

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)

Given this general captivity of all higher education, it is at least possible to conclude that any differences within the "captive domain" are insignificant.

What does the public vocational university mean? For students it means large classes, few electives, curricula heavily oriented toward lower semi-professions such as teaching, social work, and the newer technical fields like computer programming. For the faculty the public vocational university means heavy teaching loads, little chance to specialize in one's area of competence, virtually no graduate work, and a highly structured and tightly administered bureaucracy. (A young friend of the reviewer recently was offered his first academic position at a new state university in the middle west. His teaching load was described as three sections of the one undergraduate required course in the social foundations of education. This three section load would be repeated the second quarter and again the third. He was also told that an attempt was being made to hold the class size to 125 per section.) For the power structure the public vocational university means a large pool of trained manpower and the postponement of entry into an overcrowded job market for a growing number of high school graduates.

Perhaps the most disturbing element in Professor Litt's book is the complete lack of anything that could be called anger or passion. To state that the American system of higher education is a captive domain and then to write a book describing in some detail how this captivity is manifested without once indicating even dissatisfaction with this state of affairs, strikes this reviewer as rather strange. It is true that in a chapter entitled, *Countercyclical Policies in the Public Vocational University*, the author does suggest some possibilities for change. He mentions the cluster college concept, the development of experimental colleges, and several attempts to enhance liberal studies, but offers no practical approach to implementing these reforms and indeed seems to hold out little hope for their success given the direct and intrusive influence of public bodies such as state legislatures and the federal government.

In his discussion of the curriculum, Professor Litt does not properly emphasize the rigidity of programs offered by vocational universities. It is not simply that they are professionally or occupationally oriented and thereby de-emphasize liberal studies, but also that most of them require a student to make an occupational choice very early in his college career with little or no provision for changing programs and occupation fields. In looking at the student culture, Professor Litt fails to bring out the difference in social class background between students attending vocational and those attending the liberally oriented university. John McDermott's writing in several issues of *The Nation* in the Spring of 1969 points out that many of the very new vocational universities, especially in urban areas, have already a predominantly working class student body. A social class analysis would help clarify differences in social activism, striving for educa-

tional reform, and deviant life styles characterizing the two kinds of universities.

To what extent does Professor Litt's analysis apply to Canada? Does Canada have public vocational universities? This reviewer would respond to the question with a tentative "yes" and qualify it by suggesting at least two traditions in Canadian education that have at least slowed down the development described in *The Public Vocational University*. One is the Canadian - British tradition of viewing the university as an elite institution and one requiring high academic performance for entrance. This tradition, of course, also has the effect of creating a predominantly middle and upper class student body. The other tradition is that of establishing post secondary technical and semi - professional programs outside of the university in non - degree granting institutions. Whether the Canadian industrial system's demand for increasing numbers of better trained manpower will override these two traditions remains to be seen.

In the concluding chapter of *The Public Vocational University* the following suggestion for change is offered:

Therefore, it is imperative that the burgeoning American knowledge system receive a new combination of mass resources and humane cultivation in order that it remain capable of providing allegiant criticism to government and private group policies that threaten to destroy the meaning of social knowledge, while expanding its voracious technical outreach. Herein, self consciousness is the first step in developing an academic political culture suitable to the needs of the most highly education and most violent period in the knowledgeable society's history. (p. 156)

Although I am sure Professor Litt considers his book an example of "allegiant" criticism it is probably more likely to persuade readers that since all higher education is captive, turning public vocational universities into liberal ones will not accomplish very much. What may well be needed is a much more fundamental and indeed revolutionary change in the relationship between higher education and the centers of power in American education. Perhaps in spite of himself Professor Litt has provided powerful reasons for such a change. What is needed is a book pointing out how it can be accomplished.

Roger R. Woock  
The University of Calgary