"We are easily seduced by 'good' causes," he writes, adding that "we are casually pressed into service on behalf of someone else's priorities," while no one, no one at all, looks out for us. This is the "cruel world" he talks about and which he rubs the noses of his readers in at every turn. We are lulled into passivity, he writes, by the "cheap praise" we attract through the "library profession's perceived role as mendicant," although this earns us "very little political leverage or professional respect." He provides stinging examples of our naiveté: In "Bailing Out the Pacific Ocean with a Teaspoon," he recounts that when Hillary Rodham Clinton graced a library conference with her presence and was enthusiastically received, nobody seemed to care that she did not talk about libraries but simply used the platform to recruit our support for her version of health care legislation. We might have offered her a trade by suggesting that in return for our support, she persuade her husband to restore program budgets for libraries. However, we did not. Perhaps librarians would consider such a suggestion rude, but it was political deals that passed NAFTA.

Later on, in "Playing Shell Games without Any Peas," he recalls how educators, our presumed allies, composed A Nation at Risk, "an otherwise superb political document that never acknowledged the existence, let alone the importance and role of libraries" in the national educational enterprise. Our only hope lies in the recognition that our competitors for public (and tax) support are not in the military or the space program, but instead, are the "other social programs, unpleasant and uncomfortable as that realization may be: ... the present competition for funding among 'good' things is ferocious and it should suggest to us an insistence on hard-nosed quid pro quos in building alliances." White is an old-school liberal who believes in libraries but believes that their interests are best served when librarians aggressively represent their own interests, not someone else's and not abstract "good" causes that only serve to distract them from the serious business of survival in a hostile climate. None of this will sound unfamiliar to readers of White's prodigious production of articles and books.

Why, then, purchase this book if most of its contents are easily found in widely held journals amply indexed in Library Literature? Perhaps the greatest single advantage of this compilation is that it brings together White's disparate writings of the past ten to fifteen years, allowing us to study White himself—a worthy subject in his own right—and to compare his thought today with that of his earlier "collected works" volume, entitled (with premature optimism, as the author now recognizes) Librarians and the Awakening from Innocence (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1989).

In the present political climate, White's style of advocacy often seems as dated as its object, the "profession of librarianship" itself. Libraries, and especially library schools, now seek success in the public arena by distancing themselves from traditional notions of libraries and librarianship, not by returning to the core values of the profession that White so vociferously upholds. Depressing comparisons come to mind while reading this book, not with sleek lobbying SWAT teams such as the NRA but, rather, with the moribund interest groups of organized labor. It is a cold, cruel world out there indeed, and White's brand of librarian militancy seems overtaken by events and strangely out of sync with the times. Maybe if we had listened to him years ago, it would not have come to this.—Jeffrey Garrett, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.


In "The American Scholar," Ralph Waldo Emerson criticized those who balk at the new and untried, but then he sets out the
dilemma of revolutionary ages, "This
time, like all times, is a very good one, if
we but know what to do with it." In li-
braries and in scholarly communication
generally, electronic journals hold both
the greatest near-term possibility of revo-
lution and also pose the most pressing
challenge of deciding just what to do with
them. Publishers, libraries, and scholars
are responding with a variety of models
for the electronic journal; some have al-
ready proven to be dead ends, but other
new models come along with regularity,
driven by economic necessity. These ef-
forts seek answers in three areas: the tech-
nical methods of preparing and deliver-
ing electronic journals to users; the struc-
tural and financial changes in journal
publishing; and the acceptance of elec-
tronic journals by users, their willingness
to use electronic formats and to make
them a part of the system of scholarly
communication and reward. All are cov-
ered in this issue of Library Trends, though
the technical and social aspects get fuller
and more varied treatment.

The three articles on technical issues
are examples of what this collection does
best: brief, understandable surveys that
prepare librarians to participate in the de-
bate. Thomas Hickey discusses the capa-
bilities and limitations of three journal
formats: simple ASCII text, page images,
and structured text (SGML). Both Hickey
and his OCLC colleague, Stuart Weibel,
who writes on Web applications, believe
that marked-up text (SGML and its sub-
set HTML) delivered over the Internet is
the most likely path for future develop-
ment, perhaps complemented by page
images of older publications. The article
by Maynard Brichford and William
Maher on archival questions identifies
continued access to information as more
important than any physical threats to
electronic media. The question of access
has a financial and contractual aspect as
well: if publishers provide data from serv-
ers, they must take responsibility for en-
suring continued access to those data.

