ceptance of some forms of social and political organization, unless it is possible for the morally autonomous person to genuinely decide to give up his autonomy of judgement. And even if this is consistent with moral autonomy it is clearly regressive. What kind of relationship to the state or to society can the morally autonomous person enter into and maintain? What form (or forms) of social and political organization must teachers in programs of moral education endorse and defend? What forms must they necessarily repudiate? Is there not implied in the development of an autonomous judgement a critical independence of the social and political authority of others. The morally autonomous person is subject to the authority of no one else, though he may at any time, and often, act in accord with authority. Robert Paul Wolff reluctantly argues the case that "philosophical anarchism would seem to be the only reasonable political belief for an enlightened man" (*In Defence of Anarchism,* Harper Torchbooks, 1970). And though the possibility of this implication is surely not news to the philosophers who have contributed to and edited the works here under review, it likely is news to most of those who it is anticipated will institute and conduct educational programs which are meant to assure the wide-spread development of moral autonomy. Showing the possibility of this implication is not the same thing as demonstrating the implication, and inclusion of the critical inquiry of social and political philosophers is obviously appropriate to and highly desirable for any philosophical or inter-disciplinary study of moral education. Only with this kind of contribution may the compatibility of moral education with democratic forms of government be clearly shown and confidently asserted.

Anthony Burton. *The Horn and the Beanstalk.* Toronto: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1972. Pp. xii, 129 (paper with bibliography)

Richard D. Heyman, Robert F. Lawson and Robert M. Stamp. *Studies in Educational Change.* Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972. Pp. ix. 259 (paper).

Terence Morrison and Anthony Burton (eds.). *Options: Reforms and Alternatives for Canadian Education.* Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973. Pp. vi, 425 (paper).

Murray Shukyn and Beverly Shukyn. *You Can't Take a Bathtub on the Subway: A Personal History of SEED—a new approach to secondary school education.* Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973. Pp. xiv, 235 (paper, appendices).

Hugh S. Stevenson, Robert M. Stamp and J. Donald Wilson (eds.). *The Best of Times, The Worst of Times: Contemporary Issues in Canadian Education.* Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972. Pp. xix, 586 (paper, bibliographies).

Other than having been published recently by Holt, Rinehart and Winston and dealing with education, these five books have little in common. Four of them are exclusively concerned with Canadian education, two of them are collections of articles, one documents an innovative educational program, and another one undertakes a critique of Canadian education.

The two collections of articles, *Options: Reforms and Alternatives for Canadian Education* and *The Best of Times, The Worst of Times,* offer an interesting comparison because the former volume is composed of articles solicited for the occasion while the latter volume was culled from extant writings. Since Morrison and Burton are generous in reporting the support received from their publisher, and as they speak also of the enthusiasm and ready compliance

of the contributors to the volume which they solicited and edited, one must conclude either that the editors made some unwise choices of contributors or else that some contributors, having given their word, pressed a little too hard in meeting their commitments. For whatever reason, the articles solicited by Morrison and Burton for *Options: Reforms and Alternatives for Canadian Education* are of uneven quality and the overall impression is that of a project ambitiously designed which did not achieve its aims. In spite of an attempt to organize the articles topically, in spite of various efforts to facilitate communication among the contributors, and in spite of the attempt to formulate a second, integrating framework in the final chapter, the book does not emerge as a product of concerted thinking about Canadian education. It is even mildly annoying to have Ivan Illich provide the lead article—as if no book on educational alternatives could be complete without an invocation offered by the sage of Cuernavaca. Illich is at least interesting to read as he throws out typical sweeping denunciations:

> Education came to mean an intangible commodity which had to be produced for the benefit of all, and imparted to them in the manner in which the visible Church formerly imparted visible grace. Justification in the face of society became the first necessity for a man born in original stupidity, analogous to original sin. (p. 10).

While Illich's criticism of education in technocratic, consumer societies may apply as well to Canada as anywhere, his article does not serve to establish a larger context within which the specific criticism of Canadian education is pursued. Though the second article, by Michael Katz, differs on some important points with the view of Illich, there is no attempt to search out some of the distorted and over-simplified analyses which continue to pervade the argument of Illich and, consequently, no attempt to establish benchmarks from which a survey of current issues in Canadian education might then have proceeded.

