

those taken elsewhere in the United States. Midwestern land-grant universities, for example, are seen as trying to be “all things to all people, incorporating not only the goals of a research university, but also the educational responsibilities and admissions standards of a junior college, including vocational training.” Likewise, postwar approaches to institutional coordination such as the State University of New York system are seen as belated attempts to enforce order from the top down on a “happy anarchy” of historically unrelated colleges and universities. Although there is an inevitable air of boosterism about this work, Douglass’s arguments concerning the unique approach to public higher education taken in California during the past century are persuasive.

Also significant is the way in which the present work complements and extends earlier studies in the history of education. Douglass’s history of educational policymaking at the state level is valuable, and it extends familiar arguments about support for K–12 public education to the postsecondary level. Likewise, his analysis of the influence of Progressive-era movements, both in political and educational reform, on the evolution of the California Idea builds on earlier work focusing on K–12 education (e.g., Tyack’s *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education*, 1974). Douglass’s analysis of the historical relationship among public investment in accessible higher education, individual socioeconomic mobility, and state and regional economic growth not only builds on earlier work, but also has important implications for contemporary debates on educational policy.

One thing that I have always remembered about the brief period of my childhood spent in southern California is that my mother never worried about how she would afford the higher education we both knew I would eventually obtain. Everyone went to college in California, my mother told me, and it was virtually free. My memory is undoubtedly colored

by the fact that I was only ten years old at the time, but my mind turned back to those days more than once as I read Douglass’s richly researched history of higher education in California. As he writes in his Introduction, “Access to a public higher education ... [was] an important facet in the lives of Californians. It profoundly shaped their aspirations and, ultimately, their views on what it meant to be Californian.”

More than once, I have encountered the brilliant products of California state schools and wondered about the development of its unusual system of higher education. This study answers a number of questions about how California has gotten to its present point in the provision of public higher education. Although many will undoubtedly question the overwhelmingly positive portrayal of the California state system as described by Douglass, its significance to programs in history of education, higher education, and public policy ensures its value for any academic library collection.—*Scott Walter, Washington State University.*

The New Review of Libraries and Lifelong Learning. Ed. Peter Brophy. Cambridge: Taylor Graham, 2000. v.1. Published annually. U.S. subscription price \$130. ISSN 1468-9944.

Editor Peter Brophy states in his opening editorial for this first volume, “Lifelong learning is among the most important policy issues across the world at the start of the twenty-first century.” The advent of globalization, the rise of multinational corporations, and the rapid development of digital networks that span continents challenge higher education systems everywhere. The definition of student and teacher are being transformed. This new serial publication seeks to show how librarians can contribute to these trends.

At first glance, one might be skeptical of the need for this journal. Many of us are not experts on the topic, nor heavily engaged in the issues surrounding either “lifelong” learners or their kin, the “distant” learner. However, further examina-

tion of this first volume leads to the conclusion that important work is being done in this area and that it is incumbent upon librarians to embrace and understand their role in making lifelong learners successful.

Theories of learning, as educators have understood them in the past, are undergoing dramatic shifts in interpretation. This is especially true for adult learners, the population addressed by this publication. As scholarly and other types of information become increasingly available through digital networks, the more independent learners can be. But do they find the most relevant sources for their needs? How would they know, and how are librarians able to measure this? What programmatic and technological aids can we contribute to the lifelong learner's success? How do traditional attitudes and policies impede or contribute to new paradigms? The premise that librarians can—and should—be an important part of future lifelong learning efforts underscores all the articles in this first volume, but with the assumption that librarians must “think out of the box” and approach their roles differently and creatively.

The first article in the collection, by editor Brophy and Alan MacDougall, explores the premise that “lifelong learning offers an approach to social inclusiveness and to individuals' personal fulfillment.” The authors proceed to explain why libraries can play an important role in promoting this idea. They emphasize that

there is no room for complacency if we are to be successful in providing relevant services.

The second article, by Elizabeth Burge and Judith Snow, addresses issues surrounding the distance education model. They discuss four factors: “technology adoption, learner demographics, constructive learning, and institutional pressures.” The article's title refers to “candles and corks” as devices that are no longer critical to the functions of modern everyday life but are still considered useful in certain contexts and environments. Like candles and corks, librarians may add a certain “qualitative dimension” to the needs of learners, and thus we must find ways to assert the continuing benefits of our services.

