among the several problems cited. Ways of coping with these obstacles, such as participation of the disadvantaged in program planning and increasing the tax base through the establishment of regional systems, are realistic, if predictable.

Librarians are more aware of the need for continuing evaluation of programs and services. It is to the author’s credit that this function is discussed and the need for it stressed. If evaluative techniques had been employed consistently as the public library evolved, the current crisis in meeting the needs of a changing clientele might have been averted.

The trend toward diversified services addressed to the particular needs of a group has its critics. As libraries take on activities such as sex and hygiene classes and consumer education groups, a reasonable question can be raised as to whether nonbook oriented activities are within the domain of library functions. These new activities, as illustrated in many of the program examples, demand an expertise beyond the training of the librarian. The author deals with this question at some length, suggesting the need for cooperation between libraries and other agencies and the use of personnel from other professions.

This reviewer detected some unsupported and somewhat biased statements (“The flight of industry and white, middle-class families to the suburbs has also robbed the inner cities of leadership.” p. 76). It is probably a subjective judgment as to whether these statements mar the effectiveness of the book; the reviewer simply found them annoying.

Library Service to the Disadvantaged should be of value as a source book for public librarians. The extensive references to ongoing or experimental programs and the suggested approaches for implementing new programs are particularly useful features. Academic librarians, who in many instances are becoming increasingly sensitive to the needs of disadvantaged students among their clientele, will find some of the guidelines relevant to their planning.—Saundra Rice Murray, Howard University.


It is always interesting to look at the solutions of a building program through someone else’s eyes. In this case the building program belongs to the University of Guelph library. Mr. Langmead, the project architect, and Ms. Beckman, Deputy Librarian, have done an excellent job of describing their philosophies and approaches to library building planning and development. It is their thesis that successful library buildings must be functionally and aesthetically satisfying.

The question one must raise is, “To what extent did the authors satisfy this ambitious undertaking?” Let us take a close look at the two parts of this book.

The first sixty-nine pages are dedicated to the task of identifying such complex problems of new library building development as site selection, selection of planning team, functional considerations for library operations, architectural considerations, furniture selection and layout, moving, and operating the new library. The second half of the book includes approximately forty pages of the University of Guelph Library Building Program and its floor plans.

After reading his work, the reviewer was left with the strong suspicion that the building program for Guelph was written before the guidelines for planning were developed in the first part of the book. The guidelines suggested reflect much of the local scene at Guelph which may or may not have any bearing for other campuses. One can only surmise that the authors’ technique is justified by assuming that what is good for Guelph must be good for others as well. A good example of this takes place in Chapter 3, where the role of the planning team is covered: the discussion reflects strictly local attitudes and circumstances.

Very few, if any, of the many items discussed in this book are explored in any depth. Major considerations are treated briefly and in almost abstract style, offering little help and few solutions to problems. The issues of centralized vs. decentralized
library, of a separate undergraduate facility and of open vs. closed stacks are discharged in less than two pages.

The complete omission of the following important considerations should also be noted:

(1) There is no discussion on the desirability of certain types of floor coverings. There is no relief to such questions as where in the building should one use carpeting or tile floor covering. What quality of carpeting should one look for? Does carpeting hold up on stairways?

(2) A number of libraries have been built during the past twenty years with automatic smoke detection systems to prevent small fires from becoming major disasters. Smoke detection systems can be installed to show the exact location of trouble. Not one word on this important safety device.

(3) The security problem in a library building can be improved by connecting alarm-activated fire exits to a central panel, thus alerting staff when a door is opened without authorization and the location of the opened door. Apparently this type of detail was not considered by the authors.

(4) The authors fail to discuss in any depth the vertical transportation problem of students and faculty. Remaining unanswered are such questions as how many elevators are needed per thousand students in various high buildings? When does one consider an escalator instead of an elevator?

(5) It is common knowledge that libraries have some doors even when completely flexible modular, open-access buildings are designed. A few strategically located doors that are a few inches too low and narrow have defeated the easy, free-access concept in many libraries. Questions on these problems are seldom raised before construction, and the subject is not brought out by the authors either.

(6) The work gives no advice on the desirability of a public address system in a large building. Should a public building of a certain size have such a system to announce closing hours? To help evacuate the building if an emergency develops? To provide the flexibility of piping programmed music in limited and select areas?

(7) The importance of the shipping-receiving area cannot be overemphasized in library buildings. Many building consultants claim that if the shipping-receiving room is undersized or poorly designed, the rest of the building will have undesirable features. The New Library Design does not discuss the receiving area at all. The lack of appreciation for a functional receiving area is reflected in the Guelph Library Basement Floor Plan, which shows a marginal receiving area (p. 86).

(8) Anybody who has planned a university library of some size will agree that faculty studies can be a touchy issue. Most libraries plan either too few or too many. Much help is needed to establish local needs. If you were looking for an answer relating to faculty studies, such as number needed, size, and location in the building, here is the quote of the entire section dealing with the subject matter:

Small private studies, available for library related research by faculty members are found in both college and university libraries. The numbers which will be necessary will vary depending on the size and character of the institution and other facilities provided on campus.

Other topics are treated with equal depth and breadth. How useful is such a statement to prospective library planners and architects? This work can not serve as a checklist of new buildings when one considers the omissions. It is equally difficult to consider this book as a guide to library planning, since it offers little or no guidance at all.

Considering the positive points, the reviewer recommends reading the work if you are interested in "how we did it at Guelph." In fact, if you buy the book, don't miss reading about the problems identified at the Guelph Library (p. 84-85). It is most educational. It is entirely possible that their problem list is only two pages long because they have used their own checklist.

The reviewer cannot recommend this work for the use of the practitioner who needs advice for an overall good building. At best it can serve as a companion to other works that are listed in the bibliography.

—Peter Spyers-Duran, Florida Atlantic University.