Book Reviews

Library as Place: Rethinking Roles, Rethinking Space. Washington, D.C.: Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR Publication, no. 129), 2005. 81p. alk. paper, $20 (ISBN 1932326138). LC 2005-551823. Available online at http://www.clir.org/pubs/abstract/pub129abst.html.

This work is, if anything, final evidence of the triumph of the complex, high-road academic library over the simpler, modular model of the 1950s. Part of the Council of Library and Information Resources series, Perspectives on the Evolving Library, this slender volume packs a lot of thoughts into its six essays and could be of particular value to colleges or librarians planning to build new structures or renovate existing ones. One of this collection's strengths is the wide range of backgrounds and experiences of the authors. Yet, they all share a common theme: the academic library today is changing rapidly, and in the process, becoming many things to many people while simultaneously seeing more use than ever.

The lead essay, architect Geoffrey Freeman's "The Library as Place: Changes in Learning Patterns, Collections, Technology, and Use," is a celebration of the ways that so many new libraries have embraced technology, become more flexible and added "value to [students'] lives." Freeman comes across as a bit preachy and self-congratulatory as he notes the many libraries recently designed by his firm (Shepley, Bulfinch, Richardson, and Abbott) that have met the challenges of changing usage. He does not discuss how well his firm's older designs have fared.

Freeman also insists that successful library designs require a collaborative effort on the part of all interested parties, including administrators, board members, students, and faculty. In stating that in older libraries "Prime space was routinely reserved for processing materials," Freeman implies that librarians have usually looked out only for themselves and failed to consider the future.

Like Freeman, retired librarian Scott Bennett's essay, "Righting the Balance," notes how new libraries are reflecting changes in academia with a move toward a "culture of learning" rather than a culture of teaching. Unfortunately, Bennett also has little good to say about librarians' judgment, complaining that librarians continue to focus on service (or "operational needs") rather than learning. Where new libraries have successfully accommodated changed learning styles, he views these happy results as accidental. Librarians just do not ask the right questions! Unfortunately, Bennett does not define these service or operational needs nor does he provide the reader with what he considers the right questions. He devotes most of the rest of his essay to a description of the University of the South's Dupont Library, where questions of learning were apparently asked and the building designed to address those answers.

In "From the Ashes of Alexandria," Sam Demas takes as his theme the evolution of academic libraries into something more than a storage and retrieval portal. The Library at Alexandria was a "research center, a museum, and a venue for celebrating the arts, inquiry, and scholarship." This is what academic libraries need to become—and are becoming.

Demas uses as a primary example of these changes his own library, the Gould Library at Carleton College, but what he describes can be seen at other locations. Demas is a practicing librarian addressing a nonlibrary audience, and his more positive attitude toward our profession is refreshing. Both his examples and statistics show an understanding of who is using the modern college library, how

and why. He promotes the idea of the library as a complexity of many things, as many spaces for many patrons, and in the process provides encouragement and a blueprint for the future.

Bernard Frischer's essay, "The Ultimate Internet Café," is based on a speech he gave in 2002. A digital theater where multimedia can be accessed in a variety of ways somehow becomes the way of the future. Along this way, Frischer manages to comment on the book, microforms, and many other informational formats. Just as this theater would assemble many pieces in one place, so does the library bring many bits of information and ways to access them under one roof. Here Frischer adds a note of hope, for he foresees that by returning to the architectural principles used in the premodern era, architects and librarians may again create spaces that entice and inspire users. In doing so, he indirectly condemns the drab, cookie-cutter buildings of the past that focused solely on storage and private study, and he celebrates the library as place for the "production of knowledge and not simply the distribution and consumption of knowledge."

The next essay describes the Martin Luther King Jr. Library, a joint-use facility that serves both San José State University and the city of San José. Christiana Peterson emphasizes that this library is a place with many different kinds of spaces. Her clear description of the building shows how its architecture and spaces shape the user experience. She defines five uses: (1) information seeking, (2) recreation, (3) teaching and learning, (4) connection, and (5) contemplation. Some of these are more typical of a public library, others of an academic, but her library caters to all these needs. Again, specialized spaces allow both conversations and silent thoughts.

If combining a public and an academic library is an unusual arrangement, the configuration of the Johns Hopkins Welch Medical Library, described by Kathleen Burr Oliver, is stranger still. In this case, the library is dispersed throughout the hospital complex. In a sense, the library has been brought to the user, complete with online resources and librarians, ensuring that practitioners can find help and information quickly and conveniently. These "Touchdown" suites have been successful and offer just another possibility for future library facilities.

