in the literature of this field. The third article, "Cooperation in Information Activities through International Organizations," tells what is really happening: "Information, in short, is being looked at as a source of power, and wherever power exists, political interest follows."

The most extensive review in this volume, with 276 bibliographic citations and a length 50 percent longer than any other review, is "Design and Evaluation of Information Systems" by Rowena W. Swanson. Swanson points out that evaluation of such systems is "still in a formative stage in which the focus is more on investigative procedures and instruments rather than on outcomes." But how she can conclude that "information organization skills and the type of understanding of users that information scientists have acquired are sorely needed" is beyond the comprehension of this reviewer.

In short, then, we have here a book that one may turn to if one is unfamiliar with information science and its practitioners and wants an annotated bibliography of what they contributed during 1974. Some of the annotations are better than others, and there is an uneven quality to the entire volume.—*Stephen M. Silberstein, Library Systems Office, University of California, Berkeley.*

The Library of Congress as the National Bibliographic Center. Report of a Program Sponsored by the Association of Research Libraries, October 16, 1975. Washington: Association of Research Libraries, 1976. 58p. $4.00.

The substance of this booklet is taken from the minutes of the October 1975 meeting of the Association of Research Libraries. It has been published separately in order to reach a wider audience; and for good reasons. The papers and discussion have great interest for the entire library community, spelling out as they do the activities and intentions of the Library of Congress in serving as the *de facto* center of national enterprise in bibliographical control.

The seventy-eighth meeting of ARL, held in Washington, D.C., featured a tour of the Library of Congress and a meeting at which its operations and plans in the area of bibliographical control were described and discussed. Following a summary of the history of LC-ARL relations in bibliographical activities delivered by Warren Haas, four LC staff members described the present state of LC's automated projects and plans for their future development: William Welsh and Henriette Avram on "Automation Activities at the Library of Congress," Lucia Rather on "The Core Bibliographic System," Henriette Avram on "The National Bibliographical System [or Service]," and John Rather on "Transition to the Automated System." Discussion and questions followed.

It is difficult to select high points in the very exciting picture that has been outlined for the future. Much of the report is concerned with development of the "Core Bibliographical System"—the virtually complete automation of LC processing activities. These are not only of interest *per se* but also because these developments will provide the basis for the "National Bibliographical System." When this latter system is fully operational, the libraries of North America will have remote access to virtually all parts of LC's processing activities—not only a much-expanded MARC (covering all languages by 1979) but also the LC internal process information file, the CONSER serials data base, the register of additional locations, LC authority files, etc. About the only area in which major developments are not planned is that of large-scale revision and modernization of the present subject-heading structure.

In his paper on transition, John Rather is candid but optimistic in detailing the problems to be faced and solved before both systems reach full development, expected before the end of the 1970s. When they are, however, the Library of Congress will clearly be the National Bibliographical Center, or, perhaps more accurately, the National Center for Bibliographical Control, if still not the National Library *de jure.* But it will be providing the services other libraries probably most want from a national library.—*George Piternick, The University of British Columbia.*