

the repetition in *Library-College USA* is a bit overwhelming. It is true that the publication of these twenty-one essays does allow the reader to observe the evolution of Shores's gospel as well as to see the various emphases delineated in the arrangement of the essays. Still, a well-edited condensation would have provided a good synopsis of the philosophy of the library-college movement in a much shorter space and in a much more readable fashion.—Richard J. Vorwerk, *Governors State University, Park Forest South, Illinois.*

Review of Automation for Libraries. Papers presented at the C.A.C.U.L. Workshop on Library Automation in a Pre-Conference Workshop of C.L.A. at Hamilton, June 20–21, 1970. Canadian Association of College and University Libraries, 1970.

This C.A.C.U.L. workshop continues a tradition begun in 1967 at the University of British Columbia. These workshops were started for the purpose of providing a place where "... institutions actually using or actively planning the use of computers in library operations ... could keep up-to-date, share information, and discuss the problems they might have in common. ..." (Introduction to 1967 workshop) The present volume continues this tradition and adds one additional goal, "... to discuss the continuing need for this type of meeting. ..." (Introduction to 1970 workshop)

The workshop at which these papers were given was organized into a two-day session with the four working papers presented the first day, and a discussion session held on the second day. The papers cover a computerized serials system at Laval University, an interuniversity circulation data system, the use of MARC at the University of Saskatchewan, and an automated cataloging system for the University of Guelph library.

Two of these papers are unabashedly how-we-do-it-in-our-library (Tom and Burgis) and remind one of the now defunct University of Illinois Clinics on Library Applications of Data Processing. Of the remaining two, one (Anable) is a plea for library cooperation through the creation of an "... Inter-university Circulation Data System ..." which would "1. Measure the

quality of service; 2. Predict future demands; 3. Aid in selection of new materials; and 4. Aid in establishing hierarchial storage requirements. ..." (p.123) The fourth paper (DeVarenes) reflects on the trials of implementing a new computerized serials system at Laval University.

The first two papers (Tom and Burgis) are descriptive, excruciatingly detailed, and (for librarians) very technical. Their audience is, therefore, somewhat limited both by expertise and interest. What was even more distressing to this writer was the fact that both papers make assumptions about the usefulness of the manual systems which are not made explicit to the reader. Indeed, one author (Burgis) disparages the necessity for even examining the existing manual system by deciding "... that if the Manual (sic) system had not been perfected over the last 10 years to a satisfactory state, then something more than a time and motion study was needed, and therefore, decided (sic) to get MARC printouts into the hands of the Cataloging Department as soon as possible. ..." (p.71–72) Such an attitude ignores the most basic premise of all library systems work: that you must first study the existing operation. Ignoring this basic requirement leaves the library EDP professional vulnerable to criticism. The workshop suffered from a lack of critical analysis and review of existing procedures both in-house and in other libraries. This was evident both in the body of the papers and in their review of other systems. Only two of the papers (DeVarenes and Burgis) took the trouble to search the literature and document their work with a bibliography.

The entire conference left this reviewer with a feeling of dissatisfaction. No one can quarrel with the work described or even with the systems themselves. The new systems are innovative and a great amount of hard work has gone into their creation. Yet this reviewer was disappointed that he found only the most meager evidence that any analysis had been made of the basic assumptions (why put *any* label on card pockets? See p.13) governing the existing manual systems with any degree of rigor. For example, it would be nice to know why "... it was agreed that an automated library system designed to complement the

building would be a goal worth pursuing . . ." (p.8), or why an accessions file was maintained to produce selective lists by department. (p.13) One wonders if we are still falling into the old trap of automating manual functions without first questioning their usefulness. Could it be that designing systems is fun, while making them perform is just plain hard work?

Poor editing of the papers also detracted from their effectiveness and often puzzled this reviewer. Why, for example, was there a reference on page 83 to page 17 when the page numbering had obviously been changed? Hand-lettering of the flow charts (p.51ff.) was sometimes difficult to read, and why the reader must be subjected to pictures of a map of Canada (p.118) or of a mini-reel of MARC tape (p.96) is beyond this author's comprehension. Flow charts, tables, diagrams, and even floor plans (p.94) are also forced upon the reader with little explanation.—*Robert W. Burns, Jr., Librarian for Research and Development, Colorado State University, Fort Collins.*

Olson, Edwin E. ***Interlibrary Cooperation.***

Part of a Program of Research into the Identification of Manpower Requirements, the Educational Preparation and the Utilization of Manpower in the Library and Information Profession. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1970.

Each new aspect of library operation produces a concomitant concern with training appropriate for the task. The relationship of the "educational technologist" or "media specialist" and the librarian, especially the school librarian, caused a great amount of curriculum study and revision. Computer entry into the library world had its impact in the "documentalist" or "information scientist" controversy with librarianship. As a result, the library school curriculum has been broadened to encompass training for computer uses. Now another library trend, that of interlibrary cooperation and especially the evolution of library networks, has made such an impact that there is a need to evaluate the training requirements of this mission. Some library schools have already enlarged their course offerings from the traditional "Larger Units of Service" to include courses in library co-

operation and networks.

Olson's study has as its first objective: "To identify and categorize the major dimensions of interlibrary cooperation which have implications for manpower development in librarianship." The other objectives are derivatives from the definition of these dimensions and are not fully attained, as Olson points out in the introduction.

The study centers on three dimensions which Olson feels have implications for manpower development in librarianship. From Norton Long, Olson borrows the concept of the "power budget" to ascertain capability of a cooperative as represented by its structure, resources, and decision-making processes to accomplish its goals. The domain of a cooperative is taken to mean the current and future claims the cooperative stakes out for itself in terms of the range of services and the population dealt with. The final dimension is that of opportunities and constraints which Olson restricts to the orientation of the director, the perception of carriers to goal achievement, and staff development. The study of these dimensions was conducted by means of two extensive questionnaires reproduced in the appendix of the report. The first questionnaire was entitled "Interlibrary Cooperative Service Policies Questionnaire," while the second is called "Interlibrary Cooperative Administrator's Questionnaire." In terms of the dimensions considered, Olson then draws conclusions from the data collected via the questionnaire process. Olson is not sanguine about the ability of library networks to effect any social change or any significant modification in library patterns. The "power budget" does not seem to carry enough clout in cooperatives to influence members, and cooperatives have only a minimal leadership role in setting goals, resolving conflicts, and mobilizing resources. The directors of cooperatives emphasized the means of cooperation rather than the end of moving the aggregation of libraries toward substantially different goals.

Translating these dimensions into manpower requirements, Olson sees a need for significant changes in the education for staffing library cooperatives. Specifically, he mentions the principles and techniques of building interorganizational structures, communication linkages, mobilization of re-