

ject searches; (3) 84 percent of the searches were successful, with author and subject searches being equally successful in that the desired items were identified in the catalog; (4) of the sixteen searches in 100 that were not successful, ten failed because the document was not listed in the catalog (one fifth of those were added to the catalog between the time of the user's search and the project follow-up search), five were for documents which were listed in the catalog and could have been located with the clues available to the user, and one failed because the user had inadequate clues; and (5) users can locate material despite incomplete information or misspelled words, and can do so better than either of two computer algorithms tested.

The most intriguing aspect of this report is the comment that "the interpretation of these results can vary greatly, depending on whether a librarian is more interested in expanding service or in conserving money and labor." The only real conclusions that Lipetz draws are that arranging the cards within a subject heading by date may be helpful; that more title-like entries would seem to be of value; that more should be done to acquire material promptly and in anticipation of need and to notify users of books that are on order or on hand but not yet cataloged; and that strong consideration should be given to improved user orientation and user assistance.

It will be of most interest to see how the Yale University Library finally interprets these results and what impact, if any, this study has on the existing card catalog at Yale and on the planning for a computerized catalog.—*Norman D. Stevens, University of Connecticut.*

***The American College and American Culture. Socialization as a Function of Higher Education.*** Oscar Handlin and Mary F. Handlin. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970. 104p.

This essay, written for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, "aims to clarify the history of the role of socialization as a factor in the development of the college." This promise to add to the disciplined knowledge of the relationship of a particular institution to a specific societal function is an objective of great importance.

A successful study of this sort would make a valuable contribution not only in its substantive conclusions but also in its usefulness as a model for similar investigations.

The difficulties of the problem demand great capacity for its solution, and the authors bring good credentials to their task. Handlin, director of the Charles Warren Center for Studies in American History at Harvard University, has long experience and a high reputation; his wife has frequently worked with him on his research. The importance of the problem and the high aspirations of the authors promise a great deal.

The result is an interesting and well-written summary of the development of higher education as part of American life. Judged in terms of the goals set for it, however, it does not succeed. The failure was made inevitable by the Handlins' decision not to define socialization exactly. They simply describe it as a "nonreligious, nonvocational function . . . connected with the desire to adjust the individual to the society." If by socialization, the Handlins do not mean to include promotion of religion, preparation for an occupation, profit to the larger society, or advancement of the graduate in society or career, the reader is left to wonder just what they do mean, especially since much of the discussion concerns these very matters.

If the study is not to be judged in terms of its stated goal, the reader must turn to the canons of historical investigation, to the nature of the evidence presented, and to his own perceptions of the subject as compared with the work in hand. The Handlins cite their sources in clumps, paragraph by paragraph. The reader is often unsure which assertions—and even quotations—are based on what sources. In a single paragraph, a number of quotations may appear without clear indication that their sources are separated by fifty years or more. Only the encyclopedic specialist could judge authoritatively what proportion of the evidence the Handlins have gathered is relevant or whether their conclusions are valid, but even a reader with a nodding acquaintance with particular aspects of American educational history will find troubling omissions and will be likely to question some of the detailed assertions and some of the broad

characterizations. It is difficult to understand, for example, the failure to refer to the insightful account of Yale College between 1845 and 1899 written by the younger Timothy Dwight following his long association with the college as student, professor, and president, particularly since works by his immediate predecessor and his immediate successor are cited. Lyman H. Bagg's reminiscences of student days are used as evidence for the period after 1870 (when his book was published) rather than for the earlier period when he was a student. Perhaps no distortion of fact is involved, but the anachronism leads to troubling doubts.

As for the major conclusions, the broadest of them are indicated by the titles of the four periods into which the Handlins divide their account: Colonial Seminaries, 1636-1770; Republican Culture, 1770-1870; The Custodians of Culture, 1870-1930; The Discipline of Scholarship, 1930-1960. To consider only one of these periods, it is surprising to see the sixty years following 1870 treated as though liberal education for its own sake was the dominant principle guiding the colleges at the time when the classical curriculum was being displaced by an elective system which permitted the introduction of practical courses that could serve the burgeoning industrial and agricultural economy, especially in the new land-grant colleges. Questions such as this one are so general that arguments can be mounted on both sides, but some of the specific assertions are likely to be considered shaky by most readers. Even for the period before 1930, it seems very doubtful that "publish or perish" was only a "myth" that never damaged good teaching or that there was no question of women's "competence to perform the required academic tasks."

It is perhaps a tribute to the study that one finds in it matters to quarrel with. The essay is competent and worthy of attention even if it does not fulfill the authors' exacting specifications for it.—W. L. Williamson, *University of Wisconsin*.

Medical Library Association, *Handbook of Medical Library Practice*, 3d ed. Gertrude L. Annan and Jacqueline W. Fal-

ter, eds. Chicago: MLA, 1970. 411p. \$15.00.

This third edition of the *Handbook of Medical Library Practice* is a required reference volume for collections serving library schools, for medical and scientific research libraries of any size, and for medical libraries with holdings of over 25,000 volumes. It is recommended for individual medical librarians practicing the art provided they have the requisite background in formal learning or experience. The book is not a procedures manual.

The *Handbook* is a manual, as the editors state in their preface. It is a sophisticated and comprehensive work which, in spite of editorial comment to the contrary, succeeds also in presenting the state of the art. This thoroughly professional presentation emphasizes the qualities in librarianship which rank it as a profession, and succeeds in justifying the unique elements which continue to raise a besetting question of faculty status in academic circles today. Chapter Nine: "Rare Books, Archives, and the History of Medicine" succeeds most directly in this, unquestionably because the area treated is a library in microcosm. This chapter is a masterpiece in organization, comprehensiveness, and clarity of language. Cavanaugh acknowledges his use of material from Annan's chapter on the subject in the second edition in preparing his longer and more comprehensive essay; we are in their debt.

Quality control was exercised in the production of this third edition and the effect is readily apparent. Authors of chapters, or more precisely, essays, read the work of all contributors; other experts were consulted as readers in their special fields, and an editorial board exercised review. There is uniform excellence in the writing and intellectually stimulating reference between chapters. Most chapters are outstanding separate essays on a particular topic, yet there is a refreshing unity of the whole. The product is one that will serve a useful purpose for some time to come. References at the end of each chapter are generous and well selected; they offer a starting point for literature searches serving research or operations in virtually every phase of library activity.

The editorial organization is straightforward.