

The Journal of Law and Education

Volume 6 | Issue 2

Article 12

4-1977

Book Reviews

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/jled>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

(1977) "Book Reviews," *The Journal of Law and Education*: Vol. 6: Iss. 2, Article 12.

Available at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/jled/vol6/iss2/12>

This Article is brought to you by the Law Reviews and Journals at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Journal of Law and Education by an authorized editor of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact digres@mailbox.sc.edu.

Book Reviews

LEGAL ISSUES FOR POST SECONDARY EDUCATION. BRIEFING PAPERS II. Edited by Dennis H. Blumer. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1976, \$5.00.

*Reviewed by Nathan Weiss**

Sponsored by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, *Legal Issues for Post Secondary Education Briefing Papers II* is the second publication of the two part publishing project dealing with areas which should be of great interest to persons in two year colleges as well as other institutions of higher education. The topics of this book—discussed by contributors with both college and legal expertise—involve such matters as hiring and nonretention of faculty and staff, security on campus, copyright on campus, dispute settlements, grievances and arbitration procedures and dealing with federal regulatory agencies.

Noting that the papers contained in the volume are directed at laypersons, the preface wisely advises the reader to consult legal counsel when actually dealing with a legal controversy.

Each chapter—there are five—contains an excellent general background, a specification of the major issues and concludes with guidelines and practical suggestions on how the hard pressed administrator might deal with the subject. The chapters, however, are somewhat uneven in terms of usefulness for the college administrator. Thus, in chapter I the view is expressed that institutions confronted with the possibility of layoff of tenured faculty involve faculty (individuals, ad hoc committees, senates and the like) in the examination of alternatives, definitions and applications of the factors to be considered in determining who goes and who stays. Although in theory this sounds commendable, such an approach unfortunately may be somewhat analagous to the exercise of asking a condemned man whether he would like to be executed by hanging or electricution—a choice, but hardly one that would be welcomed.

The chapter on copyright on campus is extremely detailed down to the various forms one should obtain from the copywrite office for the types of protected works. By contrast the section within the chapter concerning educational use of reproduced materials by teaching faculty—an area of considerable importance for instructors—is inadequately developed.

The remaining chapters, which deal with security, dispute settlement and federal agencies, are right on target. Thus, the advice in the paper on campus security that one way to provide for the needs of all segments of the campus

* President, Kean College of New Jersey, Union, New Jersey.

community is to have a campus security force composed of two types of offices—campus police officers for crime prevention and security officers to provide watchman service—is most sensible. Equally perceptive is the awareness in the chapter on dispute settlement that middle managers must be trained to handle grievances and the sensitive recognition that even when management wins an arbitration case, if employees and union representatives are unnecessarily affronted, the favorable decision may be achieved at a very high price to be paid in revengeful installments over a long period in the future. Chapter V, which addresses dealing with Federal agencies offers welcome suggestions on what the administrator should do when faced with what he or she believes unjustly jeopardizes the policies, integrity or financial viability of his or her institution.

On the whole, despite some unevenness in the usefulness of the chapters, one must conclude that this is a most welcome addition to the growing literature in the field of higher education jurisprudence. Indeed, it would not be too much to say that no college administrator should be found without a copy of this valuable work.

MALE AND FEMALE GRADUATE STUDENTS: A QUESTION OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY. By Lewis C. Solomon. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1976, \$17.50.

*Reviewed by Everett W. Nicholson**

Discrimination in higher education has become an area of interest with the advent of civil rights legislation. Accusations about sex discrimination have been leveled on many fronts and the graduate schools have proven to be no exception. Apparently a need was perceived for a condensed source of information about sex discrimination as related to graduate schools. To fill the need, the National Institute of Education and the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare extended a grant to the author. In compiling the work, Solomon identified three basic areas to be investigated to clarify concerns relating to men and women graduate students. They were:

1. An attempt to arrive at a proper operational definition of sex discrimination in graduate schools.
2. To quantitatively determine the validity of allegations previously reported through opinions that sex discrimination did prevail in graduate schools.
3. To analyze what impact affirmative action legislation has had on treatment in graduate schools, that is, whether differential treatment exists, and if so, whether it originates with the institutions or is a result of earlier conditioning of both sexes in our society.