All but Freeman's essay include bibliographies, and another five pages of readings follow Kathrin Smith's "Afterword." Taken together, these essays might seem to offer a confusion of options and futures, but there is value in this approach. With more examples and richer thinking, the reader can gain greater understanding of the possibilities. Good design can result in great spaces, spaces that inspire and encourage use. Libraries are changing as both their missions and users change, and these essays help point out some of the ways.—*Michael W. Loder, Pennsylvania State University, Schuylkill.*

The Press. Ed. Geneva Overholser and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. New York: Oxford Univ. Pr. (Institutions of American Democracy Series). 2005. 473p. $65 (ISBN 0195172833). LC 2004-29861.

The second of five books in Oxford University Press's Institutions of American Democracy series, *The Press* is a compilation of articles and essays by scholars and journalists that address the major challenges facing the media today. The other institutions of democracy covered in this series—public education and the three branches of government—all are evolving at the same time, each influencing, and influenced by, the evolution of the press.

The editors are immensely qualified for this undertaking: Geneva Overholser is Hurley Chair in Public Affairs Reporting at the Missouri School of Journalism Washington Bureau, and Kathleen Hall Jamieson is professor of communication at the University of Pennsylvania and director of the Annenberg Public Policy Center. The volume focuses on the press

as an institution of American democracy in four expansive sections. An essay summarizing the articles to follow precedes each section.

The first section suggests that there are many types of journalism, with wide-ranging and dissimilar audiences, purposes, and functions. Robert Entman, for instance, divides journalism into four major varieties: mainstream, advocacy, tabloid, and entertainment. Many scholars agree that the definition of journalism is a work in progress, though one or two definitions have seemed to dominate the public's consciousness. Perhaps the most favored, though "least securely institutionalized in the daily mission of the contemporary news organization," is the notion that the press should serve as a watchdog for the people.

The second section looks at the function of the press in a democracy. The best of the articles in this volume, such as "The Watchdog Role" by Bennett and Serrin, not only provide historical context but also pose cogent questions to encourage discussion and offer constructive recommendations. Bennett and Serrin define the watchdog role as documenting, questioning, and investigating the public on "matters of importance for the working of American democracy." They provide a historical context, from the heyday of the 1920s and 1930s (when strong, well-formed social movements worked in concert with the press) to well-documented recent failures (Iraq War/WMD, corporate scandals), to illustrate why the contemporary press has failed to fulfill this implied obligation. Bennett and Serrin offer a number of reasons why journalism schools do not teach this idea of righting wrongs and news agencies discourage hard-hitting investigative reporting. They offer hope, though, by referring to the press in this period as a "sleeping watchdog."

Section three examines the often ambivalent and always interactive relationship between government and the press. It explores the importance of the relationship to the effective operation of the American political system and, in particular, scrutinizes the press's coverage of war.

The authors collected in the final section comment on the structure of the contemporary American press and the quality and value of its work. One scholar now considers news a commercial product, seriously questioning both the quality and the value of our news. He finds that news coverage today "has shifted to an increasing emphasis on what people want to know and away from information that they may need as voters."

Although scholars and practitioners disagree about many aspects of the press, most agree that it has entered a deep transitional period. It was for that disquieting reason that the editors gathered together this collection to examine the press and its role in our democracy. The final essay, by Carey and Hicks Maynard, looks toward the future, considering how the many fast-paced demographic, economic, and technological changes will alter journalism, while also explaining why some things will remain the same.

Several things appear certain for the near future. The nineteenth-century model of a partisan press appears to be reemerging to some degree, which calls objectivity into question. Conglomeration increases commercial pressure, again questioning objectivity. The impact of the rise of the Internet—this massive new source of information, opinion, and news—on our press, society, economy, and government cannot be overstated. It has created a way for those with resources to produce their own "spin sites" and "specialized news outlets are now thriving throughout the country." Whether these certainties bode good or ill depends largely on the will of the public.

