The electronic global village sounds like a particularly unpleasant shopping mall but we are all in it because our business is information and much of information is intended for and read by a global audience. Every time the ARL pronounces, academic librarians in New Zealand take note. The weekend meditations of some (including me) on liblicense@lists.yale.edu are read by thousands of lurkers, as you find out when you have transmitted something particularly badly thought out. They tell you about your stupidity in the street. In the global village, not all the traffic is one way in spite of US dominance of the Internet. Here are some stories, which may interest the readers of ATG. If they are good stories, they will have added a few chapters by the time you read this.

Document Delivery

Everyone knows that inter-library loan is not a loan if you are faxing an article, but the misnomer is typical of a confused area. Conventions for document delivery in print, or sort of print e.g. Ariel, are more or less established through case law, but what rules are applicable to cover fair use in an electronic domain are very, very uncertain. Recently in Europe, there has been one interesting conference and some interesting and ongoing developments.

The conference took place in London on 25th September. The planned US conference was cancelled. The title was “Assumptions versus reality: user behaviour in sourcing scholarly information” but it was mostly about document delivery. I expect something substantive will eventually appear on www.ingenta.com but you can buy the proceedings from institute@ingenta.com. The official message, a re-run of the ICSTI research of 1996 and subsequently, is that the availability of individual articles does not discourage libraries from taking out subscriptions. Two interesting factoids that emerged were that over twenty five percent of individuals responding to a questionnaire bought individual articles themselves using a credit card; and that over fifteen percent of documents acquired were from journals already subscribed to. Knee-jerk headlines suggested either that libraries were proving to be inefficient or challenged or both.

The message for publishers was that users are in the driving seat in the digital environment and the understanding of changing user behaviour is key to market development.

Publishers worry about fair use and its boundaries every so often, and currently they are worrying about the British Library – or at least some important members of the STM community are. Take a look at the Web site of the International Association of STM publishers at www.ism.org/news/2001-4/draft.html, where there is a draft position paper on International Document Supply. The word “international” is a give-away. It is the cross-border activities of the BLDS AC which is the main concern prompting this document.

There are also echoes in the drafting of the ongoing lobbying in European countries over the implementation into national law of the EU copyright directive (europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/oj/ 2001/L_16720011062en.html) itself an implementation, like the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, of the WIPO Treaty of 1996. Both library and publisher organisations in Europe welcomed the Directive, probably a first, but they are not, in the UK at least, working together on joint lobbying of government. For once this is not the fault of the publishers: it is the librarians or perhaps the so-called representatives of higher education, who are reluctant to talk through the issues in an open forum. The problem is that two key principles have emerged, which might be compatible but are not easy to join together. The European Directive gives serious prominence to what is called the “Berne 3-step test.” The test essentially mandates that exceptions to copyright should be in special cases only, and should not conflict with the normal exploitation of a work nor unreasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the rightsholder. At the same time all parties in the UK want the range of exceptions, offered as a menu by the Directive, to be cut down to those already present in local law in print. Can these principles be reconciled? And what does digital is different mean in practice?

Finally the British Library, under the rule of its first real librarian ever, is recognising with a completely new management team taking radical views and perhaps radical action. Insiders suggest that outside the UK the British Library will be supplying many fewer documents under library privilege and it is also likely that transmission by Ariel will continue on page 94.
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the best worldwide resources. Predominately links to journals, societies, and departments, the pages also offer several preprint archives, online texts, jobs board, and historical sites. Join their mailing list or suggest a resource! — http://www.mathgate.ac.uk/

Physics

How many general relativists does it take to change a light bulb? Doug Craigen (aka "DC"), a former Acadia University and University of Winnipeg physics professor maintains DC Physics, an eclectic mix of physics links including Animations, Hobby Physics, Lecture Notes, Research Papers, Reference Desk (tables, constants, etc.), and Online Textbooks and Tutorials. A number of light bulb answers can be found in his wonderful humor section - my favorite answer: Two. One holds the bulb, while the other rotates the universe. Seriously, you can also find links to Cartoon Physics pages here, as well as a satirical musical called Cold Fusion and the answer to Is It Worth Running in the Rain? — http://www.dctech.com/physics/

Reference

Bernd Sebastian Kampis, M.D., Ph.D., Senior Editor, is dedicated to the promotion of free access to medical journals over the Internet. AMEDEO, The Medical Literature Guide (copyright by Flying Publisher), offers free weekly alerting services in the topic and for selected journals of your choice, as well as a special Free Medical Journals.com section which purports to link to every medical journal offered free online in English and 15 other languages. Included is their site of the month, as well as titles which are available free online after one or two years (that is, older articles are available). Access is via specialty or alphabetically by journal title. AMADEO users who are medical professionals are eligible for listing in the Medicine on Earth (MedonE) "who's who" section after one year. — http://amedeo.com/
I recently attended a forum celebrating the inauguration of the Hong Kong Center for Problem-based Learning. My purpose was to learn more about this trend in higher education and how my library could do a better job of supporting the students and teachers employing it. The keynote speaker from Griffith University in Australia, Don Marston, used a phrase from John Dewey to sum up the reason for problem-based learning: “Without a problem, there is blind groping in the dark” (The Theory of Inquiry, New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1938).

