freed from having to live the gut question, "What are librarians partners in education for?"

Datedness is another criticism of this book. These journal articles which were originally current comments have become historical documents after six to nine years. They are presented out of their initial context and without follow-up. The drying up of the flood of federal spending serves to make prose that explains operations that were projected or prototype in 1966-69 just empty rhetoric in 1973.

Two 1966 pieces by John E. Tirrell offer another example of the gulf between librarian and educational administrator implicit in LRC. The program he reports at Oakland Community College, Oakland, Michigan is a combination of programmed learning (curriculum materials) and independent study (time factor required by each individual to cover material), supported by a tutor. No word is offered as to what has happened to these "Tutorial Laboratories" in the ensuing six years. Tirrell seems to think that Oakland Community College invented the functions of Reference, Reader's Adviser, and Instruction in Use of Library Materials, when as we all know, these are traditional library services. The tutorial laboratory of O.C.C. employs library materials as the heart of the instructional program; in doing so, it practices what library textbooks steadfastly preach. Tirrell's situation is unusual in that it makes a success of library service when most educational libraries are failing.

Two factors of bookmaking limit the volume's usefulness. The editors included no identification of the authors beyond their names. This lack makes a thorough knowledge of the literature in all the fields included necessary in order to independently evaluate the authority of the writings in LRC.

The emphasis of this book should not be a surprise to those who know Drs. Butler and Pearson. For those who do not, a part of their biographical entries from Leaders in Education, 4th edition, 1971 is included in this review. Under the heading of "Professional Interest" is found for Butler: "Training of professional media personnel for integrated instructional materials centers," for Pearson: "The field of education-
al technology, audiovisual education in all its ramifications."

There is a spate of new titles on this specific subject, though not all of them define it as does LRC. A few minutes spent with the 1972 Subject Guide to Books in Print reveals these figures in areas where subject-matter overlap is certain to exist: There are fifteen titles under "Individualized Instruction," eight under "Instructional Materials Centers," forty-three on "Libraries, High School," thirty-eight on "College and University Libraries," etc. There does not seem to be a void waiting to be filled by this volume. Especially so since the projects reported in it herald the good news of federal funding at the moment in time of its crucifixion. Do, then, consider its place in your collection with these grains of salt before you purchase.—Carolyn C. Leopold, formerly librarian, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.


In June and July 1970, the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor, chaired by Representative Edith Green (Oregon), held hearings on Section 805 of House Resolution 16098, the Omnibus Post-Secondary Education Act of 1970. The intent of Section 805 was to eliminate sex discrimination in employment by federal government contractors and by educational institutions, to bring matters relating to sex discrimination under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, and to bring executive, administrative, and professional employees under the equal pay for equal work provision of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The Government Printing Office in 1971 issued the oral testimony and written documents that were placed in the record of the hearings, plus some prepared statements and supplemental materials in a two volume set titled, Discrimination against Women. Hearings. . . . The work reviewed here is an edited version of the GPO edition.
and consists of the oral testimony plus a selection of the written material.

That there were such hearings is by itself of considerable historical interest, since, although the struggle by women for equal rights has extended well over a century, these were the first ever held by a Committee of Congress to consider the subject of discrimination on the basis of sex. The emphasis of the testimony and documents was on the then current situation, though information on trends was presented in a number of cases.

The people testifying included representatives of women in education (students, counsellors, and educators), national organizations whose primary concern is equality for women, women in the labor market and President Nixon's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities. The breadth and depth of their testimony and documentation gives undeniable and overwhelming evidence of the existence of discrimination against women and of its perpetuation by attitudes unconsciously accepted by many people, by determined actions on the part of a wide variety of people and employers, and by neglect on the part of some of the federal agencies charged with enforcing existing laws and regulations dealing with sex discrimination.

Also represented were the Departments of Labor, Justice, and Health, Education and Welfare. The point of view of the enforcer of legislation and regulations is, naturally, somewhat different from that of the proponent of the establishment of such. In each instance, the people speaking for these agencies, though they made considerable efforts to do so, were unable to dispel the impression, pointed to by facts, that the agencies attached very little importance to the problem of discrimination against women.

As one might expect when twenty-six people testify on the same subject, there was some repetition. However one major point that was not hammered home is that the present “degrading, dehumanizing, immoral, unjust, indefensible, infuriating” situation exists in spite of over 100 years of active campaigning by women to overcome it.

It was Representative Green's intent that the record of the hearings be “the most complete record that has been assembled in terms of the discrimination in both the legislative and the executive branches [of the Federal government] and in all other forms of discrimination against women.” (p.85) It is certainly that. Here are gathered all the strands that have been woven to make the strong fabric of sex discrimination which has worn so well for so long. Legislation alone will not correct the situation. People must be concerned enough to monitor the enforcement of the laws and regulations if their intent is to be carried out and equality under the law gained by women. This volume should help to heighten people's consciousness of the gross inequities that still exist and thereby assist in the eradication of “the last socially acceptable form of discrimination.”—Margaret Tjaden, Head, Physics and Mathematics Research Libraries, University of Washington, Seattle.


This eighth volume in the well-received series in Library and Information Science may be the one most difficult to fit into the series editor's overall goal stated as the synthesizing of the most essential contributions from elusive and innumerable sources. The compiler states forthrightly that the reprints in this volume are articles which she enjoyed discussing with her students. As with any collection of reprints, these papers vary in quality, perhaps a bit less in relevancy; they are neither the most essential contributions, nor are they from the most elusive of sources. More than half of the material is reprinted directly from the Bulletin of the Medical Library Association. With two exceptions, the remainder should be readily available on the shelves of every medical library of reasonable size.

Unquestionably the collection has value beyond immediate classroom use with library school students. The overall impression conveys that subtle something which sets a medical library apart. In her introductory remarks, the compiler acknowledges a finely drawn distinction between types of libraries. She states unequivocally that one must conceive of medical libraries