As might be expected, the article by Illich was not written expressly for the present volume, and it happens that of the remaining thirty-seven chapters in the book, thirteen are revisions of, or identical to, articles appearing elsewhere. The editors did not succeed, therefore, in producing a collection for the occasion; given the time constraints it was perhaps inevitable that they would not be able to fulfill so ambitious an aim. However, it is fair to warn the reader that in respect of continuity and focus upon issues, *Options: Reforms and Alternatives for Canadian Education* is not notably better organized than any selection of extant writings that might have been assembled by a careful editor. One may also question whether the editors are correct in arguing "The fact that most of the articles have been written since the spring of 1972 may help to give the book a tone of freshness and immediacy" (p. 1).

A few of the articles are neither cogently argued nor informative, and the fact that they may be freshly written is small compensation. Chapter 12, "The Transcultural Education of Teachers," is a pretentious and awkwardly phrased argument for teachers to transcend their culture. Granted the importance of cultural transcendence, the article does not afford new insights into its achievement. Moreover, when we are told of "ordering the oikoumene in accordance with ecumenical ideals," (p. 127) it is at least disappointing to turn to the glossary (one-page glossary for a twelve-page article) and learn the statement may be interpreted as saying, "ordering the inhabited earth according to ideals pertinent to the inhabited earth."

The articles contributed by one of the editors, Anthony Burton, are more readable but still fail to be convincing. Burton's article, "Futures in Teacher Education in Manitoba," rests, in large part, on a serious inconsistency. The claim that drastic changes are needed in teacher education is supported by reference to research done by W. James Popham. Popham's finding that "experienced teachers are not particularly skilled in bringing about specified behaviour changes in learners " derives from research based on a behaviouristic model of teaching.[1] The inconsistency arises because Burton, in proceeding to recommend new strategies of education to improve the skills of teachers, expressly objects to a behaviouristic emphasis in teacher education: "Behaviouristic approaches to teaching have only limited utility here, and I would suggest that such models are too influential in faculties of education at the present time"

---

[1]W. James Popham, "Teaching Skill Under Scrutiny," *Phi Delta Kappan,* Vol. LII, No. 10, (June, 1971), p. 601.

(p. 377.) In short, the kinds of weaknesses Popham found in teachers are not the kinds of weaknesses which Burton intends to amend.

There are some good articles in the collection, such as Crittenden's "Ethical Pluralism and Moral Education in the Public Schools," and Tompkin's "National Consciousness, the Curriculum, and Canadian Studies." In total, the unevenness of the collection is greater than might have been expected in a book which is said to have been planned and to have been produced through considerable collaborative effort. Most notably, it fails to be systematic or comprehensive in treating the various topics which provided the basis for organization of the volume.

By contrast, the other volume of collected writings, *The Best of Times, The Worst of Times,* escapes the most severe censure directed at the previous work because this straight-forward and wide-ranging collection does not purport to deal systematically and thoroughly with a single topic. Each of the thirteen chapters in the volume deals with writings on a specific topic such as "Language and Education" and "Public Pressure for Educational Change," but the total collection is intended to be widely representative. The most striking difference between the two collections is in this matter of range of representation, for *The Best of Times, The Worst of Times* includes much material from the popular press—newspapers and magazines—as well as articles from scholarly journals and publications devoted exclusively to education. The attempt is to document public concern with contemporary issues in Canadian education, and not merely to report varying shades of professional opinion. More extensive introductions to each chapter would be helpful, but given the variety and number of articles reproduced in each chapter, it would be an enormous task to set each one of them in context. The editors, Stevenson, Stamp and Wilson, may have taken the wisest course in offering only brief introductions and in not attempting to provide context or commentary for every article. Use of the volume in classes thus requires some supplementation if students are to make best use of the material here provided. One could wish that conflicting articles had been more often selected and juxtaposed, as in the instance when John A. Young's response to the *Vancouver Sun's* editorial on "The Burden of Education" was included.

In most chapters of the book there does not seem to be a balance of opinion, particularly on such questions as "Minority Groups and Education" and "Religion, Morality and Education." Perhaps, to the contemporary mind, there is only one possible view of the alleged failure of public education to serve the interests of minorities, but broader questions of the extent to which minorities need to acquire the values of the larger culture if they are to have any hope of securing their own interests are worth at least a passing glance. The almost universal critical chorus which has been raised in behalf of minority rights might at least be tempered by some reflections on economic and social possibilities in Canada. Given, for example, that the reserve system has not worked, to what extent does the Indians' coming to grips with Canadian society and their more effective participation in the economy entail some loss of cultural identity?

