

different from the traditional Queen's student. How did they react to student life at Queens, to the "Code of Ethics", to extra-curricula activities? Did they as easily become members of the Queen's family? Although the author indicates that veterans did participate in student life he doesn't tell us the effect this participation had on either intellectual or social behavior.

One other aspect of life at Queen's that is noticeably lacking in this study is the role of women — especially women students. The index reveals the paucity of references to women and the uninitiated might truly wonder if Queen's did welcome women and if the university had produced any noteworthy female graduates. There is no discussion, for example, of the fact that the medical school was still not accepting women students as late as 1942. As well the impact of the wartime exodus of men resulting presumably in a high female enrollment is not addressed. Women students during the war, we are told, "made bandages, quilts and socks," became involved with Red Cross work and raised money for field purchases. The intellectual accomplishments of the female student and her impact on the social life on the campus receive little attention.

The relationship of the university with the city of Kingston deserves mention. Although housing for students and land expropriation problems are addressed the long term, ongoing relationship which must have existed between town and gown does not appear in the volume. Given the size of Kingston and the growth of the university each must have been quite important to the survival and development of the other. We really do not know what, in social, financial and educational terms, the university has meant to the city. For example, did the Kingston Public School System have a higher proportion of degreed teachers than other areas of Ontario? Was the percentage of students from Kingston going on for university education greater than that of other urban centers in the province?

Despite the above criticisms, *Queen's University* is a readable, well written account of one university's growth. Professor Gibson has brought to his task the canons of good historical research. He has included evidence from a variety of sources, both private papers of individuals and records of government departments. He has looked at newspapers and periodicals and at student publications. The text is interspersed with seventy-six illustrations, most of male administrators, prominent professors, and of buildings. (Women appear in four photos — the Ban Righ House Council, the Registrar, the Dean of Women, and as cheerleaders!). The dates of this volume 1917-1961 mean that many of the events, and people important to Queen's are familiar ones to Canadian academics. Matters relating to academic freedom, to the teaching versus research debate and to the conscientious attempts to acquire and maintain a first class faculty are highlighted. The subject matter and the style of writing make this an interesting text, one that I would certainly advocate as the best history of an individual university in Canada to date.

Nancy M. Sheehan
The University of Calgary

Lagemann, Ellen Condliffe, *Private Power for the Public Good: A History of Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1983, 246 pp. \$17.95 cloth.

Having benefitted from a resident fellowship with the Rockefeller Foundation at Bellagio, Italy, I quickly learned two lessons from the experience: first, that scholars are *not* necessarily or universally at their most productive and creative in icy garrets or in the draughty reading room of the British Museum library, Marx notwithstanding; and second, that not only capitalists and other co-opted individuals enjoy the continuing benefactions of past philanthropic millionaires. Even Marx needed Engels to support his genius! Therefore I am gratified to review this particular book realizing that I owe it to myself at least to understand the philosophy and the educational and social contribution of a similarly placed philanthropic foundation.

This somewhat dispassionate account of the Carnegie Foundation will be a disappointment to idealogues; its scrupulous attention to the nuances and contradictions of the philanthropic impulse and practices will, however, be immensely satisfying to historians and students of social policy and/or higher education. The first critical history of the Foundation as such, it is a valuable contribution to American educational and social history. It makes for particularly interesting reading in a time when philanthropic endeavour has been largely replaced by State interventionism and subsidization of educational effort. To understand how private agencies have and can still contribute to the delicate relationship between "private power and the public good" is to grasp the tension between political egalitarianism and economic individualism in a democratic and pluralistic society.

The book's format, while not strictly chronological supports the author's premise that contemporary problems cannot be understood without appreciating their origins. She sustains the premise by a thorough discussion of both the personalities that shaped the Foundation and the paradigms that shaped the direction of higher education. Lagemann devotes greater attention to the early years of the foundation's history but attempts to provide perspectives on the present without assuming the ubiquitous role of "progress". Indeed, she argues that the Carnegie Foundation helped raise the "expert" to a new authority through its reports, studies and commissions so that progress was no longer just allowed to happen — it was made to happen through innovation, industry and social planning; in short, a new growth industry of experts, professionalizers, policy makers and administrators engaged in "purposive social action."

Private Power for the Public Good examines seventy five years of major programs and studies, the relationships between education and social stratification, the growth and influence of science to democracy, and the "politics of knowledge." The author's discussion of the men behind the Foundation is astute and necessary — from its founding chief executive, Henry Smith Pritchett, to those who followed, — as well as the composition of the Boards and commissioners and the interest groups and power structures they represent. To reify institutional or organizational impetus without a discussion of its engineers and their "blue prints for social action" would be shortsighted.

Throughout this reconstruction Lagemann avoids the seductions of social control theories and while not neglecting political motivations she does not confuse intent with consequences while recognizing that consequences make for the meat of history. The Carnegie Foundation, like its founder reflects the dilemma of being "a rich man who wanted to be a good man [but] was not sure that he could be both" (p.4). Before explicating the dilemma it is crucial to recall some of the Carnegie Foundation contributions which, it must be admitted, are neither immodest nor insignificant in either their scope or their effects.