Phillippa Levy's article discusses how new “information and communication technologies” (ICTs) provide alternative ways to delivering curriculums. She specifically describes a project called NetLinkS, which was developed at the University of Sheffield. Maurice Line's contribution includes a description of what the ideal future library would look like to the independent learner. Articles by Margaret Kendall, John Allred, and Veronica Adamson describe specific projects administered by U.K. public libraries, the U.K. Department for Education and Employment, and the University of the Highlands and Islands (Scotland), respectively. “Hybrid Librarians and Distance Learners: The Fact Controllers?” by Debbie Lock and Jennifer Nordon, describes some of the very real practical considerations one must address when attempting to embed distance learning services into a traditional library setting.

An annotated bibliography at the end of the volume may be useful to those seeking more information on these topics. Sections A and B of the bibliography deal, respectively, with international and national perspectives on lifelong learning policy. Section C is devoted to “Lifelong Learning and Libraries.”

This new serial comes out of the United Kingdom at a time when the topic is of great

Index to advertisers

AIAA	211, 250
CHOICE	288
EBSCO	cover 3
Faxon/Rowecom	cover 4
Greenwood Publishing	208
ISI	238
Library Technologies	259
netLibrary	cover 2, 207
OCLC	226
ScienceDirect	215
University of California Press	213

interest to educators worldwide. Thus, the audience is not limited to those in Western nations. The editorial board includes a number of “names” within the lifelong/distance learning community, although the membership is drawn primarily from Commonwealth countries. The writing is well edited and the articles relevant to the mission of the publication. I shared the volume with the distance learning library services coordinator at our library and her impression was favorable; in fact, she was impressed, exclaiming that “these people really ‘get it.’” As with any new journal launch, it remains to be seen if it will succeed. The proliferation of journal literature guarantees that it is a risk; however, the topic is timely and reports of successful outreach to lifelong learners by librarians are certainly welcome and useful.—*Eleanor Cook, Appalachian State University.*

Successes and Failures of Digital Libraries: 35th Annual Clinic on Library Applications of Data Processing, 1998. Eds. Susan Harum and Michael Twidale. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Graduate School of Library Information Science, 2000. 134p. \$30 (ISBN 0-87845-107-2).

One of the most important things we are learning about technological change today is that it increases at a rate that many of us find is hard to match. Moore’s Law gives us eighteen months; other laws give us less. Another important thing we are learning is to discriminate between the kinds of information packets that need the full bibliographic and digital treatment and those that are more transitory—packets that have timeliness, but not necessarily staying power. We also are learning how to take advantage of Web technology to provide warp-speed access to information and events.

These were some of the thoughts going through my head as I started to read these papers: timeliness, relevance, and future interest quotient. How does this publication measure up against these criteria?

These annual clinics, sponsored by the Graduate School of Library and Informa-

tion Science at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, are organized around specific themes designed to expose librarians, information scientists, and others to new trends and approaches in information technology. The theme for the 35th clinic in 1998 was digital libraries, the successes and failures thereof, although perhaps a better and certainly more descriptive title for this work would have been “digital library test bed projects funded by the four-year NSF/ARPA/NASA Digital Library Initiative (DLI).” Indeed, a brief history of the DLI, phase 1, is the topic of the first paper contributed by Stephen Griffin, NSF program director.

Are there lessons here for librarians struggling with the “if, why, and how to go digital” dilemma? Not really, because the technologies described have already both migrated and become more mainstream. For the researcher? Perhaps. But it is clear to most educated participants in the digital arena that the remaining issues are primarily nontechnical in nature. Cultural, social, and legal issues are the crucial stumbling blocks still to be overcome.

The laborious processes described in these papers call to mind the TULIP (The University Licensing Program) experiment in the early 1990s, which held out so much promise for taking librarians to the cutting edge of electronic information delivery. Yet, by the time it took to fully conduct all those e-journal test bed projects, the world had moved on, the technology had changed, and Tim Berners-Lee had launched Mosaic from CERN. It is important that library researchers participate in these kinds of projects, and yet it seems we cannot proceed quickly enough. One of Thomas Hickey’s conclusions in his paper describing OCLC’s early efforts with full text—that users were not interested in e-journals until they had become used to the Web as a technology—seems almost prehistoric because so many of our users today will not look at anything that is not available on the Web.