In seeking answers to the areas above, the author clarifies the social and cultural backgrounds that have caused sex discrimination in the past and distinguishes which discrimination practices are (1) the result of social conditions, or (2) the responsibility of the colleges and universities. The first

* Associate Professor, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

distinction was made by noting that certain social conditions support discrimination by (a) societal attitudes about women in higher education, and (b) the cultural heritage "it's a man's job." The latter distinction relating to universities' responsibilities in the problem arises out of the nature of their admissions policies, rules and regulations. The author conducted research in the following areas:

- 1). Acceptance rates for men and women graduate students,
- 2). Time spent on graduate study by men and women doctoral recipients,
- 3). Geographic and interinstitutional mobility of men and women graduate students,
- 4). Awards of financial aid to men and women graduate students.

With each topic the author offers the reader a detailed review of the research literature. The extensive data presented in the text could well have been placed in appendices and the essence of the data summarized in a more meaningful format. Nevertheless, in dealing with acceptance rates for men and women graduate students the research demonstrated there was little or no sex disparity. The author points out that discrimination occurs only to the degree that graduate school admissions officers who usually select the best candidate regardless of sex will, for example, choose the male if two competing candidates of the opposite sex are equal. The criterion which takes precedence is that the male will more likely contribute to the social good.

In reviewing the research on the time spent by sexes in graduate study, the author concluded that there is relatively no observable difference in completion rates. The notion that women have greater inter-institutional mobility because of their family obligations and their tendency to move as their husbands relocate jobs was proven insignificant. In the area of financial aid to men and women the research concludes that disparities do exist within institutions. In general, the financial aid picture across graduate schools demonstrates that sex discrimination is on the decrease even though the minimal data which is available tend to show minor disparities still do exist. At the present time, colleges and universities are struggling to deal adequately with the sources of financial assistance which have a number of their own criteria for distribution and still maintain a non-discriminatory distribution of the funds on their campus.

There are two assumptions set forth in the book which may be challenged in part. One assumption presented is that women graduate students have fewer models in terms of women professors than men have in men professors. This, the author feels, has an impact on women. The reviewer does not feel that mentoring is necessarily a function of sex, but rather it is one more of intelligent use and dissemination of information, understandings, and skills.

A second assumption is that colleges and universities are similar in nature to public utilities and operate similarly. It is implied that services are the basic *raison d'être*. Consequently, decision makers in higher education would behave in ways analogous to decision makers in public utilities. The reviewer feels the universities' function is not analogous to the public utility. Universities do not exist for a profit motive *per se* while utilities do even though the profits are regulated.

In fairness, however, Solomon does point out that analogies for discrimina-

tion between "institutions of higher education and private corporations whose profit potential is limited should not be carried too far." He goes on to discuss relationships between elite institutions, those in the middle of the prestige hierarchy and those at so-called poor schools. This interesting discourse suggests the first type of institution often to be among the most discriminatory. This is due primarily to the size and quality of the applicant pool which is available to the more prestigious institutions. Of course, many other factors are at work here and are discussed in some detail by the author.

The reviewer contends that college and university administrators will find this book very helpful and definitive, especially if those officers are called upon to defend a practice that appears to be discriminatory. There are many facets of discrimination among the sexes that administrators of institutions of higher learning should investigate. It is recommended by the author that fact finding committees be established to monitor equal opportunities for financial help. These include the number of faculty and administrative positions assumed by women, the availability of day care centers for women graduate students who are also mothers, equal counseling and health care for women, and the ratio of graduate students admitted in each department. All of these fall within the domain of the schools. Socialization factors, due to society in general cannot and should not be the responsibility of the schools. The research supports the trend that sex discrimination is decreasing in society and that is in turn reflected in the graduate schools.

In summary, the book has brought together much relevant research into one source. Those interested and involved with administration of graduate school programs should definitely avail themselves of this information. It is also a rich resource for anyone reviewing the literature or planning to conduct research in the area of discrimination against women in higher education.

TOWARD EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY: THE REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY UNITED STATES SENATE. Edited by Francesco Cordasco. New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1974. Pp. 459, \$15.00.

*Reviewed by Nancy Douglas Joyner**

Every decade or so, educators seem to find themselves confronted with a new educational "crisis" which not only engenders deep public concern, but also produces a special terminology or conceptual watchword in academic circles. Such a phrase today is "reverse discrimination," and its meaning is assuming greater significance as major court decisions such as *Baake v. Regents of the University of California*, 539 F.2d No. 3 (Sept. 16, 1976) reach the chambers of the United States Supreme Court for adjudication.

