

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-

Reviews

cial England. At other points, we are treated to tables of "social status," as Morgan tries to suggest the complex interplay at Cambridge of provincial politics, national religious requirements, familial social status and ambitions and, finally, Cambridge's academic and political life. But Morgan is mesmerized by this interplay; he does not provide an explanatory framework within which to make sense of it. In his study of the debt which Cambridge and its graduates owed to "the country," is he arguing that Cambridge was held tightly in the grip of social forces, forced into curricular and statutory conservatism? It is hard to say. Surely an argument and a subsequent explanation, however tentative, are much to be preferred over legislative and numerical depictions.

While Guy Lytle's essay on patronage patterns at Oxford is better than the work of Morgan, there is little doubt that the papers of Professors Stone and McConica come closest to providing satisfying interpretations of the 16th and 17th century evidence. Stone is concerned to explain variations in the size and composition of the Oxford student body between about 1580 and 1910. Because he is attempting to make sense of wildly disparate data from three and one-half centuries (centuries qualitatively different from one another), his exposition is understandably shallow at times. But in demonstrating the relevance of war, pestilence, political intrigue, and the changing social function of a university education — all of this in relation to the numbers and social origins of students in Oxford — Stone points to new ways of understanding some very important developments in the University's history. New light is shed on the unhappy condition of Oxford in the eighteenth century, for instance, and it is a little easier to see how graduation from Oxford and Cambridge came, in the last half of the 19th century, to guarantee speedy progress through the highest ranks of the English civil service.

The remaining essays of these volumes are written at a consistently high level of interpretation and style. I have never seen essays so suggestive

of the advantages of doing comparative history as those in Volume II on universities of 18th and 19th century America and Germany. If these papers are a fair index of intellectual activity at the Shelby Cullom Davis Centre for Historical Studies (Princeton) where they were all conceived, one can only hope that their publication will stimulate activity of the same sort in this country. Whether or not that happens, *The University in Society* draws attention to a virtually fresh field, the history of universities. Certainly in economically developed nations, at least, the relevance of this new historical study to policy decisions in educational and other domains can hardly be denied. This work should find its way onto the shelves of policy makers and of teachers, not just the arid reliquaries of university librarians. As history books go, this one is surely a bargain.

William A. Bruneau

University of British Columbia

Cyril S. Belshaw.
TOWERS BESIEGED:
THE DILEMMA OF
THE CREATIVE UNIVERSITY.
Toronto:
McClelland and Stewart,
1974.
224 pp. \$5.95.

There are professors who will give high evaluations of papers consisting of little more than symbolic assertions, expressed illiterately, provided those assertions fit the professor's own way of life. And . . . there are professors who will do that, even though it is against their intellectual beliefs, not because they are afraid, but because they have coned themselves into thinking that this is "the new way." (p. 56)

A fatal flaw in the headship system is that, although heads are technically removable at the will of higher authority or on the request of department members, the situation can slide very far