added and improvements can be made.—*Vasa D. Mihailovich, University of North Carolina.*


This is a collection of eleven periodical articles and seventeen chapters of books from nine different subject fields on various aspects of research. Half were originally published in 1960 or later, and another 40 percent in the 1950’s. There are several appendices, including a long annotated “Bibliography of Social Science Research Methodology,” a short “Bibliography of Library Research” (including Price’s Little Science, Big Science), and a sample interview schedule, attitude survey form, and mail questionnaire. In addition, the editors have written brief introductions to each of six parts of the volume and to each of the twenty-eight selections. There is no subject index.

“The fundamental purpose of this volume is to assist its readers to genuinely perceive the nature of scholarship and its relationship to the goals of librarianship.” (p.vii) The selections reprinted here succeed in general in fulfilling the first part of this goal, but not the second. Most of the selections are by distinguished authors and social scientists, e.g., Cohen and Nagle, David Riesman, Robert K. Merton, and Samuel A. Stouffer. Many of them have written brief introductions to each of six parts of the volume and to each of the twenty-eight selections. There is no subject index.

The content of these twenty-eight selections has all been reset in two-column pages with unjustified right-hand margins and very few typographical errors. Not all the selections from books are identified by chapter number or paging. The names of the editors appear on the cover in reverse order from that on the title page.—*Herbert Goldhor, University of Illinois.*


This book is both more and less than its
title indicates. More in that it contains a good deal of encyclopedic information about the economic, demographic, political, educational, and bibliothecal scene in Colombia, the influence of which on education for librarianship is not always specified. The work is something less than its title would lead one to expect in that the Escuela Interamericana de Bibliotecologia is the main topic. This is probably justified inasmuch as the Escuela far overshadows any previous efforts of the sort in Colombia.

The Escuela began operation at Medellin, Colombia's second or third largest city in 1957. It has been a joint project of the Rockefeller Foundation (to the tune of a half-million dollars) and the Universidad de Antioquia with which it is affiliated. This is probably justified inasmuch as the Escuela far overshadows any previous efforts of the sort in Colombia.

The Escuela began operation at Medellin, Colombia's second or third largest city in 1957. It has been a joint project of the Rockefeller Foundation (to the tune of a half-million dollars) and the Universidad de Antioquia with which it is affiliated. This is probably justified inasmuch as the Escuela far overshadows any previous efforts of the sort in Colombia.

Given the vicissitudes that have befallen the School, the wonder is that it has survived, let alone achieved some of the goals for which it was established. Every political change in Colombia has resulted in a new administration for the Universidad and a major adjustment for the new library school. Student strikes and walkouts, endemic in Latin America long before they became popular in the United States, closed it down for one period. Recruiting of suitable students was not always successful, especially from countries other than Colombia, with the result that the School has not lived up to the name "Interamericana." Turnover of teaching staff—particularly those from North America—has also hampered progress. A move from the area in which the main units of the University are located to the very pleasant, but bibliographically isolated, quarters now occupied has meant that the School must maintain a rather large library of its own—some 10,000 volumes as of 1965. Cutoff point for most data seems to be that year, although in revising the original doctoral dissertation the authors have supplied some information as late as 1967.

Another reason for developing a large library was that the curriculum of the School attempts to give a general collegiate education plus library training (including a thesis) in three years. At first the School gave its own liberal arts courses, but more recently these have been given under the auspices of the University. To get all of this into so short a time, students are required to spend up to twenty-eight hours a week in class, plus four hours of laboratory. In short, grafting a Norte Americano style professional education onto the academic patterns of a typical Latin American university is a goal not easily achieved.

Although they give obiter dicta on many topics, the authors speculate very sparingly on the future of the School after the Rockefeller money runs out in 1970. They are certain, however, that the School already has substantial attainments to its credit. Furthermore, they somehow convince the reader that this is true without specifying these achievements in much detail. We are not even given a table showing the numbers of students enrolled and subsequently graduated with the licenciatura. The authors hope that, in time, this coveted paper will be worth something in terms of salary and of the appointment of graduates to responsible library positions—instead of the distinguished poets or worse, political hacks now occupying such posts. Sometimes the authors give clues to the influence of the School in discussing other topics. For example, they have tacked on to the end of the book a section on a new library school that has been established at Cali. In the course of their rather uncertain prognosis for this institution, they mention casually that "the courses in library science . . . are taught by members of the library staff of the Universidad del Valle, all of whom are graduates of the Medellin School." If that isn't a feather in Medellin's cap, what is?