Yet, just as "reverse discrimination" holds importance among legal issues

* Post-doctorate Research, Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.

in American education in 1977, so the quest for equal educational opportunity has maintained a priority position in legislative activities and policy decision-making for more than twenty-five years. Had it not been for the Watergate scandals, the unraveling of which took command of the news media and monopolized the attention of the American people, release of the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity's report of late 1972 might have received greater public acclaim. Instead, four years later its impact is just beginning to be felt, a development which is being substantially facilitated by Francesco Cordasco's edited compendium, *Toward Equal Educational Opportunity: The Report of the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, United States Senate*.

Despite a plethora of writings on the landmark 1954 decision of *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* (*The School Desegregation Cases*), little systematic effort has been devoted to either formulating a truly operational definition of the term "equal educational opportunity" or assessing in a logical and coherent manner the implications of equal educational opportunity as a national goal. To this end, the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity was established early in 1970, and it endeavored for three years towards evaluating

the effectiveness of existing laws and policies in assuring equality of educational opportunity, including policies of the United States with regard to segregation on the ground of race, color, or national origin, whatever the form of such segregation and whatever the origin or cause of such segregation, and to examine the extent to which policies are applied uniformly in all regions of the United States. (p. vii)

The finished product is ample evidence of the Committee's willingness to meet this difficult task.

Its report is divided into eight major sections. Section I provides an objective summary and overview of the Committee's findings (covering more than 11,000 pages of testimony and supporting evidence), as well as a cogent synopsis of the Committee's final recommendations. The second section explores a wide variety of educational disadvantages experienced by pre-school and school-age children, including problems of hunger, inadequate housing, minority group discrimination, and low socio-economic status. Also alluded to is what the Committee considered an important area of child development—namely, children's television programming; however, this treatment seems somewhat misplaced as part of the section itself. Inequality in education entails the thrust of the third section, which is presented through a succinct analysis of the diverse effects segregation may have upon American school children from racial and ethnic minority groups. Of especial interest is the inclusion of Dr. James S. Coleman's Study of 1966 concerning the impact of educational socialization, as well as relevant criticisms of his conclusions by other eminent scholars (e.g., Samuel Bowles and Henry M. Levin).

Section IV presents a review of school integration efforts since 1954, augmented by a discussion of the historical background of *The School Desegregation Cases* (1954), and more detailed assessments of various techniques presently being implemented to achieve more fully racial and ethnic integration in primary and secondary schools. The remaining four sections provide a series of brief, but useful commentaries on: problems of minority language

education; the need to make education more responsive to the American public; financing public education; and the special needs of rural school children.

Typical of congressional committee reports, these findings present conflicting individual viewpoints. For example, three southern senators proffer their own perspectives on the liabilities of various modes of racial integration, which are then counterbalanced by a report from senators from Nebraska, Kentucky, and Colorado that expresses disagreement with the Committee's general conclusions, particularly in the areas of civil rights enforcement procedures and the use of busing to achieve racial balances.

Admittedly, many of the ideas and information prominently placed in the Committee's final report are available elsewhere in education journal articles, books, and public documents. The primary merit of this volume, however, is couched in the fact that it contains a valuable collection of major philosophical and political opinions and relevant statistical evidence which seek to measure the distance travelled from 1954 to the present towards the noble, though seemingly elusive, goal of equalizing educational opportunities in the United States. Moreover, although its findings are confined to pre-school, primary, and secondary public education, the background data is still useful for ascertaining the conflicts and concerns faced by insistence that schools *do* make a difference in determining equality of opportunity in American society, despite contrary findings by the Coleman Report. Coleman noted in *Equality of Educational Opportunity* that parental and family background, coupled with cultural ties, were more responsible for directly influencing a child's achievements than merely his educational experiences.

Interestingly enough, this contention by Coleman lent credence to the later findings of other distinguished educators, namely Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Thomas Pettigrew, and subsequently a more forceful study by Christopher Jencks, entitled *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America* (1972). Jencks' conclusion that educational reform would not likely produce more than marginal influence in narrowing the disparity of economic inequality among the nation's populace was not entirely ignored by the majority of the Senate Select Committee; however, it was purposely brushed aside to the extent that more optimistic conclusions could be reached.

