material was hastily written and not revised. The sentence structure is often long, involved, and at times so awkward and disjointed that the meaning is obscure. As a result of omissions and misspellings of words, some sentences actually defy interpretation. The misspelling of words, combined with what Geoffrey Lloyd generously refers to in the preface as “philosophical phraseology and classification jargon,” often lead to confusion. Perreault is fond of words such as: analysable, orderedness, stratigisation, foundational, nontrivially, computerisable, automatisation, professionality, etc. When one adds misspellings such as: froundworks, thougheroughly, and Or­bana, Illinois, the interpretation becomes difficult.

In addition to these problems, letters, words, lines, and paragraphs are curiously spaced throughout the book. The reader has no way of knowing in which instances this is for emphasis or is just poor typography.

The reader is never certain of Perreault’s purpose in collecting the essays together in this volume. If it is (as Lloyd suggests in the preface) to improve the UDC so that it will be recognized and used throughout the world, such a poorly written book will not help Perreault accomplish his purpose. One only can hope that before Perreault publishes more of his work, he invests in a copy of The Art of Readable Writing and a good editor. Both the UDC and future students of classification deserve better material than this.—Lucille M. Wert, University of Illinois.


This report describes the evaluative survey conducted by the author in June 1970. The purpose of the survey was “a general evaluation of the processing center, with special emphasis on the attitudes of the participating libraries on the product of the center, and the feasibility of using this cooperative endeavor as a springboard for the other inter-library efforts (in the region).”

Chapter I includes a brief general discussion of library cooperation related to “larger units of service.” Hendricks then comments on centralized processing as a particular type of library cooperation, outlining the advantages and disadvantages of centralization. He cites the authority for cooperative library programs in Ontario (The Public Libraries Act of 1966), mentions factors which may encourage or impede cooperation, and describes the activities of the Midwestern Regional Library System with regard to the regional situation.

The bulk of the report discusses the system’s processing center. Evaluative measures used include: processing time lags, quality of the product, “enterability” or compatibility of the processing center product to previous processing, staffing patterns of member libraries, production considerations, and costs of processing. Narrative descriptions and charts of the center’s ordering, cataloging, and processing routines are included. Hendricks makes recommendations regarding the space, work layout, and staffing patterns of the center. He concludes that “the development of one aspect of library cooperation (the center) has laid a strong foundation for additional kinds of library interaction.”

The reviewer was particularly pleased to see the following comment regarding processing time lags and member library complaints: “In order to gain a true picture of the additional delay incurred by dealing with a processing center, a library should first have a documented concept of the time it takes a book to clear its own technical processing department. Then a comparison with the times for delivery from the processing center would reveal whether the library has a legitimate complaint.”

Technical processing personnel everywhere—take note!

Member and nonmember library reactions to the center were elicited through use of an interview schedule during on-site visits. On the basis of the replies and other comments recorded during the course of the study, Hendricks made qualified recommendations for regional library activity in areas of: union lists, an expanded telephone network, rotating collections of popular material, delivery service, a central reference service, photocopy of periodicals, selective acquisitions, and a common borrower’s card.
The appendix lists the cataloging code currently used by the center in cataloging and processing books for adult and juvenile collections.

Hendricks covers a lot of ground in the survey, going from general considerations to a regional and to a specific geographic base. The study seems well planned and well carried out, and the purpose of the study has been met. The survey has a far broader interest group than the system or the region studied. Librarians concerned with regional cooperative projects and centralized processing would do well to read the report. Any group planning an evaluative survey of existing and potential cooperative programs should benefit from the investigator's approach to the problem.—Lawrence E. Leonard, University of Illinois, Urbana.


Mrs. Stevenson has done a very thorough and intelligent assessment of the library associations of Southwestern United States. While the subject matter does not lend itself to exciting reading, those persons interested in effective professional organization will find this useful as virtually everything presented may be applied to any library association.

The major recommendations (p.107-09) could be used as a basis for self-analysis and discussion by library associations although actual implementation of some recommendations would be exceedingly complex due to the disparities from state to state and the proliferation of organizations.

One small criticism: This reviewer would have preferred the recommendations to start with the Individual Librarians and work on up to the national, as the key to any progress is the individual.

Throughout the study other comments and findings of equal importance are given as related to "where do we go from here." Consequently, the entire report must be read carefully or pertinent points could be missed.

For example: On page 93 is a very brief paragraph concerning legislative activities of regional library associations, which supports the idea that such an activity is inappropriate at the regional level (this is not to imply fiscal support of national legislative activity is inappropriate!).

Also, the devastating outline of activities given on page 95 which are indeed "thin" when placed against not only the dollar cost but also against the effort and energy of the people involved. It is quite conceivable that enthusiasm for conferences runs in inverse proportion to experience of direct involvement in the actual preparation of one.

Another example is actually one of the most far-reaching conclusions in the report and could easily be overlooked. On page 80 a concept of relationship with ALA is developed that this reviewer has not seen elsewhere. It is worthy of more than passing consideration and should be studied by the regional associations individually and collectively.

Especially interesting to this reviewer was the conclusion on page 49 that "More regional meetings within the states, small regional conferences and institutes" were wanted by members but no reference was made to this in the final summary. The reviewer's interest arises from the fact that in 1972 PNLA plans to proceed with a series of small regional meetings of the workshop variety in several locations within its region. Already rumblings of dissatisfaction as to such a radical departure are being heard in spite of the fact that the membership approved overwhelmingly a constitutional change to biennial conferences with the alternate year devoted to workshops!

One point all chronic grumblers about associations should read and take to heart is the conclusion beginning on page 36. "There is a further obligation on the individual members—the obligation to volunteer. Perhaps we can't expect this of the new, possibly diffident, member, but there are prima donnas in every organization who feel their talents should be sought after rather than offered freely. Over and over again from each state, there was voiced the difficulty of getting people to accept assignments, or failure to discharge their responsibilities after they had accepted." It is too much to hope that those members of the profession to whom these words apply...