The purposes of the book are to explore how the press as we know it today came to be; to understand the role of the press in giving voice to the concerns of all Americans; and, the central theme, to examine what a democracy should expect of the

press. Because it is one of our most fundamental freedoms, the center of a thriving democracy, understanding the issues and their impact on other aspects of our lives is imperative. Overholser and Hall Jamieson have taken a large, complex, and evolving subject for which there are no simple answers and organized a volume that gives the reader confidence that solutions are possible with logic, determination, and patience.—*Kurt Cumiskey, North Carolina State University.*

Betsy O. Barefoot, et al. *Achieving & Sustaining Institutional Excellence for the First Year of College*. San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass (Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series), 2005. 432p. alk. paper, $45 (ISBN 0787971510). LC 2004-26197.

This book is a recent addition to the Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education Series. This series has been long recognized for its high standards of excellence, and this volume is no exception. The book is the result of a research study conducted by the Policy Center on the First Year of College (www.brevard.edu/fyc/), an organization based at Brevard College in Brevard, North Carolina. Six of the eight authors were members of the center's staff when the studies leading to the publication of this book were conducted. The bulk of the book offers thirteen case studies from institutions determined to represent excellence in offering support systems to first-year college students.

The book is compiled in an orderly, easy-to-use fashion, with the cases presented in thirteen chapters organized by institutional type and size, beginning with two-year institutions and proceeding through four-year institutions organized by enrollment increments starting with those with fewer than 2,000 and proceeding to coverage of those with more than 20,000 students. The study was conducted between 2001 and 2003, and the results reflect the programming that was in place at these institutions during the 2002 academic year.

The authors are careful to emphasize that this book is a collection of case studies and not a programmatic or policy guide. The brief prefatory material describes the rationale for a project of this kind, outlines the criteria for inclusion, and clearly delineates the research methodology employed in gathering the data.

The participants of this study were not randomly selected. Nominations for inclusion were solicited from chief academic officers at all regionally accredited higher education institutions in the U.S. and from participants in electronic discussion groups focusing on the first-year experience. They were invited to nominate institutions to be recognized as an Institution of Excellence in the First College Year. This process resulted in a large number of nominees, which was reduced to fifty-four semifinalists and, eventually, to the thirteen finalists. The authors created five criteria that enabled them to narrow the list for inclusion: evidence of a comprehensive program focused on the first-year experience, continuing programmatic assessment, broad impact and participation of significant numbers of students, institutional/administrative support, and campus involvement of a wide range of faculty, administrators, student service offices, and so on. The thirteen institutions selected were the Community College of Denver, LaGuardia Community College, Eckerd College, Kalamazoo College, Drury University, Elon University, West Point, Lehman College of CUNY, Texas A&M (Corpus Christi), Appalachian State University, Ball State University, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, and the University of South Carolina.

The design of the study employed standard qualitative research methods and relied on multiple sources of data. Participating institutions submitted a variety of documents (mission statements, planning documents, catalogs, brochures, and so on), key individuals on campus were interviewed, and site visits were made by research staff. Previously

identified research questions guided the information-gathering process.

The result of the study is a rich portrait of these institutions and the model programs they have developed. The case studies reflect a moment in time, specifically 2002, but include historical information and descriptive material concerning multiple aspects of campus life. Although each of the institutional profiles reflects unique and specific circumstances, they all are broadly relevant and applicable to other settings that colleges and universities could adapt to their own situation. The authors let the case studies speak for themselves but do point out twenty common themes that emerge in successful programs. These include initiatives that focus on some well-known issues: advising, orientation, residence life, convocations, first-year seminars, mentoring, and so on. Less familiar success factors include experiential learning and service initiatives, common readings and core curriculum, electronic portfolios, peer leaders, and faculty development, among others.

The book concludes with a brief chapter entitled "Findings and Recommendations." Not surprisingly, the findings mirror the criteria established at the beginning of the study that determined which institutions should be included. For example, the first criterion for inclusion was "evidence of an intentional, comprehensive approach to improving the first year . . . ." The first finding is that "institutions that achieve first-year excellence place a high priority on the first year." As for recommendations, the authors urge colleges and universities to conduct major self-studies of their first-year programs, adopt the five criteria of the Institutions of Excellence program, model some of the twenty common themes they identified, and use their book as a focal point of discussion and program consideration. It may be of interest to academic librarians that the library featured prominently in only two of the case studies, Eckerd and Kalamazoo Colleges, both

four-year institutions with fewer than two thousand students.

