activity that utilizes an average of 10 percent of the file each day, less than 0.1 percent of a library's catalog will be used each day. There is thus a relatively small base of activity over which to spread costs. The investment in conversion, storage, and maintenance must therefore be justified by "increased benefits" to a much greater extent than in business data processing.

Such warnings are well taken.

The volume seems uneven and is redundant in many places; for example, Fig. 19.7, List of Representative Data Bases, p.692–94, and the Inventory of Available Data Bases, p.829–75. If more time had been taken in organizing and editing the text, this would have proved to be an even more valuable contribution.—*Henry Voos, Rutgers University.*

Any Person, Any Study; An Essay on Higher Education in the United States. Eric Ashby. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971. 110p. $4.95.

Newman, Frank, and others. ***Report on Higher Education, March, 1971*** (HE 5.250:50065). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971. $0.75.

That higher education in the United States is in trouble today must be fully apparent to anyone who does a fair amount of reading. Unfortunately, this is often clearer to almost any segment of society than the one most seriously affected: the academic community itself. Part of the problem, as we are accustomed to telling each other, comes from the enormous expansion of enrollments and facilities during the sixties with its corollary promises of more education for a larger proportion of the college-age populace. For many of us the short-term problem, as Ashby notes, is M-O-N-E-Y (p.5). Yet these are not the only problems and we delude ourselves in thinking that they are. Fortunately, these two books, one an analytical but highly readable treatise by a British educator and the other a report destined to have significant impact upon the federal government, appear at a propitious moment in academic history. Both should find their way onto the shelves of all academic libraries. They should also be read and discussed by academic librarians both on campus and off.

Any Person, Any Study is the first of a series of essays by "distinguished authorities in other countries" under the sponsorship of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, whose books by this point should be familiar to every academic librarian. These books are having an impact upon the general public that hasn't been achieved since James Bryant Conant took on the American high school in the late fifties. Almost every new volume in the Carnegie Commission series results in newspaper headlines, the most provocative so far being Earl Cheit's *The New Depression in Higher Education* (1971), with its thesis that 71 percent of some forty-one of the nation's most prestigious colleges and universities are either in serious financial trouble or heading that way.

Unfortunately, Sir Eric Ashby's book is not likely to achieve such headlines, though it deserves more attention than many other Carnegie volumes. For Ashby, master of Clare College, Cambridge, and formerly vice-chancellor of Cambridge University, has challenged one of the basic premises of American higher education: that it should be for everyone. Hence, of course, his title, taken from Ezra Cornell's famous statement that he intended to found a university where any person could find any sort of study he wished. Cornell's idea and the land-grant movement went hand in hand, so that a hundred years later his ambition is close to fulfillment in many institutions.

What specifically does this British academician, with some forty years of intermittent experience in American higher education, see as the major question for our society? He answers on the first page of his chapter on "Analysis" (p.23): ". . . if enrollments continue to rise and finance continues to flow into higher education, will it be good enough simply to enlarge or multiply institutions without reconsidering their pattern, their curricula, their social purpose?" Ashby obviously thinks not and the Newman Report in its analysis concurs (p.61, 82–83). For both books see an urgent reexamination of institutional mission as necessary, with Ashby opting for the university as a place of rational enquiry and discourse, a posture he believes it is now in danger of losing.

Basically, Ashby's book is a well-written

description of some current problems in higher education, including the lack of consensus on what should be taught undergraduates, the high attrition rate of freshman students, the overemphasis upon the Ph.D. (while recognizing its continuing usefulness for its original narrow purpose), testing, credentials, university administration and governance, and the extent of student participation in university policy-making. Omitted are comments on two problems where he lacks familiarity: higher education of blacks and the future of Catholic colleges (p.1). As one might expect, Ashby's descriptions are literate, cogent, and challenging. In passing one might note his suggestion that lucid, simple writing might well be a fundamental skill for undergraduate education, which he thinks the British teach better than the Americans (p.49).

Whether Ashby is commenting upon the notable lack of success of cooperative enterprises (p.17), or arguing for the adequacy of ETS tests (p.61), or touting a less structured approach to university administration (p.68–73), he takes the reader back again and again to fundamental assumptions, for the "gravest single problem facing American higher education is this alarming disintegration of consensus about its purpose." (p.104) Because universities have undertaken more functions than they have the ability to discharge, they have both neglected their chief function of undergraduate teaching and have lost any consensus about the relation between universities and American society.

Whatever one may think about Sir Eric's "Personal Speculations," as he calls his last chapter, he has raised questions which many academic librarians will find provocative, and which they and their faculty colleagues had jolly well better face realistically if they expect continuing support from the tax-paying public.