Accordingly, the Committee sought to provide a positive response to the perennial question, "Do schools make a difference?", and the report's summary remarks point up the answer as "yes." In its original operational definition of "equal educational opportunity," the Committee combined both the results of education and the manner in which those results were brought about. By taking such a broad, sweeping view of the concept of equal educational opportunity, the Committee thereby could support more readily and assuredly the belief that, while a pupil's socio-economic status may be of some import in determining his level of achievement, other resources, or lack thereof, could also account for substantial differences in academic performance. Thus, it was noted that equal educational opportunity

refers to the absence of those educational practices that help produce the unequal results of education. Stated positively, it is the availability on the basis of need of all those material

and human, tangible and intangible things that society puts into its schools, and that collectively affect the process of formal schooling. (p. ix)

In other words, *something* is always inherently unequal in a public school system: quality teachers, facilities, textbooks, financial resources, the availability of well-trained counselors and administrators, and the myriad of impinging phenomena which enhance or detract from the relative ability a school can have in determining the success or failure of its clientele. Hence, the Committee appeared eager to straddle the fence between current, often-times conflicting research results, and unscientific intuition for substantiating the fundamental conclusion it wished to find:

A child's socioeconomic status, his parents' educational level and occupational status, the extent to which he and his family are the victims of racial discrimination and all the other elements of his home environment determine in large measure his performance in school and his success or failure in life. (p. x)

In support of this conclusion, the Committee made numerous recommendations for achieving equal educational opportunity. Among the most outstanding were: 1) a strong denunciation of any attempt to amend the U.S. Constitution to curtail current remedies used by Federal courts for ameliorating discriminatory effects of school segregation, especially the use of busing; 2) expansion of opportunities for non-English speaking children to overcome language and cultural barriers to learning; 3) encouragement of community participation in education; 4) denial of tax-exempt status to racially segregated private schools; and 5) increased federal aid to education, particularly in those areas where the need is perceived to be greatest.

It is a well-known axiom among diplomatic negotiators that when specific items of international agreements cannot be achieved, one merely agrees on that which is vague and general and appears to be acceptable to the majority of the parties involved. The Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity seems to have pursued a similar course of action. Senator Mondale, the Committee's chairman, in writing of poverty, ghettos and disadvantaged children, concludes that the adverse effects of discrimination can be at least partially overcome through fair and equitable access to our nation's educational resources. Without, or even with, statistically verifiable data to substantiate this conclusion, how could it be possibly refuted?

Despite these shortcomings, this edited compendium is replete with charts, tables, and recommendations which offer significant insight into a more comprehensive understanding of the complexities of furthering educational opportunities for American schoolchildren. It is a valuable tool for both practitioners and scholars, as well as governmental officials entrusted with the responsibility to provide for the public welfare. Certainly education alone cannot account for nor can it erase the disparities between the rich and the poor in this nation. But, when placed in proper perspective with other national social and economic commitments, it becomes abundantly clear that public education in America is nevertheless essential for the well-being and preservation of a progressive society. Therefore, public belief in the importance of education as a means of achieving a "better way of life" still appears to be the most valid measurement of significance in assessing the value of equal educational opportunity.

ALTERING COLLECTIVE BARGAINING. Citizen Participation in Educational Decision Making. By Charles W. Cheng. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1976, \$16.50.

*Reviewed by Robert V. Iosue**

The problem with this book is that it reads too much like a doctoral dissertation where the form must satisfy conventional criterion, i.e. copious footnotes, substantial documentation and many quotes to indicate that the research involved really does advance the state of the art. All of this is important—and traditional—in doctoral work. However, it does not lend itself to advancing the common knowledge in the field even for the so-called experts. Quite frankly, the style of this book will put off the casual reader, and appeal not much more to the interested and knowledgeable person.

It is one hundred and seventy-nine pages in length, has a selected bibliography of twenty-three pages, an index of four pages, and six pages of appendices. The rest of the book might be labeled as text except that page after page is filled with quotes and excerpts from countless documents, reports, and other such references, and, I might add that each of the seven chapters ends with pages of notes that serve to document either the quotations or confirm the case presented by the author.

