

but also by military historians and Smithsonian administrators. Although he later would ignore the fact and campaign fiercely against the exhibit, Air Force historian Richard Hallion, commenting in a February 1994 memo to Harwit on the first draft of the exhibit script, wrote: "Overall, this is a most impressive piece of work, comprehensive and dramatic, obviously based upon a great deal of sound research, primary and secondary."

Harwit also recounts the manner in which criticism from the academic and peace communities played into the hands of the AFA. Soon after the NASM curators announced they would be consulting with the American Legion over changes to the exhibit script, several historians voiced opposition to such collaboration. Harwit writes:

I felt the historians and pacifists had not been helpful. They criticized us for submitting to pressures from veterans' groups without knowing what we had done or why. And they failed to make their own countervailing views known through the media or in Congress. That combination of criticism and political inactivity acted to add to the criticism advanced by the Air Force Association and other detractors, who often claimed that neither they nor the historians were happy with the exhibition.

As one of the few people fortunate to have read both the first and final script for the exhibit, this reviewer shares Harwit's aggravation toward the groups that should have rallied to support the NASM. The input from veterans groups did not pressure curators into betraying historical facts. The exhibit was greatly strengthened by all those who reviewed it, and NASM curators proved valiant in their determination to present the public with a comprehensive and objective exhibit of a turning point in world history.

An Exhibit Denied is recommended as a rare and fair eyewitness account of an

important case of censorship. It will also provide educators with a fascinating glimpse of the battles waged within the contested terrain of public history. Lessons learned from the *Enola Gay* controversy should guide librarians, educators, and all others who oppose censorship to be mindful of the tactics of censors and to be prepared to rapidly organize anti-censorship forces when the opportunity arises.—*Elaine Harger, W. Haywood Burns School, New York City.*

Research Misconduct: Issues, Implications, and Strategies. Eds. Ellen Altman and Peter Herson. Greenwich, Conn.: Ablex, 1997. 206p. \$73.25, cloth (ISBN 1567503403); \$39.50, paper (ISBN 1567503411). LC 97-18061.

This collection of eight essays explores the uncomfortable topic of research misconduct from the perspective of its impact on libraries and librarians. Whether it is called research misconduct, academic dishonesty, or just plain fraud, the subject goes well beyond simple plagiarism and includes the intentional fabrication and falsification of scientific, medical, or academic research generally. This disconcerting phenomenon seems to be occurring with increasing frequency among professionals of the intellect, but it is not a subject that university administrators or the heads of learned societies relish discuss-

Index to advertisers

| | |
|---------------------------|---------|
| AIAA | 499 |
| ACRL | 571 |
| Archival Products | 522 |
| BIOSIS | 495 |
| Blackwell's Book Svcs | 496 |
| R.R. Bowker | cover 2 |
| Columbia University Press | 584 |
| Endocrine Society | cover 3 |
| Greenwood Publishing | 585 |
| Haworth Press | 534 |
| Library Technologies | 511 |
| Minolta | 544-545 |
| OCLC | 502 |
| PNAS | 523 |
| Primary Source Media | cover 4 |

ing. To admit its existence in their own institutions or professions is to acknowledge a fundamental failure of their mission. This book shines a useful light on a very shadowy area.

The editors of the book, Ellen Altman and Peter Hernon, are its principal contributors, authoring or coauthoring all but one of the essays themselves. Hernon is a professor at Simmons College in Boston, editor-in-chief of the *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, and author of more than thirty books and dozens of articles. Altman has been a professor and head of the graduate library school at the University of Arizona, features editor of *Public Libraries*, and a member of *Library Quarterly's* editorial board.

In their view, although the number of books and articles dealing with the problem of misconduct in research has grown, few writers on the subject have been concerned with the impact of false research and tainted publications on the scholarly literature; none has addressed the impact on libraries or the bibliographic process; and none has discussed whether librarians have any obligations to notify users about materials found to be bogus. This volume is intended as an "exploratory" foundation on which others, within and outside library and information science, might build.

Among its virtues, the book collects, reviews, and synthesizes in an appendix more than sixty publicly discussed cases in which scientific misconduct was determined and which involved research literature that was fabricated, falsified, or plagiarized. (Excluded are cases involving plagiarism in grant applications to the federal government, of which, according to the editor-authors, there are many.) Reports of the federal government's Office of Research Integrity are the primary source for these data, but the government did not begin releasing the names of individuals found guilty of scientific misconduct involving federally funded grants until 1993.

