

a good first step. More discussion on the use of specific analytical tools (Latin square design, regression analysis, marketing research techniques, etc.) would have added immeasurably to the text. Sections 12.4 and 13.1 on elementary statistical measures and experimental design should be moved to the front of the book. These are prerequisites if the reader is to fully grasp what he reads. It would also have strengthened the ties between author and reader if someone with a background in the traditional disciplines of library science (cataloging, reference, acquisitions, etc.) could have been allowed to comment on the manuscript before publication. Aside from those points mentioned earlier the methodology is basically sound and a second edition should see a further refining of both the strategy and tactics for studying document transfer systems. The book is strongly recommended to the experienced systems person having no previous background in document transfer systems, as well as to the beginning library analyst or administrator with sufficient background (calculus, economics, systems analysis) who needs assistance in planning the experimental design for a systems study.—*Robert W. Burns, Jr., Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado.*

Woman and the Equal Rights Amendment: Senate Subcommittee Hearings on the Constitutional Amendment, 91st Congress. ed. by Catherine Stimpson in conjunction with the Congressional Information Service. New York and London: R. R. Bowker Company, 1972. xvi, 538p. \$12.50.

A news story from South Africa a couple of years ago reported the case of a civil servant named Sylvia who underwent a series of sex change operations, switched to the name Andre, and upon returning to work medically certified as a male, received an immediate pay increase.

Less bizarre, but possibly more startling because they occurred here under our laws, are the patterns of sex discrimination revealed in these U.S. Senate subcommittee hearings on the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA).

Testifying in May 1970, witnesses point-

ed to the legal distinctions between men and women for jury service (women in only "28 states . . . serve under the same terms as men"); and to differing penalties for men and women who commit identical crimes ("the legislative rationale seems to have been that it required longer to rehabilitate a female criminal than a male"). Another of many illustrations was the double standard for admission to certain state educational institutions (during one recent period 21,000 women were turned down for admission to the University of Virginia, while not one male was rejected); and in some states "women attain the age of majority at 21, while men attain majority at 18."

The ERA says simply: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of sex." At one sweep, the measure would declare men and women equal before the law. "Even if the equal rights amendment did nothing but state the principle," declared witness Caroline Bird, "it would be worth it." Yet both opponents and proponents agreed that constitutional adoption would affect a substantial array of federal and state laws, including the draft and a large body of family law and protective legislation whose benefits and obligations are applied selectively, to one sex or the other.

Major controversy centered around ERA's ramifications for protective legislation. This covers wages and hours and other working conditions such as rest periods, seating provisions, weightlifting limitations, etc. Advocates of the amendment strongly urged the extension of these laws to men, but viewed the protections as "restrictions" on opportunity when applied to women only. Basically, proponents of ERA preferred to risk the possibility that it might eliminate such legislation than to qualify ERA in any way. Representing labor's objections however, one AFL-CIO witness summarized labor's serious concern that "enemies of labor legislation powered by a combination of middle class feminists and employers, could speedily wipe out all forms of protections afforded specifically to women, whether they are 'restrictive' or not. . . ." A majority of the labor movement has firmly opposed ERA from the start, al-

though the hearings include some testimony in support.

A momentary glance backward to Melvil Dewey's nineteenth century justification of unequal pay for equal work indicates how the concept of protection has been used to women's disadvantage. Referring to librarians, Dewey claimed that since man, in contrast to woman,

can in an emergency lift a heavy case, or climb a ladder . . . or can act as fireman or do police duty, he adds direct value. . . . Woman . . . almost always receives, whether she exacts it or not, much more waiting on and minor assistance than a man in the same place and therefore, with sentiment aside, hard business judgment cannot award her quite as much salary.

Although this argument is rarely used today, in practice its consequences endure, and its philosophical underpinnings remain tenacious. (If anyone doubts this, just read some of the testimony in this volume, or turn to page 527 where a senator quotes Kipling on motherhood.) The ERA would undoubtedly help to shake loose this Victorian holdover.

Throughout the May 1970 hearings there were lively and dramatic interchanges, and sections of the testimony bear out the editor's introductory suggestion that the congressional committee room is "an authentic source of American theater." Some of the scenes are as revealing as the official documents.

The preface states: "Our purpose in publishing this volume is to make accessible to the public in a hardcover edition the record of influential government operations, to make obtainable what might otherwise be ignored." A commendable idea! But priced at nearly four times the \$3.25 original, this edition may be ignored, too.

Edited by a Barnard English professor in conjunction with Congressional Information Service, the book is, essentially, a somewhat shortened reproduction of the 800-page hearings with a reorganized plan of arrangement, and a few additions. It preserves most of the original text, including the occasional typographical errors. Unlike its model, in this edition the complete oral testimony is brought together in one, smooth-running flow, and most of the documentary material is reassembled in a sep-

arate section organized in pro and con sequences. Deleted are those documents and statements the editor deemed repetitive, along with almost all of the prepared testimony (about 200 or so pages, all told). The result is a much more readable volume, whose essential content has, with a few exceptions, been maintained.

The revised and added indexes however, lack the important identifying information about witnesses and documents provided in the original; and because of the rearranged textual sequence, more link-up between documents and documents and testimony is required than these indexes supply.

First introduced in 1923, shortly after the 19th amendment extended the vote to women, an equal rights amendment was introduced again in nearly every subsequent session of Congress. The hearings reprinted in this book contain the first legislative testimony on the amendment since 1956; but it is unfortunate that the otherwise informative introduction does not mention later relevant hearings which took place before this book was completed. Hearings were held by a Senate committee in September 1970, and by a House subcommittee in March and April 1971. However, the editor does include some colorful excerpts from the *Congressional Record* not in the GPO edition, which neatly convey the character of the longer range ERA controversy. Approved by Congress forty-nine years after it was first introduced, the constitutional amendment now awaits ratification by the states.—Anita R. Schiller, *University of California, San Diego*.

Hyman, Richard Joseph. **Access to Library Collections**. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1972. 452 p., index, bibliography. ISBN 0-8108-0434-4. LC 77-169134.

Of the three parts to Hyman's *Access to Library Collections*—a "documentary analysis," a definition of browsing and browsability and a "questionnaire analysis"—only the definitions are of sufficient substance to bear study. The documentary analysis merely rehashes at intolerable length the century-old arguments of librarianship, especially classification theory. Hyman's intentions were to bring together a great deal of literature on the various questions of librarianship rel-