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through the sifting sands of reference." Divided into four sections, the authors cover fundamental concepts for reference and information services, an introduction to major reference sources, special topics, and developing and managing reference collections and services.

In the first section, “Fundamental Concepts,” chapter 1 introduces readers to the history of reference services and typical activities involved such as readers’ advisories, information literacy, promotion and marketing, and staff and service evaluation. Chapter 2 focuses on the reference interview, including steps to take in conducting reference interviews as well as things to avoid. The section concludes with chapter 3 on basic search techniques and common pitfalls to avoid.

Part 2, “Introduction to Major Reference Sources,” offers readers an overview of the primary resources consulted when answering “how, what, where, who, and when questions.” The authors discuss using bibliographic resources, encyclopedias, dictionaries, indexes and full-text databases, government resources, biographical resources, and more. In addition, there is a separate chapter on “Answering Questions about Health, Law, and Business.” Each chapter opens with an overview of the resources and the ways librarians can use them. All have a list of the top ten sources in the topic area as well as a list of some recommended free Web sites on the topic. Each chapter also includes a list of the recommended resources discussed in the text.

The next section deals with Special Topics in Reference and Information Work, which include using the Internet as a reference tool, Reader’s Advisory work, working with children and young adults, and information literacy. In the chapter on using the Internet, the authors include five steps to successful Internet reference and a chart of some general search engines, metasearch engines, and subject directories to use. The chapter on Reader’s Advisory looks at some common Reader’s Advisory questions and lists the top ten Reader’s Advisory tools.

The work concludes with part 4, “Developing and Managing Reference Collections and Services.” The chapters in this section discuss sources for review and evaluation of reference works, how to manage staff and services, assessment of reference services, Reference 2.0, and the future of information service. The chapter on the future looks at new service models and competencies needed for 21st-century librarians.

Cassell and Hiremath end each chapter with recommendations for further reading and a bibliography of works cited. Included in the Appendix is RUSA’s Outstanding Reference Sources 2005–2009, the association’s list of the best reference publications for small and medium-sized libraries. In addition to the subject index, the authors provide an index of reference resources described in the text. They also maintain a companion Web site at www.neal-schuman.com/reference21st2nd/.

Librarians new to reference work will find Reference and Information Services in the 21st Century a great introduction to the field. Seasoned reference librarians will find the work to be a good refresher.—Nicole Mitchell, University of Alabama.


The author makes it clear from the outset that this is a work of advocacy addressing complex ethical debates arising from the re-examination of traditional assumptions about archivists’ roles. Borrowing heavily from the views of such thinkers as Nelson Mandela and Verne Harris, and drawing from his own wide-ranging experience as historian, archivist, and former president of the Society of American Archivists, Jimerson has crafted an informed, assertive, and sensitive challenge to the profession.

There is no longer a consensus among archivists and historians regarding whether archivists are—or should be—neutral guardians of historical source materials.
Jimerson weighs in on the side of those who believe archivists should intentionally shape our knowledge of the past, arguing that such activism, exercised judiciously and impartially, is necessary if we seek as complete a picture as possible of our culture. Throughout history, the selection and preservation policies of archives have frequently favored the powerful elites in societies. Jimerson claims that archivists have a moral professional responsibility to avoid the kinds of biases that so often exist when “history is written by the winners.” Archives can and should be an important source for promoting accountability and social justice. Archivists should ensure that their selection and preservation policies include the records and stories of those who have been marginalized, thus balancing and rectifying our cultural memory.

Jimerson offers copious historical examples of how records and archives have checked totalitarian power and brought terrible injustices to light. Particularly compelling are his discussions of how the Nazi and South African apartheid governments meticulously built enormous information resources that favored their policies and philosophies, thus helping to repress their enemies. Yet ironically, many of the same archives were used to bring atrocities to public attention, return stolen property to rightful owners, and provide conclusive evidence of malfeasance.

But there are pitfalls inherent in archivists sacrificing their image of neutrality and exercising a social conscience in the pursuit of their professional responsibilities. If the archivist has been neutral in her work, doesn’t that lend legitimacy to the resulting archives? Shouldn’t we fear that our archives would still be biased, but in a different direction? Jimerson responds by emphasizing a distinction between objectivity and neutrality, in which an objective archivist strives to be fair, honest, detached, and transparent. To take one example, in the interests of transparency it would be appropriate for an archivist to provide, along with the repository’s official selection and preservation policy, notes on the reasoning the archivist used in making various decisions regarding acquisition, retention, processing, and the like.

