

location in a commercial or traffic generating area; location of libraries more by where people go for weekly chores than by where they live; construction of larger units which usually serve larger neighborhoods; and the highest use comes in direct correlation with education and economic status. The team of Coughlin-Taieb-Stevens have for the first time set about to statistically analyze the placement of branch library facilities in relation to service goals and performance. That they too use a multitude of assumptions as a base is not to discredit a study which attempts to provide measures and models for planning in the urban setting. The study uses the Free Library of Philadelphia as its case study.

It is not surprising that the authors found the social-economic factor is the strongest determinate in the use of the public library. The placement of branches in shopping areas is questioned as a strong attraction factor as opposed to the provision of larger book collections. The team does admit that "People who combine a trip to the library with shopping are clearly willing to use a library farther from home than are persons who make no other stops on their library trip." They also admit that they lacked "examples of libraries with large bookstock in areas of low social status or of libraries with small bookstock in areas of high social status." The much maligned book circulation statistics appear to have more statistical correlation and validity than other statistics now gathered by public libraries.

Market areas are defined (area from which 80 percent of the users come) with ranges of 0.4 to 1.2 miles for children to 0.5 and 1.85 for adults. "The ratio is shortest in areas of low socio-economic status."

The authors attempt to build models for branch library location but they raise more questions for further research than they present solutions for the library administrator/planner. It is admitted that "perfect library service is virtually unattainable" and that "only when cost is considered can one evaluate the trade-off between larger and more efficient libraries and a greater number of libraries more closely spaced." The weakness of this study is that much of the analyzation is based upon presently collected data and assumptions in lieu of data.

The value of the study is that an attempt is made to provide data for a scientific method of branch location in relation to stated single system library goals. The mixture of political considerations with such a method is another story. There are many statistical conclusions in the books so that this study provides a useful tool for public library planners and is an important book in library planning.—*John F. Anderson, City Librarian, San Francisco Public Library, San Francisco, California.*

Nielsen, Waldemar A. *The Big Foundations*. A Twentieth Century Fund Study. New York: Columbia University Press, 1972. 12, 475p. \$10.95.

With federal grants disappearing and with appropriations from state legislatures growing thinner, many academic librarians have cast longing eyes on the large foundations as a possible source of additional support for their libraries. Every time another millionaire dies and leaves his fortune to yet another foundation there is the potential for future library support. Yet an article in *LJ* last year (July 1972) by a Ford Foundation official wouldn't give much encouragement to the academic librarian's dreams, his thesis having been that foundations look for the creative and innovative ideas within a broader framework. Waldemar Nielsen, also a former Ford Foundation official, may give us more hope. For if Nielsen is correct, the majority of American foundations in the \$100 million plus category do not fulfill their oft-proclaimed mission of being pace-setters and of using their wealth for creative high-risk projects for which other funds are not available. "On the whole, the principal function that foundations now perform is to transfer funds to sustain reputable non-profit organizations in the private sector." (p. 400) Among those "reputable non-profit organizations" are surely academic libraries and the unintended message of Nielsen's book may be for the librarian to cultivate friends or donors on the boards of these foundations. One could even argue that support of such traditional projects has validity and is even a worthy goal for foundations.

Nielsen, of course, wishes that it were not this way. He is critical of foundations for not having been innovative, for not having backed new social ventures, and he hopes for a kind of self-renewal which will enable the foundations to realize their enormous potential. Citing the Rosenwald Fund as a foundation which did pioneer on the race question, the various Rockefeller groups which funded training for a generation of black leaders, and Carnegie for the Myrdal study, he asks the rhetorical question, "who else would have put up the money?" except for these foundations. So there is a serious possibility of making the foundations live up to their oft-proclaimed objectives if they will make the effort, though Nielsen admits the prospects are not encouraging.

On his way to these conclusions Nielsen describes in highly readable chapters the activities of the top thirty-three American foundations, since, as a group, "they present all the major public policy issues raised by modern philanthropy." (p. 26) He obviously thinks highly of Carnegie's "Emergence from Elitism," of the "Formidable Rockefeller Fleet," Danforth and Kellogg ("Fine but Flawed"), and gives the back of his hand to such conflict ridden groups as "The Ducal Du Ponts," and such "Underachievers and Delinquents" as Surdna, Bush, Pew, and Irvine. Since many of the family foundations are now in the control of individuals in their seventies and eighties, here is hope that they may yet turn their vast wealth to socially useful purposes. In that effort, of course, they will be both assisted by and hindered by the Tax Reform Act of 1969, which raised serious questions about the special tax incentives allowing the growth of such foundations in the first place. Up to this point they had operated in a context of friendly encouragement. Now they confront skepticism and more strict governmental surveillance. Unless they mend their ways, Nielsen suggests that additional controls are inevitable.

