papers (Aliprand 2000). On page 165 the author states: “LC practice is to always transcribe Hebrew unvocalized, even when vowels and marks of pronunciation (which are positioned on consonantal [sic] letters) appear on the source of information.” (My reason for writing this letter is not to point out the split infinitive or the misspelling of consonantal in the quoted sentence.) The sentence describes current LC [Library of Congress] practice accurately, but the conclusion of the paragraph—“So we’ve never been 100% faithful”—suggests that omitting Hebrew vowel points and diacritics has always been LC practice. As I pointed out in a survey of Anglo-American Hebraica cataloging practices that was originally presented at an international conference, LC used to faithfully transcribe (split infinitives sound good sometimes) vowel points from the title pages of Hebrew books (see figure 1) (Weinberg 1992).

The authors of a recent book on Hebrew cataloging discuss this issue in the context of the interpretation of AACR2R rule 1.1B1 (1988, 18), which states, “Give accentuation and other diacritical marks that are present in the chief source of information” (Lazinger and Adler 1998, 102–5). In two chapters, Lazinger and Adler (1998, 103, 162) quote a relevant point from the introduction to the proposed Hebraic character set for RLIN (Weinberg 1985): “[T]his proposal features a full set of vowel points and diacritics. . . . These special characters, are included . . . to enable the cataloger to record them when they occur in the work being cataloged.” Since Ms. Aliprand is the staff member of the Research Libraries Group (RLG) who worked on implementing a complete Hebrew character set in RLIN, I am confident that she would want the historical record set straight. The relevant principle from RLG’s work on non-Roman scripts is: “The character