From the Editor

Librarians... the Next Generation

It is exciting to feature an article by two graduate students at the Information Sciences program at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville. John Grubb and Amy Bond are both distance learners, and their paper in this issue grew out of a project that began in class. The data, in fact, was collected from among us, members of the Tennessee Library Association, particularly subscribers to the TLA-L electronic discussion list.

One of the most satisfying experiences for any human is that of nurturing, whether of children or of new colleagues. The Tennessee Librarian is proud to nurture library students and other first-time authors in its pages.

Excited about publication opportunities for novice authors in the Tennessee Librarian? If you have an idea for an article for TL, contact Kelly Hensley or Mark Ellis, using the information on page 2 of this issue. Either will be glad to talk with you about the procedures and typical timetable for publishing an article.
Copyright Issues in Libraries: An Introduction

Diane Baird and Karin Schreier Hallett

Copyright is an issue of endless depth and complexity, particularly for libraries. As librarians we need to be aware of its implications for teaching and learning since we deal with ideas and information conveyed in copyrighted works on a daily basis. Moreover, understanding copyright in the electronic age, with new modes of communication and publication, poses additional and constantly evolving challenges. To what extent does the law enable the use of protected materials in a fair way without infringing upon the rights of authors? We cannot offer a comprehensive discussion of the topic but we can offer an introduction to the issues.

Background

Copyright is not a modern institution. The concept of copyright is over 400 years old. The protection of creative property had little impact early in history because copying was a labor-intensive, time-consuming, skilled craft that was expensive. A brief look at the history of copyright law will give us a better understanding of our current laws.

The English Stationers' Company, a membership guild that published the works of its members, was granted a Royal Charter in 1557 (Gasaway and Wiant, 5). The guild paid a lump sum to an author and the Stationers' Company held the copyright. In 1710, the Statute of Anne was enforced, which allowed the author to hold copyright for 14 years (Gasaway and Wiant, 6). In the United States, the Statute of Anne was in effect until the drafting of the U.S. Constitution by the Federal Convention. The Convention deemed it wise to provide copyright protection stating that "the Congress shall have power...to promote the progress of science and useful arts...by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive rights to their respective writings and discoveries" (Gasaway and Wiant, 7). George Washington signed the first United States Statute in 1790, thereby establishing copyright and patent rights in America. This statute was frequently amended to include new formats, new technologies, art forms, and various creative efforts and became cumbersome. In 1909, it was rewritten, prompting Mark Twain to observe, "Only one thing is impossible for God: to find any sense in any copyright law on this planet. Whenever a copyright law is to be made or altered, then the idiots assemble" (Zall, 92). The new statute included many new formats and established a term of copyright of 28 years plus a renewal of 28 years.

The last revision, in 1976, included inclusive language that would not limit format or technology (Gasaway and Wiant, 8). This revision provided a term of copyright for the life of the copyright holder plus 50 years (see http://www4.law.cornell.edu/ uscode/17/ for the text). In 1989, the United States joined the Berne Convention for international copyright protection, thereby eliminating the requirement to register a work or display a copyright notice. Two things are necessary: the work must be original and must be in a fixed, tangible medium. Any work conforming to these two principles has the potential for copyright. As recently as October 1998, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) was signed into law to update copyright law for the digital environment (to read the text of the Act, see http://www.loc.gov/copyright/legislation/hr2281.pdf).

Fair Use

Copyright law provides for the exclusive use of original works by the copyright owner. Yet, exclusive use by the owner would not do much in fostering a scholarly environment, or the exchange of ideas. Therefore, the Fair
Use Guidelines were implemented to establish a balance in the relationship between the rights of the copyright owner and the rights of the user of copyrighted works (for the text of the Guidelines, see http://www.fairuse.com lawcode.htm). Fair use assures learning is not impeded by copyright but still protects intellectual property. While fair use provides an avenue to photocopy copyrighted works for purposes of teaching, scholarship, or research, it does not allow the abuse of copyright under the guise of educational application. There are four factors that determine fair use as provided by the United States Code, and all four must apply:

- The material must be used only for educational purposes without a hint of commercialism.
- The nature of the work must lend itself to photocopying a portion of the work.
- The amount copied should represent only a portion that does not impinge on the creative aspect of the work or portion copied.
- The quality and quantity of photocopying does not affect the potential value of the work.

The Fair Use Guidelines are not quantitative specific, but model guidelines are available from most professional groups. The American Library Association (ALA) has written copyright guidelines for librarians. These guidelines address the concepts of brevity, spontaneity, cumulative effect, and prohibitions as recommended in the Fair Use Guidelines. Brevity would cover a chapter of a book, an article in a journal, a poem, or a chart; it would not be more than approximately 10 percent of the whole. Spontaneity allows the copying of material, which has just been found and is needed for effective teaching. Cumulative effect limits how much can be copied from one source or one author and curtails the number of copies and distribution of these copies. Each copy should contain a notice of copyright (ALA).

Copyright in Libraries
Reserves

Materials on reserves often are photocopies and should contain a copyright notice and complete citation. The same photocopied materials should not be distributed every term period. The copy should be free of charge except for the cost of actual photocopying. The photocopied reserve materials should not have a detrimental market impact. Generally, it is best if the library or the person reserving the material owns a copy. All requests should follow American Library Association guidelines.

Electronic reserve is a popular topic of discussion in copyright. Electronic reserves is a digital copy of text distributed and displayed at workstations providing downloading or printing of copies. The scope of material available in electronic reserves should adhere to the Fair Use Guidelines and the American Library Association guidelines http://www.columbia.edu/~rosedale/guidelines.html). Each digital photocopy should display on screen a copyright notice and citation, and caution the user against extensive distribution. Access must be limited to students and faculty by individual password, group password, course number, instructor name, or certain workstations. Restrictive language in the DMCA could further limit access to the institution’s or library’s premises. Electronic reserve items should not be stored for reuse unless copyright permission is requested.

Interlibrary Loan

Interlibrary arrangements are covered in Section 108 of the Act. Interlibrary borrowing and lending operations are expanding for practical purposes, namely to continue serving patrons in the face of decreasing library budgets and
dramatically increasing prices, particularly for serial subscriptions. Naturally, publishers, who are the copyright owners in most cases, have a vested interest in keeping the number of photocopies produced low and the number of subscriptions, in the case of serials, high. Therefore, the purpose of the CONTU Guidelines (recommendations made by the National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works, established by Congress) is to "signal a reasonable limit and indicate when a library should reinstate its own purchase of the original work" (Crews, 98). For the text of the CONTU Guidelines see http://www.cni.org/docs/infopols/CONTU.html. The CONTU Guidelines are possibly the only guidelines to actually set a practical limit to photocopying.