The value of this book lies within the case studies. They are richly developed, thorough, and well written. Some of the prefatory material, as well as the large number of appendices, seem unnecessary. These materials make the book seem more like a final report to a funding agency than an interesting collection of cases. For example, inclusion in the appendices of a list of institutions considered, but not included, copies of forms and letters relating to the study, and IRB consent forms detract from the main focus of the book. The short list of references contains mostly institutional publications and is dated.

Despite these minor shortcomings, this book is recommended for academic administrators at all levels concerned with the first-year experience of college students. The wealth of information represented in the case studies, particularly because the information is contextualized within the institutional setting in which it occurs, is extremely valuable and worth reading.—*John W. Collins, Harvard Graduate School of Education.*

Conway, Flo, and Jim Siegelman. *Dark Hero of the Information Age: In Search of Norbert Wiener, the Father of Cybernetics*. New York: Basic, 2005. 423p. alk. paper, $27.50 (ISBN 0738203688). LC 2004-22116.

Journalists Flo Conway and Jim Siegelman have given us a well-written, well-researched portrait of the personal and professional life of an often-forgotten, but central, player in the politics and ideas of twentieth-century science, technology, and engineering, Norbert Wiener (1894–1964). Although the authors are not trained in any of these fields, they do an excellent job of conveying in nontechnical terms Wiener's contributions; extensive notes and references provide additional sources for readers who wish to pursue specifics in greater depth.

The late sociologist of science Robert K. Merton pointed out that at some stage

in the development of a science ideas become so accepted that citations to their contributors are no longer made. He refers to this process as "obliteration by incorporation" (OBI).

When I read Conway and Siegelman, I had the recurring thought that it is not much of an exaggeration to suggest that Wiener's entire career suffered from OBI. In addition to the often-unacknowledged contributions he gave to numerous colleagues, Conway and Siegelman point to his contributions to the development of the computer, to the first intelligent automated machines, to the development of the interdisciplinary field of communication and computation, and to the conceptualization of the central role of "feedback" in the transmission of information from neural systems to social systems.

Failure to recognize the Father of the Information Age in many of these areas reflects a combination of Wiener's dark side, eccentricities, his lack of acceptable interpersonal skills, and personal, professional, and institutional politics.

In contrast, the early postwar years were good ones for Wiener. For instance, throughout his career he brought into his circle of influence ("invisible college") colleagues ranging from former and present students to John von Neumann (computers) and Claude Shannon (information) to Margaret Mead (anthropology) and Paul Lazarsfeld (sociology). And beginning in 1946, the Josiah Macy Jr. Foundation supported a number of conferences for this group and other invited scholars. The height of his personal and professional influence is reflected by his 1950 best-selling book *The Human Use of Human Beings: Cybernetics and Society.* As the title suggests, Wiener was concerned with the role of the individual in what today is called the postindustrial age, the information age, or the age of globalization. Given the emergence of India in this new age, it is worth remembering that in the early 1950s he advised Nehru and other leaders to build "the class of skilled technicians" and "to create an entirely new kind of technological society."

However, within a few years, the cybernetics movement in the United States had all but disappeared. The authors convincingly account for this disappearance in terms of the larger political context. To summarize, in the postwar years Wiener became a public critic of government-funded projects, atomic weapons, and the military-industrial complex; cybernetics attracted much support in the Soviet Union, and the Artificial Intelligence (AI) movement emerged at a number of centers. Conway and Siegelman quote Heinz von Foerster of the Biological Computer Laboratory, University of Illinois: "They (U.S. military) wanted to chase out cybernetics as fast as they could. It was not suppressed, but they neglected it and began funneling all their money into intelligence, whether it was artificial or natural."

In 1964, President Kennedy accepted Wiener's nomination for the National Medal of Science and the award was presented by President Johnson. Three months later (March 18,1964), he died on the steps of the Royal Institute of Technology in Stockholm. Wiener was 69 years old. It was not until his death that the seventeen-year-long FBI file and security investigation ended.

The highs and lows in Wiener's professional life also were found in his personal life and individual behavior. He spoke of his "emotional strains" and his need for "psychoanalytic help." There is little disagreement that throughout his life he suffered from manic depression. The authors argue that, early on, traumatic life experiences played a role in his illness. His father Leo was central to those experi-

ences. Leo arrived in the United States as a nineteen-year-old and with twenty-five cents. However, he had already mastered over ten languages; he had taught himself English and learned Spanish from fellow ship passengers. After a brief teaching experience at the University of Missouri, Leo, his wife, and son Norbert moved to Boston. He soon was appointed, at Harvard, to the first instructorship in Slavic languages and literature in the U.S., and in 1911 he became the first Jewish tenured full professor at that university.

