so many different specialists. Comprehensiveness within page limitations is, of course, an additional problem. I would have liked very much, for instance, to see attention paid to professional concerns, the literature of librarianship, as well as to current areas of research in library and information science.

The editors have succeeded in an admirable fashion to find a balance between these problems, and the book should be a real help for quite some time to come for many in the profession. As an example of what can be accomplished, this is an important contribution and I hope that it will stimulate American efforts in the same direction.—Hendrik Edelman, Cornell University Libraries, Ithaca, New York.


The management of computerized on-line retrieval services is a subject of growing concern. To the librarian doing on-line searches, to the librarian referring patrons for searches, and to the administrators who must plan, allocate resources, and decide whether, when, and how the library will offer on-line searches, the proceedings of this meeting have much to offer.


Less comprehensive or prescriptive than David Wax’s On-Line Bibliographic Search Services (ARL, Office of University Library Management Studies Occasional Paper No. 4, June 1976), these papers address, from a variety of viewpoints, the new issues that plague us and the opportunities they present.

Anne Lipow’s paper covers the elements necessary to interpret the on-line service to potential users and describes such an integration at the University of California, Berkeley, within a seminar for faculty on “How to Use the Library for Advanced Research in the Social Sciences and Humanities.”

As might be expected with a new area, most of the authors introduce their topics well and summarize the state of the art, but as with any rapidly changing field, many questions do remain unanswered.

Peter Watson’s paper outlines areas of concern in evaluating an on-line search system before contracting for it and relates these to organizational considerations. Richard Dougherty reminds us that innovators must be prepared for a variety of responses and need to prepare a climate favorable to the acceptance of those responses.

It is the attitudinal climate of the middle 1970s that is the focus of the first section, which consists of surveys reported by Carlos Cuadra, Danuta Nitecki, and Pauline Atherton. Both the Cuadra and Nitecki papers repeat material published elsewhere (Judith Wanger, Mary Fishburn, and Carlos A. Cuadra, On-Line Impact Study [System Development Corporation, 1976], and Danuta A. Nitecki, “Attitudes Toward Automated Information Retrieval Services Among RASD Members,” RQ 16:133–44 [Winter 1976]).

The Atherton paper reports the impact on library reference staff, on library directors, and on library clientele. All seem to point toward rising professional status for the librarian, some changes in priorities by library directors, and increasing use of collections by clients.

This spiral-bound soft covered volume is
well worth its price of $3. It shouldn't be missed by libraries offering or planning online services or by schools of library and information science.—Sara D. Knapp, Coordinator, Information Retrieval Section, State University of New York at Albany, Albany.


Any assessment of this third Japan-U.S. Conference must be made in the context of the two preceding ones in 1969 and 1972. Ryohei Hayashi, 1975 steering committee chairman, observed that the first conference, in Tokyo, had been an important event for Japanese librarians faced with the rapid expansion of higher education in his country. For many participants, both Japanese and American, it had highlighted the differences in the organization of academic libraries in the two countries. It was difficult to share common experiences because, clearly, development of Japanese libraries had lagged seriously behind that of the United States and other Western countries.

The second conference, held in Racine, Wisconsin, also was concerned with these disparities but nevertheless moved with determination to consider problems common to both countries. It concentrated, therefore, on the theme of library cooperation and on ways to utilize new technologies to further it.

This third conference, in Kyoto, dealt with the theme of "Inter-library Networks: Prerequisites for Sharing Resources." Again, there was much talk by Japanese participants about impediments to cooperation among themselves, not to mention internationally. The disparate goals of university libraries and the independent endeavors of the scientific and technological communities were stressed repeatedly. Most importantly, Japanese universities were shown to be clinging to the costly and inefficient system of maintaining separate "central" libraries and faculty laboratory libraries, side by side. (But there has been one startling and heartening break in this pattern at Keio University, where the two types of libraries have recently been integrated into one organic whole.)

It was remarked bluntly by professors Hosoye and Tsuno, of Hitotsubashi and Tokyo Universities respectively, that some prominent librarians in the Tokyo area have "little intention of cooperating with other libraries"; and Yasumasa Oda, distinguished systems librarian of the National Diet Library, observed that "unfortunately, Japanese librarians have not been as concerned with standardization as they should be" and progress toward participation in broad cooperative programs had therefore been impeded. These, and other similar expressions, were seen as symptomatic of a widespread lethargy and reluctance to give up older attitudes and practices and move toward cooperation.

In contrast is the description by Takashisa Sawamoto, of Keio University, of a cooperative program among agricultural libraries in Japan—certainly one of the most encouraging evidences of progressive planning and of the beginning, at least, of a valuable experiment. With this should be mentioned the important paper by Yoshinari Tsuda, also of Keio, in which he reported on the well-organized network of Japanese medical libraries, already in operation.

Speaking for the United States, Douglas W. Bryant described eloquently some of the major programs of research library cooperation, depicting in some detail the Research Libraries Group. It seems regrettable that Joseph Becker's bold proposal for an experiment between Japan and the United States through a project for a binational library and information network in some specialized field of common interest was apparently considered a bit too advanced for serious consideration by the conferees. Perhaps it can be retrieved sometime in the future.

Yet, despite evidence that Japanese libraries still lag discouragingly behind their