as educational TV, computer-assisted instruction, and continuing education, to improve the educational process. The Council, which soon became known by the acronym EDUCOM, did not restrict its mission to any field.

The first tangible effort to develop an action program was begun by the Task Force on Information Networks, under the chairmanship of George W. Brown of UCLA. The Task Force was charged with investigating a way by which a network could be established and was asked to prepare a proposal to seek the necessary funding for establishment of a pilot operation. With the state of the art of network technology still unclear, there was need to obtain technical advice and also to explore numerous other considerations. In July 1966 the Task Force, with small grants from several federal agencies, assembled at the University of Colorado 181 persons from education, government, and industry, to assist in the preparation of the proposal. The EDUNET Conference, as it came to be known, delved into all possible ramifications of a network system for the educational community, the definition of needs, network applications, organizational and institutional context, and finally the preparation of a specific network proposal. Those in attendance were asked to prepare working papers on the above-mentioned topics, which in turn served as the basis for extensive discussion. More than one hundred and fifty working papers were written during the study. Plenary sessions were used to pull together much of the work. The conference proceedings first appeared as a preliminary draft dated September 1966 and had a very limited circulation. This draft was used as the basis for the publication now under review. Although some editorial work appears evident in the final version, the material is presented here in the same form, and there are very few changes. The working papers do not appear in full, but extracts are taken from each, with the author and area of application cited. The extracts have been arranged in a reasonably logical sequence and are held together by comments and brief narratives. What emerges is essentially a series of short statements by many people rather than an edited and polished presentation. For this reason there is much unavoidable redundancy, and one finds many recurring topics. Although the book is an important summary of the views of many knowledgeable people from a variety of backgrounds and training, it is probably not a volume that will be read from cover to cover. As to the material that appears in the volume, there is no doubt that a very substantial case is set forth for the need of a network and that sufficient evidence is presented to demonstrate that there are shareable machine-readable resources that could be used to establish a pilot network. It would have been interesting if some of those in attendance at the conference had presented a case for not establishing a network.

It is impossible to comment on the many extracts cited, but the views of J. C. Licklider of IBM and John Carr of the University of Pennsylvania are especially worth noting. Mr. Licklider feels that the system should consist essentially of a network of networks and that one of the valuable things that EDUCOM can do is to maintain a central registry or directory of networks and related resources. Prof. Carr stresses the need for standardization and system compatibility feeling that EDUCOM should be responsible for standardizing "on-line communications up to the interface with the members, and the members should have the responsibility of meeting these standards. . . ." Throughout the volume, many diverse views are presented, and it is to the credit of the editors that the main message—the need for improving the educational and research process by the sharing of each others' resources through a network—comes through.—*John P. McGowan, Northwestern University.*

Library Surveys. Ed. by Maurice F. Tauber and Irene Roemer Stephens. N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1967. xxii, 286 p. $13.50 (67-25304)

The present collection of papers by leading lights in the somewhat esoteric world of library surveys is based upon a Conference on Library Surveys, held at Columbia University in June 1965. The expanding interest in the general theme is shown by the recent publication in England of a work with the same title, Maurice B.

Line's *Library Surveys,* subtitled *An Introduction to Their Use, Planning, Procedure, and Presentation.*

No fewer than seventeen speakers contributed to the Tauber-Stephens compilation, among whom one recognizes such veteran surveyors as Guy Lyle, Edwin Williams, Leon Carnovsky, Donald Bean, Lowell Martin, Stephen McCarthy, Morris Gelfand, Frances Henne, and Walter Brahm, as well as a surveyor of surveys, E. W. Erickson. From such a group, we would expect a diversity of views, and we get it.

Background for the series is provided by Guy Lyle in his article exploring "the origins and evolution of the library survey." Lyle selects for extended comment a half dozen "landmark surveys" of the past ninety years, placing them in their proper historical setting and reviewing their methodology and accomplishments. Beginning with the special government report issued in 1876, *Public Libraries in the United States,* the story continues through the ALA *Survey of Libraries in the United States* (1926), Wilson's *The Geography of Reading* (1938), Joeckel and Carnovsky's *A Metropolitan Library in Action* (1940), the Public Library Inquiry (1949-52), and institutional library surveys, exemplified by the pioneer *Report of a Survey of the University of Georgia Library* (1939), by Louis R. Wilson and others. Lyle also considers the place of the self-survey (as do a number of the other contributors) and evaluates the influence of the Carnegie Corporation and the Chicago graduate library school on the development of surveys.

The rather bewildering variety of library surveys merely demonstrates that they are designed to serve different functions. Thus we have comprehensive investigations, such as those listed by Lyle; studies of library collections; of technical services in libraries (sometimes subdivided by analyses of acquisition procedures, cataloging, classification, applications of automation, etc.); library use; building and facilities; general administration; budgets and finance; personnel; and of types of libraries—academic, public, school, special, and state—all considered by experts in the Tauber-Stephens work.