If there is any one thing notably lacking in this extensive and interesting collection of contemporary writing on Canadian education, it is a sense of dialogue, of earnest differences on important educational questions. Differences there are in the views expressed in the book and John Macdonald, for example, presents a careful argument at variance with the free-swinging reform spirit of John A. Young. But their articles in Chapter 1 were not originally written in opposition to each other, and they are less obviously in disagreement because the level of analysis and the topics dealt with are quite different. It would have been more indicative of deeply-held differences to set Macdonald's statement against some of the pleas for child-centred education in the Hall-Dennis Report.

Criticism of the articles selected for a volume of readings is always possible in relation to judgments about the kinds of readings which would be most informative, most representative, and so on. The editors might thus argue, for example, that Richard J. Neeham's "Billions for Schooling for What " deserves a place because it represents a widely held point of view. Its representativeness thus outweighs its loose use of unsubstantiated cost figures—perhaps the loose tossing about of such figures is again representative of much argument in Canadian education. Nonetheless, we have had in Canada such sharp commentary as

Professor James Daly's *Education or Molasses.* More attention to some of the disputatious writings in Canadian education would have added to the volume, particularly to its potential for instructional use.

Altogether, *The Best of Times, The Worst of Times* is more successful in relation to its purpose than is *Options: Reforms and Alternatives for Canadian Education.* In particular, unevenness of quality of the articles is no objection to the former volume since it undertakes to represent a range of writing, both scholarly and popular. The latter volume, with its claim to probe deeply into the possibilities for reform and with the reported selection of contributors should maintain a better standard of analysis and argument.

Turning attention to *The Horn and the Beanstalk* by Anthony Burton, we are faced with a book which purports to undertake a sweeping social analysis and educational criticism

> . . . education has become big business, and has therefore ceased to be education. Big business is basically oppressive, and it is nowhere more oppressive than in our schools . . .
>
> The third point to be made in this book is that there are ways for people to liberate themselves from the dehumanizing effects of such pleasant coercion . . . What I hope to do is to show to ordinary people the degree to which they are oppressed, and the means by which they can commence the struggle to become free. (p. 3).

To deal adequately with such questions requires a comprehensive social theory, a comprehensive educational theory, and empirical information on the present state of society and education. We get nothing substantive under any of these headings, and instead, are treated to standard denunciations of the perversion of education by the corporate influence. These denunciations draw parallels between business expansion and the growth of education which are highly dubious and, furthermore, the charge that corporate enterprise is oppressive rests upon an understanding of oppression which makes no distinction between being coerced and being persuaded (p. 1).

More indicative of the flaws in the argument of *The Horn and the Beanstalk* is the criticism of age-grading and the recommendations for improving upon it. Age-grading is the first of four educational problem areas discussed in the book. The criticism begins, in standard fashion, by asserting that age-grading is mechanical and that expecting all children in a class to learn various skills at exactly the same rate is educationally inappropriate. Evidence in support of this charge consists of instances of rigid behaviour on the part of teachers and principals and also the general observation that poor teacher preparation combined with monotonous repetition of a limited teaching cycle causes teachers to approach the teaching of reading in an unimaginative and inflexible manner. The argument seems to be about the quality of teaching practice rather than the grouping of students.

His further objections to age-grading are that it is wrong to keep students in a restricted age group (i.e., all within an age range of eighteen months) and that schools "in fact, are little corporations with a series of groups graded according to institutional status" (p. 28).

In part two of the book, *Pseudo-Liberation,* alternatives such as continuous progress and individual student programming are dismissed as mere rationalizations and refinements of age-grading. The comments lack specificity and rely heavily on the use of figurative expressions such as "boxes" and "packages."

> Children in Continuous Progress schools still have to go through grades. The ones in Saskatchewan go through two now instead of six. Some of them may escape from the last box a little earlier than before, and others may take more time to emerge from the last box. But the leaders and the laggards are still the same people, and they come out of the new boxes clutching the same old packages. (p. 45).

