

Graduate Education in the United States. Bernard Berelson. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1960. vi + 346 pp. \$6.95.

Book Reviews

Who Wants Disarmament? Richard J. Barnet. Beacon, Boston, Mass., 1960. xviii + 141 pp. \$3.50; paper, \$1.45.

The major dilemma of the current arms race lies in two fundamental truths that are stated by Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles in an excellent introduction to this book. The first is that arms races throughout history have *usually* ended in war. The second is that unpreparedness and unilateral, or unsafe, disarmament have *always* ended in national catastrophes.

There are two fundamentally different approaches for dealing with this dilemma. The first, now known as arms control, is to try to raise the odds that the arms race does not lead to total thermonuclear disaster. It accepts the continued existence of thermonuclear weapons and delivery systems but tries to alter national postures and intentions to make a nuclear explosion less likely. Although he hedges his conclusions, Barnet seems to reject this approach as failing to come to grips with the fundamental problem of the thermonuclear age, that is, with the existence of very large thermonuclear stockpiles.

This leads the author to seek a solution to the second problem: to devise a multilateral, safeguarded disarmament scheme that would lead to peace and not to national catastrophe. Unfortunately, the book fails to take a hard look at the political and military problems and assumptions of total and complete disarmament. It pleads, instead, for research of a technical nature. In the final analysis, the author argues that we should look hard and then take the risk because the other course leads to disaster. In making this plea, he is reversing Bowles' presentation by suggesting that the arms race must lead to war and that disarmament may not. Although this is frequently asserted, Barnet has not brought us any

closer to a demonstration of how it can be done.

In the tradition of books on disarmament, the author felt it necessary to review the efforts made toward disarmament since World War II. In doing so, and in particular in his discussion of the Baruch plan, he displays a sophistication and an awareness of the reality of international politics which seem to be lacking in his later proposals. In addition, the book begins to fill the great void in our knowledge about Soviet attitudes toward arms control. In a way this is the most disappointing chapter in the book. Barnet, who is connected with the Russian Research Center at Harvard University, might have been expected to provide a penetrating analysis of Soviet motives. His analysis of Soviet doctrine leads him to the conclusion that serious disarmament negotiations with the Soviets are not possible. He then jumps to a discussion of hopeful signs and signs of progress and concludes that we should not let our awareness of the contradiction between disarmament and Marxist ideology stand in the way of possible negotiations.

We need to know much more about arms control than we now know before we either dismiss it, as Barnet seems to do, or completely accept it. What we know suggests that, without a radical alteration in the nature of man and international society, total disarmament will not mean an end to disputes, violence, or arms races. Until we have a much clearer idea of what it does mean and of what its consequences are, we should not accept disarmament as the goal. Even if we had all the evidence, we might still have to answer the author's question—if he means *total disarmament*—by replying “not us.”

MORTON H. HALPERIN
*Center for International Affairs,
Harvard University*

As the destiny of our society grows ever more dependent upon specialized intellectual competence, the graduate schools of our universities are assuming an increasingly complex but vital role. Here at the apex of the higher-education pyramid, however, is found a near maximum of academic conservatism, and about these venerable heights have gathered thickening clouds of controversy. Pages of discursive debate about graduate education, its organization, its quality, its very validity, have multiplied in plentiful supply; opinions have been as numerous as solid factual knowledge has been scarce. As Bernard Berelson recognized at the outset of his endeavor: “The assumptions have been various; the values ambiguous or in conflict; and the facts alleged, contradictory, scanty, or altogether absent.” There can be no doubt that we have been much in need of an extensive, objective study such as the one on which Berelson here reports.

Probably there has never been such a comprehensive survey of graduate education between the covers of a single book, certainly none based on as wide an array of accumulated fact and authoritative testimony. In an effort to bring understanding perspective to the first century of graduate work in the United States (1876 to 1976), the author draws with incisive care upon the accumulation of documents already available on library shelves. Concentrating his primary attention upon the years just past and those just ahead, he has drawn new and richly diversified insight from the field: from the practicing deans and faculties of the principal graduate schools; from young men and women who have recently earned graduate degrees; and from persons seeking to employ the products of graduate education.

As he summarizes his two years of effort under the sponsorship of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, Berelson speaks of having “read countless pages and collected numerous statistics, attended about 10 formal meetings, visited 20 or more institutions, secured about 45 disciplinary consultations, conducted 5 or so special studies, talked to over 150 people, and systematically collected facts and judgments