Like most books comprised of collected pieces by various authors from various disciplines, this one suffers from a lack of continuity and focus. The editors set out nobly enough by concluding in their opening notes: “We believe that the driving force behind the development of new programs and systems should not be simply the allure of new technology. Rather institutions should continue to base their decisions about new ventures in telecommunications on the educational and societal problems that they wish to solve and on the learner needs that they wish to meet.” However, the book fails to explore these problems and their possible solutions. Instead it takes you through some rather mundane discussions: why more educational television material isn’t produced, audiovisual media-use statistics, and Robert Gillespie’s unexceptional views on computing in higher education, which have virtually no relevance to the issues at hand, at least as they are defined by the editors. Michael Goldstein writes about public policy, but this is not related back to learner needs. Glenn Watts’ article about the changing workplace is better reading than the others, but most readers will find the veneer of the content awfully thin. The editors’ concluding comments are the best part; they capulize the few useful points made. But after reading the book, I did not feel I had gained any real insight into the telecommunications issues that confront our colleges and universities today. The effectiveness of using telecommunications and computing in education is assumed from the start. There is no consideration of where either might be appropriate or ineffective. We are not provided a strategy for planning or a road map to guide us into the future of telecommunications. We are not given new insights into the technology.

The book is a disappointment, for telecommunications is a misunderstood and inadequately planned area on most campuses, and good guides on the subject are sorely needed. This book does not fill the vacuum. Most readers would get just as much insight into telecommunications issues for campus administrators and planners by reading the New York Times education supplements or the Chronicle of Higher Education.—Thomas Hassler, University of Alaska, Fairbanks.
on several programs intended to increase the effectiveness of academic libraries. The author describes those programs and how they came about, discusses their role in contemporary academic librarianship, and assesses their effectiveness in meeting their implicit and explicit aims.

Although most of the programs have been forgotten by all but the most senior of us today, they were viewed during the period as central to the most significant developments in academic libraries. Principal among these programs, in the minds of most academic librarians at the time, were a series of collection development grants made by the Carnegie Corporation to four-year, junior, teachers', black, and state colleges and to technical institutes. In determining who should receive these grants, Keppel relied almost entirely upon several advisory groups of librarians and educators, all chaired by Bishop. In total these groups were instrumental in seeing that some $1,636,800 was granted to 248 institutions for strengthening their library book collections. In addition, the corporation granted $1,824,500 to college libraries on its own initiative.

Among other accomplishments within the academic library profession that resulted from Carnegie grants between 1928 and 1941 were the development of the first sets of four-year and junior college library standards, the preparation by Charles B. Shaw of the first list of books for four-year colleges and of Foster Mohrhardt's list of books for junior college libraries, and B. Lamar Johnson's "library-college" experiment at Stephens College. Carnegie support also led to the writing of William M. Randall's landmark monograph on The College Library, B. Harvie Branscomb's classic Teaching with Books, Erret McDiarmid's treatise The Library Survey, and James T. Gerould's pioneering College Library Building. In addition, the nation's first centralized library acquisition program was established and operated for thirteen years under Carnegie auspices at the University of Michigan.

All of these activities are treated in this book. The author appears to acknowledge the importance to us of all of them save the program of book-fund grants. Here he opines that perhaps fewer but larger grants would have done more good. He laments the absence of objective evaluative material in the Carnegie archives and, finding no hard evidence of success, cautiously and somewhat dourly assumes no success. Although he may be right in his assumption, one feels constrained to recall that this period spanned the years of the Great Depression when many American colleges, as well as individuals, went bankrupt and when money was worth vastly more than it is today. Perhaps, at the time, simple survival itself, even courtesy of the Carnegie Corporation, was a form of success. Moreover, it may seem a bit inappropriate to fault the Carnegie for lacking sophisticated evaluative mechanisms a half-century ago when few if any grant-furnishing foundations, or government agencies for that matter, have them today.

This is an excellent book, thoroughly researched, effectively presented, and well documented. It belongs alongside George Bobinski's Carnegie Libraries, which documents the foundation's earlier role in the provision of library buildings, and John Richardson's Spirit of Inquiry, which recounts its place in the evolution of library education and research. Taken together, this scholarly trilogy constitutes a massive and salutary reminder of the profession's great debt of gratitude to the remarkable Carnegie philanthropy, even if we assume that the program of grants for book-fund support was not a complete success.—David Kaser, Indiana University, Bloomington.


Another solid, useful reference tool has been born and added to the education librarian's shelf. A long time in coming, it will be worn and dog-eared before the next accreditation team has left the campus. Indeed, if such an experience is imminent on your campus, it is recom-