

Review Articles

Space for Study

Student Reaction to Study Facilities, with Implications for Architects and College Administrators; a report to the Presidents of Amherst College, Mount Holyoke College, Smith College, and the University of Massachusetts. . . . [Prepared under the auspices of the Committee for New College.] Amherst, Mass. 1960. 60 p.

A first reading of this report leaves me with some uncertainty as to whether I want to laugh or weep: laugh because the report is so well done; weep because every single conclusion the committee arrived at has been well known to those of us who have worked with the problem of college library buildings since the war. Those of us who live in the hinterlands have learned to expect a fair amount of provinciality among New Englanders, just as we have learned to accept the fact that many of our ideas aren't respectable until Harvard comes along and rediscovers them, but, really, this report is just too much!

There isn't the slightest bit of evidence in this report that its authors have any conception that dozens of librarians and architects have wrestled with these problems for fifteen years, that much has been written on the subject, that dozens of modular libraries have been built and all kinds of experiments have been attempted with conclusions that are already well known to most of us. For example, I have been saying for years that 80 per cent of the space for readers should be in the form of reading room carrels and only 20 per cent in the form of flat tables. I could list library after library that has been organized along the lines of the conclusions this committee discovers. What kind of scholarship is this that blandly ignores the record?

Foundations will read this report and will soon be preaching the gospel to us innocents who haven't had access to the latest research! Amen.

Having paid my respects to the committee for its bibliographic manners, may I now congratulate it for conducting a good, clean-cut experiment and for having arrived at

conclusions that are sound, wise, and helpful. This is a report that every college and university librarian should read because it will give each of them "scientific" evidence to back up what he already knows about how to analyze the problem of planning study space for a campus.

The validity of the study for comparative purposes is limited by the lack of all kinds of facilities in the colleges included in the study.

The summary of twenty-seven findings on pages 40-42 of the report will give the college librarian the ammunition he needs to combat the wishful thinking of campus planners who have the idea that empty classrooms and dormitory libraries will solve the problem of providing study facilities on the campus. For this help we should all be grateful. Also, this report will bolster the courage of those librarians in charge of modular buildings who haven't dared subdivide their reading room spaces along the lines of the committee's findings.—*Ralph E. Ellsworth, University of Colorado Libraries.*

Building, Shelving, and Storage

Buildings, by Ralph E. Ellsworth. *Shelving*, by Louis Kaplan. *Storage Warehouses*, by Jerrold Orne. (The State of the Library Art, Volume 3) New Brunswick, N. J.: Graduate School of Library Service, Rutgers, the State University, 1960. 3v in 1. \$5.50.

The only thing really wrong with this book is that, for the most part, it simply does not cover the subjects named in the title. Everything in the book is on the subject, but for two out of three of the parts, the material covers only a portion of the much broader headings. The majority of the book (151 pages) is supposed, by title, to cover "Buildings," but it is perfectly clear that the author, Ralph Ellsworth, is not attempting to do this. As a matter of fact, he starts his introduction by stating: "The problem of hous-