It is the Carnegie Foundation that established the first pension fund for College professors in 1928 and conducted sophisticated surveys which included Abraham Flexner's *Medical Education in the U.S. and Canada* (1910) and massive reports on Legal Education in 1914, 1918, 1921, and on Engineering Schools in 1918. Such studies led directly to the standardization and professionalizing of these schools. In 1920, one of the first major studies of the perennial questions surrounding the academic versus the vocational aspects of Teacher Education were examined and influenced its direction until Paul Mattingly's *The Classroom Profession* (1975) which did not offer a substantially different model to that proposed half a century before. Between 1968 and 1973 comprehensive reports were issued on "Quality and Equality" in education whereas in the 1960's task forces issued reports on "Poverty and the Disadvantaged" with the Board reflecting a greater diversification in its membership than it had previously.

By far the most wide reaching studies funded by Carnegie were those related to quantifying and measuring student potential through standardized testing thus pathing the way for claims that constant testing was a "feasible" means of "improving education". The most eminent behavioral and test and measurement psychologists informed these studies whose findings were so pervasive as to result in a power struggle between the recommendations of the Carnegie Foundation and the Progressive Education Association which wanted more varied and pedagogically oriented means of educational evaluation. The PEA argued for "evaluation", that is the assessment of school methods and outcomes, whereas the Foundation argued for "the true capacity of the pupil" thus leading to the matching of students with careers. Many renowned educators, including Harvard's president, James B. Conant, became embroiled in the debate. Moreover the reputable educational journal *School and Society* never underestimated the influence of the Foundation and neither did the Association of American University Professors whose concerns surrounded principles of academic freedom and their perceived erosion as colleges transformed in forms of governance, control, funding and administration due to the philosophy expressed in the Foundation's recommendations.

The Carnegie Foundation's later studies were no less potent and included commissions on the future structures and financing of U.S. Higher Education (1967-79) which was the longest and broadest survey on the subject undertaken. Educational television, public broadcasting, policy studies in higher education, and child life all came under the Foundation's purview. Consequently major shifts in structures, roles and expectations — the new "Academic Revolution" — can be traced to many Foundation recommendations.

Lagemann draws out the conflicts between the communalistic "progressives" represented by the philosophical assumptions of John Dewey and Jan Addams and the *efficiency men* with their divergent views of how science would shape the intellectual and institutional contours of "The Great Society." The Carnegie Foundation, in no

small way, decided the direction of this struggle in its advocacy of systemization in educational measurements, its professionalization campaigns, collegiate reform and standardization of entrance requirements, the independent evaluation of professional schools, the financing of those institutions which met the specifications, and the intrusion of "elites" into the modernization process through deliberative leadership and planning.

By far it is in the dilemmas and unexpected consequences of the intrusion of private power into the public domain that make for the most intriguing reading in Lagemann's case study. For example, Flexner's report led not only to "better" (that is, more scientific) medicine, but also to entrenched assumptions about income, control, and status of the profession, while eroding those competitive functions which limited the physician's domain (e.g., nursing and midwifery). While resulting in more infusion of large amounts of money into quality American and Canadian medical education it effectively, but not intentionally, led to racial discrimination as standardization reduced the number of Black Medical Colleges within fifteen years of the report to two.

In contrast The Reed Report (1921) argued for less elitism in legal education than had been argued for medicine as its author was concerned with "the poor boy's" access to the profession and the exclusion of minority and immigrant groups. In this case the American Bar Association quickly moved to establish its own professional standards in order to repress such democratic expansiveness! Both the medical and legal reports reflect the sympathies of their authors. In the case of Teacher Education the divisions between the "sequential" and the "professionalized" approaches were so irreconcilable as to minimize the Carnegie Foundation's success in professionalizing teaching. Moreover, uniformity in college entrance requirements led to studies on the "vertical progress" of the student through the school system which shaped a High School system fraught with problems whose residue overwhelms us to the present.

Even the seemingly humane intentions of a pension fund floundered when its proponents insisted that the principle be extended to professor's widows, librarians, deans, registrars, and other meritorious individuals. The fund could not cope and argued for contributory schemes and an actuarial basis. Faced with "moral" problem of pensions which were intended to make the difference between dependence and independence; to assist in resignations thus regenerating institutions with a constant supply of scholars; to encourage a poorly paid profession by offering security at the end of a career; and to assure that men of "character" would enter and remain, the Foundation found itself recommending more government intervention. The pension fund itself had negative consequences not anticipated: it permitted a minority of professors to mark time and perform in a perfunctory manner until retirement; and it led to College governors denying their responsibilities to the professoriate.

After consideration of the "Social Philosophy of Pensions" and corporate versus state responsibility, the Foundation analyses influenced the federal government's social security program with many of its original pension criteria embraced in the Social Security Act of 1935. Ironically, a private philanthropy based on a philosophy of Self Help helped to transfer welfare functions from the voluntary to the public, from the local to the federal level.

The greatest impact on "the public good" was that the thrust of the Carnegie influence has been to perpetuate hierarchical structures. Consequently recommendations were less innovative than they might have been and there were broad political consequences even if not avowed or intended. This is a book about social engineers and social efficiency; thus a review of it can't help but reiterate the word "shape".

Although a book about private power which analyses a foundation that is peculiarly American, this work contains an implicit caution to Canadians whose research largely operates under government auspices (which may tempt us into complicity and compromise no less than that of private power). Finally, although Lagemann laments the *paucity* of philanthropic history in the U.S. in what amounts to a ten page bibliographic "note" (!) this is a sober reminder to Canadians that we have scarcely begun similar policy studies or such a history and that even in a nation bereft of such grand philanthropic foundations there remains much to be analysed about the relationship of private power and the public good in our own society.

Patricia T. Rooke,
The University of Calgary