Throughout this collection, there is a
realistic and refreshing willingness to con-
cede that many technical problems
still exist, but also an optimism that time
and money will solve them. There is,
however, less certainty about the personal
and institutional acceptance of electronic
publishing. Kenneth Arnold critically sur-
veys the theories suggesting that elec-
tronic information will transform schol-
arly and other communication, and Laura
Gasaway provides a lucid exposition of
the current state and possible future of
copyright, but the bulk of the essays deal
with the acceptance of electronic publish-
ing by individuals, scholarly disciplines,
and institutions. Because I have been vis-
iting offices and computer labs on my
own campus to evaluate access to elec-
tronic information, I was particularly
drawn to Ann Bishop's account of her
experiences using seven electronic jour-
nals, assessing the reader's likely aware-
ness of their existence, ease of access, and
ease of use. She supplements this by in-
terviewing engineering faculty and stu-
dents (and gives a URL for those inter-
ested in the continuation of her work).
Although her experience was with jour-
nals delivered via listserv and gopher,
methods that are largely being sup-
planted by the Web, her approach can
serve as a model for the ongoing local
surveys that are needed when we make
an investment in organizing and deliver-
ing electronic information.

Here and in other articles, there is
agreement that a reader's acceptance of
electronic information will vary greatly
from discipline to discipline and indi-
vidual to individual. Carol Tenopir also
asks what is needed for the author to ac-
cept electronic publishing. In addition to
quicker and more effective distribution of
research, academic authors expect that
their contributions to electronic publica-
tions will receive due consideration when
tenure, promotion, and salary decisions
are made. Some of the touted speed, com-
munication, and financial advantages of
electronic publication may not be possible if much of the editorial and peer review apparatus must be retained to accommodate the academic reward system. Interestingly, only Arnold mentions in this context the role of the print journal with an electronic version, as, for example, with Project Muse at Johns Hopkins University Press. This seems an attractive transitional vehicle for gaining scholarly acceptance—available over the Internet, but with all the trappings of a traditional journal.

Two articles deal specifically with the acceptance of electronic information in the library. Bryce Allen's article on personality types and organizational attitudes to change is interesting, but his solutions often seem too general. His focus on personality issues neglects institutional politics and priorities in areas such as the relationship between the library and the computing center. Gay Dannelly's article on resource-sharing covers that topic well, but also goes beyond it to deal briefly with some of the core collection development issues such as leasing, access fees, and preservation of the historical record.

This issue of Library Trends is required reading for anyone who is beginning to grapple with electronic journals, electronic information generally, or the changes in scholarly communication. Most of the essays attempt to establish the state of the art and lay out the questions rather than solve the problems, so those who already have experience in the field might want to look only for the areas that still trouble them.

The one major perspective that is missing in the collection is the publisher's. Many in the library community and some in the scholarly community believe that academe must regain control over its product. Lancaster's survey of the priorities of university administrators suggests that the necessary money will not be available in the near future, and it seems probable that we will be dealing with commercial publishers, university presses, and scholarly societies for some time to come. The essay by Donald King and José-Marie Griffiths provides useful data on the costs of paper and electronic journals. Publishing is also discussed in passing elsewhere, but a survey of the ways in which publishers of all kinds are attempting to deal with the issues of electronic information would have been extremely useful.—James Campbell, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.


The title of this book will get the attention of those especially concerned with education for the profession—and not only our profession—but the content will not hold it for long. This short text contains no information on actual library school closings and no attempt at a serious analysis of closings. J. D. Willardson of the College of Education at Brigham Young University (BYU) contributes a twelve-page sketch of historical trends and forces in American higher education. Larry Ostler and Therrin C. Dahlin, librarians at BYU and part-time library school instructors (presumably at the now closed BYU library school), contribute sixty pages, briefly discussing the history of library education and the social changes affecting it, the nature of the profession of librarian, the need for strategic planning, and the importance of accreditation for schools and certification for practitioners; and then offer a proposal to revamp the system of library education. Their idea is to introduce an undergraduate degree program that would include information and education on basic library operations and philosophy and would teach skills that would prepare students for paraprofessional work in libraries. After three