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

universities (based on Dr. Belshaw's wide experience) are a challenge to some ideas that have become current in the past decade or two. It is a coherent framework against which one's own ideas can be reconsidered.

Belshaw lists the special characteristics of a university as (a) the objective of generating inquiry and creativity; (b) the objective of expanding cultural resources, including scientific knowledge and artistic work; (c) the objective of developing powers of scientific, aesthetic, and moral judgement; (d) the assumption that students are adults; and (e) the derived activity of education for the application of cultural resources, including knowledge, attitudes towards enquiry and disciplined judgement. Recognizing his list omits "service to society," he asserts that a university meeting these criteria will inevitably serve society by creating a corps of educated, questioning, creative, humanly wise men and women. A strength of the volume is that the author does not simply state then abandon his special characteristics, but uses them throughout as a recurring foundation for his arguments.

Professor Belshaw blames senates and faculties for not ensuring that university values rather than values of professions determine curriculum in instructional programs. By acting as administrators rather than academic judges, faculty members have not demonstrated the powers of judgement the university should stand for, have failed to educate students and the public in the nature of academic judgement, and are losing control over their destiny. This is an example of a recurring theme in the book which might be referred to as "the enemy within" component of the "siege." Belshaw characterizes certain views of Jerry Rubin, Eldridge Cleaver, Goodman, Marcuse and Illich as symptomatic of the anti-rational stance of many elements in society that treat complex issues through the simplicity of slogans and dogma. He warns that universities cannot expect to resist such tendencies, unless they combat them internally and embark upon a rigorous task of public education in the rational university values.

Professor Belshaw treats the multifarious question of university organization and suggests that the university-wide senate be advised by two operating units or committees: one for academic initiation, and a second for academic review. The first would receive suggestions for new academic programs and conduct independent analysis. The second would assess the functioning and needs of existing academic units, make suggestions for strengthening them, for altering their objectives and style of operation, and for reducing or closing them. The senate would have the power to issue, amend or cancel charters of operation of Collegiate Faculties, Collegiate Institutes, and University Departments. Such charters would be the objectives and the mandate for operation of the academic unit. Attached protocols would deal with the teaching, research and operating methods, and philosophy approved for the unit and would define the academic subject matter to be covered as curriculum or research strategy. These statements would be of sufficient clarity so that review committees could determine the extent to which teaching and research meet expectations and the degree to which changes are necessary or desirable. Once the charter has been adopted, the academic unit would be completely free, within the constraints of budget, to revise the detail of its work without any further interference from senate, except at review time.

Unless a significant portion of the faculty were prepared to live up to Professor Belshaw's special characteristics of the university it is clear that the proposed structure would be ineffective. The significant flaw is that faculty members have not been prepared to make tough academic judgements outside their specialties. Yet in light of the obvious merit of the proposal, if faculty are not prepared to make responsible academic judgements, one wonders whether any organizational structure will permit scholars to control universities. And to play out the scenario, if scholars don't control the institution, is it a university?

Professor Belshaw correctly observes that almost every decision within the university bears on university values. Any tendency which attempts to separate decisions into administrative and academic categories is bound to create separate administrative empires and rivalry that inhibit the operation of university values. Consequently this should rule out, for example, any notion that technical officers of the university have decision-making authority of the kind applied in the role of a vice-president. This overstates a good point. Leaving aside the practical argument that presidents need "cabinets" because of institutional

complexity, the logic which permits the president (partially a technical officer?) to delegate to a vice-president (academic) allows also delegation of other presidential responsibilities. Witness for example, the vice-president who has presidential qualifications as well as appropriate technical qualifications. This delegation need not and should not imply staff functions or activities independent of institutional objectives.

Belshaw seems to assume that a judicial mix of professorial adherence to the special characteristics of a university and thoughtful reorganization will yield effective institutional management. Nevertheless, there is a missing crucial element. Management of universities and other human organizations includes functions such as policy formulation, planning, resource allocation, personnel motivation, evaluation, control and accountability. As with skills and knowledge required of a good teacher and university researcher the skills and knowledge of an effective university professor qua "manager" must be acquired through study and experience. The acquisition of these abilities and insights is necessary for both Professor Belshaw's university and existing Canadian universities — and Belshaw's book is one of the texts which should be required reading for that field of study.

An active faculty association is, in Professor Belshaw's opinion, essential to the successful university. The four main functions of the faculty association are to ensure adequate financial rewards and material conditions of work; to establish the legitimacy of criticism in university life; to recognize when the formal university organization is not adapting to a particular situation or circumstance and to step into the breach until the formal organization takes up the matter satisfactorily; to care for the professional standards of conduct of the university and its faculty. This section addresses the traditional issues of academic freedom, tenure and judgemental procedures but unfortunately the current important topics to Canadian post-secondary education of collective bargaining and faculty unions are omitted. The spread of collective bargaining in Canadian universities has been accelerated by increasing discontent and frustration among faculty members. The ultimate effect of collective bargaining on university values will be determined by the collective wisdom and judgement of Canadian faculty members. The issues need to be debated and reflected upon by all members of the higher education community.

Belshaw sets the university at the joining point of two major national interests: post-secondary education and creative, fundamental applied research and cultural innovation. This dual function gives a special character to its teaching and puts special responsibilities and limitations on its research. Provided the system was carefully designed so that support for basic university research did not suffer, Professor Belshaw suggests a parallel and a somewhat competitive research system to universities along the lines of the French Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. However, Belshaw does not relate his proposal to the special Canadian university problems of science and research policy which arise because of the differing jurisdictions and interests of provincial and federal governments. In the last chapter, he objects that the issue of "How much university should there be?" is usually put in terms of student numbers and says that this is a philistine decision that ignores a major part of university operation. It seems doubtful that Belshaw's opinion is widely held. There are those who have argued convincingly that funding universities on the basis of institutional programs is to open the way to non-university control of these programs.

It is hoped that Belshaw's ideas will provoke debate in academe on the proper management and role of the academy. There is much current literature including the publications of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems in the United States and OECD's Centre for Education Research and Innovation to name a few. There are many truths to be dispelled both within and without.

Bernard S. Sheehan
The University of Calgary