

been an important shift in thirty years that begins to come out as Glazier tries to return the term *small press* to its original meaning. Little magazines (increasingly a misnomer) have received most of the attention while the volume of publishing has shifted largely to books. "Academic quarterly," "alternative" and "underground press," or "independent publisher" are all too astigmatic or wide-angle to serve as descriptive terms, including as they do, the nonliterary, the too-commercial, and the insufficiently independent. The problem is that there has been a culture shift, and what Glazier chooses finally to call *small press*, numbering about 700 at the beginning of his period, has been overwhelmed by small, independent publishers of New Age books, cookbooks, and self-help books. While the small press has tripled in size, these other publishers have gone from nothing to some 12,000 in the same period. The noncorporate, locally based, small scale press of limited readership and unmodified cultural ideals (described here as the epitome of the species) has become a minority force even on its home ground. Nowhere is this revealed more clearly than in the sequence of COSMEP catalog listings (items 167-170), from the first (a "who's who" and a "vital record" of the mimeo revolution at a crucial moment) to the last (a "disappointment" and captive of the "commercially expedient"). In between, we have the lavishly designed and illustrated Whole COSMEP Catalog in reverse alphabetic order and the microfiche third version, innocent of editing. The fourth is thoroughly professional, typeset, paginated, edited, and vetted—and soulless. Well, this is the history of the boomers themselves, who made this movement and now have come to middle age and power. I hope that Glazier's optimism is justified. One thing is clear: small presses (and literature, and we, too) are not what they were, whatever they are to become.

Meanwhile, I've spent hours browsing through the entries, and all that familiar, funny, laughable, confused, wonderful time again. Don't put this book on the

reference shelves. Let people check it out and take it home with them.—Charles W. Brownson, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona.

*Euro-Librarianship: Shared Resources, Shared Responsibilities.* Ed. by Assunta Pisani. Binghamton, N.Y.: Haworth, 1992. 605p. \$49.95 (ISBN 1-56024-266-3).

This volume documents the proceedings of a conference held in April 1988 in Florence under the auspices of ACRL's Western European Specialists Section (WESS). Weighing in at a hefty 605 pages, it comprises some fifty individual contributions offering in their totality an impressively diverse collection of topics, approaches, languages, and potential readerships. According to the brief introduction by Assunta Pisani, the purpose of the conference (and presumably of the volume) was to foster an exchange of information between Western European specialists in North American libraries and their Old World counterparts, centered on the relatively conventional theme of efforts to "collect, organize, and preserve materials that support research" and a potentially more controversial "examination of both the needs for research on Western Europe and of the programs underway to support these needs."

So far, so good. Few library collection managers with responsibilities that include Western Europe would dispute the need for a cogent and detailed examination of these topics. And yet, many potential readers of this volume will be both attracted by the topics and repelled by their presentation in the uneven, redundant, and diffuse format of this lightly edited collection.

The compilation's problems are at least threefold. First, the spread and distribution of topics defy clear description. The papers are distributed among fifteen rubrics, but the intended meaning of these rubrics is muddled by their application. At least one paper, Herbert Lottman's smooth "A Library User's View," stands outside these categories altogether; another category ("Access: Cooperative

Microfilming") holds but one five-page article on preservation options, which is thus segregated from a related category ("Access: Microforms") with papers yielding information about specific microform projects. Some sections use general themes ("Scholars' Sources in Western Europe" and "Research Centers and Special Collections") to gather short descriptions of specific repositories, while others, particularly the two dealing with fringe movements, provide more substantive essays attacking circumscribed problems from various angles. The poor interrelating of the parts represented by the rubrics has the effect of dragging the contributions along a very bumpy surface indeed.

A second problem is closely related to the inadequate organization of the volume: the quality, focus, format, and intended readership of the individual contributions are inconsistent. The stylistic range varies from chatty, fast-paced, and even anecdotal to dry and descriptive. Adding to the stylistic diversity, seven papers are in French or Italian, despite English titles in some cases. Most of the first hundred or so pages consist of sparse summaries of library services, with more than a few qualifying barely as abstracts. The middle of the volume contains more substantive and imaginative treatments of topics such as regional publishing, fringe movements, the émigré question, issues of marginality, and personal narratives. These contributions deserve better treatment in a more selective and intensively edited volume, and the relatively tight focus of these five sections may suggest a future project along these lines. The last third of *Euro-Librarianship* is a potpourri of largely descriptive papers with a generally traditional focus on library matters, such as access to a variety of formats and the pricing of library materials.

A third issue, quite separate from the quality of the proceedings, is whether it is necessary to republish them after prior publication as volume 15 (1992) of the journal *Collection Management*. The sole difference between the two versions of these proceedings is the addition of an

index for the book volume. In this light, it is worth noting again that the WESS conference took place more than five years ago, so that one might have expected more substantial revisions. At least, it would have been reasonable to excise the eight-page conference schedule, including meals, receptions, and sponsors for coffee breaks, and improve the abstracts provided for some of the papers. Moreover, some of the contributions have already appeared in other journals likely to be held in many libraries. A modicum of editorial rigor would have greatly increased the appeal and readership for these proceedings. And yet, despite these faults, RLIN and OCLC records suggest that many academic libraries find themselves in possession of both printings of the conference proceedings at a total cost of nearly \$200. Considering the role of librarians in the production of this volume, this expenditure of library resources for the duplication and reduplication of conference papers of uneven quality is ironic.

In all, *Euro-Librarianship* will be a great disappointment for Western European specialists. Despite an impressive list of contributors, admirable goals, and some undeniably good papers, this volume fails to provide either a set of foundation texts or a platform for coherent discussion of issues in European librarianship. There are choice morsels to be found, but the stew is toilsome to digest.—Henry Lowood, *Stanford University, Stanford, California*.

**Hannedóttir, Sigrún Klara.** *The Scandia Plan: A Cooperative Acquisition Scheme for Improving Access to Research Publications in Four Nordic Countries.* Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1992. 340p. alk. paper, \$42.50 (ISBN 0-8108-2540-6). LC 92-1070.

A group of large research libraries in Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden established the Scandia Plan in 1956 to divide the responsibility of acquiring little-used non-Nordic (plus Icelandic) materials thought to be important to Nordic scholars. Participation in the plan was voluntary, and each library had to bear its