The title of the introductory chapter "The Most Remarkable Boy in the World," summarizes young Norbert's intellectual achievements (for example, began reading at three, recited Greek and Latin at five, and entered Tufts College at eleven after only three and a half years of formal schooling).

The prodigy's early education was conducted under his father's tutelage. Although Leo referred to his training program as "tactful compulsion," Norbert later described his experiences in these words: "I had to stand beside him and recite my lessons by memory, even in Greek, at six years old, and he would ignore me until I made the simplest mistake, then he would verbally reduce me to dust." His lessons often ended in the same family scene, "Father was raging, I was weeping, and my mother did her best to defend me, although hers was a losing battle." By the age of eight, Norbert's eyestrain was so extreme that a doctor ordered him to stop reading for six months. However, the training program had to continue. His mother read to him, a Harvard chemistry student was brought in to teach him, "And, for six months, Leo made his son do all his reasoning, reckoning, and arithmetic in his head." Quite a way to develop a near-photographic memory and to be able to do higher-order mathematical calculations in one's head. He graduated from Tufts after three years at the age of fourteen, and in 1913 became the youngest Ph.D. in Harvard's history. In 1919, he began his lifelong, if at times conflict-filled, affiliation with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The achievements of prodigies are fascinating to the rest of us *because* we cannot duplicate them. However, Wiener's professional achievements are instructive *because* they point to the significance of support structures and positions taken that may be available to each of us. I have cited the importance of collaboration, what Derek J. deSolla Price called "invisible colleges," and to institutional and financial support in the development or lack of development of scientific and professional ideas and disciplines.

Indeed, one of Wiener's best-known eccentricities can be interpreted in terms of his understanding of the significance of "informal communication," "strength of weak ties," and "networking." I am referring to his daily walks through the corridors at MIT during which he would engage students and colleagues. The walks acquired the name "Wienerwags" (Wiener walks or wanderings). He soon expanded his wags to the surrounding community. Although these apparently aimless walks and exchanges gave Wiener opportunities to vent his latest concerns and to disseminate his latest ideas, they also provided him with feedback from others concerning developments in their areas of interest and specialization. This routine helped him to make contributions across disciplinary lines.

The use of the term *information science* within the library profession as well as the technological revolution within libraries are clear indications of the debt librarians owe to Wiener. Librarians and information scientists will be particularly interested in the account of the relationship between Wiener and Claude Shannon, the" father of information theory." Early during World War Two, Shannon became aware of Wiener's military work on information theory and, in the words of the authors, "Wiener shared his thoughts unstintingly with Shannon." However, in Wiener's words, he soon grew weary of Shannon's visits "to pluck my brains."

Others have attributed more to Shannon than he himself has. He denied that he was the father of "information theory" and stressed that his work was limited to the more narrow concept "communication" versus Wiener's broader concern with "information," that is, the organization and meaning of the communication.

Although Wiener's life was fascinating and issues of recognition, priority, and historical accuracy are important, Wiener's most significant and profound contributions may reside in the issues he raised concerning the very nature of the individual in the twenty-first century, and in his resistance to the inhumane uses of science and technology by the government and other ruling institutions. As one might expect, in the information age, librarians and information scientists are among the first to confront the issues of control over information, privacy, and identity (for example, the Patriot Act). Wiener's words and actions provide models for information professionals concerned with this responsibility.

In sum, Wiener is relevant to us because he was a prophet, not because he was a prodigy.—*Mark Oromaner, New York City.*

Onwuegbuzie, Anthony J., Qun G. Jiao, and Sharon L. Bostick. *Library Anxiety: Theory, Research, and Applications.* Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow (Research Methods in Library and Information Studies, no. 1), 2004. 400p. alk. paper $39.50 (ISBN 0810849550). LC 2003-17677.
Library anxiety was first identified as such by Constance A. Mellon (who contributed the book's foreword) in 1986. The central thrust of this book is to give an overview of the current state of library anxiety research, much of which is based on the use of the Library Anxiety Scale (LAS), a tool developed in 1992 by Sharon L. Bostick to measure the construct and other, similar instruments. Bostick has had a long career in libraries, working in the user services field. Onwuegbuzie is an associate professor in the Department of Educational

Measurement and Research at the University of South Florida, and Jiao is an associate professor and reference librarian at Baruch College, CUNY.