While depending upon his vague, figurative language to sustain the allegation that schools are mechanical and monotonous, Burton gives a wrong report on changes in Saskatchewan. The two divisions in the elementary system are primarily administrative, and children do not now go through two boxes instead of six. The levels used in Saskatchewan are, in fact, more numerous than the former grade divisions, and most important of all, individual students can progress at different levels in different subjects. A student no longer takes all his instruction in all subjects at a single, uniform level, or grade. Quite apart from not

being able to distinguish between the administrative divisions of the elementary school and the instructional groups, Burton goes on to dismiss as trivial the fact that "some of them may escape from the last box a little earlier than before." If such a change is trivial, what is the point of the earlier complaint that children who can read ahead of their classmates are usually held back from so doing? (p. 26). If he wishes to defend the right of the child to go ahead of his own pace, it is at least a step in that direction to allow children to complete the primary program in different periods of time and also to progress at different rates in different subjects.

Apart from these challenges to the consistency of his argument is the question of whether Burton's complaint is accurately directed at age-grading. In the passage previously quoted he declared: "But the leaders and the laggards are still the same people, and they come out of the new boxes clutching the same old packages." Rather than being an objection to age-grading, this complaint is to the effect (1) that students are still differentiated and ranked in the same way with respect to accomplishment and (2) that students are still learning the same things. There is no necessary reason why a change in age grouping should change the comparative accomplishments of various pupils and, apart from a change of curriculum, neither should it alter the material that is learned. Both of these things could, in fact, be changed without changing the system of age-grading, and conversely, age-grading could be changed without altering pupil rank or the nature of what was learned.

After a series of such negative, vague, and confused comments on age-grading, it is surprising to find in the third part of the book, *Quasi-Liberation,* the claim that age-grading is natural. In the section headed, "Avatars in the Aviary," Burton notes that his alternative school colleagues got into trouble because they were unrealistic in *not arranging to do anything about age* (italics mine). He concludes, "The Rousseauesque educator who seeks to avoid such divisions and to bring children together 'naturally' is in fact oppressing them" (p. 62). If some age-grouping is therefore necessary, what has Burton been arguing against? He attempts to explain:

> If age-grading is natural after all (sic), what is so wrong about the age-grading of the pseudo-liberator? The answer is that the technocrat does not only recognize stages of growth, he creates boxes full of gadgets and goodies as mirror-images of the stages of growth: he then fits the children into the boxes, even if many get squeezed as he presses down the lid. The children must then learn to adapt their physical and psychic growth to the boxes. (p. 62).

Under all the metaphors which enable the writer to convey his sense of disdain without being informative, we may still discern that the grounds of argument have, once more, shifted. The objection is not to grouping children according to age, but to treating them in a certain way.

Turning finally to the section, "The Stages of Age," it is *not surprising* to find nothing said about stages of age, certainly nothing said about the ideal, proper, or most useful range of age for any instructional group. What are offered are vague moral exhortations, closely paraphrased here and presented in sequence:

> (1) . . . children need love . . . (2) Piaget and Kohlberg have argued that children pass through certain identifiable stages of cognitive development before they become autonomous beings . . . (3) the evidence suggests that by the early teens children are ready to fly the nest . . . (4) the fugitive adolescent should somehow be linked with those who love and can help him . . . (5) we should ensure the adolescent has people in the background who have specialized training and knowledge . . . (6) such broad responsibility for helping the adolescent should be accepted, not by the state, but by those responsible for, and involved in, the life of the child . . . and (7) such tacit recognition of the stages of growth is what true liberation from age-grading means. (pp. 87-9).

This series of largely unrelated statements fails to tell us anything about age-grading, or about any system of grouping for instruction. It reads like a deliberate attempt at obfuscation. The confusion and lack of specificity apparent in this argument pervade the educational analyses offered in *The Horn and the Beanstalk.* Burton fails to make a documented and informative case against the failings he alleges, and the remedies he proposes are themselves unclear and unhelpful.

Both on the basis of this book and of the articles he contributed to *Options: Reforms and Alternatives for Canadian Education* it must be judged that Anthony Burton is not advancing us towards an informed and useful criticism of Canadian education.

You Can't Take a Bathtub on the Subway: a Personal History of SEED is, in one respect, the most interesting of the five books here discussed. SEED is the acronym of Summer of Experience, Exploration, and Discovery, a program first organized under the aegis of the Toronto Board of Education to provide an alternative for students in the summer of 1968 when few summer jobs were available. The interest stems from the fact that the authors, Murray and Beverly Shukyn, were personally involved in SEED from the outset: Murray was the first co-ordinator and Beverly was one of the first catalysts. SEED has continued since 1968 with some important changes; most notably it has changed into a full-time alternative school. This personal history of SEED has the interest of an effective, anecdotal record compiled by persons who were in the thick of the action. It also has the deficiencies of such a work, principally in that it offers an uncritical report of what occurred because what we here see of SEED is what was seen by enthusiastic proponents. In fairness, it must be said that problems of organization, particularly the difficulties in working out a program in co-operation with students, are noted.

