oral history project at Columbia University. A long, slow decline led to today’s more purely commercial orientation.

Radway interprets and deconstructs the Book of the Month Club as a social and cultural symptom and force with relish. Her ability to find meaning in what some might regard as a minor, if not trivial, subject is prodigious. Middlebrow culture, she demonstrates, defined itself in opposition to high culture and not as a diluted form of it. Valued above all was the personal experience of both author and reader, the emotional experience of being caught up and transported by a book. The Book of the Month Club saw itself as the “book club of record,” which maintained the highest standards in balancing reader demands and literary quality, matching the best books of all types to potential readers. Radway rather hesitantly defines the readership as a socially insecure, rising class of managerial professionals who used these books both to gain information about contemporary issues and for the emotional element missing from their professional lives.

Radway is an exciting thinker who can ring interesting changes even on the familiar triad of race, class, and gender. Early critical attacks on the Book of the Month Club, for example, had an underlying gender bias, and popular novels during the Cold War subtly promoted the superiority of the white man. Yet, I found the book profoundly irritating. The trendy words desire, performance, boundary work, circulation, and construction echo like mantras. Radway’s residual grudge against the English professors who clipped her wings in college leads her to belabor the culture wars between modernist and middlebrow culture ad nauseum. Repetition and overinterpretation leave the reader weary, whereas important questions, such as the cost of buying these books and their reception by ordinary people, remain underexplored. (Radway’s explanation that data on readership are lacking is not convincing. What about book reviews in newspapers and popular magazines, book club lectures, etc.?) The book’s tone can be inflated comically, as in the claim that “a system enshrining speed, repetition, circulation, and integration . . . did away almost from the start with the very idea of origin, creation, inspiration and source.” Unfortunately, all the comedy is unintentional in this earnest exploration of a subject that cries out for humor, as Sinclair Lewis well knew.

School and public librarians may see themselves mirrored in the Book of the Month Club judges who tried so hard to anticipate the needs of all kinds of readers. The relevance of A Feeling for Books for academic librarians is less direct. This is a fairly accessible example of cultural criticism that can serve as an introduction to the burgeoning study of reading, readers, and the book. It explains (albeit in a biased way) some of the ideological struggles going on in academic departments of English. It can make us pause and consider the assumptions and biases that go into our own choice of resources for the library, and to understand that there are no eternal, universal, and unconstructed (to use a trendy word) principles of selection.—Jean Alexander, Carnegie Mellon University.


The computer has radically changed how librarians and patrons access information. Librarians search to find the best organizational structures and services to utilize new technologies most effectively. Numerous articles and books address these issues. Now, the ACRL has published this collection of nineteen essays concerning library organizational change in light of technological development. Although these essays offer few new insights, they
provide an excellent discussion on the effects of technological change on libraries.

The essays focus on five areas: assessment of traditional library organizations and services; relationship between libraries and computer services; state and regional consortia; case studies of library organizations; and library–university relationships. Editor Charles A. Schwartz (University of Massachusetts-Boston) contributes the opening and closing essays. He discusses the theory of “boundary spanning,” which identifies ideas and relationships outside traditional thinking and practice that can meet the new challenges. His closing essay touches again on this theme and how it fits into a balanced organization.

In section one, David W. Lewis reviews changes in public services resulting from efforts to make more effective use of new technologies. Next, Herbert S. White emphasizes the importance of campus politics for ensuring support for library services. Control of the virtual library is a turf battle for scarce resources.

The next section opens with Richard M. Dougherty and Lisa McClure’s essay on the models for realignment of library–computer center relationships and the importance of understanding the difference between the working “cultures” of librarians and computer center staff. Meredith A. Butler and Stephen F. DeLong discuss reorganization efforts at the University of Albany, and Nina Davis-Millis and Thomas Owens cover similar ground at MIT. The last essay echoes Dougherty and McClure’s discussion of cultural differences between the two groups.

The role of state and regional consortia in library reorganization is the emphasis of the next section. David E. Kohl discusses the OhioLink project and its impact on individual library operations, especially in collection development. Barbara McFadden Allen and William A. Gosling look at the Committee on Institutional Cooperation’s work among major research institutions. Sue O. Medina and William C. Highfill discuss how development of computer networks facilitated library cooperation among Alabama academic libraries. Derrie B. Roark closes the section by presenting the successful use of centralized, directed technological change within the Florida Community College System.

Rebecca R. Martin, Caroline M. Kent, Joan Giessecke and Katherine Walter, Gloriana St. Clair, Rita A. Scherrei, and Peggy Seiden contribute case studies on restructuring efforts at Vermont, Harvard, Nebraska-Lincoln, Penn State, the University of California system, and seven leading liberal arts colleges. Scherrei’s study of the effects of reorganization on midcareer librarians in the University of California system is especially good. The final part presents essays by Charles B. Osburn and Douglas G. Birdsall examining the relationship between libraries and universities and the political aspects of strategic planning.

The overall quality of the essays is quite good, and the book provides much for librarians and administrators to consider. It echoes and complements many of the themes presented in recent books such as Gateways to Knowledge (MIT Press 1997, reviewed in C&RL 59:1). All librarians and library administrators would benefit from this work, as would university administrators.—Stephen L. Hupp, University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown.


The title of this timely volume is deliberately provocative. Without even mentioning the dreaded and dated Marx, the authors have produced a convincing analysis of the transition of the academy from its own protected form of feudalism