

eral dropping off of foundation grants to build collections. He briefly covers exchange and cooperative agreements as valuable sources of support.

One could wish that this lecture had more detail on the prospects for university library support through what must always be its principal source—direct university support by appropriation. Ten years ago Keyes Metcalf pronounced, at the dedication of the Midwest Interlibrary Center, the thesis that “in our libraries we have a section of our universities that tends . . . to increase in size and cost geometrically, while the rest of the institution grows arithmetically. It is obvious that this cannot go on without the library taking an increasing percentage of our total resources.”¹ That same year the reviewer appeared before the Sixteenth Annual Conference of the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago to present evidence that the situation was exactly the opposite. This states, in part: “As university income has grown enormously in dollars and far less rapidly in purchasing power, the increases have been shared with the libraries but not shared proportionately. We may argue that libraries should be receiving a larger increase than other academic departments, but university administrations have not operated in accordance with that argument.”² Now that ten years have elapsed an examination of library support from university appropriation would be a great service to the profession.

Dr. Louis Shores in “The Undergraduate and His Library” develops the main thesis that “the primary reason for the failure of much of our college education today can be found in the current approach.” As this would indicate, the writer swings a heavy axe on teaching methods in a manner that most librarians would applaud. But we might question that “the current Undergraduate Library trend is but another milestone along the road to educational revolution” or that “the Undergraduate Library is simply another evidence that reading room and classroom are about to exchange relationships.” The subject of the lecture was undoubtedly dictated by the establish-

ment of an undergraduate library at the University of Tennessee and the author performed a worthy service in presenting the potential for the undergraduate library.

The principal contribution to our professional literature comes in Archie L. McNeal's 1960 lecture on “Divisional Organization in the University Library.” He shrewdly points out that while “In theory, the subject division is staffed by a professional librarian with qualifications also in the subject matter of the division. In practice, the subject specialist is many times the professional librarian available.” He then presents evidence to show that “the provision of subject specialists . . . is limited approximately half the time the libraries are open for service.” Finally he challenges the theory that the specialist in a field provides better service in a divisional library than “the good general reference librarian.” Other advantages of the divisional plan are placed under the microscope and found deficient so as to build up a strong case for the general, upper division research library with central reference service.—Arthur T. Hamlin, *University of Cincinnati*.

Academic Administration

Government of Colleges and Universities.

By John J. Corson. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960. 209p. \$5.50.

This study was undertaken at the suggestion of John W. Gardner, President, and James A. Perkins, Vice President, of the Carnegie Corporation, supported by grants of the Corporation, and published as one of the books in the Carnegie Series in American Education. It is interesting that a professional management consultant was chosen to conduct the inquiry, and his findings and conclusions should not be particularly surprising to presidents, academic officers, faculty members, and trustees who have been concerned with the question of governance.

Two private, two urban, two denominational, and two state universities and two liberal arts colleges were selected for ob-

¹ Keyes D. Metcalf. “University Libraries Face the Future,” *Library Quarterly* 22:5-12 (January 1952).

² Arthur T. Hamlin. “The Financial and Economic Status of Research Libraries,” *Library Quarterly* 23: 190-198 (July 1953).

servance at first hand of their processes, and Mr. Corson apparently read extensively in the literature of college and university administration. The eight chapters cover the nature and significance of governing, the university as an administrative enterprise, the role of university-wide officers, academic officers, and faculties in governance, the university as a contrast in administrative process, the ecology of governance, and the effect of institutional character and leadership on governance. Two appendices deal with the character of the institutions observed and the author's comments on his readings.

In the opinion of Mr. Corson there is a "disturbing lack of sophisticated analysis of the functioning of our colleges and universities." He attempts in the several chapters to "identify the distinctive nature of the problems of college and university governance that cry out for analysis." Most of the questions he suggests as being profitable areas for further study are not new. A majority of them, for example, were considered by Algo D. Henderson, an experienced academic administrator, in his book, "Policies and Practices in Higher Education," published at about the same time as the Corson study.

If Mr. Corson is correct in his finding of a lack of orderly and sophisticated analysis in this area, it is a challenge to academic administrators to go to work on these problems in the proper fashion. Perhaps they should seek foundation support for management consultants to attack what Mr. Corson considers to be major weaknesses in the governance of colleges and universities. There is the precedent of large sums of foundation money being made available to study internal and particularly business administration of these institutions.—*Eugene H. Wilson, University of Colorado.*

Developing a Specialist

Science Information Personnel: The New Profession of Information Combining Science, Librarianship and Foreign Language. By Leonard Cohan and Kenneth Craven. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1961. 74p. \$1.50.

The Modern Language Association's im-

print on this report is quite incidental to its contents. The importance of languages in science information work has received only a minor emphasis as a part of the total educational and training requirements of the profession. Undoubtedly the study will be of more interest to librarians than to linguists.

The authors first set out to describe this "new" professional, the science information specialist, and define the elements which comprise his work. Twelve of these elements represent current tasks; another five indicate recent trends in the profession. Although little criticism can be made of the enumeration, it is difficult to identify any unique activities. All have in some degree been a part of special librarianship for a considerable period of time. Only when measured against a passive, archival brand of librarianship do the elements of science information work appear "new." The authors make this distinction: "The role of the librarian has been to keep a facility complete, up-to-date and accessible. The information specialist has been concerned more with promoting information, anticipating user requirements, and setting up special information services to meet them."

Whether this distinction is altogether justifiable remains an academic question if the administrators of research organizations, industries, and government agencies, who are instrumental in staffing information centers, consider it valid. Even more important is its acceptance by the potential recruit, in this case the science major, who consequently turns to the laboratory, not the library, for a career. The increasing shortage of trained information specialists demands the services of those with science backgrounds. If this shortage is to be filled by design and not by improvisation, librarianship, so labeled or not, must appear as a challenging and attractive career, and library training must seem pertinent and meaningful. The question is whether there has been a failure in public relations or in education.

Since the major portion of the report concerns itself with constructing a curriculum for the science information specialist, it is obvious that the authors consider present library education inadequate. In this cast the concept of librarianship held by the technically-oriented public is of more than