It is unfortunate, indeed that the author has chosen to so document his work to the extent of discouraging the reader from determining what point is being made, or what is the thrust of the book. The summary and conclusions help us to a limited degree in ascertaining the direction taken.

Style aside, the substance of this book initially holds some promise but fails to deliver in the end. The author traces the origins of faculty unionization in the public school sector, placing greatest emphasis on the desire of teachers to make gains in salary matters. Mr. Cheng loses some objectivity in his work when he states "... from the beginning teachers unions were chiefly concerned, *and rightfully so*, with the plight of teacher salary schedules." His suggestion that federal legislation, signed by President Kennedy in 1962 granting bargaining rights to federal employees provided some impetus for the union movement in the public sector, is probably correct. Such legislation did indeed signal a change in attitude.

Mr. Cheng devotes some attention to the scope of negotiations illustrating quite vividly that wages, hours and conditions of employment do not clearly define the items under consideration. Indeed, there is no uniformity or consensus as to what is fair game for negotiation. Many unions would like to gain control over policy matters while management seeks to gain in so-called management rights. No conclusions are made as to what is considered a proper scope of negotiation since the process has a life of its own. When money is available, other considerations may be set aside. Or, perhaps job security will be the main thrust if money is scarce. In other words, the conditions differ at various times and different locations, resulting in a potpourri of negotiable items.

* President, York College of Pennsylvania, York, Pennsylvania.

The author then shows how teachers' unions grew stronger and developed a hierarchy and bureaucracy of its own—forsaking the rank and file in the process. It is a point well taken, the pyramidal structure is not the unique design of bureaucracy but is indeed a design—perhaps unwittingly—of most unions. From here the author implicates the school board as being less than representative as it goes about its work with the union. As examples, he raises the question of a white school board adequately representing the minorities within the community as it negotiates educational policy with the union. Perhaps the author should address himself to the question of how school boards come into being—and if elected, why are they not representative? It is not an idle question since the author's main thesis is an alternate to the present system, the implication clearly being that the present system fails to represent all constituents.

A particular weakness in the book shows itself at this junction, and one that repeats over and over again, making the book easy to put down. Mr. Cheng refers to the controversial Ocean Hill—Brownsville situation but at no time does he indicate what occurred. It is a pattern repeated throughout the book. The reader either knows all about these situations (and thus need not be a serious reader of the book) or he knows little about these situations both before and after reading the book. As mentioned earlier, it's a style endemic to doctoral dissertations where the research is arcane and of interest to a limited number of people.

Back to the substance of the book: Mr. Cheng now proposes, after determining that both the unions and the school boards are less representative than they should be, that community representatives be made a party to what was formally a bi-party affair. There are other suggestions such as an ombudsman, and limitations on the scope of negotiations, but the primary recommendation is for three-party negotiation. This was first tried at the State Teachers College in Fitchburg, Massachusetts where students entered the fray as consumers and not as invited parties to either team.

Mr. Cheng, who is an experienced negotiator and student of the union movement, should appreciate that negotiations, like the mating rites of many species of animals, involves much posturing and positioning of the parties before a period of bliss results. *Menage à trois* might be too exotic for the union movement.

WOMEN AND EDUCATION By Elizabeth S. Maccia with M. Coleman, M. Estep and T. Shiel. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C Thomas, 1975, Pp. 381, \$13.75.

*' Reviewed by Alexinia Young Baldwin**

A plethora of writings, organizations, and debates have mushroomed in the last decade and have focused the attention of citizens on the second class status of women. The most common strand in all of the rhetoric is the role

* Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Policies, Programs and Institutions, State University of New York at Albany, Albany, New York.

that education plays as the culprit against or the vehicle for change. *Women and Education*, another contribution, has skillfully brought together the articles of several writers in order to give the reader an enlightened view of the pervasive nature of the total educational experience obtained in a culture which has accepted as tenable, the second class status of women.

Many of the articles draw attention to the effect of early childhood experiences where females are portrayed as "sugar and spice and everything nice" in their roles as help-mate in the doll corners and the nursing stations while boys are portrayed as strong, objective and able as they work in their block and building corners or at the nursing stations as doctors.

