of modern McGill but, as chairman of the Federal Government Advisory Committee on Reconstruction, he became one of the chief architects of the plans for Canada-after-the-war. As president of the National Conference of Canadian Universities and chairman of the finance committee, he successfully led the campaign to persuade the federal government to provide the funds necessary for the further development of higher education in Canada.

Readers would surely welcome other casual but perceptive historical vignettes which could provide additional dimensions of academic life not found in official histories. Aside from her portrayal of the men for whom she ran interference, protecting them from cranks and other time-wasting intruders, Mrs. McMurray has left a unique record of a "golden age" when, within the limitations of the institutional statutes, university heads could use their special intellectual and administrative talents to do their jobs as they saw fit, and the universities themselves were neither accused of being public liabilities, nor was there any attempt to convert them to public utilities.

Gwendoline Pilkington
University of Toronto

Graeme C. Moodie and Rowland Eustace.
POWER AND AUTHORITY IN BRITISH UNIVERSITIES.
Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1974.
256 pp. $10.50.

First, it is important to be clear about what this book is not. It does *not* concern itself — except by implication — with such issues as the university's responsibilities to the community, or the proper balance between professional and non-professional schools, or the pro's and con's of academic freedom. Rather, it is a study of how British universities are governed, or, perhaps one should say, govern themselves. The authors describe their work as a "general and methodologically old-fashioned survey of the processes of decision-making within British universities today." Their evidence was gathered from interviews, informal discussions, internal university documents, official publications such as university charters, handbooks, commissions—royal and otherwise—and, of course, from their own experience.

Their description, however, is too modest. The book gives a lucid, illuminating and, at times, entertaining account of the decision-making processes in British universities. Chapter II, "The Development of Modern University Government," will be of particular interest to historians of education since it deals with a topic ignored in most histories of education — recent developments within university governance. Subsequent chapters deal with particular parts of the universities' system of government and their contribution to and participation in the making of decisions. Thus, the role of academic departments (and department heads), of faculties, senate, council (i.e. board of governors), vice-chancellor, registrar, are all described and examined. One of the strengths of the book is the authors' avoidance of the pitfall of mistaking appearance for reality. They are well aware of the difference between the way decisions are supposed to be made and the way they are, in fact, made. For example, they have some sensible observations on the intertwined roles of vice-chancellors and registrars and the impact of personality thereon. In the same vein, they quote at length and with effect from an unpublished lecture by Sir Eric Ashby on the importance of "happy tact" in making major decisions.

Chapter VIII of the book contains a particularly useful — if necessarily brief — survey of programming-planning-budgeting systems (PPBS) which are apparently now being introduced into British universities. For those who are unfamiliar with PPBS this chapter will be especially useful, containing, as it does, a brief description of what such systems entail and an examination of their strengths and weaknesses.

In their last chapter ("What Kind of Government?") the authors depart

from the predominantly descriptive nature of the rest of the book and enter into argument as to the most desirable form of university government. Using three categories, which they describe as democratic, oligarchic and republican, they plump for the last on the ground that, "since a university's purpose has to do with scholarship and education," it alone puts authority where it belongs — in the hands of academics. A short review is not the place to join this argument. Suffice it to say that all university teachers will find in this chapter plenty of scope for discussion.

Indeed, university teachers could benefit from reading the whole book, especially at a time when demands for increased participation in university affairs are being heard, from both within and without the university. Unfortunately, for Canadian readers, the authors did not have cause to discuss the impact of faculty unionization upon the decision-making process. Even so, this volume is useful for the comparative light it throws on Canadian concerns. More specifically, students of higher education and of comparative education should attend to this book. It contains a wealth of information and, unlike many studies in education, is written without jargon. Moodie and Eustace must be two of the few people left who know the difference between "uninterested" and "disinterested"! Their book nicely complements the recent studies of higher education in Britain by Ashby, Caine and Halsey and Trow.

Ken Osborne
University of Manitoba

Lawrence Stone, ed.
THE UNIVERSITY IN SOCIETY.
Princeton:
Princeton University Press,
1974.
642 pp. 2 vols. $22.00.

The relation of universities to the societies in which they operate has never been well understood. Even in France, where universities have been centralized but relatively unimportant vehicles of educational policy for a century and more, writers from within and without the Université have debated at length whether money spent on higher education has been wasted. In 19th century Germany, where universities had a "clear" objective (they prepared for civil service examinations and for the life of scholarship), the years just before 1914 were filled with acrimonious debate whether to accommodate the "modernist spirits" of industrial life. Thus the social and intellectual significance of higher education has been difficult to assess even in "straightforward" cases like those of France and Germany.

Of course, the truth of the matter is that university-society relations in Europe and North America have been extremely complex, always and everywhere. The two-volume collection of essays under review here does a good job of making this very point. If these essays are not wholly successful as history, it is because their several authors are too often content to *describe* rather than *explain* the sorts of evidence with which they are concerned. This is particularly true of evidence relating to the *context* of the university's enterprises. These historians are the victims, rather than the victorious explainers, of the complex matters they describe.

Both the pleasures and the perils of statistical inference uninformed by historical reason are evident in the several essays (Stone, Lytle, McConica, Morgan) which try to show how social class and geographic origin were related to attendance at Medieval and Reformation Oxbridge. Perhaps it is Morgan, writing on "Cambridge and the 'Country'," who best illustrates the point. Morgan describes and mathematically tallies the geographic origins, county by county, of students at Cambridge University between 1560 and 1640. Combining these figures with information on the sources of collegiate endowment during the same period, and adding a summary of the relations between certain grammar school foundations and their "parent" Cambridge colleges, Morgan concludes that the University was tied closely to the political and religious life of provin-