

and distributed. Although not heavily used, when the board is employed both the patron and the staff involved agree that it facilitates communication efforts and contributes to successful interactions.

While technology has been a boon to persons with disabilities, after working with this project and determining its effectiveness in serving patrons with mobility and speech impair-

ments, it is apparent that a low-tech approach has definite benefits.

Note

1. United Cerebral Palsy Associations of New York State. Rochester-LeRoy Area Study Group. *Aphonic Communication For Those With Cerebral Palsy*. New York: United Cerebral Palsy Associations of New York State, 1967. ■

Letters to the editor

Editor's note: We received several letters in response to "Rethinking library development: the ethical implications of library fundraising," by Phillip J. Jones, which ran in the "The Way I See It" column in September. The following are excerpts from some of these responses.

Mr. Jones expresses a concern that collection growth may be dictated by the donor, not the librarian. This concern can easily be overcome by developing guidelines in advance and then sharing those guidelines with prospective donors. I have found that donors interested in donating their collections, or portions thereof, understand the need to focus collections. According to the Donor Bill of Rights, donors have the right to be informed of the organization's mission, of the way the organization intends to use donated resources, and of its capacity to use donations effectively for their intended purposes. I would encourage Mr. Jones and other librarians to review this document as well as the "Code of Ethical Principles and Standards of Professional Practice." These can be found on the Web site of the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP). Every fundraiser who is a member of AFP adheres to these standards.—*Caroline J. Punches, San Jose State University, cpunches@sjsu.edu*

As a library development officer, I object to Mr. Jones's characterization of library development as the corruptor of librarians' ethics. Every library development officer I've met has worked very hard to build strong collegial relationships with library faculty, and an article like this one, published without any counterpoint, can do real damage to

those relationships. Also, development professionals work even harder to create relationships with prospective and current donors that will allow us, when the right time comes, to match the donors' needs (e.g., for recognition, to "give something back") to the library resource needs of our students and faculty.—*Tina Surman, University of Miami, tsurman@miami.edu*

Are librarians and fundraisers incompatible bedfellows? No doubt the quest for money can undermine a library. It can equally mislead a school, a church, a hospital, the United Way, the Red Cross, families, and individuals. Libraries are no more and no less susceptible to the seduction of money. Choosing to ignore fundraising may provide libraries with an escape from temptation, but noble budget shortfalls will hobble their attempts to implement their missions.

The choices are not really that stark. I believe that discourse about mission and ethics provides a secure, high ground. Just like a librarian, a fundraiser must know what her organization's mission is. Librarians have the advantage over fundraisers of internalizing their discourse in the process of studying librarianship. Fundraisers need to receive explicit communication about the nature of their particular library's mission . . . Development professionals know that mission drives fundraising and that ethics are its bedrock. Without these two things institutional advancement is by definition unprofessional and in reality unsuccessful. By valuing both, librarians and fundraisers share essential habits of thought.—*Dale Walker, University of Chicago, duwalker1@midway.uchicago.edu*