helpful as an introduction to the field. Even those dealing mainly with children and adolescents who have such disabilities as hemophilia, muscular dystrophy, and spina bifida would be valuable in understanding the background of the handicapped college student. For others, however, the book is one to be skimmed, since only a few articles are relevant to academic libraries.—Lucille Whalen, State University of New York at Albany.


Many librarians and administrators have considered resource sharing a partial answer to the escalating cost of library staff and materials. Encouraged by government and private foundation support, library consortia have multiplied to the point where the library without a consortial affiliation is the exception. With so much interest and involvement in cooperative library arrangements, it was to be expected that the Pittsburgh Conference on Library Resource Sharing held from September 29 to October 1, 1976, would attract outstanding contributors and participants, and that the papers presented would provide, not only a better understanding of the state of library cooperation, but also a look into its future.

Through prior distribution of position papers contributed primarily by members of the University of Pittsburgh faculty, conference participants were encouraged to focus on the goals of resource sharing, progress towards goals, problems needing attention, the economies of libraries, telecommunications, and the future. The varying quality of these key papers is reflected in the responses of the principal speakers or reactors. Some papers, such as Allen Kent’s discussion of “The Goals of Resource Sharing in Libraries,” stimulate thoughtful and apposite responses, while others appear to be politely disregarded by the respondents.

Transcripts of discussions following the presentation of each major topic provide useful additional information.

The strength of this collection of papers is in the contributions of some of the outside principal speakers. Connie Dunlap’s consideration of the cost of cooperation and our tendency to see it as the solution to all our problems; Allen Veane’s well-developed statement on progress and growth in resource sharing; William Axford’s examination of obstacles to resource sharing; James Rush’s contention that “pride in collection has got to be supplanted by pride in patronage (users)”; and John McDonald’s plea for the establishment of a national periodical library are among the most thought-provoking essays. One could only wish that Allen Kent had expanded his limited comments on “Directions for the Future” at the conclusion of the conference.

Unfortunately, the quality of the editing leaves much to be desired. In view of the price of this volume, one would have hoped for more care in its preparation for publication.

Despite its shortcomings, Library Resource Sharing is a valuable book that should be read by librarians, most of whom find themselves involved in cooperative library programs.—Willis Bridegam, Amherst College, Amherst, Massachusetts.


The Responsibility of the University Library Collection in Meeting the Needs of its Campus and Local Community. A symposium in Honor of Melvin J. Voigt upon His Retirement as University Librarian of the University of California, San Diego, Friday, September 17, 1976. La Jolla, Calif.: Friends of the UCSD Library, 1977. 52p. $3 if check accompanies order. (Order from Friends of the UCSD Li-
Library, The University Library, C-075, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093.)

Two small publications recently issued honor two outstanding librarians, Louis Round Wilson and Melvin Voigt. Their contents parallel the lives of the two men in dealing with library education and university library management.

The pamphlet honoring Wilson is indeed a worthy tribute to the centenarian. In its two parts we have a creditable job of portraying the evolution of library education in the Southeast by Ed Holley, Jack Dalton, Virginia Lacy Jones, and Mary Edna Anders and a thought-provoking paper on research libraries by Herman Fussier. Some of the history and thoughts expressed have been stated before in other publications, but there are "proposals" and "prospects" that give them meaning for today.

A proposal, made near the end of Dalton's paper, is worthy of our close attention, particularly in view of the demise of the ALA Library Education Division. It is his suggestion that library educators in the Southeast call another invitational working conference to consider the complexities and problems of the changing library profession that today attempts to serve the nation's populace.

If the reviewer may be so presumptuous, he would broaden Dalton's proposal and suggest a nationwide conference or several regional conferences. It just may be that we as librarians, collectively, are outmoded, but the technology that can be applied to our profession is not, and we should make an effort to rectify the situation.

Fussier leaves history out, picks up the university library where it is today with its multitudinous problems, and proffers some possible solutions. His paper is a minicourse in research library problems for advanced practitioners. The terminology will be difficult for uninitiated library science students, but even so the work should be required reading for prospective academic librarians.

This is a profound paper of thoughtful content. It is unfortunate that its editing was obviously hurried and that the evidence of proofreading seems totally lacking.

The California symposium brought together some outstanding librarians and scholars. Professor Andrew Wright and Basil Stuart-Stubbs dealt with a definition of the parameters for a university library collection. Here a "working scholar" and a university librarian have at it, the scholar asking for his "bread and butter" collection close at hand and the librarian predicting a day of reckoning with the absolute saturation of all available library space.

The matter of research library cooperation was treated in another session of the symposium. In his paper, Russell Shank spoke of cooperative collection development as often being less than satisfactory: "We do not always get the anticipated payoff from cooperative collection development schemes."

Robert M. Hayes, in his description of library networks, said we do not have to wait any longer on the technology for resource sharing, only the funding. For a successful sharing endeavor, he would favor endowing the large libraries to become larger.

Clara Jones described the new information and referral service now in use in many large public library systems, delineating in particular the program now operational at the Detroit Public Library, a system that incorporates information from beyond the walls of the library and the backs of books.

Handsomely produced by the Friends of the UCSD Library, the small paperback is as attractive as it is thought-provoking—Roscoe Rouse, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.


The first edition of Planning and Design of Library Buildings appeared in 1973. It was indeed a wonderful addition to the literature, for it gave a complete overview of then current construction practices, standards, and descriptions of library buildings in Britain. But, one must question, as this writer indeed does, "Why a repeat edition in just four years?" And at $25 per copy, too. One praised the comprehensiveness and organization of the first edition and appreciated its illustrations and photo-