According to these Guidelines, the "systematic reproduction or distribution" of copies is prohibited. However, certain photocopying or reproduction of a work may be within the limits of fair use, specifically as long as the photocopying or reproduction falls under the "Rule of Five." This rule stipulates that during one calendar year, no more than five articles, published within the last five years, may be copied or reproduced from one periodical title. Also, the requesting library must indicate on the request form compliance with the CONTU Guidelines and must maintain records of all requests for photocopies or phonorecords for three years after conclusion of the calendar year. While photocopies or reproductions from articles older than five years are not addressed in the Guidelines, they must not be considered available for unlimited use. Instead, copyright law is still applicable, particularly Sections 107 and 108.

The recently enacted DMCA revised Section 108(a)(3), which concerns the notice that libraries must place on works they reproduce under the library exemption. Until recently, most libraries have been following the ALA-recommended procedure of stamping photocopies and other reproductions with the following statement: "Notice: This work may be protected by copyright." However, the revised Section 108(a)(3) now reads:

"The reproduction and distribution of the work contains a notice of copyright that appears on the copy or phonorecord that is reproduced under the provisions of this section, or includes a legend stating that the work may be protected by copyright if no such notice can be found on the copy or phonorecord that is reproduced under the provisions of this section."

According to this revision, a library must include the notice of copyright that appears on the original work by either reproducing the page that contains the notice, or by creating a rubber stamp with ©, ________ (for copyright owner), _________ (for year published) and filling in the notice information as it appears on the work. The rubber stamp with the ALA recommended statement can now only be used if the copyright owner did not place a notice of copyright anywhere on the work (Gasaway 1999, 14, 16).

There is one exception to the rule: a library engaged in a licensing agreement with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) is not required to place a copyright notice or photocopy the copyright owner's notice when reproducing an article. However, this is only true for those photocopies of copyright owners (publishers), who are registered with the CCC. For all others, libraries are still required to include a notice of copyright in the above described form.

Copyright in Digital Environments

The issue of copyright in digital environments is probably the most challenging to librarians. Technological developments force us to continuously re-examine and re-apply our understanding of the copyright statute to new formats of communication. The recent DMCA was passed in order to bring
copyright legislation into the digital age by conforming with recent World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) treaties and asserting that copyright applies in digital environments just as it applies in print media.

Like the Copyright Act of 1976, the DMCA attempts to balance the rights of the copyright owner with the needs of the user of copyrighted works. Section 103 of the DMCA adds a new chapter (Chapter 12) to Title 17 of the U.S. Code. New Section 1201 stipulates that it is a violation of U.S. law to circumvent technological measures used by copyright owners to protect their work, as well as to remove any copyright information that copyright owners affix to a digital document. This prohibition is subject to various exceptions. Of interest to librarians is the exception which "permits nonprofit libraries, archives and educational institutions to circumvent solely for the purpose of making a good faith determination as to whether they wish to obtain authorized access to the work" (US Copyright Office, 5). Also, the DMCA stipulates that nonprofit educational institutions have the right to copy and share digital documents for purposes of archiving and preservation, in accordance with Section 108.

The Internet

The Internet, for the purposes of this paper, is defined as the technology providing the means of transmitting digital formats. The current copyright act is "technology neutral" and, until revised, is the standard for using information transmitted through the Internet. Digitized materials are covered by the guidelines for fair use since they meet the two requirements for copyright: creativity and a fixed medium. The non-requirement to affix a copyright notice to an original work extends to works from all Internet services, including e-mail, gopher, telnet, or the World Wide Web. A common misconception is that material on the Internet is free when indeed material on the Internet must be considered copyrighted and not copied or distributed without permission.

In the case of Web pages, to avoid copyright infringement, possibly the best practice may be to simply link to a Web page. An Internet link generally conforms to copyright and fair use since it may be considered equivalent to a cross-reference.

Copyright infringements on the Internet should be approached much the same way as in the traditional environment. However, the recently enacted Digital Millennium Copyright Act gives the copyright owner the right to demand the Online Service Provider notify a copyright infringer to remove material from the Internet. The infringement must be removed within a given time or the online service can be denied.

Distance Education

Bielefeld and Cheeseman define distance education as a situation where "one or more students who are not in the physical presence of the teacher receive instruction through some method of technology" (Bielefeld, 135). The instruction can take place via different modes of technology, including passive video, audio, and video conferencing, the broadcasting of pictures and sound from one classroom to another via satellite transmission, or teacher-student interaction via the Internet.

Two main exemptions define permitted uses of copyrighted works in distance education situations: the Fair Use Guidelines and exemptions delineated in Section 110(2) of the Copyright Act. Because of its general language and because it is technology-neutral, Fair Use can be applied to distance education as well. Section 110(2) more specifically addresses distance education, restricting the type of work that can be performed or displayed to "a nondramatic literary or musical work." A literary work is any work other than audiovisual, meaning a motion picture, video, or computer screen display is excluded. A definition for "musical work" is not provided. For example, showing a videotape in a traditional face-to-face classroom situation is
perfectly legal. In a distance education situation, however, the instructor has to seek permission from the copyright owner each time the videotape is shown.

Many questions regarding distance learning remain unclear and legal divided. For example, is a remote site considered a classroom? Is face-to-face instruction to be taken literally (Bruwelheide, 89-90)? In the future, distance learning courses may be received in a student’s home. This, however, is not within the limits of the statute (Gasaway, Oct 1998, 43).

The delivery of educational courses via the Internet poses additional questions. Gasaway advises that in order to deliver copyrighted works via the Internet, “the institution must restrict access to enrolled students” (Gasaway, Nov 1998, 15). For inclusion of nonprint works on a course Web site, permission from the copyright owner must be obtained. However, inclusion of “short clips of these works on a protected web site may be a fair use because the copying is de minimis, but including larger portions is not likely fair use” (Gasaway, Nov 1998, 15).

