with divergent alternatives in the use of catalog copy.
The book should be quite useful to library school students and new catalogers. For those catalogers with considerable experience, there is perhaps too much detail and tedious repetition, although many will welcome the handy reminder of the alternatives they face daily. Detailed discussion is provided regarding integrating the description, main entry, added entries, subject headings, and classification/call numbers into an existing system. The format consists of many questions, followed by alternative answers, each of which is accompanied by a list of the benefits and liabilities that will result from any decision made. A summary of the questions and alternative answers is provided at the end of each chapter, and then a comprehensive summary closes the entire work.

The author has provided a great deal of help to the novice in understanding the idiosyncrasies of Library of Congress practice. Several appendixes also provide useful information, such as a comparison of ISBD and pre-ISBD punctuation rules, a sample copy cataloging manual, and descriptions of commercial sources of equipment for photocopying entries from book catalogs, duplicating services, sources of catalog card sets, and processing sets.

The author effectively demonstrates that "it is possible to use outside copy exactly as it appears only if the library and its users are willing to accept the potential consequences: varying forms of entry; lack of some locally needed entry points; subject separation of editions and other related materials; errors or discrepancies that cause mis-filing or that convey misinformation; widely variant classification for the same subject, editions, or translations; and insufficiently complete call numbers" (p.231). A careful reading of Cataloging with Copy should provide any cataloger with a better understanding of the perplexities of copy cataloging.—John L. Sayre, Director of University Libraries, Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma.

The aim of this series of studies is to acquaint librarians and library students with the latest developments and trends in management theory and practice. This third volume in the series contains six studies drawn from both sides of the Atlantic and one from Australia.

The first study, by Ralph Blasingame and Mary Jo Lynch, looks at the work of the Public Library Association on defining new standards or guidelines for public library systems and is a rewrite of their contribution to the debate on this topic. For those, like the present writer, who are not fully conversant already with the debate this paper should be of considerable interest and value. The authors' analysis of the traditional public library and its setting is one which could be usefully applied to other libraries outside the public sector.

James A. Hennessy's study on urban information management requires very careful reading and a background knowledge of British local and national government to be fully understood, and this paper may be beyond the reach of many library students particularly in the U.S.A. Elizabeth Orna presents a clear and far-sighted view of the structure and inner workings of an industrial training board and the importance to the development of an effective service for an organization.

Patricia Layzell Ward's study of the career patterns of U.K. librarians is mainly of interest for its survey of trends over the past forty years. Gileon Holroyd's survey of the Maryland manpower studies, whilst making interesting reading, is also a valuable starting point for selecting parts of the Maryland project for reading in depth.

The study on finance and librarians deals with the financial background to British public libraries and universities. Whilst this background is only too familiar to practicing British librarians in these sectors, the details are accurate and up to date and would make valuable reading for students specializing in these fields of librarianship. Colin F. Cayless' concluding paper on evaluating administrative effectiveness is as much a literature survey as an evaluation.

All the studies are very readable, and the majority contain a commendable lack
of jargon. Useful bibliographies appear at the end of each study. They should be of value to library students in both Britain and the U.S.A., not only for their insight into current problems in library management but also for the valuable background information they contain.

Practising librarians may well not wish to read every study in detail, but the majority should find something of relevance and value in this volume.—J. K. Roberts, Librarian, University of Wales Institute of Science & Technology, Cardiff, Wales.


Expecting much from a book with such a title and from contributors of recognized stature, I was acutely disappointed. This volume, designed to explore the relationships that exist between the library and archival professions, is weak because it is devoid of analysis and without demonstrable historical perspective. The principal authors, Robert L. Clark, Jr., and Frank C. Burke, simply don't get to the heart of the matter.
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