This book also highlights the significance of the interaction between those who direct the development of the human being and the human beings themselves. The credibility of assumptions based on this interaction comes from research related to: intellectual development of women, as discussed in David Lynn's article "Determinants of Intellectual Growth in Women;" the sex role concepts and sex typing; and the roles women play in academe. The curriculum which provides the vehicle for this interaction assumes a crucial role. Whether one defines curriculum as a structured series of intended learning outcomes or all of the interactions an individual has in the process of obtaining an education, the dilemma is the same. Are the objectives of the curriculum the same for girls as for boys? Do textbooks and courses perpetuate the stereotypes by erroneous inclusions or glaring omissions? *Women and Education* gives a well rounded and inclusive discussion of curriculum influences from nursery school stories to courses in higher education through eight perceptive, in-depth articles. This section on curriculum relays the indelible influence of curriculum on women's stereotypes yet it highlights important revelations in self-awareness that occurred as women struggled to develop curriculum which channeled women out of servitude.

After the authors give the reader a look at what is and has been, they look to the future stating what can and should be. Women are at the threshold of a new ideology. Shall the model of this ideology be pluralistic, assimilative, or hybrid? Can rights and liberation be accomplished in this ideology? The hybrid model is proposed by Alice Rossi because in her estimation it does accomplish rights and liberation.

One cultural reality which was not discussed in detail in *Women and Education* was laws and their effect on women. Laws related to women's rights, e.g., the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) and the most recent Supreme Court decision on women's right to receive worker's compensation for pregnancy leave, have aroused fears and resentment among men and women. This resentment has come out of a learned cultural tradition which permeates the total fabric of society. The question which should be posed along with the suggested hybrid model is will the passing of laws to obtain rights change the traditional concept of women? Will women be liberated?

Woman and Education does not give a straightforward or singular answer to all of these questions and herein lies its importance as a collection of points of view on a current issue in education. Maccia's concluding article does attempt however, to state a point of view through a critique of models for

women's liberation. She posits that philosophical considerations are central to education because they provide models for the human being. Out of this position she calls for a "transcendent woman model" where the emphasis is on the intrinsic qualities of the individual or on self development. She has suggested that philosophy incorporated in the curriculum at all levels will help women transcend the cultural traditions which have kept them in their second class status. Maccia talks out of her professional training as a philosopher, about lofty ideals for humans. Her emphasis has been placed on decision-making and action not being tied to the more austere sense of reason which produces science and technology but to supportive nurturing sense of reason which produces philosophy. In proposing her transcendence model, she has classified all of the activities related to liberation under two basic models—"Womanpower" or "Woman Power." Her critique of each is significant in that she feels that womanpower succeeds in taking the woman away from the routine roles but it makes her a resource for the establishment. Woman Power on the other hand establishes a role which is not submissive and she is liberated from man but it places her in the position of oppressor which Maccia considers untenable. Yet the transcendence model which Maccia proposes seems to place the responsibility on women to transcend this state of affairs. Can this model, in reality, bring about the change without the operation of the other models? Analogous to this is the entreatment of Blacks to a higher being in their prayers and chants to elevate their spirits above their physical and psychological enslavement and so they could "tolerate" the injustices. Yet other models which included political, educational, and economic emphases were the levers for change. The model of transcendence when applied to this analogy helps the black man as a person but does little for him in relation to other human beings unless these humans too have had the experience of transcendence. Similarly the transcendence model holds small hope for a cultural change in attitudes toward women unless it is encouraged for men and women alike.

Summarily this book is a collection of scholarly articles which have been carefully selected to give an in-depth analysis (from experimental and theoretical bases) of the ideology of a society which nourishes the perpetuation of the second class status of women. The juxtaposition of these articles in groupings under common headings allows the reader to focus on the broader topic from several perspectives. The organizational format is particularly helpful in that it gives a thumbnail sketch of each section and poses questions concerning each article of that section. The common thread throughout the book seemed to point to a need for emphasis in education on human development with a redefinition of male and female roles.

This book should be a *must* reading for educators and their students both male and female. Hopefully a companion book will analyze the results of the models suggested here.

THE WASHINGTON LOBBYISTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION. By Lauriston R. King. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, D. C. Heath and Company, 1975, Pp. 128, \$11.00.

