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challenges, and, of course, technological design issues. But the concept, like Free Software, calls upon the members of a community to engage and contribute, not only to sustain the endeavor but also to reach a point where it is self-sustaining by its community.

But Two Bits is only partly about geeks, code, technology, or software. It’s also about the cultural significance of those elements and how they’ve influenced, and will continue to impact, the ways people work, organize, collaborate, and even think. The reader, however, must come to his own “policy prescriptions,” as such aims are beyond the scope of Two Bits, which Kelty acknowledges is more a work of history and anthropology “in the hopes that it is more lastingly usable.” Kelty’s fine book provides an anthropological basis to investigate our own practices and community.

Not only do academic libraries, and their parent institutions, often rely on Open Source software solutions, but they also initiate and support a substantial number of Open Source projects, managing, therefore, the technological hurdles and legal pitfalls, and organizing and facilitating community collaboration and communication. Libraries are, if not historically, increasingly becoming recursive publics, especially as more and more institutions (libraries) begin to tackle the technological needs of libraries today: VuFind and Scriblio in the field of OPACS; Koha and Evergreen in the Integrated Library System sector; digital library and institutional repository software; and numerous other smaller projects. These are software applications and tools designed by libraries for libraries to be used in libraries, often by librarians, who then develop modifications, and so on. This is all very recursive, and infectious.

Along his way, Kelty found himself embroiled in the very issues he was researching—a participant in the Open Source culture, a geek of sorts. Not only did Kelty participate early on with Connexions, but also Two Bits, attractively published by Duke University Press, is available under a Creative Commons license at twobits.net.—Kevin M. Ford, Columbia College Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.


This new collection of essays offers an exceptionally clear, concise, and well-organized overview of how certain higher education trends are affecting the archival profession, and how archivists might respond. Some of the trends include the need to assess and document institutional effectiveness (especially in the realm of student learning), new standards and training in digital technology, and increasing user expectations for access to digital information. There are thirteen chapters in all, grouped into four categories: “Redefining the Role of College and University Archives,” “Capturing Campus Histories,” “Managing Efficient Programs,” and “Serving Our Users.” The editors and contributors tend to be archivists or special collections librarians at major research universities, as well as members of the Society of American Archivists (SAA).

As the editors point out in their preface, there are three specific themes that run through most of these discussions of how archivists should address their challenges: the opportunities created by new technologies (which also bring new challenges), the need for collaboration with other campus units and throughout the profession, and the value of being proactive and innovative. So, for example, as Nicholas Burckel wonders in the opening chapter, could institutional effectiveness assessments be strengthened by collaboration among the members of the SAA to identify best practices in documenting student learning, followed by the development of guidelines and strategies for archivists to carry out such documen-
Or, as Helen Tibbo suggests in her essay, “The Impact of Information Technology on Academic Archives in the Twenty-first Century,” could more proactive archivists lead to a greater likelihood that adequate procedures and protocols are put into place to ensure the scientific and cultural heritage found in blogs and Web sites are preserved for future generations? Taken as a whole, this collection is a clarion call for aggressive leadership on the part of archivists, whose function is too often regarded as minor or even a luxury. Interestingly, the three themes, which are the core of Nicholas Burckel’s advice to today’s archivists in the opening chapter, “Academic Archives: Retrospect and Prospect,” are very similar to the recommendations he offered in his contribution to this book’s predecessor, College and University Archives: Selected Readings (1979). More than one author underlines this same point: for all the changes archivists have seen, most tend to be in how archivists go about achieving their core mission, not so much in the core mission itself. In as much as the contributions are uniformly provocative, thoughtful, and well-documented, I am reluctant to single out just a few chapters as examples, yet space does not allow for a summary of every chapter.

Nevertheless, I cannot resist highlighting the paper by Hyry, Kaplan, and Weideman that is reprinted from the Spring/Summer 2002 issue of American Archivist. This is an extremely useful response to a concern found in almost any university archives: how to decide what kinds of faculty papers are most appropriate for collecting in the university archives. As with the other essays in this book, readers are treated to a lucid and thorough consideration of the pragmatic and political factors that must be addressed, and are then provided with suggestions and solutions that would be feasible at most kinds of institutions. However, this may be the best place to return briefly to the fact that the contributors are all employed at research institutions. While most of the authors acknowledge where appropriate that some of their proposals may be beyond the means of smaller universities, it would have been interesting to include the perspectives of a few archivists at such institutions.

In all, a first-rate contribution to the professional literature.—W. Bede Mitchell, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, Georgia.


Over the past several years, the ways in which academic librarians have been offering reference services to their campus community has changed and evolved. Librarians have embraced the information age and its attendant technology to find innovative and creative ways to adapt and change with the times. The Desk and Beyond: Next Generation Reference Services presents a look at how 13 academic libraries have used technology to achieve these goals. It is a compilation of contributed papers on the topic of current and future trends in reference services with the use of the digital environment.

The ideas here range from the easily doable to the inventive. Yet each will prove cost-effective and liberating to academic librarians, especially those who embrace this new frontier. Libraries,