art, colleges of technology, technological universities, and polytechnics. Consequently, the descriptions may be helpful to those interested in British higher education and its libraries, and a library seeking exhaustive coverage of British librarianship may wish to acquire the book despite its mediocrity.—*W. L. Williamson, The Library School, University of Wisconsin at Madison.*

Danton, J. Periam. ***The Dimensions of Comparative Librarianship.*** Chicago: American Library Assn., 1973. 184p.

This is a landmark book which will be cited for many years to come. Troubled by the confusion in thinking over the past two decades as to the meaning of "comparative librarianship," Professor Danton here sets out on a rigorous exercise in logic and argument to determine its proper definition and nature, and he succeeds admirably. He groups the main body of his comments into five parts:

1. He points out the benefits enjoyed by other social sciences (law, sociology, education, linguistics) from the application of the comparative method.

2. He finds variety, unclarity, and contradiction in the library community as to the meaning of comparative librarianship, and he proposes a definition.

3. He reviews the several purposes and values to society which can result from the study of comparative librarianship.

4. He examines the present state of education, research, and publication in comparative librarianship and finds it wanting.

5. He discusses the comparative method as it can and should be applied to librarianship.

He concludes with seven recommendations for gaining greater attention to comparative librarianship, and he appends a fine outline for a seminar on the subject, a brief bibliography, and an index.

This book accomplishes in large measure its primary implicit intent of clarifying a previously muddled area of our discussion and doubtless also of our thinking, and it should go far toward bringing greater commonality of direction to this meaningful but inadequately developed aspect of librarianship.

Yet it is also in some ways a painful book to read. Seemingly as though he did not wholly trust his very considerable powers of logic and dispassionate persuasion, Professor Danton frequently resorts for emphasis to the use of italics, emotion-laden adjectives, and broad generalities, which will to some readers make his book seem more hortatory than reasoned. He finds statements of other authors "absurd," "at best misleading and at worst self-contradictory," "completely counter to accepted definitions," and having "no logical justification." He condemns much existing literature for not having been comparative when it was neither intended nor claimed by its authors to be comparative. He discounts by name Munthe's *American Librarianship from a European Angle,* Bostwick's *Popular Libraries of the World,* Asheim's *Librarianship in Developing Countries,* Esdaile's *National Libraries of the World,* and others of similar authority and significance as not being "useful . . . in the sense of advancing the profession in fundamental ways" because they were not comparative in accord with his definition.

That is pretty sweeping stuff, and although this reviewer for one does not think Professor Danton means it in quite the way it sounds, it could lose him some friends as well as, more importantly, fail to gain adherents to his cause, and that would be a pity because his cause deserves adherents. Comparative librarianship, he proposes, "may be defined as the analysis of libraries, library systems, some aspect of librarianship, or library problems in two or more national, cultural, or societal environments, in terms of socio-political, economic, cultural, ideological, and historical contexts. This analysis is for the purpose of understanding the underlying similarities and differences, and for determining explanations of the differences, with the ultimate aim of trying to arrive at valid generalizations and principles" (p.52). With the possible exception of substituting "or" for "and" as the antepenultimate word in the first sentence, most will doubtless feel that this is a pretty good definition.—*David Kaser, Graduate Library School, Indiana University, Bloomington.*

Lee, Sul H., ed. ***Planning-Programming-***