*Reviewed by Glenn C. Atkyns**

The Washington Lobbyists for Higher Education is another in the Lexington Politics of Education Series. In it the author purports to look at the politics of higher education as practiced in the nation's capitol, trace the changing relationships between higher education and the federal government in the past half century, examine the emerging operational style of higher education politics and assess the prospects for higher education in national interest politics. He does this in a straightforward descriptive study. His interest is in the politics involved with the federal government, legislation, appropriation and administration. The study is limited to those organizations that are representative of major institutional components of higher education such as community colleges or land grant institutions. Special task organizations such as the American Sociological Association or the Organization of American Historians are considered to be only part-time players so they are omitted. Aside from the literature in the field, the information is based on interviews with the chief executive officer and the person in charge of federal relations in the representative agencies. Over sixty persons were interviewed in this category and an additional twenty-five interviews took place with present or former officials of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, professional lobbyists for labor and education, executives of individual membership groups or task associations and several "observers particularly knowledgeable about higher education politics." From this data base Dr. King is able to present a comprehensive picture of the manner in which politics of higher education is practiced in Washington.

The Evolution of Federal Policy for Higher Education is the title of his opening chapter. For the reader of the Journal of Law and Education, other than the educational historian, this section is sufficient to paint the picture of the developments in higher education-federal relations encompassed by the educational century beginning with the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 and concluding with the turmoil in higher education of the late 1960s. The formation of The Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations in 1887 is described as a spin-off of the land grant act, an organization representing a particular set of institutions that became immediately active in pushing federal legislation in behalf of its constituents. World War I demanded the cooperation of the government and the colleges; this resulted in the Emergency Council on Education, later to be known as the American Council on Education. Major changes came with World War II and its aftermath. In particular the author accurately singles out the 1958 National Defense Education Act as asserting more forcefully than at any time

* Department Head, Department of Higher, Technical and Adult Education, School of Education, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut.

since the Morrill Act the national interest in the quality of education that the states, communities and private institutions provided. It also included, the author asserts, in addition to the elements of national defense, some suggestion that the federal government was moving in the direction of guaranteed opportunity for higher education, a concept given earlier impetus by the G. I. Bill. While science, mathematics, and foreign language study were specifically singled out for federal sponsorship, the bill also required assurance that "no student of ability be denied an opportunity for higher education because of financial need." The Educational Opportunity Grants were but a later fulfillment. The Great Society of Lyndon Johnson saw higher education dealing not merely with national defense but a host of other national problems ranging from housing to transportation. The author gives particular attention to the development of big science and its government role through the National Science Foundation.

One of the most useful portions of the book deals with the structure of Washington's higher education community. This is a handy reference for the educator who is not in continuing contact with the organizations that make up this group. Each major association is described as to size, origin, major developments and goals in approximately one and one half pages each. These organizations are: The American Council on Education (ACE), National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), Association of American Colleges (AAC), Association of American Universities (AAU) and the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC). There is also a discussion of the role of state offices (such as the State University of New York's Washington office, which opened in 1965), small associations and private grantsmen.

The study proceeds to describe the role of these Washington representatives, how they deal with the federal government on the one hand and their constituents on the other. There is a section, not particularly useful, detailing such information as the age, sex, race, religion and political party of these chief institutional officials. One item of this type is worth noting, however. The more recently employed representatives are less likely to have prestigious academic experience but are *more likely* to have had practical political experience or a role in the federal government!

The remainder of the book deals with the progressive changes in *modus operandi* that have taken place since 1960 in some of these organizations. The author defines three perspectives and their methods of operation. The "traditional" perspective sees higher education as having a unique character. Its adherents believe congressmen can be approached with rational arguments and that the congressman will respond in terms of the national interest to place higher education properly among the national priorities. These spokesmen consider themselves educational statesmen and readily enter into a philosophical discussion of the pros and cons of the nation's various priorities, the proper role of church-state relationships, etc. "The most important political consequence of the traditional view is the assumption that when education does become involved in national politics, it must do so in a way that

transcends narrow concerns of self-interest and incorporate the widest possible consideration for the national interest." Some have characterized this view as "snobbish elitism" because its adherents believe higher education holds a special intellectual place in the life of the nation. Much of the reverence for this position had been rubbed off, the author contends, by the student discontent of the 1960's.

A second perspective is "pragmatic realism." It is defined simply as higher education's adaptation to the new political relationships. Higher education is now a major expenditure of the federal government and that means big league politics. A less reserved approach is called for. The job is to get the money for one's constituents. One does not discuss the issues philosophically but tries to sell one's own institution's products. The older pragmatists tend to "regret that higher education seems increasingly willing to enmesh itself in adversary politics without thinking through their involvement and trying to justify its policy demands in the broader context of national priorities. These concerns are rarely confronted, and have been faced with decreasing frequency and sensitivity by a younger generation of politically aware representatives."

