Book Reviews

The New Press has published an important, thoroughly engaging, and much-needed collection of essays on the influence of the Cold War on the growth and direction of higher education in the years following World War II. In *The Cold War & the University*, each author approaches the topic from his or her own academic discipline and personal experience in styles ranging from conversational narrative to scholarly analysis. Three essays, those of David Montgomery (Yale), R. C. Lewontin (Harvard), and Noam Chomsky (M.I.T.), describe the forces that generated a climate in which the prevailing Cold War ideology shaped the development of academic departments, curriculum, research priorities, and the hiring (and firing!) of faculty. The remaining essays describe in detail how the Cold War influenced specific academic disciplines: literature and English by Richard Ohmann (Wesleyan); history by Howard Zinn (Boston); anthropology by Laura Nader (University of California-Berkeley); earth sciences by Ray Siever (Harvard); area studies by Immanuel Wallerstein (Binghamton/Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales); and political science by Ira Katznelson (Columbia).

Editor Andrew Schiffrin could not have selected a better introductory essay than David Montgomery's "Prosperity under the Shadow of the Bomb." Montgomery personally encountered several of the social perversions without which the Cold War could not have proceeded: censorship, blacklisting, and the erosion of academic freedom. These encounters took place within three of the Cold War's main "theaters" of action—Los Alamos (birthplace of atomic weapons), the labor movement, and academia.

In May 1946, Montgomery, now an eminent historian but then a new Army recruit, was posted at Los Alamos, site of the Manhattan Project, where the U. S. military made extensive use of university personnel to develop the atom bomb. His first direct contact with the nascent Cold War culture came when, as a radio operator, he assisted in recording a series of broadcasts by Manhattan Project scientists who, out of deep concern over postwar nuclear development, hoped to inform radio listeners about the nature of atomic weapons and to urge Americans to place atomic energy development under international control. The radio series was never broadcast, victim of either censorship by the military or self-censorship by those radio stations given the opportunity to air the series.

Censorship, self-censorship, and silence are referred to frequently in these essays as the most powerful weapons of the Cold War and the greatest inhibitors of academic freedom within the university. Zinn writes that: "The silence of the academy in regard to Cold War foreign policy in the 1950s was matched by its passive acceptance of the Cold War's equivalent on the domestic scene: the firing, the blacklistings, the attacks on unions, the FBI harassments—all justified as part of the fight against Communism." The silence, according to Nader, "left students marked," it caused "we students of the 1950s [to be] dubbed 'the silent generation'—conformist, cautious, passive, paralyzed."

R. C. Lewontin's excellent essay, "The Cold War & the Transformation of the Academy," provides an insightful overview of the rise of government funding for universities and describes why the Cold War can appropriately be described as "a solution to a major dilemma of American economic development." That dilemma resulted from the conflict between the economic necessity of massive state intervention in the functioning of modern capitalist economies and the prevalent ideological opposition within the United States to exactly that type of government intervention. The economic forces at work during the Cold War made it necessary to socialize not only the costs, but also the conduct of research, technological and scientific education, and other intellectual production. For secrecy in the interest of ownership and profit, not openness, is the hallmark of private research. Lewontin asks, how can the cost and process of innovation be socialized given Americans' deep-rooted hostility to government "interference" in business? The answer is, of course, war. In the midst of the Civil War, for example, the federal government began funding the first land-grant colleges for agricultural experiments to determine whether Southern crops, cotton in particular, could be grown in Northern states. The growth of higher education after World War II likewise depended upon government largesse and direction.

The essays following those of Montgomery and Lewontin illustrate the manner in which Cold War influence on the production of knowledge through the elaboration, justification, and mystification of Cold War ideology at universities wormed its way through the academic disciplines. Zinn frames his discussion of the Cold War as one of "a persistent conflict—in politics, between repression and resistance; in the history profession, between a spurious objectivity disguising conservatism and

an openly declared commitment to social change." For literary studies, Ohmann describes how "the state could pry into and severely punish our affiliation and politics, with the cooperation of our employers, dedicated as they supposedly were to freedom of thought . . . [and how] a professional was to be nonpartisan, to abstain from historical agency." Nader, in describing some of the many instances in which anthropologists cooperated with government/military research projects, recounts one Pentagon project involving anthropologists studying political movements in Thailand. "We learned later of horrible [Thai] government repression of people labeled Communists in order to liquidate all government opponents." Many of those people apparently had been revealed to the Thai military through anthropologists' research.