In the Newman Report one finds similar concerns, indeed some striking parallels in both approach and solutions. Naturally the government report is more forceful in its recommendations. Surprisingly, it is almost as readable as Ashby's book, and is refreshingly free of the "governmentalese" so often characteristic of such efforts. Unlike Ashby, Frank Newman, associate director of University Relations at Stanford, is not a well-known name in academic circles. Moreover, his task force, appointed by HEW Secretary Robert Finch and funded by the Ford Foundation, deliberately contained no "big names," either from university faculties or administrators. (See *Chronicle of Higher Education,* 15 March 1971.) However, the Newman Report has already had a profound impact upon the Nixon administration's higher education proposals. That it will get even more attention is apparent from Secretary Elliot Richardson's enthusiastic foreword which notes that "It is provocative without being irresponsible; unconventional without making a fetish of being so; blunt and critical, yet clearly written by individuals who are higher education 'insiders' deeply committed to their profession." (p.v) Obviously such attention from high governmental officials merits serious attention in academia.

In analyzing the problems facing higher education in the 1970s, the Newman Report focuses on the growing homogeneity of institutions; the professionalization of the faculty; discrimination against minorities, the old, and women; the growing trend toward centralization and bureaucracy in state systems; the problem of drop-outs, and the isolation of the academic community from the society it serves. The last point receives special attention and runs like a thread throughout the report. While recognizing that American graduate education has become the envy of the world, the writers find that there is a serious isolation of faculty and students from society as a whole (p.19), that graduate education tends to reinforce this isolation (p.4–5), that the graduate university model has been shamelessly copied by other institutions to their own detriment (p.12–13), and that there are few practitioners in graduate professional schools who can relate highly theoretical knowledge to life as it exists outside the ivy-covered walls (p.77). In the long catalog of academic sins in chapter 5, "The Professionalization of Learning," most of us can recognize a few of our own. Library school faculties, particularly, which have moved toward emulation of other research disciplines, had better give this part of the report special attention.

Yet the sins are not all within the academy. There is a growth of bureaucracy

which stems from legislative concern and multicampus systems. Such systems have not yet gone very far in management, but now that their building programs are over, they probably will. The result is less autonomy for the local campus and less authority for the local president (p.26). To hasten innovation and reform the report calls for the educational entrepreneur but recognizes that "Entrepreneurs rarely thrive in a climate of detailed budget review, pressures for equal treatment, statewide interest groups, flagship campus dominance, or concern for political expediency." (p.27) Among the other bureaucracies needing attention is the interlocking directorate of universities and accrediting agencies. Medical licensing is a national scandal but is far from the only one (p.41). Moreover, the relationship between academic training and success in a profession is not nearly as direct as is frequently assumed (p.39–40).

The Newman task force suggests that the time is critical for change in the system, though it does not underestimate the difficulties. What can one do about all these problems? Society can create new enterprises with different missions and provide new enterprise funding. State governments can utilize competitive grants similar to foundation grants or to the University Grants Committee in Great Britain (p.65; cf. Ashby, p.85–89). Federal funding can adopt a marketing approach where the student takes an institutional grant plus his own grant and selects the institution best for him (p.65–66). Universities can diversify their faculties by bringing in "practitioners who are outstanding in their jobs, and . . . given full status within the institution." (p.77) They can also reduce discrimination against women and older students and adapt minority education to the students rather than making the student conform to the traditional mold (p.79). Most of all, of course, institutions can reexamine their individual missions, especially necessary if cost effectiveness is to work in academic programs. Community colleges, for example, must cease being dominated by the four-year institutions and meet the specific needs of the students they serve (p.60). For the real problem is "How can skill in resource utilization become a factor in the system of academic rewards?" (p.86) All of this is a rather large order, but the task force is not pessimistic about solutions, if they can stimulate debate on the problems. Fortunately, their report is short enough and inexpensive enough to be placed in the hands of all those interested in the future of higher education. That group should surely include academic librarians and the professional associations to which they belong.—*Edward G. Holley, University of Houston.*

Tales of Melvil's Mouser; or Much Ado About Libraries. Paul Dunkin. New York: R. R. Bowker Co., 1970. 182p.

Q. Pimbran Thotwon put down the book. Heady stuff, this.

A book by a librarian (P. Dunkin, to woe and to wit) could and did declare outrageously tongue-in-jowl war upon the host of sacred cows to which we all ('cept you 'n me) bow down. Why, is nothing sacred anymore? quoth Thotwon queryingly. Indeed, a perusal of the tome revealed that Melvil's Mouser was indeed a clever cat: he several times took poor Thotwon for a dunking in his own chuckling perplexity.

Surely it cannot be a verity that the venerable NLA always comes out third-best in every two-sided battle? And yet, pondered Thotwon ponderously, perhaps there *is* something peculiar about an institution which seems ever on the brink of discovering that it *is!*

Surely, stammered Q. Pimbran, some librarians have been overeager to snatch at schemes: but surely only *some* catalogers have sat at the stoop of the Seer of the East and swallowed the many facets of the Five Laws . . . ?

Surely, turbulated Thotwon, IMCs (Q.P.T. knew what *that* meant even in his sleep—*I*nstructional *M*aterials *C*enters) do need promotion: after all, aren't we all heathen looking toward the salvation of the funny-looking missionaries? (Somehow Thotwon was dimly aware that his words had tripped up somewhere—but never mind, he'd *read* it somewhere.)

And surely, tremulated Thotwon to himself, library education is *not* in a shambles: "The broad sweep of the library universe" swam before his ken as he fondly recollected dear Miss Bittybotty and her class in Foundations of Librarianship many years