The focus of the book is the organization of the program including such matters as finding space, scheduling subject meetings, recruiting catalysts, selecting students, arguing with school trustees, and coping with requirements of the Provincial Department of Education. Catalysts, by the way, are adults who volunteered to meet with groups of students and who have knowledge and experience concerning a topic the students wish to pursue. What emerges from this description of the development of SEED *is not* a handbook for the organization of an alternative educational program, because much of the unique character of SEED can not be generalized for the guidance of other innovative programs. All that can be claimed is that the Shukyns have given us some sense of the way in which a new program can be shaped under a spirit of voluntarism while also warning of some notable pitfalls.

Among the more striking, and more depressing, pitfalls were the suspicions of some members of the Toronto Board of Education. The suspicious trustees seemed wonderfully innocent of any interest in the educational content of SEED while being keenly interested in the character and political bent of the young people involved. Because a student secretary signed some letters with the biblical parting wish, "peace," because there was mention of needing pillows in a carpeted elementary school with few chairs large enough for adults, and because illustrations from *Alice in Wonderland* were used on program materials, some trustees inferred that the students involved in SEED were political radicals and acid heads with intentions of fomenting an orgy. The ultimate in fatuity may have been achieved in August, 1971, when the Board was debating whether to continue SEED without setting any attendance requirements. Two trustees voted against the program, and they expressed opposition to the entire concept of SEED. One of them declared, "It is contrary to the philosophy of all the major religions." (p. 78).

Such excesses of silliness aside, the Toronto Board of Education had good reason to inquire searchingly into the organization of SEED, for the program required great latitude in the manner of evaluating student progress, it escaped typical attendance restrictions, it led to a lottery for the selection of students, and, in proportion to the number of students involved, it must have engendered record level of contact between the Board and parent-student delegations.

Most important in this report on the first years of SEED are the emergence of an alternative model of education and a striking point about the governance of a program which shares planning responsibility with students and parents. The authors deny that all the students in SEED were highly competent; the most they will allow is that "the kids who were interested in public relations for the program were highly verbal, very articulate, and generally fairly confident" (p. 93). They insist that the students at SEED were a hundred individuals and were not all talented or highly motivated. The complaints reported by some of the pupils to the effect that some of the kids who came into the program through the lottery were not really interested in what SEED had to offer would bear out these disclaimers.

However, there were enough capable and energetic pupils to make the program. go. The question that can then be asked is whether a program which serves a comparatively small number of pupils and which requires a lot of pupil initiative can be justified.

If such a program can be organized within the resources of a metropolitan system, and if it is beneficial for even a small number of pupils who have talent and who are disenchanted with the regular school program, there would seem to be reason for allowing it. In effect, why not have an alternative for a group of pupils who are willing and able to share more directly in the organization of their own education? To attack such a program as elitist seems to miss the point if in fact a great deal can actually be done within the program while at the same time not making a disproportionately heavy call upon the resources of the system. SEED suggests an alternative which may only be applicable to a few, but is there any reason why the few should not have that alternative if their having it does not adversely affect the rest of the school system?

The experience of SEED has at least demonstrated a possibility. Even if that possibility cannot be the model for an entire metropolitan school system, it may still be a useful alternative. The important point about governance relates directly to the value of SEED as a small-scale alternative.

The question of community involvement in school management is now much in vogue, with such instruments as school-community councils being suggested. The Shukyns make the important point that "it is very difficult for a community that cannot agree on direction to become involved in the policy decisions of a school" (p. 137). Their point is that geographical contiguity is no guarantee of educational agreement, and they suggest that smaller units, drawing together only some of the people in a community, are more promising as the basis for organizing self-managing educational programs. Given the mobility of people in large urban centres, this questioning of the neighbourhood school is most trenchant. Let us also understand that it is a questioning only of some aspects of the neighbourhood school, for there is no reason why all schooling should become unitized and removed from a common geographic base. However, if alternatives such as SEED are to be followed, and if there is to be greater citizen and pupil participation in educational management, it is imperative that such school units be formed on the basis of common interest rather than on the basis of spatial proximity.