Correspondence with the editors of CRL imply that the present reviewer was selected because of (rather than in spite of) his lack of knowledge of Latin American librarianship. For him, at least, this was a wise decision for he has learned a lot from this slim volume. In order to do this, however, he has often had to work against the physical and intellectual grain of the book. The authors, one of whom (Litton) was once Director of the Escuela, have chopped up their material in such a way that the uninitiated must refer back and forth in order to get a reasonably complete account of
such interesting topics as student unrest, political interference, influence of foreign professors, and even curriculum. Significant details are sometimes glossed over (or dropped out entirely) while other facts are repeated several times in a vain attempt to help the reader deal with the foreshadowings and flashbacks. The unjustified-line, cold-type format is legible but uninviting and the placement of running heads annoying. The bibliography seems adequate and the index seems somewhat better than those found in other Scarecrow books.

The carping of reviewers must be discounted; this is an informative work and is worth every bit of the effort it takes to digest it.—Perry D. Morrison, University of Oregon.

British University Libraries. By K. W. Neal. Published by the author at 7 Church Road, Wilmslow, Cheshire, England, SK9 6HH, 1970, 149p. 35s.


It is interesting that the spring of 1970 should produce two volumes on the subject of university library administration, treating the facets of the subject in almost the same order, quoting widely from many sources, much preoccupied with the "Parry report," filling about 140 5½" x 9" pages, and selling for 35s. Yet these two are quite different works and a single review, I believe, is appropriate for proper comparison.

The authors are well-known librarians; Neal, a Senior Lecturer at the Manchester School of Librarianship and Thompson, the Librarian of Reading University. Both authors attempt to compress the essence of university librarianship into about a hundred and fifty pages, which results in a cross between a library science course syllabus and a Reader's Digest Condensed Books version of Wilson and Tauber (to which, incidentally, Neal never refers). The order of topics treated is similar though not identical: general functions of a library system, library government, committees, departmental libraries and collection organization, finance, staff, selection procedures and policies, cataloging, binding, circulation, periodicals, public instruction in library use, library building planning, and library cooperation—an order reasonably dictated by logic, if not custom.

Because of the shortness of the works, the chapters can only cover briefly the salient features of the subject at hand. To remedy this, Neal gives a list of "Other Reading" at the end of each chapter. Thompson's bibliography would lead, of course, to more extensive discussions. The problems that are caused by this brevity are typified by the chapters on building design. Neal realizes the complexity of the subject and devotes rather more pages to the discussion (twenty, to be exact) but is then seduced by this quantity of space into attempting to outline details of matters such as furniture, lighting, and air conditioning. Thompson is more general and contents himself with eleven pages, mostly consisting of a summary of Ralph Ellsworth's Planning the College and University Library Building, but such a brief discussion is almost worthless from the standpoint of information.

It was noted above that the authors quote widely, but both their method and, more interestingly, their sources vary. Neither use footnotes, but Neal is quite precise giving page numbers in parentheses in the text and a bibliographically complete citation to the article at the end of the chapter. Thompson gives enough information in the text to enable one to identify the cited work in the bibliography at the end of the book. Such minutiae aside, however, it is more interesting to note that of something over two hundred citations in Neal, only fifteen were of U.S. origin, while of forty-five works cited by Thompson, thirteen were U.S. And this points to the essential difference in the two works as far as utility to an American student is concerned. Neal has limited himself to the British scene, discussing in much detail aspects of British librarianship and British libraries. Thompson tends to paint with a broader brush, discussing in more general terms the philosophic principles which pertain to library policy and administration. That both are knowledgeable and experienced librarians is obvious, but one has a feeling that