Cataloging practices have long recognized the need and desire to permit variations for particular types of materials and for needs of special users. This is reflected in the existence of cataloging rules and rule interpretations and in the acceptance of specialized thesauri and classification schemes—all part of the standard bibliographic record. Economic pressures to accept shared bibliographic records blindly must be weighed against the possible negative impact on access to the local collection and the needs of local users. This compilation of papers assures that we will retain that perspective.—Barbara B. Tillett, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla.


This New Treatise is a sequel of sorts, following by nearly a dozen years the similar compilation edited by Robert D. Stueart and George B. Miller, Jr., Collection Development in Libraries: A Treatise. It has been issued by the same publisher, appears in the same series as its predecessor, and is virtually indistinguishable from it in design and format. It is tempting, therefore, simply to read this collection of essays as Stueart/Miller Revised.

Upon closer examination, however, it becomes clear that this is a very different work. In the first place, the editors of New Treatise, in contrast to their forerunners, have been freed from the mission of filling a gaping hole in the professional literature. A glance at the bibliographic notes in these volumes demonstrates that the 1980s were busy times for authors writing on the various fields subsumed under collection management; many of them may have been inspired to some degree by articles appearing in the first Treatise. Charles Osburn and Ross Atkinson, in their brief forward, emphasize the dynamism, evolution, diversity, and challenges evident in collection management, and they appear to have accepted as their primary goal the provision of a forum for critiques, new ideas, revisions, and glimpses of future

the Art & Architecture Thesaurus (Cathy Whitehead), the Bliss classification system (Alan R. Thomas), and OCLC and RLIN standards and practices to meet the needs of individual libraries (Liz Bishoff/Glenn Patton and Ed Glazier, respectively). The biases and problems with descriptive cataloging are pointed out by Norman Anderson. An index by Ed Swanson should add to the volume’s usefulness as a supplemental text in library schools. The exceptionally tiny type used in many of the examples and notes almost requires a magnifying glass to read.

Several papers specifically focus on academic libraries. Mary Parr’s “Standard Cataloging Data and the Academic Library: The Technical Services Manager’s Point of View” provides a very brief identification of questions and an addendum of pragmatic opinion on what to do with inaccurate or superseded data on copy. She reminds catalogers of cutting variations due to changed rules for main entry, classification decision differences for general indexes and bibliographies, variant practices for traced and not traced series, typographical errors on copy, and erroneous data printed in publications with CIP copy, including fixed call numbers. Additionally, academic libraries will find useful information in several of the other papers about cataloging needs for special collections (an article by Patricia Elliott and Celia Bakke) and for special types of materials (articles by Charles Whitlow, Bob Armitont, and PohChin Lai and Ming-Kan Wong). The article by Sook-Hyun Kim examines the practice of including serials holdings information in notes in bibliographic records, rather than relegating such information to a linked holdings record.

Standards change over time and should be questioned periodically in order to improve and to develop even better standards. As noted in the article by Sheila Intner, it is not enough just to teach current practices. Students should also be introduced to nonstandard systems and organizational theory so they will be prepared to design future bibliographic systems.
directions. They have moved away from the notion of a book that fixes the state of the art to one that gathers diverse perspectives concerning what is to be done.

It should, therefore, come as no great surprise that both the topics and the authors represented in the *New Treatise* bear but slight resemblance to those of the original *Treatise*. Only a handful of individual articles in the *New Treatise* cover the same ground as counterparts in the earlier compilation, and only one author, Paul Mosher, contributed essays to both projects. Citation studies claimed nearly 20 percent (and three articles) of the first *Treatise*, only to disappear from the table of contents of the *New Treatise*. The treatment of specific kinds of collections, types of resources, and modes of selection activity points to the transformation from functional, at times pedagogical, concerns to broader issues in *New Treatise*. In the earlier compilation, the editors adopted a straightforward separation of articles concerned with format from those dealing with process. Those articles in the *New Treatise* that deal with areas of collection development practice covered in the 1980 compilation now are scattered among rubrics such as "The Information Universe," "Selection," and "Types of Libraries." The boundaries dividing these categories are not clearly demarcated.

This *New Treatise*, then, is less a summing up of the theory and practice of collection management than a presentation of viewpoints and strategies. It offers, in the words of its editors, a "kaleidoscope of perspectives" on collection management. Indeed, according to Osburn and Atkinson, "the authors were asked to be as creative as possible because it is clear that only bold new ideas can be the catalyst required by librarianship to seize control of its destiny in the current environment." The ambition of the editors, in fact, is to explore the various intellectual and practical realignments that hold promise for guiding collection management through troubling times and tempting opportunities.

So much for the target. The aim of the contributing authors is often, but not always, true. A potential problem with the editors' sweeping agenda is the multiplicity of viewpoints, readerships, and vocabularies that it implies. A real danger is incoherence of the parts, and the editors have not skirted it entirely. The reader who proceeds through these two volumes in the order imposed by the topical rubrics should be prepared for a bumpy ride. In part, this is because, as one would expect, some essays are not as interesting as others. Unfortunately, most of the bland or puffy contributions (and it must be said here that these are in the distinct minority) either lead off sections or stand out by taking on broad topics. However, the most daunting obstacle to an integration of the contributions in the reader's mind becomes apparent only as one proceeds through this compilation: for whom, ultimately, is it written? The authors are on several wavelengths with respect to this issue. Some appear to be writing for library administrators; others summarize their experience as bibliographers, curators, and managers for colleagues operating at similar levels of selection practice (these are generally the most consistently informative contributions in the collection); and a third group (the smallest of the three) operates in the rarefied air of theory rather than practice.

In brief, the *New Treatise* offers the advantages and shortcomings of a diversified portfolio. One expects, and indeed finds, a few losing ventures in the mix. Nonetheless, this package of articles can offer something for most stakeholders in library collection development and management. In the end, a modest profit is virtually guaranteed.—Henry Lowood, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

**Steele, Victoria, and Stephen D. Elder.**


"In the coming decades fundraising will literally make the difference, for many libraries, between mediocrity and excellence," Susan Nutter predicts in her preface to this volume.