The complex matter of surveying library collections is treated in depth by Edwin Williams, whose *Resources of Canadian University Libraries for Research in the Humanities and Social Sciences* has had an enormous impact on Canadian library development since its publication in 1962. The prolific output of reports on collections is examined by Williams from the points of view of purposes, methods, and results. The methodology is still far from standardized, but Williams provides some useful guidelines.

The editors are the authors of a chapter on another popular area, "Surveys of Technical Services in Libraries." Tauber's seasoned approach, conditioned by innumerable investigations in the field, comes out in a detailed discussion of the choice of the library consultant, the literature of such surveys, reasons for, how to conduct processing surveys, and a review of three typical processing surveys: those of McGill University library, Dallas public library, and Nassau library system.

An old hand with another kind of survey, Leon Carnovsky, looks at studies on the use of library resources and facilities from the points of view of circulation trends by type of agency, by classes of material, and by reader. While circulation statistics are relatively easy to come by, Carnovsky emphasizes the difficulties in their interpretation. Particularly complex is any meaningful study of library reference work.

Library buildings and facilities are of basic importance, because of the large sums of money involved and their bearing on the general effectiveness and efficiency of the whole library operation. This type of survey is examined by Donald Bean, who writes from a background of many years of commercial consulting.

In other chapters, John A. Humphry deals with surveys of budgets and finance, Lowell Martin with personnel, and Stephen A. McCarthy with administrative organization and management. Five contributors concern themselves with surveys of types of libraries, and E. W. Erickson concludes with a convincing review of the value, effectiveness, and use of the library survey as an instrument of administration.

The Tauber-Stephens work is the first full-scale investigation of an increasingly important branch of library science. No

significant aspect of the multifarious field is omitted. Experienced surveyors and those planning any type of survey will find in the compilation a variety of helpful discussions on the methodology, purposes, limitations and uses of the library survey in its many manifestations.—*R. B. Downs, University of Illinois.*

Prince of Librarians: The Life & Times of Antonio Panizzi of the British Museum. By Edward Miller. Athens, Ohio: The Ohio University Press, 1967. 356p. $7.50. (67-26123).

The life of Antonio Panizzi, the volatile Italian who set the British Museum on its road to greatness in the mid-nineteenth century, has fascinated practitioners of the biographic art for the last ninety years. In addition to Louis Fagan's major two-volume work which appeared in 1880, a year after his mentor's death, there have been numerous articles and several monographs treating some aspect of his life. If he was not the "Prince of Librarians," as his admiring young staff member William B. Rye called him, he surely approached such distinction more nearly than anyone else.

Panizzi began his long association with the British Museum in 1831 when he was appointed Assistant Keeper of Printed Books. Upon his appointment Panizzi discovered that, despite its rich collections, the Museum was grossly inadequate as the national library and that it was presided over by a group of elderly clergymen who had neither the dynamism nor interest to make it worthy of the English nation. What others lacked, it was quickly apparent that Panizzi had. He was a scholar whose editions of Boiardo and Ariosto were even then coming from the press, and this background in bibliography and literature fitted him well for his task. Beginning with cataloging, a problem which would plague him during his entire stay at the British Museum, Panizzi demonstrated his capability to the trustees and subsequently to a whole series of Parliamentary committees. He was promoted to the position of Keeper of Printed Books in 1837 and finally to Principal Librarian in 1856, but throughout all the intervening years he was a major force behind the Museum advancement.

When one reads of the disorganized collections Panizzi inherited, the necessity to establish a strong collecting policy, to assemble staff, to argue for better book budgets, and to plan additional space, he can feel right at home in nineteenth-century England. Few administrators accomplish their tasks in eight-hour days, and obviously Panizzi did not. As an administrator he drove both himself and his staff hard, but he was always fair and argued constantly that such service deserved reward in the form of higher salaries. For this reason most of his subordinates admired and respected him; but some, especially the incompetent, had occasion to experience his ruthlessnes. As biographer Miller notes, Panizzi was not one to suffer fools gladly.

In reading the biographies of nineteenth-century librarians one is struck by their continuous problems with trustees. Strength of character was needed in abundance and Panizzi had that. His legal background was helpful in marshalling arguments and those who entered the fray against him could be assured a worthy opponent. Having had to endure long years of misrepresentation and pettiness Panizzi might have been expected to respond in kind.

In presenting all the controversies in which Panizzi was engaged, Miller has tried to be fair to all parties and has generally succeeded. Yet he obviously has sympathy with his subject—a prime requisite for a good biographer. He does not hesitate to make generalizations reflecting his apparently low opinion of administrators, perhaps best characterized in his summary of Panizzi's contributions: "He was forced early in life to abandon the delights of academic research for more arid pastures, but, even there, he was able to leave his mark" (p. 321, *cf.* 131). Occasionally one wishes for a better revelation of the personality of the man. Still there is a chapter on "Friends and Acquaintances" and throughout the book one gets glimpses of Panizzi's association with the Italian revolutionaries and the leading Whig officials of his day.

On the whole this is a well written and interesting book. Typographically it is undistinguished which seems unfortunate for such a substantial contribution to library history.—*Edward G. Holley, University of Houston.* ■■