Part of the research for the book was done while the editor-authors were visiting professors at Victoria University in

Wellington, New Zealand. The research included a clever (if a bit unsettling) clinical experiment in which the author-editors wrote a deliberately falsified study, containing a number of mistakes, and tested it among library school students, librarians, university deans and professors, and journal editors. The faked study, purportedly written by a new faculty member named Maxwell A. Mega, easily took in its readers, even prompting the journal editors to provide helpful suggestions for subsequent revisions. In follow-up interviews, the academics were quite consistent in one respect: if Max Mega carefully targeted fringe and less prestigious journals, it is likely that he would get published. If caught and if he does not admit guilt, it is less likely that the university would take action against him. Moreover, those interviewed questioned whether it is even the role of journal reviewers to detect fraud. After all, some would say, the whole academic system is based on trust.

One chapter is devoted to the implications of research misconduct for libraries and librarians. In the view of the author-editors, many authors take no responsibility for the accuracy or correctness of any of the information in their collections. Because, since 1967, the ALA's "Library Bill of Rights" has omitted any reference to the factual correctness of library materials, library users are responsible by default for judging both the accuracy and the relevance of any and all information obtained from a library. As awareness of the problem of academic dishonesty grows in library circles, however, librarians are beginning to assume greater responsibility for the accuracy of their collections. In particular, greater attention is being—and, in the author-editors' opinion, must be—paid to systematically recording or cataloguing errata and retractions, both within the library's own collection and through electronic databases.

The book persuasively argues that research misconduct is a serious problem. But how much of a problem, and how to

deal with it, remains a challenge. If trust is indeed the basis of academic life, routine mistrust of researchers and their written findings would cast a pall over that life. Nevertheless, some skepticism is healthy. After all, how do you know the book I just reviewed even exists?—*William M. Hannay, Schiff Hardin & Waite, Chicago.*

Sableman, Mark. *More Speech, Not Less: Communications Law in the Information Age.* Foreword by Paul Simon. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Univ. Pr., 1997. 277p. \$49.95, cloth, alk. paper (ISBN 0809320711); \$19.95, paper (ISBN 0809321351). LC 96-53449.

Mark Sableman is an attorney who practices communications law and comments regularly on the field in the *St. Louis Journalism Review* and in legal professional publications. In *More Speech, Not Less*, his great knowledge of and concern for First Amendment issues affecting the media are apparent. As the title implies, in the ongoing debate over limiting speech with harmful results, Sableman is a strong proponent of speech and press that is as free as possible. He believes that we, the American public, should take greater responsibility for our role in our democracy's legal process. Sableman encourages us to learn about the issues, to think critically about them, and to use our understanding to influence the direction of the law. Unfortunately—and to a fussy reference librarian, annoyingly—the author has not made it easy for a reader to use his work to that end.

Reference librarians like books to be useful. This book lacks standard tools a book needs to be useful to a reader. First, there is no index. This noted, the table of contents does list the broad subheadings in each chapter and would serve to direct a reader to the general area where a topic is discussed. Next, unlike most law books,

it has no table of cases to help a reader find each mention of a particular court decision. Finally, the notes are difficult to use. They are printed at the end of the book, grouped by chapter and then by topical headings within a range of pages. There are no footnote numbers in the text identifying where a reader might find a case citation or other supporting sources.

These flaws would be more forgivable if the book read well as a piece. In *More Speech*, Sableman has revised and organized many articles he originally wrote for media and legal professionals. Now intended to be a guide for interested citizens, the book suffers from insufficient editing, for both style and content. At times the language is ponderously legal and at other times overly simplistic. The writing is often murky, in places almost a stream of ruminations. For emphasis, Sableman relies too often on italics rather than clear prose. More disciplined editing would have prevented the disjointedness and repetition caused by merging various pieces on similar topics.

The media bring the law into our lives in a way previously unimaginable. More and more frequently, the law we learn via the media in fact involves the media. Sableman is a keen observer of the scene and provides legal principles and analysis on topics such as censorship and prior restraint; news gathering; confidentiality and sources; libel; privacy; copyright and protection of ideas; advertising; broadcasting; fair trial and free press; the business and education of the press; and the Internet and electronic information. His mission of alerting Americans to the threats to our freedoms and involving us in the law-making process is laudable and worthwhile. It is too bad that a book subtitled *Communications in the Information Age* does not communicate better.—*Janet C. Katz, Harvard Law School.*