Library anxiety is described by the authors as "an uncomfortable feeling or emotional disposition, experienced in a library setting, which has cognitive, affective, physiological, and behavioral ramifications." Many seasoned professionals might be quite disdainful of the concept. Is it a legitimate field of study? Is it on a par with test anxiety or mathematics anxiety? The early chapters, which discuss the construct, will allay these fears. Interesting quotations from numerous qualitative research studies attest to the fact that library anxiety is a valid phenomenon. At first glance, the LAS seems a useful tool and is certainly much more accessible and easier to understand than the various LibQual survey questionnaires that academic libraries have been putting themselves (and their constituencies) through the past few years. In the first chapter, the authors document in considerable detail how the LAS instrument was developed, validated, tested, refined, and revalidated. However, if you are unfamiliar with library anxiety as a construct, do read chapter 2 first where you will find a full description of its nature and etiology.

The uninitiated reader might wonder if there is a difference between a single user's library anxiety (described as time- and situation-specific rather than trait based or part of a general anxiety state) and a particular library's unhelpful services/policies/staff. Is the LAS perhaps, instead, a quality control tool to evaluate how well a library is doing in being user oriented? Does the LAS measure the personal anxiety of any one person or the service quality of a particular institution? How can we separate a recognizable condition that can be named 'library anxiety' from the feelings created by experiencing a library that does not see its mandate as providing high-quality personalized service and support? In other words, the

old 'staff-centered' library as opposed to the current philosophy of a 'user-centered' library.

The book bases its discussion on historical research conducted in the 1980s and 1990s (much of it by the authors themselves) that predates the momentous changes in libraries over the past five years. Look in the index and you will find no listing for Google as a topic. The book includes two references to studies of anxiety associated with the educational use of the Internet; one is very brief and the second refers to an interesting study done by two of the authors in 2003, showing the multivariate relationship between library anxiety and anxiety with computers. And that's it for the twenty-first century, folks, which is disappointing for a book published in 2004. The authors do admit that the bulk of the research done on library anxiety, using the various measurement instruments out there, is dated and that the information environment has changed drastically. The final chapter, "Future Research, Issues and Challenges," asks, "Does library anxiety research need to be more narrowly focused, shifted or expanded? Are the research findings … still applicable to today's library and information environment?" This surely has to be the most interesting part of the phenomenon. Is library anxiety so closely linked to computer anxiety that they are one and the same? Nowadays, students come to the university so well versed in the use of computer technology that their expertise often far exceeds that of the librarians attempting to help them. No library catalog or indexing tool was ever adopted in such great numbers as Google (which has now become an active verb as in "Did you Google it?"). It may even be that on one level, library anxiety is shifting from the users to the librarians (particularly we gray heads) that serve them. Now that would be an interesting question to research.

This book is painstakingly written with extensive documentation and lengthy bibliography, subject, and author indexes.

It is well organized, each chapter laying out what it will say, with chapter subheadings and good summaries. The chapters on anxiety theory, research methodology, project design, and applications are well worth reading for any library school student who needs to conduct a research project. The authors are aware of the problems with their topic and the lack of up-to-date research, but it is clear that the LAS is no longer a valid tool and needs considerable updating for use in today's information-seeking environment. If the chapter titled "Prevention, Reduction, and Intervention of Library Anxiety" had been framed within the context of a renewed sense of "the library as place," the Barnes and Noble café trend, and the movement to make our users feel more comfortable and "at home," the discussion would have seemed more relevant. The movement to create a user-centered library is only briefly touched on, and there is no heading in the subject index, despite the large body of professional literature on the topic.

I learned some things from this book. I can understand why some students might feel as though the whole world of knowledge is weighing down on them as they look down row upon row of stacks. I can sympathize with users who would rather leave empty-handed and frustrated than ask a forbidding librarian how to find an answer to a simple question. One senses that the authors may have felt the need to document their research topic before it disappears before their eyes like a hologram, but I was left wanting more from this book. I wish that the historical research had been condensed while the authors explored, instead, how library anxiety might or might not have changed post-Internet and post-Google (never mind post 9/11 and the anxiety caused, for both librarians and users, with the passing of and enforcement of the PATRIOT Act).

