conversion in Europe: The Council of Europe’s Initiatives,” by Peter Rau (Hochschulbibliothekszentrum, Köln).

Of particular interest to American catalogers may be Alan Jeffreys’s paper, “The Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, 2d Edition (AACR2): Now and in Europe.” While he notes that AACR2 has been translated into more than a dozen languages, from Arabic to Urdu, Jeffreys states, “I see little prospect of AACR2 being extended beyond the Anglo-American environment in which it is firmly embedded.” The more likely candidate for an international cataloging code, he writes, is the MARC format, with its more easily transferred numeric structure, or a whole new set of ISBDs, cataloging rules, and machine formats developed, this time, in synchronicity.

The thirty papers are framed by excellent summarizing reports by the editor, Lorcan Dempsey of the Centre for Bibliographic Management, and by Paula Goosens of the European Foundation for Library Cooperation (EFLC). Dempsey’s introduction gives an overview of the topics covered in the volume, citing the reasons for differences in developments in the European countries and speculating on the difficulties these differences pose for the future. In Goosens’s summary chapter, titled “The European Library: A Summing Up,” she creates a future scenario and a model for a European Library and then uses the contents of the papers to explore the chances of “realizing in practice such an ambitious cooperative program.” Goosens examines the new tools and techniques necessary for bibliographic control and access, and she reviews the political, economic, and organizational structures needed for an “active and positive contribution to a European cooperative program.” She concludes with a list of the requirements for bibliographic access in Europe: quality databases, access via user-friendly OPACs, national bibliographic utilities in each country, and cooperative efforts on a supranational level.

The value of this volume lies in the insight it provides the reader into the projects and innovations of European libraries, institutions with which the American cataloging specialist usually has little contact. It is easy and pleasant to browse and choose among the thirty short essays on a myriad of specialized topics, and the keynote and summary essays provide an excellent overview of the state of European bibliographic affairs in 1989.—Heidi L. Hutchinson, University of California, Riverside.


Larry Hardesty (Eckerd College) is interested in the oft-repeated maxim that the library is the heart of the college. According to Hardesty, previous studies on the use of the library clearly show that this truism is not, in fact, true. Working with the concept that student use of the library is prompted primarily by the faculty, he has investigated the attitudes of college faculty toward the library. The results of his study are useful and informative.

The most useful parts of this book are the historical sections, which show clearly how little has changed over the years. Hardesty cites a number of studies that show that college libraries serve primarily as study halls and reserve book collections, as they have for so many years.

The key chapter in this book, “Selecting Library Materials for Undergraduates,” should be required reading for every beginning college librarian. In this chapter, Hardesty shows that there is often little relationship between the need for library material and the actual material acquired. This discrepancy is most evident in the case of serials. In a comparison of mathematical journals held by six college libraries, Hardesty demonstrates that the library with the least need and the least money subscribed to the most journals. He also shows that an alarmingly large proportion of books purchased by college libraries is never used.

My disappointment with this book stems from the fact that it is more concerned with questions about methodol-
ogy than with librarianship. I would have preferred that Hardesty had abbreviated the statistical and methodological sections and concentrated on the lessons to be learned from his research.

The lesson that he seems to draw is that other college libraries should emulate Earlham College. It is clear that of the college faculties he studied, Earlham’s is the most successfully integrated with its library’s program, a fact explained, of course, by the fundamental role of library instruction in that college’s mission. It is certainly not the model for every college, as each has its own particular mission.

Hardesty argues further that librarians should work closely with faculty to encourage use of the library, an argument that assumes the library is always vital in the educational process. There are many courses in which library use should, in fact, be discouraged by faculty members. The assumption that the library should be used more extensively than it is leads Hardesty to devote his chapter on working with the faculty to ideas about how librarians can change faculty instruction. Instead of being a useful guide to working with faculty, this chapter is about the need to reform the faculty’s teaching. I am not convinced that it is a librarian’s function to change faculty behavior.

Although the research in this book is well presented, what, one has to ask, are its implications? It may be that instead of working to change how faculty teach, we librarians should work to change how we run libraries. Perhaps we do not need so many reference librarians. Perhaps we should cut the periodicals that are never used. Perhaps we should concentrate on having usable college libraries rather than miniature research libraries. We could certainly save colleges a lot of money.

This book raises a number of questions that need discussion. I hope that Hardesty’s next book will be less about sociology and research and more about how libraries should respond to the implications of that research. This book is valuable as a handy distillation of much research, but it is not the guide to working with faculty that college librarians need.—John Ryland, Oglethorpe University, Atlanta, Georgia.


This is an important book. It presents the thesis that American social science developed under the influence of a national ideology of uniqueness, or “exceptionalism,” exaggerated to the point of claiming that this country was exempt from the vicissitudes of European history. The result was an American social science that became excessively abstract and ahistorical.

Ross’s book is organized chronologically in four parts. In part one, she places the beginning of social science in the eighteenth century as part of a historical development she calls the “discovery of modernity,” and she traces the development of American ideas and their divergence from what was seen to be the European experience. American exceptionalism was formed by the experience of gaining national independence, and it was reinforced by celebration of our republican political institutions and abundant natural resources. When liberalism emerged early in the nineteenth century, with an inherent conflict between humanism and commercialism, humanism and freedom from oppression were considered secure for exceptionalist America; so national energy could focus on commercialism associated with free enterprise. Early social science writers of this time emphasized civil liberty, self-government, private ownership, and free trade. Up until the Civil War, they believed in natural law discovered through liberal enlightenment, and they regarded the study of history as an intrusion of superstition and corruption.

In part two, covering the thirty years after the Civil War, Ross focuses on the crisis in exceptionalist ideology and the formation of social science disciplines, particularly economics, political science, and sociology, which she regards as the “core disciplines.” From the founding of