Until the Copyright Act is amended “to make it clear that distance learning is the modern equivalent of face-to-face instruction” (Gasaway, Oct 1998, 43), it is better to be on the safe side and seek permissions. Bruwelheide recommends that, “Developers may also need to acquire rights to create, reproduce, and distribute any derivative works that might result from the course. Distribution rights to send materials to distant learners may need to be obtained—prior to delivery. A course developer must think ahead about possible uses that will affect distribution, transmission, and taping” (Bruwelheide, 88).

Lastly, Section 403 of the DMCA requires that the Register of Copyright consult with representatives of copyright owners, nonprofit educational institutions, and nonprofit libraries and archives, and thereafter report to Congress on “how to promote distance education through digital technologies.” The report was published May 25, 1999 (for the text, see http://www.loc.gov/copyright/copypub/de_rpt.pdf) and recommends an updating of current copyright law exemptions for distance learning, while implementing safeguards to respond to proprietor concerns. Some of the recommendations offered by the Register include: emphasize the concept of mediated instruction by ensuring that the performance or display is analogous to the performance or display that would take place in a face-to-face classroom situation, eliminate the requirement of a physical classroom and instead substitute it with a requirement for official enrollment, expand the categories of works covered, and require the performance or display to be made from a lawfully-obtained copy. Nothing is cast in stone, however, until the lawmakers have decided on how best to amend Copyright Law.

Formalities and Definitions
Copyright Notice and Registration
As mentioned earlier, since the U.S. joined the Berne Convention in 1989, registering the work with the U.S. Copyright Office and affixing a copyright notice are no longer required to protect your work from infringement. Instead, a work is automatically copyrighted as long as it is an “original work of authorship” and “fixed in any tangible medium of expression.” Yet, it would be a mistake to overlook the benefits of copyright notice and registration.
Placing the copyright notice “®” on a work not only provides important information to the reader, such as who the owner of the copyright is, it also helps prevent infringers from claiming innocence. Registering the work with the U.S. Copyright Office also provides the author with other important legal benefits (to register, go to http://www.loc.gov/copyright/reg.html). For example, if a copyright owner’s work is infringed before registration, the owner is entitled to remedies but cannot legally enforce his or her rights until the work is registered. “The copyright owner of a registered work may recover statutory damages as well as attorneys’ fees if a case goes to court. Also,
registration clearly advises the public of the copyright for a work. In most instances, registration is required prior to filing suit for infringement (Bravewellheide, 7)."

Duration of Copyright
On October 28, 1998, The Sonny Bono Copyright Term Extension Act was signed into law (see http://lcweb.loc.gov/copyright/legislation/s505.pdf). This Act extends the duration of copyright for published works created on or after January 1, 1978 by twenty years to life of the author plus seventy years. Anonymous and pseudonymous works, and works made for hire are now protected for ninety-five years from their first publication, or 120 years from their creation, whichever term expires first. A work first published more than seventy-five years ago is generally considered to be in the public domain.

Works created by U.S. Government employees during their employment are in the public domain. This, however, is not the case for works created by state and local governments, which may claim copyright.

Similarly, unpublished works created on or after January 1, 1978 are protected for the life of the author plus seventy years. "Unpublished works might include diaries, letters, survey responses, manuscripts, photographs, art, or software - any type of work that has not been distributed to the public in copies" (Crews, March 4, 1998). In the case of unpublished works created before January 1, 1978, however, the copyright will not expire before December 31, 2002. "Until then, the privileges of copyright and the limits of fair use apply to unpublished manuscripts, letters, and diaries of even America’s leading historical figures" (Crews, March 4, 1998). Unpublished works created on or before January 1, 1978, which are published between then and December 31, 2002 are protected for the life of the author plus 70 years, or until December 31, 2047, whichever is greater.

Copyright Ownership
The person who does the creative work is considered the copyright owner, unless the "work is made for hire." In such cases, the employer rather than the creator is considered the author and copyright owner. Independent contractors are not considered employees and therefore likely retain copyright ownership (Crews, Mar 6, 1999). Copyright ownership comes with the following exclusive rights, granted by the Copyright Act, which last for a specified time period (see above):

- The right to reproduce or copy the work
- The right to prepare derivative works
- The right to distribute copies or phonorecords of the work to the public
- The right to publicly perform the work (in the case of an audiovisual work)
- The right to publicly display the work (in the case of a literary, musical, dramatic, or choreographic work, a pantomime, or a pictorial, graphic or sculptural work)

Requesting Permission from the Copyright Owner
In order to use other people’s copyrighted works, written permission must be obtained. First and foremost, the correct copyright owner must be identified, while keeping in mind that copyrights may be sold or given away. A permission letter should include a description of the material to be used and a detailed explanation of how it will be used. It should also include a place for the recipient to sign indicating that permission is granted. An affirmative response must be received, otherwise permission cannot be considered granted.

Liability
Chapter 5 of the Copyright Act deals with the remedies for infringement. Remedies afforded a copyright owner are injunction, impounding or destruction of the copies and the equipment used to produce the copies, and
recovery of all costs, including attorney’s fees. Monetary remedies may also be awarded. KNOWINGLY infringing on the rights of the copyright owner in a manner not within their fair use may result in legal action. If found guilty, penalties can range anywhere from $500 to $20,000 per work infringed upon and up to $100,000 for willful, or knowledgeable infringement. DAMAGES for “innocent” infringement may be $200, or even remitted for employees of educational institutions. “The courts shall remit statutory damages in any case where an infringer believed and had reasonable grounds for believing that his or her use of the copyrighted work was a fair use under section 107. If the infringer was: (1) an employee or agent of a nonprofit education institution, library, or archives acting within the scope of his or her employment…” In the case of willful infringement, the infringer may be criminally liable. In 1997, Congress amended the Copyright Act, adding tougher criminal liabilities for willful infringement, particularly in electronic media.

**Conclusion**

Libraries support or make possible the conveyance of information from one party to others. Libraries, therefore, are particularly vulnerable to copyright infringement, making awareness of copyright law vital for all librarians. The Copyright Law is intended to balance the interests of copyright owners with the interests of the users of copyrighted material. The Fair Use Guidelines are particularly relevant for “nonprofit educational purposes.” They assure the use of information for appropriate purposes, even without the permission of the copyright owner. This does not mean, however, that librarians can violate copyright law. Rather, the following general guidelines must be considered before taking action: always apply the Fair Use Guidelines, always secure the copyright owner’s permission when in doubt, and, if necessary, seek alternatives. In addition, consider seeking legal advice and document that you have done so. Check institution policies or guidelines on copyright. Always act in good faith and use common sense. In short, you protect yourself best by erring in favor of the copyright owner.