If so much effort has gone into taking the "foreignness" out of the library (the Barnes & Nobleizing) and computers are

an integral part of most people's lives, have librarians been successful in reducing library anxiety for their users? The increasing numbers of people visiting libraries, particularly new or redesigned ones, might lead us to think so. Gone are the days when users think they will "break" the computer if they press the wrong key. However, only careful and well-designed research studies can definitively answer this question. Although this book does not contribute new knowledge, it does pull together the historical research and points out the need for new studies in this area. It provides an excellent stepping-off point for potential research studies or Ph.D. dissertations. It is well targeted toward educators, researchers, librarians, and advanced graduate students in library and information science.—*Gillian M. McCombs, Southern Methodist University.*

Wendorf, Richard. *The Scholar-Librarian: Books, Libraries, and the Visual Arts*. New Castle, Del.: Oak Knoll Pr. and the Boston Athenaeum, 2005. 247p. alk. paper, $34.95 (ISBN 1584561599). LC 2004-66282.

The Scholar-Librarian is an appealing book, in both style and substance. At first glance, a collection of ten essays on topics as diverse as collecting Piranesi etchings, a critique of Michelangelo Antonioni's film *Blow-Up*, Alexander Pope manuscripts, and the changing styles of print in eighteenth-century England may seem eclectic; but all are linked, not just by the fine and precise language and discriminating insight of the author, but by something larger, namely the underlying premise of the book, which is both broadly stated and subtly inferred throughout. The title essay nimbly makes the case for the need and encouragement of the exotic, and possibly endangered, species of scholar-librarian; in a world of diminishing finances and expanding job duties, librarians who want such an outlet should be supported with either funds or time (or both) to pursue scholarly interests for personal benefit, the library

profession, the librarian's institution, and the larger field of the humanities. Wendorf persuades concisely, logically, and even with humor. If he "talks the talk" in this particular essay, in the rest of the book, he "walks the walk," proving just exactly what fine scholarship a scholar-librarian can produce.

The essays are uniformly elegant. And as to be expected in a book that takes printing fonts and appearances of texts as one of its subjects, they are handsomely presented. Notes for each essay are not banished to the foot of the page or the back of the book (or back of the bus like second-class citizens) nor is their importance diminished by small, hard-to-decipher type. They follow each chapter, in nearly the same-size font, making their perusing easy and part of the narrative. Information on the evolution of the individual essays is provided as well. Although some have been previously published, most have not; others existed in alternate formats. The illustrations often feature various printed texts; the reproductions of Piranesi etchings, perhaps to be expected, suffer a bit in offset reproduction formats.

In one essay, the author describes his first tentative steps in becoming a Piranesi collector. He confesses how awestruck he was crossing the threshold of an expensive gallery, feeling unease at the elegance of the proprietor. He argues that special collections and/or private libraries also may need to avoid this same appearance of being rarified worlds unto themselves, fit only for the elevated. It is good advice—indeed, advice that the author himself, unfortunately, has only partially heeded. Although the essays are certainly accessible to the general reader, and the procedures discussed in some of them (such as tracking changes in published texts and the deductions that can come from such work) can fire the imagination of those just embarking on a scholar's life, the essays are really aimed at the already initiated. (In the one essay specifically aimed at a wide general audience, Wendorf, formerly a professor

and a dean, past librarian of Harvard's Houghton Library and currently director and librarian of the Boston Athenaeum, felt, for some reason, that he had to mention masturbation in passing, as if winking at the groundlings.) In other essays, he could have been much more welcoming to his readers with small additions of appositives or dependent clauses, which would explain persons and concepts. A middle chapter, for instance, deals with the poetry of eighteenth-century poet William Collins; but not until a later chapter is a brief biography given, which would have made the first essay much easier to read if supplied then. Similarly, some essays refer to printing terms that are not defined until later chapters.

These small flaws detract but little from the whole effect of the book and, indeed, one almost feels gauche in mentioning them. The book is a handsome product (headbands are present on the text block in memory of the role they served in hand-bound books), and the essays illuminate their individual topics and reflect well on their author. But mostly, they provide intense satisfaction to the reader and may very well beckon the hesitant to join in the rank of scholar-librarians. When catalogued, if the book is missing from the shelf, the wise may find it open on an intrigued librarian's desk.—*Harlan Greene, Avery Research Center for African American History and Culture, College of Charleston.*