

curate reference to the contents of the volume. Format and typography are well adapted to the subject matter and add to the ease of use.

Later editions may see improvement, but it is difficult to believe that this first edition of *American Junior Colleges* will not prove as indispensable to administrators, students, and librarians as has its predecessor, *American Universities and Colleges*.—Lois E. Engleman, *Frances Shimer Junior College Library, Mount Carroll, Ill.*

The Junior College Library Program.

Harlen Martin Adams. Joint publication of the American Library Association and Stanford University Press, Stanford University, Calif., 1940. xii, 92p. \$2.

THIS is a very useful book. In its twelve pages of introduction and ninety-two pages of text, it reviews and epitomizes the literature on the junior college library. It dismisses the quantitative standards of past years and pleads for an active, educational, cooperative program based on conscious analysis of school and library functions. The data of the book were derived from the 136 junior colleges (out of 178 selected by the Carnegie Corporation for visitation) which replied to a questionnaire. Reference is made throughout the volume to current aims and practices; hence, its vitality and appeal. Following a short introduction stating scope and plan of the book are six chapters: (1) Standards and functions; (2) The library and the curriculum (trends and correlations); (3) The library and the student (instruction, guidance, silent reading, reading program); (4) Administration and organization; (5) The new library program at Menlo Junior College (Cal-

ifornia); (6) Selected basic principles. Bibliography and index follow. Most stimulating, perhaps, are the two chapters on trends in function and curriculum correlation and the account of the Menlo Reading Council. One would judge that the library at Menlo really functions.

It is interesting to note the trends in junior college library literature. Miss Ermine Stone's book¹ states the accepted junior college library functions as completely and effectively as does the present book, but stresses organization, finances, and to some extent quantitative standards. Dr. B. Lamar Johnson's description of the Stephens College library plan² emphasizes the central activity of the library in the instructional program and demands a broad concept of library materials. The present book makes a fresh statement of current practices and trends toward integration, correlation, and planned library participation in the educational process. It is to be noted, perhaps, that all three of these landmark books are written by librarians of private junior colleges.

Meditation upon these books in connection with Dr. Walter C. Eells' recent directory-summary³ leads one to feel that over 575 junior colleges (with 196,000 students) have many of the same problems that confront the four-year colleges and universities. It does not seem to the reviewer, however, that we may transfer and apply directly and completely the experiences and inferences of a junior college library program to a four-year college. After all, a two-year "preparatory" program is but the first two years of college, even though some junior colleges

¹ Stone, Ermine. *The Junior College Library*. A.L.A., 1932.

² Johnson, B. Lamar. *Vitalizing a College Library*. A.L.A., 1939.

³ Eells, Walter Crosby, ed. *American Junior Colleges*. American Council on Education, 1940.

perhaps do their two years better than do some colleges. And a two-year "terminal" program is what it is—vocational, terminal. And a "community-cultural" program is only half of the college liberal arts program, even though the junior colleges sometimes do it better because compression of time requires more definite aims. Much "college" teaching would benefit by the definition and correlation of a librarian-dean of instruction, but do you see it in operation in that form at Dartmouth, or Swarthmore, or Macalester, or Pomona, for example?

All our libraries, both junior college and college, are somewhat in the position of a heavily loaded transcontinental passenger train: when the railway management puts on two engines (for the train must get through) but only one diner (passengers stand in line for food). A full-fledged library program must go along with the first-class college.—*Willis Kerr, Claremont Colleges Library, Claremont, Calif.*

Report of a Survey of the University of Mississippi Library for the University of Mississippi. By A. F. Kuhlman, assisted by Icko Iben. University, Mississippi, 1940. 164p. (Mimeographed)

AT THE REQUEST of Chancellor Butts, Dr. A. F. Kuhlman, assisted by Dr. Icko Iben, has prepared this report of a survey "to measure the adequacy of the (University of Mississippi) library as a means of attaining the objectives set in the teaching, research, and public service program of the university and to suggest ways and means for improving it." The report begins with "the economic resources of the state and the university" and "an outline of the essentials in an effective university library." These introductory chap-

ters are followed by chapters on book resources, physical plant and equipment, personnel, organization and administration, use, financial support, and government of the library. The report is well arranged and clearly presented for convenient use. Part I is a concise "Summary and Recommendations." Part II is the body of the report. The arrangement is helped by division of the statistical data into shorter tables in the text with longer ones at the end as appendices to the main work.

Library science profits from the fact that the authors of a survey must discover or create standards, set up comparative tables, and find and utilize "check lists," or "yardsticks," to test and measure the library under consideration. Unfortunately, this is a report on a weak institution in a very poor state. Consequently, the tables, lists, comparisons, and discussions to show its condition and needs seem at times a little like a highly complicated anti-aircraft gun set up where a fly swatter would do the trick. Precise survey methodology does not get a hard test in a survey of this collection of 67,000 volumes, in a large measure obsolete, and supported by annual appropriations of something like \$6,000 per year for the purchase of books. At the same time, one interested in survey techniques may wonder if the devices used would be enough to test and measure accurately the condition and needs of a better institution.

The report has a purpose, however, and for this it is well designed. It is thorough and detailed. It should serve as a sound basis for library development at the University of Mississippi for many years to come. The authors patiently point out the needs and recommend steps for improvement. These range from the pri-