Changes in the information world continually challenge interpretations of copyright law. Therefore, we must stay current on legislation, particularly as formats for communication of ideas become more sophisticated. For a topic of endless depth such as copyright, there is an equally endless amount of information published. A suggested list of ready-reference sources follows this article.

**References**


Suggested List of Sources

Books


18. Tennessee Librarian 50(4) Spring 1999
Articles


World Wide Web Sources

American Association of Law Libraries (AALL)
http://www.aallnet.org/committee/copyright/

American College and Research Libraries (ACRL): Copyright Committee
http://www.library.cmu.edu/Unofficial/ACRL.
ACRL's charge is "To elicit the concerns of ACRL members on copyright and to gather information about copyright issues that impinge upon academic libraries; to bring before the ACRL Board issues and problems that may require legal action or interpretation on the part of ACRL; to represent ACRL when necessary in forums about copyright; to work with and appoint liaison to ACRL Government Relations Committee, ALA's Copyright Subcommittee.
invite solutions to the myriad of copyright tangles that currently permeate the Web..."

Cornell University Law School, Legal Information Institute
http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/
Links to the text of the Copyright Act of 1976 (Title 17 of the U.S. Code).
Section entitled "Law About...Intellectual Property" provides a good overview and links to many sources, including international sources.

Digital Millennium Copyright Act (October 1998)
http://www.loc.gov/copyright/legislation/hr2281.pdf

Fair Use: An Online Guide for Educators by Russell Smith
http://www.fairuse.com

Franklin Pierce Law Center; Intellectual Property Mall
http://www.ipmall.fplc.edu
Provides information on all legal aspects of intellectual property. Covers copyright issues and copyrights. Allows posting and viewing of topics of interest. Provides links to copyright policies of academic libraries.

ILT Guide to Copyright
The Institute of Learning Technologies (ILT) offers a wealth of information, including a section entitled "Copyright and the Library."

Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis: Copyright Management Center
http://www.iupui.edu/~copyinfo
Covers all aspects of copyright, fair use, distance education, and library-related issues in the academic environment.

International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA):
Position Paper on Copyright in the Electronic Environment
http://www.ifla.org/V/0epl/copy.htm

Manning and Napier Information Services: IpFrontline (Recent News, Trends, Technologies, and Legislation)
http://www.ip.com/ipfrontline/
Information about current issues and litigation involving intellectual property. See section titled The 10 Big Myths about Copyright Explained under the link "Copyright Information" in particular.
National Commission on New Technological Uses of Copyrighted Works (CONTU) Guidelines
http://www.cni.org/docs/infopolis/CONTU.html

Sonny Bono Copyright Term Extension Act
http://lcweb.loc.gov/copyright/legislation/s505.pdf

Special Libraries Association (SLA): Selected References on Copyright and Special Libraries
http://www.sla.org/membership/sc/copyright.html
Reading list covering most aspects of copyright in library management.

Special Libraries Association: Current U.S. Copyright Activities
http://www.sla.org/govt/digital.html
Information about and analysis of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act.

Stanford University Libraries: Copyright and Fair Use
http://fairuse.stanford.edu
Discusses the legal meaning of fair use. Links to primary materials, including statutes, judicial opinions, regulations, treaties, and conventions are provided, as well as links to current legislation, cases, and issues. Also links to related Web sites and electronic mailing lists, electronic documents concerned with library copyright issues. A helpful overview of copyright law is also provided, including a "Fair Use Test" and a Timeline History of Copyright in the U.S. from the Association of Research Libraries.

University of Texas
http://www.utsystem.edu/OGC/intellectualproperty/cprtindex.htm
A crash course in copyright covers the basics. Links to national and international copyright laws, including U.S., Berne Convention, WIPO, Japan, and more.

U.S. Copyright Office
http://lcweb.loc.gov/copyright
This site is part of the Library of Congress' Web site. Link to the history and work of the office and to recently passed and pending legislation. The "What's New" section provides recent press releases, speeches and testimony. There are also links to general information and publications of the Copyright Office. Don't miss the link "Copyright Basics" to find the full-text of information circulars (see Circular 21 in particular, "Reproductions of Copyrighted Works by Educators and Librarians").

U.S. House of Representatives Internet Law Library/Intellectual Property:
Copyrights
http://law.house.gov/325.htm
Links to national and international copyright laws.

World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)
http://www.wipo.org
Link from "Intellectual Property" to information about international copyright issues, including "Copyright and Neighboring Rights", "Text of WIPO-Administered Treaties", and "International Protection".

Guidelines

American Library Association: Model Policy Concerning College and University Photocopying
Gopher://ala.ala.org/70/00/alagophix/50403001.document

Classroom Photocopying, Music, Off-Air Recording
http://www.musiclibraryassoc.org/Copyright/

Classroom Use of Videotapes and Computers Software
http://www.ifla.org/documents/infopol/copyright/ala-1.txt

Ethical and Legal Use of Software
http://www.ifla.org/documents/infopol/copyright/educom.txt

Fair Use Guidelines for Educational Multimedia
http://www.libraries.psu.edu/avs/fairuse/guidelinesdoc.html

Guidelines for Electronic Reserves Systems (Memorandum)
http://www.columbia.edu/~rosendale/guidelines.html

UCLA: Library Copyright Policy
http://www2.library.ucla.edu/copyright/toc.htm
Internet Filtering: A pilot study of Tennessee public librarians' attitudes

John Grubb and Amy Bond

Introduction

Internet content has become a controversial topic in recent times. Just as the codex and the printing press made new things possible, the Internet is changing the world. For some there is an optimism that surpasses any problems that may arise; others have serious misgivings about the outcome of the information age. Where is the middle ground in this issue for our society? More specifically, where is the middle ground for our profession? How do practicing librarians in administration and on the front lines see this issue? What experiences have they had? Is there a dichotomy between their practice and attitudes? These questions would shed light on how the profession is coping with reality after philosophy and legality have been discussed and await trial.