The book closes with Ira Katznelson's essay, "The Subtle Politics of Developing Emergency: Political Science as Liberal Guardianship," which examines the role political scientists and theory played in consolidating and strengthening a liberal democratic power structure dominated by elites during a time of political and economic instability. According to Katznelson, "The cold war deployed the urgent and threatening counter-factual of illiberalism at a moment when the capacity of liberal democracies to secure freedom and prosperity simultaneously still was in grave doubt in the aftermath of the post-1929 collapse of capitalism and the second of two unprecedented world wars." Katznelson's essay is an important one, not only for what it reveals about the Cold War and political science, but also for the opportunity it provides political activists today to understand the extent to which our ideas concerning politics, representative democracy, electoral activity, interest groups, and the—both real and imagined—roles and responsibilities of political players have been

shaped by a class of intellectuals that mistrusts and fears "the people."

The Cold War & the University is an important book that hopefully will be used to open up debate about the role of the university as a social institution in the post–Cold War era. Two copies belong in every academic library in the nation.—*Elaine Harger, New Jersey Historical Society.*

Erens, Bob. *Modernizing Research Libraries: The Effect of Recent Developments in University Libraries on the Research Process.* London: Bowker-Sauer, 1996. 283p. alk. paper, $60. (ISBN 1-86739-174-8; LC 96-38003).

American academic librarians are familiar with *The ACLS Survey of Scholars: Final Report of Views on Publications, Computers, and Libraries*, published in 1989 by the American Council of Learned Societies. In that survey, book and journal collections received poor marks from respondents, especially among younger faculty members. However, scholars expressed widespread satisfaction with library services, including computerized resources. In that same year, the British Library Research and Innovation Center (BLRIC) conducted a similar study on scholars in the United Kingdom. The results appeared in *Research Libraries in Transition* (1989) and *The Research Process: The Library's Contribution* (1990). BLRIC repeated this survey in 1995. The result is an interesting picture of current academic library use in Britain and a chance to make comparisons with American institutions.

The study was conducted for the BLRIC by Social and Community Planning Research in autumn 1995. Postal questionnaires were sent to 4,496 scholars in medicine, natural sciences, social sciences, and the humanities from seventy-six universities throughout Britain and Northern Ireland. The respondents were asked for opinions on access to book and journal collections, if the collections were up to date, status

of library services, use of electronic resources, and how changes in library collections and services affected research.

Not surprisingly, three of four respondents named their own main university or department library as the primary collection for research. Access to high-quality monograph and journal collections ranked first among library services. Three of four respondents said that their home university libraries met their needs for British books and journals, but less than half were happy with holdings of non-British published materials. Scholars from Oxbridge universities were the most satisfied with their collections, whereas respondents from polytechnics expressed the lowest satisfaction. These findings echo results from the 1989 survey.

Overall satisfaction with home university collections dropped from 76 percent favorable responses in the 1989 survey to 67 percent in the 1995 survey. This change was due to the cancellation of important journals and a decline in acquisition of current monograph collections due to funding cuts. Natural scientists were more likely and social scientists least likely to report collection deterioration. Access to electronic services, quality of photocopying services, library operating hours, and the quality of assistance provided by librarians received positive marks. Respondents also cited e-mail and bibliographic databases as the most important electronic resources. Areas cited as problems included limited library space, lack of staff time for reference assistance, slow ordering of new materials, and time spent to reshelve materials. Interestingly, respondents were evenly divided on the quality of ILL services.

As was noted in the 1989 survey, scholars relied less on browsing library shelves for materials and were more careful in recommending materials for library purchases. About half said they