

grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. The volume here under review—edited with an introduction by Hallie Beachem Brooks and published in an attractive format—brings together the papers presented at the conference and the discussions which followed them.

The various papers presented at the conference provide much information, and much food for thought; they merit a careful reading by all who are concerned with and interested in the South and things Southern. Monroe C. Neff (North Carolina State Department of Community Colleges) considers those forces and factors which will provide "A Sound Environment for an Evolving Social Institution." Lawrence L. Durisch (Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville) and Reed Sarratt (Southern Education Reporting Service, Nashville) define the South in terms of her social-economic-cultural and educational aspects. Archie L. McNeal (University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida) describes and analyzes the role of the library in relation to the South's social-economic-cultural problems. Virginia Lacy Jones (Atlanta University school of library service) defines the role of the library in relation to the South's educational problems, and suggests that librarians "need to go 'way out' at times and perhaps appear to be impractical, to get our feet off the ground—perhaps to attempt the impossible with verve and spirit and faith." Ruth E. Warncke (deputy executive director of the American Library Association) provides an evaluative summary of the conference, pointing out its strengths and weaknesses.

Leon Carnovsky (graduate library school, University of Chicago) delivered the conference's banquet address, in which he dealt with "Libraries and the International Scene." Thus, while the conference was concerned appropriately and primarily with problems of the American South, its planners wisely chose to include a place on the program for a consideration of the world beyond the South.

In *The Role of the Library in Improving Education in the South* we have a thoughtful and thought-provoking consideration of an important topic. Both those who attended the conference and those who were not

so fortunate will welcome the publication of these proceedings.—*John David Marshall, University of Georgia.*

A Survey of the University of Delhi Library. By Carl M. White. Delhi: Planning Unit, University of Delhi, 1965. xvi + 184 p. 6 tables.

The University of Delhi, one of the younger universities in India, was incorporated in 1922. The major growth of the university and its library, however, has taken place since 1939, and particularly after 1942 when Shri S. Das Gupta assumed the post of librarian following a period of training under S. R. Ranganathan. The development and expansion of the university since that time has been remarkable. From 1945-1965, the enrollment increased 840 per cent, reaching a high of 29,550 in the academic year 1964-65. The book collections in the same period increased by 462 per cent, and the total expenditures for the library 995 per cent. A new library building was erected and occupied in 1958 and now houses 168,263 volumes. The total book resources of the university, including the departmental and college libraries, total 872,034 volumes. A brilliant future is anticipated for the university as it assumes an increasing role of educational leadership in India and becomes an important cultural link between India and other countries.

This survey was made at the request of the University of Delhi, acting on the suggestion of Professor S. Das Gupta, the librarian, by Carl M. White, who served as a Ford Foundation consultant during the period of the survey. It is a penetrating study backed by an impressive amount of supporting data in the form of statistics and opinions from faculty and librarians on various aspects of the library problem. Dr. White brings to the analysis of the library's needs the knowledge and perspective gained through wide experience as director of three major libraries in the United States—the University of North Carolina, the University of Illinois, and Columbia University. A significant feature of the study is the evidence of wide consultation with concerned individuals in the university community. Suggestions and opinions gathered

by means of questionnaires and conferences lend weight to the evidence presented and to the final recommendations which follow each chapter and are summarized at the end.

The survey covers in detail primarily the libraries under the jurisdiction of the University of Delhi librarian. This excludes the libraries of the thirty-five constituent and affiliated colleges of the university. In discussion of over-all planning, however, these are brought into the total picture, and a separate study of the relationship of the college libraries to the main library is recommended. The college libraries, with a total of 631,000 volumes, are under the administration of the individual colleges and ordinarily serve only their own clientele. It appears from one of the tables that the campus colleges spent 770,511 rupees on their libraries in 1964-65, as compared with 798,448 which was spent on the university library. On the other hand, a comparison of the distribution of use made by students of all the libraries, indicates that 52.9 per cent relied principally on the university library as compared with 21.9 per cent who reported the college libraries as having their principal patronage. In a long range program to bring the college libraries into the main stream of library development in the university, several suggestions are made. The first is a cooperative project under which the college libraries would provide a catalog record for a central union catalog in the university library for every book acquired. This would seem to be an absolute necessity in order that maximum use be made of the book resources of the university. A second recommendation is for a coordinated administration of the college and university libraries. A third recommendation, while a more radical departure from the present arrangements, may have special appeal in view of the increased enrollments expected and the demand for more space for books and services. This is to build a centrally located library to serve all undergraduate students. This would offer better book collections, to be used by more people, less duplication, a wider range of services, and the means of providing a more competent staff.

Caution is recommended in the creation

of departmental libraries, on the grounds that if these are to be generously provided with books and adequately staffed, they become too costly and in the end will undermine the proper role of the university library itself. Instead, it is suggested that the university consider the divisional library idea, placing the collections in broad subject divisions, "creating units large enough to be viable, manning each unit with librarians with special knowledge of the literature." It is pointed out that the advancement of knowledge and the development of new fields has blurred the lines which formerly separated departments of study, making the narrowly defined unit no longer efficient.

To carry out the suggestion of the divisional approach, a separate science library building is recommended and the conversion of the main library into two divisions, one for the social sciences and one for the humanities. The physical location of the departments of science is favorable to the idea of a separate library facility, and it is predicted that such a unit "would make possible the creation of a science library of national importance." The main library building could be remodeled to become a "scholar's workshop" for the social sciences and the humanities.

Several fundamental recommendations are made relating to the government of the university library, all of which seem necessary to the creation of a centrally administered university *system* of libraries. Among them are the following: (1) making the university library official owner of all library materials, however acquired by the university; (2) establishment of bibliographical control over all such materials; (3) formally delegating the powers of management now vested in the Library Committee to the librarian and making him answerable directly to the vice-chancellor.

Dr. White begins his study with the premise "that library service of high quality is the heart of an academic program of high quality." The report is frank and factual in its evaluation of what is needed to achieve this end, and at the same time pays tribute to the substantial foundations that have been laid.—*Rudolph Gjelsness, University of Arizona.*