The third perspective is that of the "activist." This group proceeds on the assumption that the unique character of higher education no longer commands automatic indulgence and support. Instead, higher education is viewed as in competition with other interests equally worthy of support. In this view adversary political activity becomes imperative. This means organizing formal lobbying through some device that will protect the institutions from loss of their tax exempt status which is specifically based on a requirement that they not lobby. The activist approach means building alliances with other interest groups for particular legislative acts, groups such as labor, elementary and secondary education, welfare, etc. It means, in the words of one spokesman, "keeping up the pressure in such a way as to bring national actions in accord with the national will for example, in the case of reduced spending for space and military projects." Quite literally it means "political logrolling," and cooperating in pushing pork barrel legislation. It means giving the Washington representative much more power to make decisions for the constituents and to meld alliances, sometimes with strange bedfellows.

Author King does not allow his personal opinion to intrude into the study very often. In the conclusion however he assesses the situation in the Washington higher education community as having, in general, moved from the traditional to the pragmatic perspective, the American Council on Education arriving more tardily than some of the others. He contends most representatives will not move to the activist role until forced to do so by the pressure of events. Unless they do so, he implies, they will not be successful. They will not have the power (the NEA may threaten a congressman with loss of office) to move from a role of *consultant* on legislation to that of *negotiator*, wherein one's political clout is sufficient so that legislators have to listen and negotiate the legislation to be passed with the representatives. It is with this assessment that the book closes.

This reader believes this a good book, handy for a "quick refresher" on the

operational role and interests of a particular association. There are minor criticisms. The historian will be irritated with the impression that can be gained that the federal government's first interest in higher education came with the Morrill Act. A more serious criticism might be that Dr. King does not always understand the constituents. He writes about 29 private college presidents (mostly small Protestant colleges) who broke with national organizations to oppose aid to private religious colleges, using such terms as "disruptive" and "counterproductive." Perhaps, but he does not realize that for the Baptist who fled to Holland along with the Pilgrims, and fled Massachusetts to Rhode Island and was jailed in colonial Virginia, separation of Church and State is a doctrine almost as important as the divinity of his Jesus. The issue is far more important than the survival of a college.

Later Dr. King implies the religious influence is no longer very important. If true it may prove unfortunate. The Church college presumably came into existence in most cases because its supporters felt they had a particular and important view of education. A few years ago this reviewer was chairing an accreditation team at a fine Catholic institution when one of the administrators joyfully announced that the state government had declared it "secular" so it would receive a sizeable state grant. "If so," I wondered, "what was the institution's *raison d'être*?" The cultural pluralism of higher education is shrinking. One may ponder if having all college presidents in agreement on all major issues is necessarily an indication that things are better because there is no "disruptive", "counterproductive" expressions before Senate committees.

This book is Dr. King's first and he can be proud of it. It raises questions worth considering. We do not need to accept all of its conclusions. For example, one may wonder whether one should take the activist role even if that one does assure immediate funds. Do we really want the kind of government where every contending interest is threatening the congressman? Is the nation, including higher education, better off with legislators who respond only in terms of the more powerful of contending vested interests, distributing largesse in terms of power coalitions? There are those who contend that some of England's present ills stem from just such a role by Parliament. Perhaps higher education should work instead for the election of those who are dedicated to the long run national priorities they believe are most important, regardless of adversary interest pressures. It may be worth considering whether it is really desirable, although financially remunerative, to give more binding power to negotiate for the group of colleges to the "Washington representative," particularly with the trend that he has less prestigious academic experience and more political experience than his predecessor. Agreed he may be a good political technician but is he the one best able to make wise policy decisions? Can a new image grasping for federal funds by political power plays, result in a political backlash from an alienated public and Congress? The "traditional" perspective that "education can and should present their appeals in terms of national interest, in terms of benefits to young people" is an honorable one. Perhaps we should not retreat too far from it. It is even worth considering again how much autonomy an institution should surrender to a federal bureaucracy in return for money: higher education can, like Esau, trade its birthright for a mess of pottage.

