enrolled, or his principal area of study, had a bearing on the way he used the two-year college library.

Readers who are statistically minded will probably object that all tables are relegated to an appendix. This means that no tabulated materials are in proximity to the text and no illustrations relieve the seriousness of the style. While some persons may prefer the compactness of this arrangement, others are certain to find it a bit troublesome, especially when they realize that the writing is largely reportorial in nature. The reader is especially aware of this hindrance as he examines chapters IV and V, for in these two sections virtually every paragraph makes reference to a table that appears in another section of the book.

The college teacher and administrator who is unaware of use surveys which have been made in academic libraries over the past forty years should pay considerable attention to chapter VII. In this part, Kenneth Allen not only summarizes and discusses his findings, but he also takes up the question of why faculty members show a number of inconsistent attitudes toward the library's place in learning. Chapter VII points out, for example, that while 80 percent of the teachers in this survey felt that students could not succeed in college without using the library, only 30 percent of the students actually read or borrowed any materials that were part of the library collection itself.

Findings of this kind should be brought to the attention of teachers, librarians, and administrators who work at all levels of the learning process. As the author points out, effective utilization of libraries is no accident even though teachers seem to feel students can relate any set of holdings to the structure of a discipline. The fact is that few students have such skill, and because of this librarians and faculty members need to form a team which can facilitate individual development through a wide range of self-selected tools.

The importance of Kenneth Allen's study, then, may lie less in the fact that his data corroborate earlier findings than in his conclusion that the way to make a library truly important in everyday learning is to develop a teaching-based library staff and a li-brary-oriented faculty.—*Howard Clayton, School of Library Science, University of Oklahoma.*

Library-College USA: Essays on a Prototype for an American Higher Education. Louis Shores. Tallahassee: South Pass Press, 1970.

At a time when the tarnished reputation of higher education is the subject of intense scrutiny, it is interesting to note that many of the innovative ideas proposed by Frank Newman's *Report on Higher Education* and the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education were suggested by Dean Shores as early as 1934.

The collection of essays in *Library-College USA* presents evidence of Shores's futuristic thinking for the past thirty-seven years, and his ideas in education are still avant-garde. His philosophy of librarianship should still extend attractive goals to service-minded librarians.

The educational concepts which Shores has explained in many different contexts through the years are here represented in both their topical and chronological development. The notion of the Library-College is described in one excerpt as having at least six basic elements: Learning Mode, Library, Faculty, Curriculum, Facility, and Organization.

The difference in Learning Mode emphasizes the shift from group teaching to individual learning. Here, the alert and academically qualified librarian can lend his expertise in the utilization of resources to the professor's subject knowledge. Without the right resources at the right time, self-paced instruction cannot be realized. Such an educational strategy calls for librarians who seek to utilize their informational resources for the education of students. They cannot wait to be asked, but, rather, must actively enter into the educational process in all of its stages. Such a librarian does not have to worry about faculty status.

Dean Shores also stresses again that the library should house all the different forms of instructional materials available today. This additional complexity offers another area in which librarians can offer their services to students and faculty.

The educational ideas presented here are both innovative and invigorating. However,

the repetition in *Library-College USA* is a bit overwhelming. It is true that the publication of these twenty-one essays does allow the reader to observe the evolution of Shores's gospel as well as to see the various emphases delineated in the arrangement of the essays. Still, a well-edited condensation would have provided a good synopsis of the philosophy of the library-college movement in a much shorter space and in a much more readable fashion.—*Richard J. Vorwerk, Governors State University, Park Forest South, Illinois.*

Review of Automation for Libraries. Papers presented at the C.A.C.U.L. Workshop on Library Automation in a Pre-Conference Workshop of C.L.A. at Hamilton, June 20–21, 1970. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, 1970.

This C.A.C.U.L. workshop continues a tradition begun in 1967 at the University of British Columbia. These workshops were started for the purpose of providing a place where ". . . institutions actually using or actively planning the use of computers in library operations . . . could keep up-to-date, share information, and discuss the problems they might have in common. . . ." (Introduction to 1967 workshop) The present volume continues this tradition and adds one additional goal, ". . . to discuss the continuing need for this type of meeting. . . ." (Introduction to 1970 workshop)

The workshop at which these papers were given was organized into a two-day session with the four working papers presented the first day, and a discussion session held on the second day. The papers cover a computerized serials system at Laval University, an interuniversity circulation data system, the use of MARC at the University of Saskatchewan, and an automated cataloging system for the University of Guelph library.

Two of these papers are unabashedly how-we-do-it-in-our-library (Tom and Burgis) and remind one of the now defunct University of Illinois Clinics on Library Applications of Data Processing. Of the remaining two, one (Anable) is a plea for library cooperation through the creation of an ". . . Inter-university Circulation Data System . . ." which would "1. Measure the

quality of service; 2. Predict future demands; 3. Aid in selection of new materials; and 4. Aid in establishing hierarchial storage requirements. . . ." (p.123) The fourth paper (DeVarennes) reflects on the trials of implementing a new computerized serials system at Laval University.

The first two papers (Tom and Burgis) are descriptive, excruciatingly detailed, and (for librarians) very technical. Their audience is, therefore, somewhat limited both by expertise and interest. What was even more distressing to this writer was the fact that both papers make assumptions about the usefulness of the manual systems which are not made explicit to the reader. Indeed, one author (Burgis) disparages the necessity for even examining the existing manual system by deciding ". . . that if the Manual (sic) system had not been perfected over the last 10 years to a satisfactory state, then something more than a time and motion study was needed, and therefore, decided (sic) to get MARC printouts into the hands of the Cataloging Department as soon as possible. . . ." (p.71–72) Such an attitude ignores the most basic premise of all library systems work: that you must first study the existing operation. Ignoring this basic requirement leaves the library EDP professional vulnerable to criticism. The workshop suffered from a lack of critical analysis and review of existing procedures both in-house and in other libraries. This was evident both in the body of the papers and in their review of other systems. Only two of the papers (DeVarennes and Burgis) took the trouble to search the literature and document their work with a bibliography.

The entire conference left this reviewer with a feeling of dissatisfaction. No one can quarrel with the work described or even with the systems themselves. The new systems are innovative and a great amount of hard work has gone into their creation. Yet this reviewer was disappointed that he found only the most meager evidence that any analysis had been made of the basic assumptions (why put *any* label on card pockets? See p.13) governing the existing manual systems with any degree of rigor. For example, it would be nice to know why ". . . it was agreed that an automated library system designed to complement the