The history of this controversy began with a July 1995 article in *Time* on the prevalence of pornography on the Internet. The shocking expose opened with a picture of a naked man wrapped around a computer and sitting on a keyboard. No less shocking was the report of widespread smut and perversion that followed, including the story of a 10 year-old boy who received email from a stranger containing pornography (Elmer-Dewitt).

New technologies have traditionally been used as channels of sexually explicit material. The telephone, satellite systems, videocassettes and CD-ROMs have all been used for this purpose. As soon as there were cross-platform graphic format bulletin board systems (BBS), they began doing big business with original and pirated pornographic images. Before the graphic capabilities of the Web, an extended amount of time was required to download images, sometimes in several parts. The viewing software was also a separate part of the puzzle. It required patience and technological savvy to view any image. So what changed? The Web brought the Internet into the public square in a dynamic and new way. Software is now continuouly easier to acquire, install, and use (Cisler).

A sidebar report to the *Time* article mentioned above was the first presentation of the idea of filtering software for the Internet on a national level. It introduced SurfWatch as a filtering product for home computers that blocked Internet sites. SurfWatch operated on lists of pornography sites. It was at that time a favored approach by libertarians that feared Congress might otherwise impede pornography on the Internet. The article also discussed Net Nanny that operated by phrase recognition and was intended to prevent children from talking with strangers in chat rooms. Net Nanny could pull the plug and shut down the software if it detected a phrase from its phrase book, e.g. "Where do you live?" (Quittner)

The chronicle of the past four years of controversy records lawsuits, the founding of grassroots organizations, and incendiary editorials. The posturing on First Amendment issues and common sense decency has pushed some to right and left wing extremes, sometimes leaving no apparent common ground. What has been the effect on the library profession? There have been no substantive efforts to date to measure the repercussions of content issues on libraries. Public libraries bear a particular burden. Other types of libraries have mission statements or service policies that are not aimed at the general public. School libraries must operate in loco parentis and thus have to meet expectations about content and learning. Academic libraries deal almost exclusively with students who are adults. Special libraries are usually focused on a particular subject or industry that excludes expectations of free access to
the Internet. Public libraries share none of the qualities that limit Internet access by virtue of mission statement or service group.

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to survey Tennessee public librarians regarding their attitudes toward the Internet and filtering. The majority of responses came from librarians serving as directors and managers. Thus, the results assessed below reflect the attitudes of Tennessee public library administrators. The study also looks for correlations through demographic data about the librarians’ credentials and institutional practices.

Librarians are largely responsible for guiding the policies at their respective institutions. While a library board or strong community movement may blur this rule, it holds that policies are some measure of the library professionals’ thoughts as a whole. Are there some identifiable indicators that might be connected to attitudes? Do librarians’ attitudes differ by education, i.e. whether or not they hold an MLS degree?

How informed are the librarians? Are they aware of the American Library Association’s official statements? Are they aware of the pro-filtering arguments? In this context, the following research questions are asked:

1. How aware are Tennessee public librarians of the issues surrounding filtering?
2. What are the attitudes of Tennessee public librarians regarding filtering?
3. Is there a correlation between demographic data and attitudes among Tennessee public librarians?

Definition of terms

There are two pivotal terms that must be operationally defined for this study.

Internet filtering – Software used to limit access to the Internet. A vendor, an association of libraries, or a local library system may establish the criteria. The software can limit access by providing pre-selected sites or by using a list of terms, IP addresses, or graphic selection to select sites to block.

This will provide a nominal measure of whether or not the activity was in fact considered filtering for the purpose of the study. Not all will see pre-selection as filtering, but this study uses a broader view to include anything that intervenes between a patron and the Internet.

Tennessee public librarian – A person holding a professional job in a Tennessee public library. The job may or may not require an MLS or equivalent, Tennessee certification, some college experience or other experience. The main criterion is that the person must be responsible for discharging at least one professional duty such as administration, management, cataloging, circulation, or reference. This should be determined from the point of view of the job description/classification and not the employee.

This definition will provide a nominal measure. Of course there is some gray area in the definition given that many library staff often perform professional duties unofficially and may feel that they are professionals by default. The state of Tennessee, in its criteria for full service libraries, does not require an MLS degree for librarians until the size of population served reaches 25,000.

A thorough search of DIALOG found no viable survey or other type assessment of librarians’ attitudes toward filtering. There is a body of material regarding the practices of libraries, but not the attitudes of librarians. Nevertheless, there is research that does speak to this topic. There have been many good efforts to assess attitudes among librarians for censorship, changing media, changing services, and a host of other topics.
Based on an earlier study by Jerry Kuntz, The Internet Filter Assessment Project (TIFAP) has been the best study to date in gauging how filters work and under what conditions they are most effective. The coordinator of the study, Karen G. Schneider, published her findings in the book, *A Practical Guide to Internet Filters*. TIFAP studied how different filtering products work on different levels of access; it was not a scientific comparison of whether filters are better than open access.

The following statistics from TIFAP are most pertinent to this study. Working from a list of questions established earlier in the project, each librarian was asked whether they personally would want a complete or conditional block on the pages retrieved. Over 10% of the time, librarians said they would want a retrieved site to be blocked. This is a rather surprising statistic. Of the sites that would be blocked by librarians’ preferences, 84% of them were pornographic. Other sites would be deselected for a variety of reasons, but pornography was overwhelmingly objectionable to these information professionals (Schneider).

Internet access has grown at an incredible rate since the coming of the World Wide Web. According to the 1998 National Survey of U.S. Public Library Outlet Internet Connectivity, nine out of ten public libraries are connected to the Internet. Seven out of ten libraries offer public access. Of those libraries offering public access, seven out of ten have an acceptable use policy in place and do not filter. Libraries offer public access with filtering almost 15 percent of the time. A significant number of libraries have no policies and do not filter at this time, roughly 14 percent. Internet access speed varies among libraries and some access is text-only (Bertot).

A survey of Ohio libraries was distributed via an electronic list for OPLIN (Ohio Public Library Information Network). The statistics showed a 17% filtering rate, similar to the results of studies done on a national level. The favored method of content control, over 70%, was the “tap on the shoulder” policy. One surprising find was that larger libraries are the ones that tend to filter. Only 10% of the respondents reported the use of privacy screens so that others were less likely to inadvertently observe the material being viewed (Hagloch).

The National and OPLIN surveys show that many libraries are managing access to Internet content to some degree. Far from the ALA proposal of unfettered access and privacy screens, most libraries maintain some form of accountability for how patrons use the Internet. This appears to agree with the above conclusions about censorship and attitudes as measured over the last four decades.

