Harwell’s *Cornerstones of Confederate Collecting*. The other large effort, excluding *Studies in Bibliography*, has been the preparation of textual studies, such as Bower’s *Essays in Bibliography, Text and Editing*, and several works by Tanselle, including *Textual Criticism since Greg: A Chronicle, 1950–1985* and *Textual Criticism and Scholarly Editing*.

The society’s most substantial contribution has always been *Studies in Bibliography*; and Robin Myers, representing the Bibliographical Society, was correct in her comments at the fiftieth anniversary when she said that it was “a very special publication … causing a yearly frisson of pleasure as it thuds down on bibliographical doormats everywhere.” However, Tanselle’s assertion that in the second half of the twentieth century, *Studies in Bibliography* took over from *The Library*, the publication of the Bibliographical Society (Britain), as the place where “one witnessed most dramatically the exploration of new techniques and new areas” may be going a bit far. This certainly is not proven by the essay that would have to set the contents of the one against the other but, instead, speaks only of *Studies in Bibliography*. Furthermore, an admittedly cursory examination of the contents of *The Library* does not bear out the assertion, at least not for the first twenty-five years, when authors and articles seemed almost interchangeable because they were by the same people writing about the same things, including Tanselle, Wyllie, and Greg. Nevertheless, *Studies in Bibliography* has carved out a niche for itself, primarily in the consideration of American subjects in which *The Library* seems to have little interest.

*Studies in Bibliography*, of course, was the creation of Fredson Bowers, and he must figure large in any history of it because few journals of such standing are created and edited by the same scholar for forty-three years.

According to Tanselle, its format was fixed with the first volume, which contained eleven articles followed by six bibliographical notes; and it came into its own with volume three, which contained Greg’s “The Rationale of Copy Text,” a point of departure for textual critics for the next fifty years. Besides this, there were eleven other articles by eminent critics, fourteen bibliographical notes, and a checklist of bibliographical scholarship for 1949.

A commemorative volume need not have wide appeal, and this one does not, but because it chronicles the rise of a scholarly society in perhaps an unlikely place, it makes for more interesting reading than one would first expect. And because the society began in Special Collections at the University of Virginia, all concerned in the administration of rare books and manuscripts could benefit from examining it. —James B. Lloyd, University of Tennessee.

The Education of Library and Information Professionals Series


The title of this monograph series, *The Education of Library and Information Professionals*, indicates the direction in which library and information science education
has been lurching for the past three decades. Submerging librarianship under the information professions rubric has resulted in major changes in both the pedagogy and the curricula of what still must be referred to as LIS schools. These curricular and pedagogical changes have been less pervasive than the cosmetic name changes of academic units reflecting, first, the intrusion of information science into the curriculum in the 1970s and, then, in the move to drop the “library” designation itself in the 1990s, which may or may not be a broadening constituency and mission. As a whole, this collection of papers mirrors these developments in the education and training of librarians.

A thematic element common to all of the essays collected here is change, but the articles themselves fall short of addressing the restructuring of librarianship into an “information profession” or even of attempting to define what that might mean. Philip Doty, in the volume on the United States, is one of the few authors represented here who has tried to arrive at a definition, but he fails to offer much beyond a few vague generalizations. In all these volumes, the authors restrict themselves, for the most part, to addressing the state of the art in the education and training of librarians in LIS schools. Essential questions about the nature of information professionalism and its relationship to libraries are almost unanimously ignored in favor of a focus on traditional areas of education for librarianship.

Given this limitation, the editors of the series and the editors of the individual volumes have done an admirable job of recruiting authors who are each in a position to write authoritatively about their topics. These are people who have steered this boat through the shallow waters of academia; the overwhelming majority of them are deans, directors, and heads of schools recruited to share their accumulated wisdom. What they have produced are not research articles but, rather, personal essays that draw on their experiences, attitudes, and beliefs. In her introductory essay on the history of what she appropriately refers to as “librarian education” in the United States, Loriene Roy perhaps expressed the expectation for the series best when she wrote: “This book consists of snapshots of the field from the perspectives of a number of leaders in library education.” The snapshots are, in most cases, taken with the participants’ own Polaroids of their local campuses. It is evident from the documentation accompanying each of the articles that virtually every author relies more on his or her own experiences than on the literature.