This set me to thinking: what is the problem that librarianship should seek to solve? Is it the same one that my staff and I should be working on? My knee-jerk answer was “how can users get the information they need?”

I had taken a useful book by Peter Brophy to the forum on the chance that I might get bored and need something to read: The Library in the Twenty-first Century, New Services for the Information Age (London: Library Association Publishing, 2001). His first chapter is provocatively entitled “The End to Libraries?” He suggests that libraries might fail because they have lost their core business due to changes in technology allowing others to deliver needed information more easily. As I thought about this possibility, I returned to thoughts about Dewey’s suggestion that unless you are trying to solve “a” question, you will be endlessly groping in the dark.

Brophy’s summary of where we are now does cause one to wonder if our whole profession isn’t doing just that: we are extremely busy groping about but not getting anywhere useful: at times we seem to be rearranging deck chairs on what is a very small ship, and increasingly trying to make it a sinking ship. In a 29-page summary of what Brophy calls “enabling technologies” he describes our use of technology over the past 30 years to meet the information needs of our users, and at the end of the book he provides a very useful glossary of the 200+ acronyms and terms used in his description of what we have been doing, e.g., ANSI, DLI, FTP, TeX, XML, and the ever-popular Z39.50. While a few book thought provoking, the glossary also suggested that what we have been doing is barely comprehensible to ourselves, and certainly not to our funders. This was brought home to me more strongly last month when several of us from Europe, Australia, and the US were called upon by Chinese publishers and librarians at a conference in Shaxi province to explain what was going on in western libraries.

While we are groping (actually group groping) about in the dark, many of our users have found the answer to the question about how do they find the information they need: they type a few words into a small box within their Internet browser and come up with usable information. Yes, I am fully capable of reciting the litany about inaccurate information, incomplete information, and too much information. But, they do just type a few words in the little box and get instant gratification (by the way I just got 69,000+ hits on the phrase “instant gratification” using Google but was able to cut it down to 2,000+ by adding the word “libraries”).

Being an old Cub Scout leader, I am always reminded of the KISIMF motto: “Keep it simple, make it fun.” I think that is what we need a lot more of in our libraries. At any hour of the day our students physically or virtually enter our libraries/home pages and want something fairly simple: information. In our fascination with making order out of the chaos we have created MARC and a few hundred or thousand other enabling techniques to help them find the right book/article at the right time (Yankee, chapter 6 verse 2). Along the way we have lost a lot of the simple and fun in our libraries. In fact, our profession is maligned as the no fun “shoers” of all time. When I suggested the other day that we create a recreational reading room with soft chairs and music, I was informed that any use of recorded music would involve paying all sorts of copyright fees. Since we can’t afford a live band, I guess that idea is out — unless there is a librarian musician who would like a 16 hour a day job in Hong Kong.

Now, lest I get branded as a technophobe suggesting that what the world needs now is a room with a bunch of printed books and journals arranged by title, let me defend myself by saying that my library is busy at work adopting single-search, as well as my library interfaces in an attempt to make it easier and more friendly to use. But, I suggest that we all need to lighten up and keep pace on the real bottom line, or in Dewey’s words, the problem: users finding information. Brophy, in a discussion of the differences between essential and non-essential performance attributes, suggests that you ask the question “Can this aspect of service produce customer delight?” (p. 81). If it can result in delight it isn’t essential. Actually, I think we need to put more time in on the non essentials and in producing delight — if we are going to keep pace.

In the case of library support for problem-based learning, to produce delight it is apparent we need to provide small group study rooms and lots of them, face-to-face as well as phone and email reference help, scheduled classroom and at-the-point-of-need Web-accessible information management skills training, lots of full-text resources, and, if we still have time, virtual reference, a few dozen conferences on standards and things.

Brophy ends his book by cautioning us all that being able to say what needs to be done, and even identifying some models to emulate, “... does not mean that libraries will of necessity occupy a central place in future society. That place has to be earned. It is librarians who must earn it” (p. 184). I couldn’t agree more.