This study requested only demographic information about each librarian and their institution in order to explore causation. It includes in the form of a Likert scale questions regarding intellectual freedom, children’s access, pornography, and the experiences of the participants.

This study was conducted via three email listservs: TNLIBTEC (the official channel of communication regarding information technology between the Tennessee State Library and Archives and public libraries around the state), TLA-L (the official channel of communication for the Tennessee Library Association), and the Tennessee Paraprofessional listserv (the channel of communication for paraprofessionals in Tennessee). Our thanks to the moderators of the lists, respectively James Houston, Bill Robinson, and Jamie McGranahan, for their permission to distribute the survey through these channels. The resulting responses are random, though not a random sample in real terms. By using these channels the results are skewed in the direction of libraries and librarians who use e-mail and embrace technology. The instrument (See Appendix A) was distributed on the listservs in February-March 1999.

Tennessee classes libraries into seven categories using a variety of criteria. Because the size of the library determines state standards for librarian
qualifications, the use of size/type creates a simultaneous homogeneity with regard to MLS requirements. Librarians in Community and Full Service Libraries (Levels 1-3) are not required to possess an MLS; librarians in Metropolitan and Full Service Libraries (Levels 4-5) are required to possess an MLS.

Results

The final tally of participating libraries for this study amounted to 46 institutions. For a look at the survey instrument with tabulated results see Appendix A. Unfortunately not all questions were answered, so in some places the results do not add up to full participation. Given that there are a little over 300 public libraries in Tennessee this indicates approximately 15% of the public libraries took part. The only category not represented in our final results is that of Community Libraries, the smallest libraries that do not meet the minimal requirements to be classified as a full service library. Librarians from all full service categories and three of the four metropolitan libraries responded to the survey.

The average library, as represented in the survey, serves a population between 10,000 - 49,999. It offers Internet access of some sort and has an acceptable use policy in place. Seventy-five percent of the time the user must present identification, a library card, or sign a form to use the Internet. If the user is under 18 years of age, about 75% of the time parental consent is required to use the Internet.

The vast majority of libraries do not filter adult or child access to the Internet but two out of three will ask the user to leave any objectionable site visited. A small minority, 7 of the 46 responding, leaves users completely unattended on the Net. Some respondents noted that although patrons are left unattended for the most part, computer monitors are placed in locations visible to library staff.

The average respondent has worked in the library between 11-20 years, is female, and works in administration or supervises a branch library. The respondent has almost a 50% chance of having earned a Master's degree but not necessarily through an ALA-accredited program. More than likely she will belong to the Tennessee Library Association and may also belong to the American Library Association or have a regional affiliation. She is between 40-59 years of age and uses the Internet daily, finding information for herself and others.

How aware are Tennessee public librarians of the issues surrounding filtering? A majority of the librarians responding to the survey do not feel well-informed by the information about filtering that they have read. This is in spite of the fact that more than 80% acknowledge that they have read information about filtering which has been presented in both negative and positive ways.

What are the attitudes of Tennessee public librarians regarding filtering? About half the librarians consider Internet filtering an option. This is higher than what might be suggested by the statistics cited in the review of literature indicating that only 15% of libraries filter. This observation is also interesting since the overwhelming majority of librarians responding to this survey work in libraries that do not filter either adult or child access. Recognition of filtering as an option versus the institution of filtering in professional practice suggests that a dichotomy exists between thought on the subject and the reality of practice.

About 60% of the librarians who expressed an opinion think the entire content of the Internet should be offered to the public. Six respondents had no opinion. Should library staff intervene to prevent objectionable material from being viewed? Contrary to the previous response about offering the entire content, 60% of those with an opinion favored intervention. Significantly, however, a larger portion of respondents did not respond to the question.
(29%). When asked whether libraries should arrange privacy screens for users of the Internet, most librarians disagreed (by a margin of 2 to 1). But many were undecided on this tactic (14 not decided).

The hot buttons of this issue usually surround children and illegal content on the Web. Thirty-one respondents disagreed (15 of them strongly) with the statement ‘Children should be given unsupervised access to the Internet without filtering’. Nearly as strong a reaction was drawn from the statement that Internet content should be regulated before it reaches the library. Overwhelmingly the librarians disagreed. Ironically an equally strong opinion was expressed that no library has sufficient resources to monitor Internet usage. There are contradictory feelings in these responses that say children need to be monitored and protected, while the Internet must be free from restraint. Between these hangs the issue of stewardship because libraries are not able to act as constant intermediaries. The strongest rallying point was the attitudes about opposition to mandated filtering. Here the librarians were the most united in opinion. 82% thought that no library should have to accept public or private funds that require Internet filtering.

Is there a correlation between demographic data and attitudes among Tennessee public librarians? Almost 50% of the respondents (21 of the 46 total) hold Masters degrees. The responses from those holding a graduate degree reflect a division regarding thought about filtering and practice. The librarians with advanced degrees are nearly evenly divided over the issue of Internet filtering as an option. The same basic split holds true for this segment regardless of the ALA-accredited status of the Masters degree earned. Out of the 21, 12 (57%) disagree that Internet filtering is an acceptable option, 7 (33%) agree, and 2 (10%) did not express an opinion on either side of the issue. There is no appreciable difference in this small sample when controlling for education.

Librarians’ comments

Nearly 3 out of 4 librarians had some experience that made them evaluate their position about Internet usage and content. Many added brief comments about their experience or position in general. The comments that follow express the spectrum of experience shared through this survey:

“...The only reason I would tap a person on the shoulder about something they were viewing on the screen was if it had to do with nudity . . . If people are interested in pornographic material, I wish them the best of luck and they can go to the local appropriate bookstore where they may spend their own money.”

“It is my opinion that the Internet is a valuable tool that opens many doors to everyone but especially to the patrons of a small town library . . . Unfortunately most people only hear the horror stories about what someone has found on the Internet. They don’t hear about the thousands of stories everyday of questions answered and horizons broadened.”

“Government officials should support and regulate a red-light zoning area on the Internet in the same way they regulate alcohol, tobacco, firearms, gambling, and pornography in the world at large.”

