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.

The struggle to come to terms with technology seems to be disheartening to one of our leading professional bellwethers. David Levy, no longer with Xerox PARC, but now an independent digital libraries consultant, relates an existential sense of our own mortality and impermanence to the concept of a universal library—thus, the apocryphal title of his paper "Give Me Documents or Give Me Death." His basic conclusion is that "whether we think of libraries as collections of documents or storehouses of knowledge, we come to the same conclusion: libraries and death are intimately related." Many of us would come to the opposite conclusion—that a universal library, whether stored digitally or not, linking us with sounds, sights, and thoughts from the past—can only show the life everlasting of creative output. Can anyone listening to the music of Mozart or watching a Shakespeare play think anything but that those two great artists live on today?

Catherine Marshall's paper on the future of the annotated text addresses questions that many of us have been pondering, including the fate of annotations, both those already written and those perhaps never to be written or captured in a digital world. However, she neglects to discuss the hand-to-brain connection that helps our minds to actually commit these notes to memory. Other papers range from a discussion of the semantic issues inherent in digital libraries (Hsinchun Chen) to a retrospective on the Illinois Digital Library Project (Bruce Schwartz et al.). Edward Fox's paper on the "Networked Digital Library of Theses and Dissertations" seems remarkable for its lack of reference to the commercial database that already fills much of this need and forces the reader to wonder if we are reinventing the wheel. The editors, Susan Harum and Michael Twidale, are to be credited for providing a useful index and biographical notes on the contributors.

In sum, this collection of papers provides a historic marker on the laser beam path from yesterday to tomorrow, and such should be archived. However, there is little enlightenment for the practicing librarian dealing with these issues. Let us, indeed, consider ways to publish this kind of rapidly obsolescing content electronically. As a step in the right direction, the interested reader can find the introduction to this collection online at http://www.lis.uiuc.edu/puboff/, as well as in the table of contents.—*Gillian M. McCombs, Southern Methodist University.*

Willinsky, John. *If Only We Knew: Increasing the Public Value of Social Science Research.* New York: Routledge, 2000. 252p. $85 cloth (ISBN 0-415-92651-3), $22.95 paper (ISBN 0-415-92652-1). LC 00-035275.

From the acknowledgments at the very beginning of his new book, John Willinsky's view of public knowledge is evident. Regarding placement of footnotes in his book, Willinsky writes, "Following my interests in the public's engagement with scholarship, the publisher has agreed to place the footnotes at the bottom of the page, rather than use the more common endnotes that are placed at the back of the book." Willinsky, Pacific Press Professor of Literacy and Technology, Department of Language Education, Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia, in Vancouver, wants a kind of scholarship—in this case, research produced in social science disciplines—that does more to engage the public. Such an engagement should affect every phase of research endeavors, from conceptualization through publication and distribution.

If Only We Knew continues Willinsky's thesis on the value of research to the general public explored in his previous book, *Technologies of Knowing: A Proposal for the Human Sciences* (1999). It is an obvious thesis at first glance, as Willinsky argues relentlessly, if not repetitively, for the importance of public knowledge of research produced by social scientists. Yet, from the very beginning, he is not so much a supporter of the popularization of research