Nielsen would join the foundation critics in their assertion that many foundations were created not for philanthropic purposes but to maintain control over family companies and other assets. Often the family-dominated boards act as though the funds

still belonged to them, which recalls for this reviewer the story of one grande dame on a Texas foundation board who didn't want to distribute the assets because she believes the income tax will eventually be repealed and all that money will return to the family!

The best foundations, according to Nielsen, are those which have the best professional staffs, an argument which he doesn't quite prove to this reviewer. He is unfriendly to those foundations which serve merely as conduits for established institutions such as the endowment of professorships (A. W. Mellon), or funds for buildings (some of the Texas group), or general support for libraries (p. 275) or even conventional medical research (Commonwealth and Hartford). Nor is he very sympathetic to support of religious activities, though a number of donors were very much motivated by their religious convictions in establishing their foundations and religion gets a smaller share of the foundation pie (about 3 percent) than other fields. Congress certainly intended its change of the tax laws in 1969 to encourage individuals to provide more direct assistance to such nonprofit groups as churches, universities, and hospitals rather than giving to foundations (p. 374-75).

There are a number of minor errors in the book. The Brown Foundation was not responsible for the library at the University of St. Thomas (p. 167), and the Rosenwald Fund did not dissolve in 1932 (p. 340) but in 1946 (p. 342). Some readers will also be disturbed about the author's value judgments, but he does not hesitate to make them. Houston blacks will probably be surprised to learn that the Houston Endowment has demonstrated a significant interest in Negro institutions (p. 160), some alumni will no doubt question that Nathan Pusey's record "until his retirement as head of Harvard University has been staunchly uninspired" (p. 225), and Ohio citizens may resent his questioning whether or not a good professional staff can function effectively in the provincial atmosphere of Dayton (p. 200).

Yet there is little question that this study, financed by the Twentieth Century Fund to the tune of \$71,000 and representing

careful analysis of trends and problems in foundation performance, will have a considerable impact upon future development of foundations. Nielsen's two-year effort has given us a thorough and critical look at the largest American foundations. As self-perpetuating bodies which wield great economic power they are likely to come under increasing attack. Nielsen has raised the question whether or not they should survive. Since many of them have given substantial support for library buildings and operations over the years, the answer to that question holds more than academic interest for the librarian.—*Edward G. Holley, Dean, School of Library Science, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.*

Whitbeck, George W. *The Influence of Librarians in Liberal Arts Colleges in Selected Decision Making Areas.* Metuchen, N.J., The Scarecrow Press, Inc. 1972.

Based on a doctoral dissertation at Rutgers, this study documents with painful clarity the peripheral role of the library and librarians in college affairs, in a sample of ten liberal arts colleges in the East. The poor integration of the library with the academic enterprise has been pointed out earlier by several authorities including Harvie Branscomb, Patricia Knapp, and Daniel N. Bergen, as well as quite a few others. However, Whitbeck brings new dimensions to the problem.

First the author explores variables which might affect the status of librarians in the academic community, and examines librarians' means of communication and their role as seen by themselves, the classroom faculty, and administrators. Then he analyses thoroughly the role of the library and librarians in three major areas of decision making: development of curriculum, budgeting—both college-wide and departmental, and key appointments. In curriculum development, he found librarians by and large uninvolved, and largely uninterested. In budgeting, neither librarians nor faculty are much involved in college budgeting; however, whereas the classroom faculty do tend to have a say in departmental budgeting, in the library budgeting is principally the province of the chief librarian alone. Like-

wise, while neither faculty nor librarians have much influence in the making of key appointments at administrative levels, the faculty are likely to be involved in appointments of new faculty members, and to utilize democratic methods of decision making in appointments, whereas appointments to the professional staff in the library are largely the prerogative of the chief librarian.

In such an apparent isolation from the mainstream of events in the college, the author questions whether or not much progress can be made towards true professionalism in such libraries. Not only are librarians largely not involved in major decision-making affairs, they do not seem to realize the importance of being participants or even to want a change. This lack of perception and this passiveness is one of the serious handicaps to more effective integration of the library into the educational program of the college.

Perhaps the most interesting parts of the study are the concluding suggestions for improving the situation. These relate to the adoption of more democratic (and less bureaucratic and hierarchical) methods, new patterns of service including more departmentalized approaches, and a studied effort to achieve a more active role in the college. The last certainly will not be easy. The author concludes, "can information and library service be superior, or even adequate, without involvement?"

Liberal arts college libraries certainly are important, but the study would have broader values if some state-supported colleges had been included. They also would serve as a kind of check. The text does contain an excessive number of tables, eighty-five in all; many are important but some data could have been presented equally well in paragraph form. The interview method used with all groups—librarians, classroom faculty, and administrators—is excellent but no doubt very time consuming. Finally, the printing is, as usual with Scarecrow Press books, adequate but undistinguished. Perhaps it reflects the sales potential of scholarly studies in librarianship.—*Arthur McAnally (deceased), Director of Libraries, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma.*