

15% of the Americans do so, it is time to stop pretending we are the fortunate benefactors of historical circumstances which make Canada "one of the few countries . . . (it may in fact be the only one) in which intellectuals can work aware that sanity prevails." Professor Conway's rationale was not quite so bizarre as the one offered by the head of Windsor's Department of Biology who argues that since intelligence is hereditary (?) "The genetic pool of this nation is undergoing a massive infusion of a variety of highly desirable genes . . ."

Not everyone will agree that knowledge feels national boundaries, probably even fewer will agree with the solutions Mathews and Steele propose, but all who are seriously concerned with the future of higher education in Canada and with the future of Canada itself should read this book.

The increase in advertising in *University Affairs* and other Canadian sources is a direct outcome of the debate to date. It may still be too little and too late. Like attract and recruit like; foreign scholars bring more foreign scholars. If scholars in North America were perfectly mobile and all positions fully known then Canadians would be outnumbered by Americans in applications by at least 10 to 1. Apparently some faculty would view the possibility of 10% Canadian faculty as a worthwhile price to pay for the virtues of internationalism and supposed higher standards. When this goes hand-in-hand with American control of Canadian industry and resources it is a price Canada may find suicidal.

Martin J. Loney
Ottawa, Ontario

Edgard Litt. *THE PUBLIC VOCATIONAL UNIVERSITY: Captive Knowledge and Public Power*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Edgar Litt, professor of political science at one of the public vocational universities he describes, has written an interesting, ambitious and yet curiously disappointing book. His main attempt is to differentiate the new educational phenomenon of the public vocational university from the older and more liberally oriented university, both public and private. The differences are there and in general Professor Litt does a competent job of pointing them out. One might, however, raise the question of whether these differences are as significant as he maintains.

For example, the preface contains the following statement:

It is my contention that the American system of higher education is a captive domain. Moreover, the roots of that captivity extend beyond the ambitions of politicians, radical students, and professional scholars. The roots of the new captivity are found in the meshing of universities and the federal government, an interlocking of function and purpose that precedes the conflicts reported in our newspapers. (p. ix)