driven out of our country and who found a haven in newly liberated Ghana. Bruce Cummings describes how power and money shaped the enterprise, and for those who say it is hard to insult faculty, they can now add it is not hard to seduce faculty. In Cummings’s story, the product of academic knowledge generally followed changes in world power and world markets. So much for independent leadership in the academy. The Slava Gerovitch piece describes the interplay between the state and academy in Russia and concludes with the surprising observation that it was very much like what was happening in the United States at the time. There was more in common than in difference between Russia and the U.S. The final essay by Lawrence Soley indicates how the national security state was supplanted by corporate-sponsored scholarship and knowledge to create an environment conducive to corporate interests. In this essay, Soley describes what must be obvious, but is not, to most university professors, especially at the “great” universities. By my observation, the takeover is coming close to total, especially in certain quarters such as business schools and integrative biology programs, but elsewhere as well. We can see it in the names of companies scattered all over the University of California at Berkeley, and elsewhere.

Such examinations of a submerged history make the reader once again reconsider the nature of knowledge. When private interest pervades the universities, just as when state interests pervade, knowledge produced becomes suspect and credibility becomes an issue. Why should anyone believe what biochemists are saying about pesticides not being related to cancer cause if there is no arm’s length? Indeed, why should special-interest knowledge be funded by the taxpayer for private interests, they may ask. Universities and Empire provides us with the nitty-gritty with which to think about such issues and insight as to what it will take to remedy them, and what we lose if we do not. This book is a sobering contribution as to how we got to where we are. It is well written, accessible, and well informed, and should stimulate thinking among students, faculty, and taxpayers alike.—Laura Nader, University of California-Berkeley.


This is a rather pedestrian addition to the usually distinguished Library Trends series. In many cases, it seems that the articles were assigned, and dutifully cranked out, but without much panache or enthusiasm. In other cases, however, they are quite lively. But, distressingly, none of them ask the key question that should have been the basis of any serious discussion of professional associations: What is a professional association, as opposed to a voluntary association that admits anyone, degreed librarian or not, who cares to join? Is ALA really a professional association, or merely one in which most of the members happen to be (but do not have to be) librarians? The lead article, “Professional Associations or Unions?” by Tina Hovekamp, would have benefited particularly from some awareness of this definitional issue, as she searches for some sort of tertium quid, rather than the false dilemma of having to choose simply between a union and a “professional association.” She concludes that a combination of both is needed, indicating the usefulness of considering new models—but she never does.

What we have here, therefore, is a book about professionalism that never defines professional—a serious flaw. That having been said, however, some of the articles do have value, and one cannot deny the overall importance of the volume’s theme. Librarians spend great amounts of time working in these associations,
whatever they are; just how much is highlighted in Joy Thomas’s survey/article on the attitudes of people who have served recently as president of a state or local association. Many of these people had no clerical support and sacrificed valuable personal and financial resources to serve, out of a pure sense of duty. This speaks well for the profession. Another well-written article is Cindy Mediavilla’s piece on the role of the California Library Association in fighting anti-Communist censorship between 1946 and 1956. Also noteworthy is Sue Kamm’s survey of why librarians choose to join associations (for networking, receipt of publications, opportunity to contribute to the profession, and so on). Other pieces march through topics such as the role of staff versus volunteer in associations and the value that associations have in individuals’ careers.

William Fisher’s “The Value of Professional Associations” comes to the remarkable conclusion that “without such associations of which they become officers, without professional association conferences at which they attend and/or deliver papers and go to meetings, and without professional association publications of which they become editors, reviewers, and/or authors, library directors would have to devote more of their time to the day-to-day running of their libraries. If they exist for no better reason than to keep library directors busy, our professional associations play an important role.” If this flippant and outrageous insult to the altruistic sacrifices of so many people constitutes a valid conclusion to one of the volume’s think pieces, one can only wonder where Library Trends is headed.—William Miller, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton.

This is Edward Rolf Tufte’s third self-published, self-distributed, and self-promoted book on representing information. Whatever one thinks of this trilogy, it is, collectively, one of the more interesting footnotes in the history of late twentieth-century publishing. As venerable old houses increasingly find themselves in the bellies of much larger beasts, as megamedia groups form and reform like giant protoplasm, there remains Edward Tufte. A professor of engineering at Yale, he is a publishing phenomenon of his own. I am unaware of any other academic who has been as successful as Tufte in putting out his own corpus.

I will not pretend to account for Tufte’s popularity; it perplexes me as much as Umberto Eco’s. To be sure, each of his books is handsomely designed and lovingly made, illustrative of the principles it communicates. But packaging goes only so far. I first encountered Tufte years ago in a smart-looking ad in the New Yorker. The fact that the ad was (a) handsome and (b) in the New Yorker was (for me, anyway) persuasive. I ordered a copy of The Visual Display of Quantitative Information, even though I did not have the remotest interest in the topic.

Whatever the reasons, one thing is certain: In this current age of the interface, where everyone is his or her own Web master, Tufte’s work is timely and relevant. Like most everyone else, librarians spend large chunks of time huddled before screens filled with words, numbers, icons, bars, colors, and anything else that can be made to fit the space. We admire their occasional elegance, and we scream at their all-too-frequent indifference to design. Moreover, librarians are not only information specialists and managers, they also are information designers. Although trained to manage information, librarians are not trained to present it visually. This is why Tufte is worth consulting. He is clear, straightforward, witty, and opinionated. He will give some context and guidelines for thinking about