There was evidently a general plan to be followed by each of the volumes; they all begin with a general introduction sketching the historical background of LIS education in the particular geographical area and conclude with a reflective essay on the future of LIS education. There were to be sections on topics of special importance to the specific countries and, of course, articles on current trends. Glynn Harmon and David Stoker, for example, provide excellent articles on distance education for the volumes covering the United States and the United Kingdom. In addition, there are numerous detailed reports on the situation at individual institutions and the special instruction available for particular arenas of librarianship.

The volumes for China, New Zealand, and the Nordic countries vary somewhat from this formula. The China volume begins with a historical introduction, but the fracturing of the Chinese effort into several different traditions (mainland, Taiwanese, Hong Kong, and Macau) forces the work in different directions. A similar pattern of fracturing the area into smaller, meaningful parts is used in the volumes for New Zealand and the Nordic countries. The Australia volume provides yet another approach that appears more functionalist than thematic and includes the only systematic treatment of education for nonprofessionals appearing in any of the volumes, although it is evident that the distinctions between professional and paraprofessional training has been a central concern in most of the
countries covered. Each volume presents the reader with a sound feeling for the state of professional library education in the countries represented.

The volume for New Zealand, written by Mary Ronnie, and the volume for Australia, written by Maxine Rochester, have the advantage of a unified voice. It is a voice that is not evident in the other volumes, which, instead, are afflicted with the high degree of redundancy too common in edited efforts. In the edited volumes, the authors have been forced to lay their own foundation of definitions, touchstones, and points of departure resulting in the same fields being plowed in different directions by different authors and places where the sod remains intact. This lack of a cohesive, comprehensive approach is particularly confusing in discussions of national academic traditions that are unfamiliar to the reader. Many articles assume knowledge of the levels of academic attainment, forms of degrees, and academic organization obtaining in individual countries, rather than providing a full explanation.

Virtually every article also carries the freight of its author’s implicit and/or explicit assumptions. When Wu Guangwei and Shao Youliang of East China Normal University in Shanghai write about “Current Developments in Library Science Education in China,” it is reasonable to assume that their term information management has a different connotation than it does in the United States. However, their meaning is not made explicit. David Stoker’s article on distance education in the United Kingdom accepts as basic that distance education is inherently inferior to the traditional process of giving full-time students the advantage of direct access to faculty members and the resources of the local institution. This is an idea that, like many others in these essays, has great appeal and fits conventional wisdom but may well be contradicted by fact.

These volumes, particularly those covering the United States and the United Kingdom, treat education for librarianship generically. The focus is on general requirements for degrees, general ambiance of schools, and on a generic workplace. It assumes graduates are preparing for careers in traditional academic and public libraries, workplaces in which, of course, many graduates do eventually find employment. Further, it is an approach that presents a strange ambiguity in that change is the focus, and the changing environment of library and information services is a primary assumption, yet it is also assumed that public and academic librarianship represent generic librarianship.

A major lacuna in the volumes on the United States and the United Kingdom is the refusal to acknowledge the existence of school librarians in the catalog of library and information professionals. Kate Beattie and Maureen Nimon cover the crucial area in the volume for Australia and Mary Ronnie does the same for New Zealand. In both cases, the place of school librarianship is portrayed as secondary and the prospects for school librarians seemingly dismal, though both authors see a potentially brighter future. It is evident that in both countries, school librarianship and work with children hold pretty much the same problematic position as in the United States. In describing the situation in Iceland, Sigrún Klara Hannesdóttir pointed to the rivalry between library education and teacher education programs for control of the school librarian. Klara observed that there “are still people who believe that school librarianship has very little to do with the rest of librarianship.” Although the role and status of school librarianship is not unknown in the United States or the United Kingdom, other than a few asides, it is completely ignored in the U.S. volume. And in Judith Elkin’s “Special Provision in Library and Information Studies Education” in the U.K. volume, it is treated in a few cursory pages as a subsection with music, health, and business information work and public librarianship. The almost systematic neglect of school librarianship in these two volumes is incomprehensible if, indeed, the purpose is to describe education for the information professions.

The volumes for the Nordic countries, the United States, and the United Kingdom
each contain final chapters on the future of library education contributed respectively by Niels Ole Pors, head of the Royal School of Librarianship in Copenhagen; Thomas Galvin, former dean of the School of Library and Information Science at the University of Pittsburgh; and John Feather, former head of the Department of Library and Information Studies at Loughborough University. These statements are competent, but undistinguished; each could have benefited from having its author read the essays preceding his own contribution. Pors seems to have taken his assignment the most seriously, undertaking a survey of possible future labor markets for graduates of the Nordic schools. But he founders on the shoals of too many schools, with too many different academic traditions, and too many markets to permit any grand conclusions.

