and it is indeed unfortunate that the library profession is reluctant to pay more than token interest to a fundamental review of library school curricula, most of which do not yet reflect any appreciable degree of change from techniques and skills to theory and principles.

Metcalfe's work is a spontaneous commentary on conventional subject headings. Although a systematic account of the subject heading systems used in library catalogs is long overdue, Mr. Metcalfe's contribution nevertheless is a most needed one. Much appreciated are his comments on a great number of problems that arise from the practical use of subject headings, particularly those of the Library of Congress. These comments appear to have originated from a thorough familiarity with the conventional card catalog system, although some of the terminology used and examples analyzed indicate an attempt to exceed the card catalog orientation.

About one half of the work, entitled "Historical Background," is devoted to a review of theories and practice of subject headings in the English-speaking world since C. A. Cutter. One would like to know more about some of the systems sketched here rather briefly (*e.g.*, Kaiser's Concrete-process). A comparative review of other terminology systems, *e.g.*, German, would have helped the analysis. The principal part of the work is covered in the chapter entitled "Input to the System." A section on cross references is of particular usefulness since in recent library literature there are virtually no systematic expositions describing the various functions of referral hidden under the uniform "see also" formula.

The remaining chapters are devoted to filing of subjects headings (entitled "The Store To Be Searched") and "Searching Methods and Output."

In his criticism of the subject heading practice of the Library of Congress (p.116) and the British National Bibliography (p.75) the author comments on the inefficiency of the BNB system and the inconsistency of the LC system. Some of these comments are of far reaching importance if mechanization of subject heading systems is considered. Automated applications to subject terminology control, however, are hardly considered in this volume. Three pages (p.131-33) and scattered comments are devoted to this aspect without indicating the implications of mechanized control of subject terminology as distinct from the use of mechanically compiled alphabetical lists of such terms.

To the reviewer automation of subject terminology appears greatly more complex than "a coin operated mechanism in which there is selection by means of an alphabetical list" (p.122). Problems of subject terminology organization and referencing methods in an automated environment become principally different from the structure of an alphabetical list and a conventional catalog. Also, the latest experience with computer-generated catalogs indicates that mechanically compiled catalogs do not appear to bear out the author's hope that such catalogs in "page form" (p.130) will solve the "takeout" (p.129) problem. Even more crucial for automation is the problem of the structure of subject terminology. Nothing less than a true system and a theory is required. In this sense the latest exposition, as the author notes (p.18), still is that by C. A. Cutter, in 1904.—*Ritvars Bregzis, University of Toronto.*

The Community College Library: A Plan for Action. By Helen R. Wheeler. Hamden, Conn.: Shoe String Press, 1965. 170p. $5. (65-16220).

This study is based on a questionnaire sent out in 1964 to 198 community college libraries. After a chapter on the ten criteria for an effective community college library program, there is a chapter summing up current practice reported in the 103 responses to the questionnaire. Current practice is far from meeting these criteria. The author asserts that "administrators, library directors and other faculty lack a systematically prepared description of the ways in which their libraries can support the unique functions and needs of their institutions." She reports that librarians, however, are convinced that given proper budgets and proper recognition of their importance, they could do much to support post-high school education whether it be junior college, technical, or adult, which is the role of the community college.

The next chapter has six case studies of widely differing community college libraries. The last chapter is a recipe for an ideal community college library. The appendixes are the usual reproduction of the questionnaire, data drawn from it, and bibliography. I would assume community college librarians will read this and it will appear on reading lists for college library administration courses.

I would have much preferred the author writing something which might be read by a wider audience than this. If the librarians are right that all of this is mostly the fault of administrators and "other faculty" they should stop talking to just each other. I hope the author will get far enough away from the machinery of her Ed.D. dissertation to write a five-page article on what is wrong with the community college library that administrators and other faculty might read. I would also hope that she will realize that what she is given to deliver as gospel will not be accepted as such. She will want to emphasize, in ways understandable to non-librarians, why the library is important and to de-emphasize the minutia of operating such a library.—*Kenneth J. LaBudde, University of Kansas City.*

Library Planning for Automation. Ed. by Allen Kent. Washington: Spartan Books, 1965. 195p. n.p. (65-17307).

This volume is the proceedings of a conference held at the University of Pittsburgh, June 2-3, 1964, that was invoked to discuss a proposal for a National Science Library System conceived by Dr. Stafford Warren, special assistant to the President for mental retardation, and promulgated by him to solve the chaos, duplication, and waste in our current handling of the increasing volume of scientific literature.

In order to scrutinize the Warren proposal a group of panelists was presented with three working papers: (1) the proposal itself which, in a nutshell, recommended that a National Library of Science System be established to "provide a pool of all the published scientific literature." This system would consist of a network of seven regional centers, each holding the contents of the published scientific journals on tape or microform and employing computer technology to analyze, store, search, and distribute these materials; (2) a paper by Samuel B. Freeman, former president, Micro-Photo Division, Bell and Howell Company, on microphotography of the source documents for the proposed system. The author examined various microforms as the storage medium and recommended microfiche as the most appropriate; (3) a paper by Andrew Osborne, of the graduate school of library and information sciences, University of Pittsburgh, entitled "The Influence of Automation on the Design of a University Library," the findings of which were that information retrieval would not radically change the basic design and size of main university library buildings, although substantial changes could be expected in the departmental libraries for science and technology.

The panels consisted of twelve library planners (eight librarians, three educators, one architect) and three periodical publishers. The library planners represented: (a) libraries recently involved in library construction programs; (b) libraries actively planning or in the midst of construction; (c) libraries contemplating construction within the next five years.

By and large the panelists endorsed the Warren proposal as a necessary and feasible step in solving one of the thorny problems in the control of scientific literature. Their questions and reservations centered on such issues as:

1. restrictions of the information bank to the literature published in the scientific and professional journals. Several participants pointed out that both bibliographical and textual control of such literature are already superior to that for the control of the report literature;
2. the plan's failure to take cognizance of the potential role of the Library of Congress in promoting such a national service;
3. lack of knowledge about the information needs of scientists and engineers;
4. whether regional centers were either economical or necessary;
5. lack of data about the utility of existing storage and retrieval systems.

The publishers on the panel worried about the economic effects of the proposal