To ask of a multilibrary survey "what are its conclusions?" is naive these days. They deal with cooperation and the interdependence of libraries. Ask, rather, about the libraries surveyed, or the sponsoring organization, and you will be better able to assess the value of the surveyor's recommended levels and techniques of cooperation.

The present survey was commissioned by the Ontario Library Association, but paid for by a direct provincial grant since it was expected that this report would form the basis for new legislation. Its scope was the broadest possible: *all* types of libraries —public, university, college, school, special, and government. Can a provincewide "plan" for a province of six million people and four hundred thousand square miles, incorporating all these diverse types of libraries, be presented in under two hundred double-spaced typescript pages?

This is not to suggest that each square mile demands a square inch of report space, but rather to ask what such a report might be expected to include of: (1) background information; (2) isolation of problem areas; (3) principles to be observed in finding solutions; (4) technical and administrative details of suggested solutions; and (5) supporting statistical evidence.

It would be kind to suggest that much of the first could be omitted since Ontario's librarians are perfectly aware of it. But why omit the important historical framework of, say, the independent religious college libraries and then spend half a page on such trivia as Ontario's scenic spots? The problem areas are identified: geographic imbalance, administrative inefficiency of small units, lack of ready communication even among nearby libraries, and lack of provincewide coordination. A less superficial treatment, however, might have lent a greater air of authority through more obvious attention to local circumstances than to a procrustean use of old published statistics and generalized norms.

The principle of cooperation is certainly valid, but the surveyors ride it so hard that one wonders if they even considered the tempering role of tradition, of day-to-day work efficiency, or of library purposes. In proposing concrete steps toward an integrated library system, this report unfortunately falls between two stools. It specifies many solutions in administrative detail rather than leaving the principles to be worked out as the time of application and the local circumstances demand. This approach is not in itself bad, but every proposed solution becomes suspect when it is found that the ramifications of some have not been thought out carefully enough by the surveyors to indicate their impracticality. Of particular interest here is the fact that the province's academic librarians are now on record as severely critical of many aspects of the report's view of their place in the grand scheme.

This is unfortunate, for the approach and conclusions of the "St. John Report" are not in general poor or invalid. And for Ontario's libraries, the report has already had the salutary effect of increasing certain provincial grants and of obtaining press headlines. Should one ask for more? For readers of this journal, this report will tell something about Ontario's conditions and needs, very little that is new or detailed about the practical operation, of cooperative efforts, and much about how not to write a survey report.—*Ronald Hagler, The University of British Columbia.*

The Role of the Library in Improving Education in the South. Ed. with an introduction by Hallie Beachem Brooks. Atlanta, Georgia: Atlanta University School of Library Service, 1965. 112 pp. Apply.

In the Spring of 1965 the Atlanta University school of library service, with the cooperation of the Emory University division of librarianship, sponsored a conference on "The Role of the Library in Improving Education in the South." To provide an opportunity for defining the role of the library in the South's efforts to solve a variety of economic, educational, social, and cultural problems; to communicate to nonlibrary groups the need for joint concern as well as the fact that libraries can make a significant contribution to programs designed for social betterment; to consider specific methods of planning and implementing all types of programs concerned with advancing the cause of education in the South: these were the purposes of this conference which was made possible by a

grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. The volume here under review—edited with an introduction by Hallie Beachem Brooks and published in an attractive format—brings together the papers presented at the conference and the discussions which followed them.

The various papers presented at the conference provide much information, and much food for thought; they merit a careful reading by all who are concerned with and interested in the South and things Southern. Monroe C. Neff (North Carolina State Department of Community Colleges) considers those forces and factors which will provide "A Sound Environment for an Evolving Social Institution." Lawrence L. Durisch (Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville) and Reed Sarratt (Southern Education Reporting Service, Nashville) define the South in terms of her social-economic-cultural and educational aspects. Archie L. McNeal (University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida) describes and analyzes the role of the library in relation to the South's social-economic-cultural problems. Virginia Lacy Jones (Atlanta University school of library service) defines the role of the library in relation to the South's educational problems, and suggests that librarians "need to go 'way out' at times and perhaps appear to be impractical, to get our feet off the ground—perhaps to attempt the impossible with verve and spirit and faith." Ruth E. Warncke (deputy executive director of the American Library Association) provides an evaluative summary of the conference, pointing out its strengths and weaknesses.

Leon Carnovsky (graduate library school, University of Chicago) delivered the conference's banquet address, in which he dealt with "Libraries and the International Scene." Thus, while the conference was concerned appropriately and primarily with problems of the American South, its planners wisely chose to include a place on the program for a consideration of the world beyond the South.

In *The Role of the Library in Improving Education in the South* we have a thoughtful and thought-provoking consideration of an important topic. Both those who attended the conference and those who were not so fortunate will welcome the publication of these proceedings.—*John David Marshall, University of Georgia.*

A Survey of the University of Delhi Library. By Carl M. White. Delhi: Planning Unit, University of Delhi, 1965. xvi + 184 p. 6 tables.

The University of Delhi, one of the younger universities in India, was incorporated in 1922. The major growth of the university and its library, however, has taken place since 1939, and particularly after 1942 when Shri S. Das Gupta assumed the post of librarian following a period of training under S. R. Ranganathan. The development and expansion of the university since that time has been remarkable. From 1945-1965, the enrollment increased 840 per cent, reaching a high of 29,550 in the academic year 1964-65. The book collections in the same period increased by 462 per cent, and the total expenditures for the library 995 per cent. A new library building was erected and occupied in 1958 and now houses 168,263 volumes. The total book resources of the university, including the departmental and college libraries, total 872,034 volumes. A brilliant future is anticipated for the university as it assumes an increasing role of educational leadership in India and becomes an important cultural link between India and other countries.

This survey was made at the request of the University of Delhi, acting on the suggestion of Professor S. Das Gupta, the librarian, by Carl M. White, who served as a Ford Foundation consultant during the period of the survey. It is a penetrating study backed by an impressive amount of supporting data in the form of statistics and opinions from faculty and librarians on various aspects of the library problem. Dr. White brings to the analysis of the library's needs the knowledge and perspective gained through wide experience as director of three major libraries in the United States—the University of North Carolina, the University of Illinois, and Columbia University. A significant feature of the study is the evidence of wide consultation with concerned individuals in the university community. Suggestions and opinions gathered