

which the author feels might deter unionization if they performed some of a union's functions. He adds, however, "ALA is encouraging other organizations to assume its role as spokesman for the nation's librarians." This pithy statement demands a challenge—if any ALA champion is awake to make it.

This book deserves special recognition on several scores. It pioneers an approach to collective bargaining among librarians—not the only approach, but a useful one which will probably now be repeated from library school to library school. Moreover, it has drawn on fields of knowledge outside of traditional library science to a degree that presages future effects of collective bargaining on the isolation of the profession.—*John W. Weatherford, Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant.*

Thomson, Sarah Katharine. *Interlibrary Loan Policies Directory*. Chicago: American Library Assn., 1975. 486p. \$7.95. (LC 74-32182) (ISBN 0-8389-0197-2)

If there is any one person to whom the current generation of interlibrary loan librarians has reason to be grateful, it is Sally Thomson. Her Columbia dissertation (later published as an ACRL monograph) was the first substantial study of interlibrary loan transactions in this country. The *Interlibrary Loan Procedure Manual*, which she published in 1970, makes it possible for the least experienced librarian to properly execute interlibrary loan requests. Her most recent contribution, the *Interlibrary Loan Policies Directory*, will in the future save numerous individual librarians the work of compiling the same data.

The *Directory*, arranged by NUC code, contains information on the lending policies and practices of 276 American academic, public, government, and special libraries. The libraries selected generally lend 250 or more volumes a year to out-of-state libraries. Information given for each institution includes addresses of interlibrary loan and photoduplication services, photocopy practices and charges, and lending policies for periodicals and other serials, microforms, government documents, dissertations and theses, genealogies, and technical reports. The information was supplied by interlibrary loan librarians following a de-

tailed form provided by Dr. Thomson.

The only similar work is the *Directory of Reprographic Services*, issued by the Reproduction of Library Materials Section of the Resources and Technical Services Division of ALA, which contains information on lending policies for dissertations and periodicals as well as information on photoduplication services. But the RLMS directory, because of its lack of standards for inclusion, its inconvenient format, and its lack of detail, has not been very useful to interlibrary loan librarians.

As long as libraries fail to agree on lending policies and practices, a directory such as Dr. Thomson's will be a necessity. The individual interlibrary loan librarian will still need to collect and compile some data since not all libraries could be included in this new directory. It does provide, however, a very substantial common core to which each library can add its own supplementary list.

In order to make it easier to add other entries and also to insert changes as they occur, it would be helpful if the next edition were issued in a more flexible format. It is undoubtedly too much to hope that this public display of their failure to agree will motivate librarians to reexamine their policies and make the publication of future editions unnecessary!—*Marjorie Karlson, Head, Reference Department, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.*

Daily, Jay E. *Cataloging Phonorecordings: Problems and Possibilities*. (Practical Library and Information Science, vol. 1) New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 1975. 172p. \$13.75. (LC 73-90723) (ISBN 0-8247-6196-0)

When the *Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR)* were published in 1967, Jay Daily evaluated Part III, "Non-Book Materials" (see his "Selection, Processing, Storage of Non-Print Materials," *Library Trends* 16:283-99 (Oct. 1967)). He was not at all pleased with the new code and subsequently issued his own code for dealing with nonprint materials. Some of his ideas can quite properly be described as radical and controversial. On the other hand, his criticisms of AACR represent something more than a personal idiosyncrasy. If Part III of the code were satisfactory, it is not