Since archivists work in many different kinds of institutions, and, depending on the nature of his or her institution, an archivist may face certain ethical challenges not encountered by colleagues elsewhere. In institutional archives, for example, there will likely be very detailed policies governing what must be kept and for how long, how the records will be disposed at the designated time, and so forth. But in manuscript repositories, the archivist may have much more latitude in selection and in seeking out additional materials, yet be constrained by limited space, donor stipulations, and the like. An especially thorny objection to Jimerson’s recommended ethical imperatives comes from corporate archivists, whose employers may be willing to support only actions that portray the company in a favorable light or contribute to the corporate bottom line. Despite Jimerson’s examples of how organizations like the Ford Motor Company have recognized that their historical records are an essential resource for understanding social issues and have responsibly made their records available to researchers investigating ties between Ford and the Nazi government, the fact remains that private entities have the right to establish their own preservation, access, and privacy policies, and archivists in such situations may sometimes confront a choice between their employers’ directives and what the archivists believe would be more socially responsible decisions. Still, as Jimerson says, such dilemmas may arise for archivists in almost any work environment, and the purpose of his challenges for archivists to be more socially conscious is not to create a test for identifying who is or is not an ethical archivist. Jimerson is more concerned that archivists think more carefully about why they make the decisions that they do and understand the importance of defining their relationship to social and political systems of power, influence, and activism. Jimerson is less interested in establishing
new codes of ethics and more interested in encouraging archivists to continually reflect, examine, and question.

In his concluding pages, Jimerson considers further the ethical implications of being socially responsible archivists and examines the weaknesses of current codes of ethics, which he believes do not provide much guidance to practitioners. Jimerson thinks most codes fail because they attempt to articulate universal principles of action that are difficult to apply to specific situations. Instead, he recommends archivists should describe and highlight the desirable outcomes they wish to achieve on behalf of societal interests. While such an approach may be just as complicated to apply when resolving moral dilemmas, it has the virtue of helping make the resulting decisions more understandable to the layman.

There are extensive notes, but a separate bibliography of the works cited would have been a useful and efficient adjunct for the reader. Jimerson writes well, especially in light of his heavy reliance on quoting other authors. But he eschews jargon and writes clearly and enthusiastically. He has produced a clear and articulate position regarding important ethical challenges to the archival profession and has solidly defended his admirable theses.—W. Bede Mitchell, Georgia Southern University.
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William H. Brandt, an emeritus botany professor at Oregon State University, has been a collector of wood engravings for thirty years. Enthusiasts who write about a subject often lack the critical engagement of professional scholars, and their views on its relative importance tend to be myopic. Brandt largely escapes this pitfall, fortunately; and, although his enthusiasm is clear, his assertions and claims do not suffer for it.

*Interpretive Wood Engraving* focuses on the known members of the Society of American Wood-Engravers (SAWE), even though the records of the Society have not survived, and places them within the larger context of the golden age of wood engraving in publishing (1850–1900). Brandt has identified the names of twenty-nine members who belonged to the Society at its height (ca. 1890–95), and in section nine gives biographical sketches of each member along with an example of his or her work (plates 21–49). The total number of wood engravers in America peaked at over 500 in 1890; by 1905, wood engraving had lost its place as the premier form of illustration in publishing to the halftone process, which allowed photographs to be satisfactorily printed on paper along with type.

The first four sections detail the history of wood-engraving, the split between the Old and New Schools of engravers, the formation of the Society, and the competition between *Scribner’s* (later *The Century*) and *Harper’s*, and how it drove the engravers to innovation. Sections five through eight focus on specifics—the role of the Grolier Club in SAWE’s history, the portfolio the Society produced, a select bibliography of American wood-engraving, and an annotated list of exhibitions in which the Society members’ engravings have appeared (1881–2001). Brandt includes a section on collecting wood-engravings, offers a defense of the practice as an art and not merely a craft, and outlines four classes of material to collect (proofs on Japan or Indian paper, proofs on plain paper, and magazine and