SEED is valuable for raising such possibilities, even if this personal history of the project is severely limited. We learn little or nothing, for example, about the content of instruction in the program, and the evaluation is very general, reporting such things as the numbers of students earning credits at various grade levels. The fact that there is much more we should know about SEED than is offered in the present volume, detracts only a little from the importance of the possibilities it suggests.

The fifth book reviewed here, *Studies in Educational Change,* examines instances of educational change in Canada, Africa and Germany. This wide-ranging study of educational change is "concerned with educational reform in the hope of demonstrating that certain types of economic and political expectations provide fundamental motives for such reform" (p. 2). Confronted with such a broad claim it is appropriate to ask if we are also confronted with a cross-cultural study which attempts a bold reductionism which would bring diverse examples of educational change under a common explanatory model? In spite of the fact that the individual studies are interesting and well presented, they do not serve to show that generalizations having significant explanatory power can be well applied to the educational changes in the three areas. At the most, a rather loose kind of economic determinism might be argued on the basis of the information presented in these studies, but the authors are not inclined to press even that far. In spite of what is said in the introduction, there is not a sustained effort to draw parallels in the three situations, and in the details of the studies the differences are at least as impressive as any general similarities.

Richard Heyman's study of educational change in Kenya and Tanzania is more effective than either of the others in arguing that "schools in a system of mass education are expected to function as a means of economic mobility and increased political participation" (p. 152).

Moreover, the demand for instruction in English and for a literary curriculum on the part of the Kikuyu Independent Schools Association represents a clarity of purpose not evident in the argument over vocational education in Ontario as reported by Robert Stamp. There was no question that command of English and certain educational qualifications were absolutely necessary for access to the economy and to higher levels of political and social influence in Kenya. Whatever may be said for vocational education in Ontario, its consequences could not be so clearly anticipated. Such differences in the conditions of the studies militate against the emergence of any cross-cultural generalizations more specific and more informative than rather loose claims that people pursue educational expansion and reform to secure their own economic advantage.

It is useful to have even such a broad claim better documented, but there is a great difference between achieving such documentation and arriving at a general model of the motivation for educational change which well explains behaviour in a variety of political and economic settings. A very great difference which is apparent between the studies of Stamp and Heyman in Ontario and Africa is that much of the impetus for reform in Ontario came from educational and community leaders who urged what they thought was good for others, while the Kikuyu in Kenya were seeking what they saw as essential for themselves. Such differences in motivation may be subsumed under the "certain types of economic and political expectations" cited in the introduction to the volume, but to include such importantly different approaches to educational change under the same terms makes the terms much broader and less useful for purposes of explanation.

Robert Lawson's discussion of political influences on educational change in West and East Germany seems even further removed from the exploration of cross-cultural generalizations of significant explanatory power. In commenting on his discussion of the extent of similarity underlying the differences in approach and practice in education in the two Germanys, he states:

> Whatever conclusions there are to this question, they are specific to the institutions, relationships, and developments of each German state, and they have been so treated here. (p. 238).

It is, moreover, true for all three of the studies that what makes them most interesting is the attention to specific details which cannot easily be related to details in the other countries studied.

Thus arguing that *Studies in Educational Change* does not proceed very far in execution of the grand design suggested in the introduction is not to say that the book has failed. Rather it is to raise the question whether there was any point in suggesting such an overriding purpose in putting the three studies into a single volume. In any event, three well documented reports of educational change are worth having.

Ralph M. Miller
The University of Calgary

Cyril S. Belshaw. *Towers Besieged.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited. 1974. Pp. 224. $5.95 (paper).

Professor Belshaw's book, subtitled, "The Dilemma of the Creative University," is an important contribution to the variegated literature of Canadian post-secondary education. In it, Belshaw examines the nature of the university, appeals for university reform and clear-cut policy, argues for outright rejection of certain values and viewpoints, scores the anti-rational attack on university values and worries about university structures which limit its ability to achieve creative goals, including its role as international instrument for the creation of culture.

Although the scope is broad, the text is well written and the arguments, for the most part, tight and lucid. It is a volume that could be read with profit by most academics in Canadian universities. Every page does not contain a startling new idea for the experienced university person but the synthesized arguments of the traditional and perhaps conservative model of