that warrant further research. Among his points is the need to establish long-term infrastructure for authentication, including provision of a watermarking process, intellectual and economic support for the process, and the technological support necessary for management of digital objects. At the current time, this management process is being driven by the motivation for profit in the publishing industry, and this will not sustain the goals of archival preservation.

Finally, Jeff Rothenberg, a senior computer scientist at the Rand Corporation, writes in his essay, “Preserving Authentic Digital Information,” that a “uniform technological approach” is necessary for the true authentication of digital objects. He accurately compares this concept with the Rosetta Stone, as it would provide translation capabilities borne through the commonality of validation. Urging cross-disciplinary communication and cooperation, Rothenberg builds a case for the establishment of a common authentication vocabulary.

These essays, read individually and as a whole, are provocative to anyone who has interests in publication, research, archives, copyright, and other aspects of information perpetuity. None is so technical as to be daunting nor so scholarly as to be obscure. This is, in fact, a remarkably clear-eyed and cohesive collection. Each essay is opinionated and compelling. The summary following the essays, written by Abby Smith, director of programs at CLIR, does a good job of identifying key issues that appear in the papers and that arose in discussions during the meeting. Her introduction also serves its purpose well. This collection can be recommended to all who are interested in this timely topic, as well as to students preparing to forge a career in the information world broadly defined.—Tom Schneiter, Harvard University.


Is there a distinctively “American” contribution to the development of higher education in the Western world? Beginning at least with Veysey’s landmark study of The Emergence of the American University (1965), a number of scholars have suggested that there is. Douglass builds on Veysey’s work, as well as that of more recent historians of higher education, including Levine and Geiger, to describe the evolution of public higher education in California as a reflection of American egalitarianism. He suggests that the “California Idea” is a model for building a broadly accessible system of high-quality institutions of higher education that eventually might be as influential on the world stage as was the German model of the research university more than a century ago.

For those unfamiliar with the subject, a short introduction is required. In its current form, public higher education in California is built on three systems: the California Community Colleges (CC), the California State University (CSU), and the University of California (UC). This tripartite system provides the youth of the state with unparalleled access to postsecondary education. Moreover, each type of institution occupies a specific niche within the system (with the UC system, for example, the only one authorized to independently grant the doctoral degree). Although the present arrangement is largely the result of the so-called master plan for higher education engineered by UC President Clark Kerr in 1960, Douglass argues that California had long been committed to coordinating a statewide system of complementary educational institutions. This commitment to both increase access to higher education and create high-quality institutions as part of “a logical and interconnected system” of public higher education is what Douglass refers to as the California Idea.

Douglass contrasts the California approach to public higher education with
those taken elsewhere in the United States. Midwestern land-grant universi-
ties, 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 coordi-
nation such as the State University of New
York system are seen as belated at-
ttempts to enforce order from the top
down on a “happy anarchy” of histori-
cally unrelated colleges and universities.
Although there is an inevitable air of
boosterism about this work, Douglass’s
arguments concerning the unique ap-
proach 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 policymak-
ing at the state level is valuable, and it
extends familiar arguments about support
for K–12 public education to the
postsecondary level. Likewise, his analy-
sis of the influence of Progressive-era
movements, both in political and educa-
tional reform, on the evolution of the Cali-
ifornia 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 analy-
sis 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 remem-
bered about the brief period of my child-
hood 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 im-
portant 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 devel-
opment 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 provi-
sion 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. Cam-
bridge: Taylor Graham, 2000. v.1. Pub-
lished 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 ev-
erywhere. The definition of student and
teacher are being transformed. This new
serial publication seeks to show how li-
brarians 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 “dis-
tant” learner. However, further examina-