Galvin presents an optimistic view of a future in which the formal education of librarians will become more intense and of longer duration in direct response to the needs of the agencies that hire the graduates. He has perceived that one of the major functions of the first professional position taken by new graduates has been to extend the period of training to incorporate practical experience—something that library education programs have been incapable of doing since the time of Melvil Dewey. In Galvin’s view, libraries are no longer capable of finishing the training of librarians in a practical setting, and it will become the responsibility of the schools to undertake this making of the complete librarian. He probably takes too sanguine a view of the potential role of the library associations, and particularly the Association for Library and Information Science Education, in leading the way in this curricular expansion. It is unclear, too, how this possible future relates to the pessimism with which he views the future of doctoral programs in the field. His prediction of an increased role for education in information studies rather than librarianship, at the undergraduate level, is a relatively safe prediction at this point.

Feather, better known in the United States for his work on the history of the book than the future of library education, presents a vision of the future that is undoubtedly more comprehensive and literate than either Pors’s or Galvin’s, but not necessarily closer to the truth. He does an excellent job of relating potential changes in library education to the changing climate of higher education in the United Kingdom, but like the others, he seems to bog down in the immediate problems of the institutional settings for library education, funding, and other concerns.

The intent of the series was purely descriptive and, indeed, several articles scattered throughout these volumes are so descriptive they are little more than directories. The combined impact of the articles in this series is to overwhelm the reader with allusions that are, too often, not explained sufficiently to enable the reader to fully comprehend their meaning. It was not the intent of the editors or the authors to produce a series in comparative librarianship, but there are enough hints, half-stated themes, and parallels running through the entire series to lead readers to develop their own thematic comprehension of the whole, raising questions that demand answers.

One major question is left very much unaddressed, although there has been some discussion of the issue over the years—the international equivalency of degrees. Each country covered in these volumes has established its own form of professional training of librarians based on its own educational traditions. Although it is apparent that these traditions represent important differences, it is less apparent that the credentials awarded for the completion of the programs leading to professional status in the different countries are appreciably different. The question of equivalency of degrees, and the potential for professional enrichment through international efforts at training and employing librarians and other information professionals, have been seemingly hampered by a few hegemonic national traditions. Ap-
parently, some effort in this direction is being made at the University of Iceland and in the Nordic countries, at Aberystwith, and in Australia through the National Office of Overseas Skills Recognition. U.S. schools have had a large number of foreign students as have had, presumably established schools in other countries. Where these students go after graduation and what influence they may have on library development in their own countries remain something of a mystery.

Included are articles that address the demographic characteristics of students, but none that really answer the questions of why students come to the schools in the first place or why they choose a particular school over others. There are also curricular questions that need to be investigated. Each of these volumes deals with academic traditions that differ, sometimes radically, but there does seem to be an international consensus on a common core of library and information studies that has been created either through cultural transfer or because this particular knowledge has been found to be essential to the work of all librarians.

The articles presented in this series reveal a, perhaps inevitable, time lag between the point they were completed and when they were published. The “snapshot” envisioned by Roy is more accurately a sort of time-lapse photographic series of library education in the 1990s. As such, these volumes might be reasonable acquisitions for libraries serving LIS schools or for institutions with an active interest in comparative education. In many cases, much of the information presented in these volumes will be available in libraries collecting comprehensively in these fields, however, the personal nature of this series’ essays make them unique.

It is unfortunate that the series ends with these volumes. Poor sales have forced the publisher to abandon the project. At an average price of almost $100 per volume, this is not a surprising development. At present, the volume on Africa edited by the late Michael Wise will be published by IFLA and the volume on the Arab Gulf States also should be completed and published by Mansell this year. Developments in Central and South America, the rest of Western and Eastern Europe as well as planned volumes for India and Southeast Asia will not be published. However, the idea behind this series is valuable enough to be continued. Perhaps other volumes would make a fitting project for several Library Trends issues, which would be the more natural format and, at the institutional subscription rate of $75 for four quarterly issues, would be a much more affordable venue for this work. —Lee Shiflett, Louisiana State University.


 Readers looking for an engaging polemic on political correctness run amuck on our nation’s campuses will be delighted to find The Shadow University. Kors and Silverglate provide scores of detailed, appropriately spun, and sufficiently alarmist accounts of cases in which cam-