

parison. However, taking only Pope's work into consideration, the median time for catalog copy to appear in 1969 was ninety-one days. Whether or not the time-lag has increased since 1961, this would still make it difficult for a library to decide whether to wait for LC copy or do original cataloging. In fact, Pope concludes at this point that the Library of Congress is incapable of closing the time gap.

In regard to the second question, a comparison was made between entries as they appeared in prepublication sales catalogs and subsequent Library of Congress entries. The agreement between the two on most items was remarkably high, and the one item which showed the most discrepancy, the collation statement, is not even presently included in the CIP record. It is in this area that Pope has the most to contribute. Elsewhere in the book it is pointed out that delays in producing catalog copy result from a book being "cataloged" many times—by the publisher, by the Copyright Office, by the Library of Congress, and by individual libraries. Pope feels that, in as much as the Library of Congress is willing to accept intact cataloging provided by foreign countries, it should also be willing to accept cataloging by publishers. This would be more likely to happen if a mutually acceptable manual of bibliographic description were to be adopted.

As of this review, the CIP project has yet to be fully evaluated, although there are indications that it is becoming more viable. This is shown by the fact that slightly more than 50 percent of the American book publishing output is represented. If publishers find it worth their while to cooperate, and if libraries across the country are willing to accept CIP copy, then this book will simply be a record of past failures. Nevertheless, Pope's extensive research forms a basis for any future studies in this area.—*Dianne J. Ellsworth, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut.*

✶ ***The University—The Library. Papers presented by Samuel Rothstein, Richard Blackwell, Archibald MacLeish at York University, Toronto, on the Occasion of the Dedication of the Scott Library, 30 October, 1971.*** Oxford: Shakespeare Head Press, 1972. 62 p.

This slender, impeccably printed volume contains, in addition to the essays by the three authors mentioned in the title, a preface and introduction by Thomas F. O'Connell, and brief biographical sketches of the three authors who were recipients of honorary degrees at the colloquy.

Dedication of a new library building is a highly important affair in an institution of learning, and perhaps even more so at York University, because of its comparative youthfulness and rapidity of growth—both in student enrollment and in library resources.

The three chief participants in the dedication represented different but allied professions. They addressed themselves to the topic: "The University—The Library." Samuel Rothstein, library educator, sketched briefly some of the academic and curricular changes of the last century in higher education, which have led to the rise of a trained, service-directed class of professionals in modern libraries. Richard Blackwell spoke of the close dependence existing between librarian and bookseller, drawing with charm and discernment upon his experiences with the firm of B. H. Blackwell.

Archibald MacLeish, poet, was concerned with the importance of a book collection as more than a mere institutional statistic. One paragraph quoted from his remarks may suffice to indicate his affirmations in the essay, "The Premise of Meaning":

For the existence of a library, the fact of its existence, is, in itself and of itself, an assertion—a proposition nailed like Luther's to the door of time. By standing where it does at the centre of the university—which is to say at the centre of our intellectual lives—with its books in a certain order on its shelves and its cards in a certain structure in their cases, the true library asserts that there is indeed a "mystery of things." Or, more precisely, it asserts that the reason why the "things" compose a mystery is that they seem to mean: that they fall, when gathered together, into a kind of relationship, a kind of wholeness, as though all these different and dissimilar reports, these bits and pieces of experience, manuscripts in bottles, messages from long before, from deep within from miles beyond, belonged together and might, if understood together,

spell out the meaning which the mystery implies. (p. 53)

The final two pages of the book contain a brief account of the Shakespeare Head Press, written by Basil Blackwell, the sole survivor of the original company. It should also be recorded that the end-sheets and a centerfold contain reproduced interior and exterior views of Scott Library.—*Cecil K. Byrd, Indiana University, Lilly Library, Bloomington, Indiana.*

- ✓ Kronus, Carol L. and Crowe, Linda, eds. *Libraries and Neighborhood Information Centers*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois, Graduate School of Library Science, 1972. 142 p. (Allerton Park Institute, no. 17).

Carol Kronus and Linda Crowe compiled the various papers presented at the University of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science devoted to library-based neighborhood information centers to form this monographic, but decidedly weak, synthesis. Unquestionably, the conference itself must have been a far more exciting and rewarding experience than the simple gathering of the papers presented. There are too many questions asked by the authors and papers presented, too many issues raised, too many simplistic answers to enormously complex problems, and too little interactive research to allow this work a more successful place on people's reading lists. Even though the conference was held at the University of Illinois on October 24-27, 1971, the results are now outmoded, some conditions significantly changed in the library world, and other projects quiet but nonetheless failures. Why?

I will not attempt at this point in time to relate the significance of this work to the world of academic libraries, but will leave that issue for the end of this review. It seems more appropriate first to discuss the shortcomings of this publication. To begin with, the articles are repetitious and disjointed. There needs to be an interweaving

of research, theory, experimentation, library operational modification based on circumstances at hand, and reworking of previously held concepts or theories about the inner city residents, labeled the urban poor. Information provided by each of the papers related to a specific subject or project, with occasional mention of similar situations. As such, each paper could stand on its own merits, but would add very little to the cohesiveness of the whole.

What was missing in the monograph was the give and take that must have existed between the participants, the audience, and the editors. The exchanges that might have congealed these library and information vagaries with the dispassionate research findings presented by nonlibrary experts could have materially improved the development of a polemic on the role of libraries with regard to information services. Instead, the reader is left to fend for himself. The necessary amalgam to make these papers a valuable interweaving of theory and practice is missing. Furthermore, the success of many of these neighborhood information centers is now in question, particularly with the decline or absence of federal supporting funds. The question never asked in this work is whether such services are the province of the public library. Is this where public libraries should concentrate their efforts?

As an academic librarian, I am disappointed by the inability of researchers and librarians alike to distill the crucial issues in one setting and project their significance into another. Urban academic libraries already are feeling the impact of a need for more assistance in providing information and services to their respective academic and urban communities. How should they cope with this problem? For those librarians with great imagination and dedication, this publication may generate some projects or goals. Unfortunately, for most librarians it will remain a closed book.—*Robert P. Haro, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.*