“I am a librarian. I believe in freedom of information. I do not feel it is a librarian’s responsibility to monitor a parent’s children. It is a parent’s responsibility to be responsible for their children.”
"...I do not want to see the library become a place where adults come to view pornography. I believe that activity should not take place in any public setting nor should tax dollars be used to support it."

Conclusions

It is a significant finding that there seems to be a dichotomy between the librarians' more liberal opinions regarding filtering, and their practice, especially with children, which is much more conservative. This tension is the core finding of this pilot study. Although this study attempts to identify causative factors affecting librarians' beliefs and practices regarding issues of Internet filtering, it must be acknowledged that the overall response rate (15%) may not be significantly indicative of statewide opinion. In fact there is no way to verify how many institutions did receive the survey.

The issue of Internet filtering has the potential to be volatile in any public forum. The low overall response rate and the individual rate at which some questions were simply not answered could indicate a degree of discomfort either with the survey tool or perhaps the subject in general. With the court cases and posturing surrounding this issue, it may be that librarians feel the issue is so charged that they do not want to get involved.

The conclusions based on this research are descriptive. However, if research in this area is pursued, consistent results could indicate a need for better communication or continuing education about content and filtering issues. It may be that the tension between access and responsibility will be unresolved, but this cannot be determined without some examination of existing attitudes and how they were formed. It is hoped that the results of this study, even prior to later confirmation, will result in a renewed interest about the role of the library and librarian outside the realm of politics.

Future research on this topic could be an area of fruitful endeavor. A comprehensive text of the filtering controversy so far would make an interesting venture. There may be cause to replicate the study in other areas and for other institutions, particularly with an expanded instrument and stratified sampling. The testing of indicators may reveal a fuller picture of what is shaping the decisions of the profession. Case studies and in-depth interviews would give a more detailed approach on a personal level. A related study could use unobtrusive methodology to study the relationship between library position and application of acceptable use policies. There have been no scientific studies conducted on the effectiveness of filters using control groups. Alternately, there have been no studies on the effectiveness of pre-selection for public libraries.

As stated at the end of the literature review, it was expected that the study would show that librarians profess a high degree of intellectual freedom. Along with this commitment librarians employ filtering or policy measures to maintain some control over how the Internet is used by patrons within the library itself. The results of this research confirm an observation in keeping with previous results of research on intellectual freedom/censorship issues, there is a minority of librarians at either end of the spectrum of thought. Most librarians are moderate about Internet content, wanting the greatest amount of freedom possible without jeopardizing the library's standing as a public good of the community or compromising the safety of children. The librarians recognize a measure of accountability that tempers intellectual freedom with community standards.

Fiske studied the practices of school and public librarians in California in 1959. This landmark study showed that many librarians frequently censored in the selection process rather than face unpleasant challenges to the collection (Fiske). Busha authored a powerful study on the attitudes of Midwestern librarians towards censorship in the early 70s. Busha established that 14% of librarians were pro-censorship while 22% expressed strong anti-censorship attitudes. The remaining 64% showed a moderate attitude toward censorship.
that seemed to conflict with the intellectual freedom principles contained in the Freedom to Read statement and the Library Bill of Rights (Busha). A 1995 report by the Public Library Association revealed that public librarians espouse intellectual freedom but temper it when selecting materials or dealing with the public. In contrast to a practice of fighting all censors, libraries take community complaints seriously and weigh the arguments against items individually (Wirth).

Weighing these studies spanning nearly forty years, it would be reasonable to assume that librarians’ practices are unchanged. Anti-censorship, or intellectual freedom, is an ideal that is upheld in the profession and tempered by realism in practice. In looking at content issues on the Internet, it should hold that librarians would claim intellectual freedom in principle but conform largely to community standards of what is and is not considered objectionable material.
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Several years ago I was asked to review a new publication titled *Tennessee History: A Bibliography* (1974) by Sam B. Smith. I did so, enjoying the process immensely, and predicted that we would use that publication daily. I am equally pleased to review the current *A Bibliography of Tennessee History, 1973-1996* edited by W. Calvin Dickinson and Eloise R. Hitchcock. This work is a companion volume to be used with Smith’s, which covers publications up to 1972. The update was predicted and necessary due to the tremendous amount of material on Tennessee published since that time.

The editors appear to make a good pair and certainly have good credentials. W. Calvin Dickinson is currently a professor of history at Tennessee Technological University in Cookeville. Eloise R. Hitchcock is the Head Reference Librarian at Jessie Ball duPont Library at the University of the South in Sewanee.

The new work has 6000 bibliographic entries which cover a broad scope of topics, some never previously used such as women, African-Americans and twentieth century music. The literature section has a good sampling of twentieth century writers on Tennessee. It would make a good buying guide to books for Tennessee libraries. The editors state that genealogy is not included unless it contained extensive information relating to the state’s history. This I hold to be a valid decision. However, even genealogical libraries will find the county bibliographies useful.

The editors have used the same divisions that Smith used plus several newer topics. Smith’s work includes 18 periodical titles, theses, and monographs in 6000 entries. Bibliographies are divided by county so you can readily limit your search. The current Bibliography also includes periodicals, theses, dissertations, and monographs. It gives abbreviations for seven periodical titles frequently cited. If you compare the bibliographies, you will find that Smith’s work is not duplicated. The two volumes cover 200 years of Tennessee history which gives them a Bicentennial flavor.

I found the arrangement of the contents familiar and easy to use. The subject index is especially helpful. I like the entries that include more than just proper names such as civil rights, gunboats, inns and taverns, log construction and medical history. You can also find citations to Amy Grant and Oprah Winfrey.

Who should own it? Anyone with an interest in Tennessee history. As for libraries who should purchase it, I cannot conceive of one in Tennessee (except elementary schools) that would not find it useful. Certainly the large universities will want it for their research collection, the public libraries for their special collections (local history) and even the high school libraries, especially the larger ones, would find it helpful for their students who do research or reading on Tennessee’s history. On a national basis those universities with an emphasis on Tennessee in their courses cannot afford to be without it. It merits a place on your own bookshelf.

Having compiled the *Tennessee Librarian*’s annual “Tennessee Bibliography” for thirteen years, and two small bibliographies, I know first-hand what a tedious and time-consuming task this can be. Perhaps thereby I more fully appreciate this book. So my hat goes off to the compilers, Dickinson and Hitchcock, who deserve special commendation for *A Bibliography of Tennessee History, 1973-1996.*
Bibliography of Tennessee History, 1973-1996. Librarians and researchers will be using it for a long time to come.

Mary Glenn Hearne
Manager, Nashville Room
Public Library of Nashville/Davidson County


Conceived by the Tennessee Bicentennial Commission, funded in part by the Tennessee General Assembly, and brought to fruition by the Tennessee Historical Commission, the Tennessee Encyclopedia of History and Culture is a comprehensive reference work on the important issues, events, places, and personalities of our state. With editorial support from Middle Tennessee's Center for Historic Preservation, scholars, experts and financial sponsors from throughout Tennessee contributed to the creation of this great resource. As stated in the foreword, "The Tennessee Encyclopedia of History and Culture has been written by and for the people of Tennessee and those who love her."

The book opens with an insightful essay written by Wilma Dykeman, Tennessee State Historian, and Dykeman Stokely entitled, "This Land Called Tennessee." The article explores the history and meaning of Tennessee and examines the "questing spirit" of its people.

The Encyclopedia's entries include biographical essays on such diverse figures as Cherokee leader Dragging Canoe, suffragist Anne Dallas Dudley, abolitionist Elihu Embree, educator Julia Britton Hooks, and many more fascinating Tennesseans who have made significant contributions to our state's history. Broader entries include articles on county histories, historical events such as the Scopes Trial and the formation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, important businesses including those in the entertainment industry, prominent architectural sites, and military engagements from the early frontier and the Civil War, as well as an array of political, social and cultural issues. There are informative and thoughtful articles on "Libraries in Tennessee," "John Trotwood and Mary Daniel Moore," "Tennessee State Library and Archives," and other topics related to library history in the state. Each essay provides a thorough overview of the topic, including factual information and a discussion of its historical significance. Many of the articles provide cross-references to related entries, as well as bibliographic citations to suggested readings. The Encyclopedia concludes with a very helpful index leading to information on subjects discussed within the main entries.

The Tennessee Encyclopedia of History and Culture is an admirable accomplishment. As expressed by the editor, "This work encapsulates how we see ourselves at the end of the twentieth century, and we trust it will provide useful guideposts for our course into the twenty-first century." It is fascinating book to read for general interest as well as a valuable reference work for every library in Tennessee.

Eloise R. Hitchcock
Jessie Ball duPont Library
University of the South
Sewanee, TN
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Jensen, Joli.

Jensen, an associate professor of Communications at the University of Tulsa, has written an engaging exploration of the culture surrounding country music during the Nashville Sound era of the 1950s and '60s. She focuses on the conflict within country music between "authenticity", or a sound that reflects what "real" country fans want to hear, and "commercialization", the manipulation of music using technology in order to appeal to a wider population.

Noteworthy in the book is a chapter devoted to the career of Patsy Cline, who in many ways embodied the authenticity/commercialization conflict. Cline saw herself as a country singer and in the early years of her career dressed in cowgirl-style outfits and gave rousing performances in honky-tongs. As she moved into studio recording, however, she was encouraged to sing ballads, and in a more pop-oriented style, which she resisted, but which yielded her most memorable recordings like "Crazy" and "I Fall to Pieces."

The Nashville Sound is a book about music, but does not explore songs or artists of the era (with the exception of Cline) in detail. Instead, Jensen examines the reasons for the development of the new, "uptown" sound in country music: the genre's response to the rise of rock 'n roll, the increase in the use of technology to create recordings, and the new importance of radio play to sell records.

Jensen overturns many assumptions about the reasons for the development of the Nashville Sound, including the notion that country music was "forced" to develop more of a pop sound to compete with rock 'n roll. Her conclusions offer a fresh, alternative way to understand the Nashville Sound era, as well as a new way to think about the continuing evolution of country music.

The Nashville Sound includes photographs of some musicians and producers of the era, extensive research notes and bibliography, and an index. The book is a product of scholarly research, but is written in a straightforward, clear style. Recommended for academic libraries and libraries with strong music collections.

April Purcell
Extension Services Librarian
Austin Peay State University

Bergeron, Paul H., Stephen V. Ash, and Jeanette Keith.
Tennesseans and their history.
Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1999

Tennesseans and their history, by Paul H. Bergeron, Stephen V. Ash, and Jeanette Keith, surveys the history of Tennessee from the days of its earliest indigenous inhabitants to the 1990's. This informative and engaging book clearly is intended as a basic college-level textbook, but also will appeal to the general reader with an interest in Tennessee history. The authors examine the early settlements, the frontier and statehood, the Antebellum period, slavery, the Civil War, Reconstruction, the New South, the reform period, the Depression, World War II, the Civil Rights era, and beyond.

While "great men" are prominent in the book, the authors do not slight the stories of common people and the role of women and people of color in Tennessee history. Along with the accomplishment of such eminent figures as John Sevier, Andrew Jackson, and Martin Luther King, readers encounter lesser known individuals such as Nancy Ward (Nanye'hi) and Samuel McElwee. Ward was one of the last of the Cherokee "Agehyagusta," women who had decision-making authority in tribal matters, and a strong advocate of peace between Indians and whites. McElwee was a black Republican State
Representative who introduced antilynching legislation to the General Assembly in 1887. Although he achieved national prominence, after the enactment of Jim Crow laws, he was forced to flee his Tennessee home for Chicago by a mob of angry white Democrats.

As the title implies, one of the strengths of Tennesseans and their history is its emphasis on social history giving the reader insight into the daily activities of the ordinary Tennesseans whose lives formed the backdrop for notable historic events. The authors recount well-known Civil War battles and lesser know facts of civilian unemployment, inflation, housing and food shortages, and the displacement of war refugees during the Union occupation. While scholarly in nature, the book contains many historical tidbits to hold the interest of the lay reader. Daniel Boone shunned coonskin caps in favor of hats. During the Civil War, Nashville’s “Smoky Row” was the site of the first legalized prostitution in America. John Scopes, of the Scopes Monkey Trial fame, was not a biology teacher and “was not sure that he had ever taught evolution.”

This well-written book is illustrated, contains numerous sidebars of interesting information, and has a comprehensive index. The authors suggest additional reading at the close of each chapter. Tennesseans and their history deserves to be on the shelves of all academic and public libraries with a collections in Tennessee history as it is both a scholarly work deserving of attention and an entertaining read.

Deborah Fetch
Woodward Library
Austin Peay State University
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