due to the incompetence or treason of some American (p. 17). This illusion has existed, particularly with respect to technology, and has made it difficult for Americans to understand how the Soviets could have got ahead of them in outer space as indicated by the first "Sputnik" in 1957 (p. 101).

Brogan notes the declining belief in Europe, after the Civil War, that America was the liberator of oppressed peoples, as it manifested imperialistic tendencies in the Spanish American war and the Canadian reciprocity proposal (1911), which Senator Champ Clark said would lead to the annexation of Canada. The British, however, conceived the United States as an ally, if not a semicolony, up to World War I and were embittered because it entered that war too late and abandoned responsibility for the peace too soon after it was over. Franklin Roosevelt, however, changed that attitude, to the surprise of some American conservatives, and Brogan believes that close Anglo-American relations have been assured since World War II. The British, although sometimes fearful that an unconsidered American initiative may mean to them "annihilation without representation," appreciate that, for their security, there is no alternative to the American Alliance.

Brogan notes the common interpretation of the American personality of 1776 as that of a man who had escaped the burdens of a historic past and was destined to establish a "new order of the ages" (p. 155), contrasted with the common interpretation of 20th-century Americans as interested only in affluence and security, without the spirit of adventure. He considers both interpretations exaggerated. Early Americans were influenced by their historic origin, and modern Americans, like all moderns, find it difficult to adjust to the speed of change and the hazards of the atomic age. Americans in all periods, he thinks, have been characterized by more egalitarianism, optimism, and uncritical belief in democratic institutions, and by less envy of, and resentments against, other nations than is usual in the European nations (p. 158). American culture, in the broad anthropological sense, he thinks, is insufficiently mindful of culture in the narrow sense of discrimination of excellence in literature, the arts, and society. He lectures Americans, rather pedantically, on the need to improve education in this field, as he does on the need for a greater sense of the responsibilities of citizenship in the state, the Nation, and the world: these lectures precede a discussion of the position of Catholics in the predominantly Protestant American Republic (p. 128).

Among the most interesting essays is that in which Brogan compares America at the time of his first visit in 1926 with America in 1956. The similarities outweigh the differences, but the later period was characterized by the greater importance of the armed services; the greater control of business by government; the revived interest in religion, conceived as an aspect of Americanism (differing from the skepticism manifested in 1926 after the Tennessee "Monkey trial"); and the developing interest, especially among members of the younger generation, in family, society, education, and the pursuit of excellence (p. 90 ff).

The reader of these essays will be convinced that Brogan is a sincere friend of America, that his interpretation is on the whole accurate, that it will contribute to international understanding, and that he has something useful to tell Americans about themselves.

QUINCY WRIGHT
Charlottesville, Virginia

Academic Administration

The Administration of Academic Affairs in Higher Education. Robert L. Williams. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1965. 208 pp. $6.

In this treatise on academic administration in American colleges and universities, Robert Williams writes from the background of an educational psychologist who has been a registrar, director of educational research, assistant to the provost, assistant dean of faculties, and, since 1958, administrative dean at the University of Michigan. The preface states that the author's plan is neither to present a case history of administration in a particular institution nor to offer an outline of procedures. As it turns out, however, the book departs from the announced disclaimers.

Twelve chapters deal successively with these topics: the faculty, academic appointments, academic personnel administration, appointment of nonteaching personnel, promotions, faculty salaries, teaching load, instructional costs, budget planning, space utilization, planning, and administrative red tape.

Williams begins with the truism that the faculty is "the heart of an educational institution." Few would disagree, but is it likely, as he goes on to assert, that able administrators view their main role as being simply to "smooth the way of their faculty"? Although it may be true that "all of the ten universities which show the highest quality of achievement would also show the most decentralized administration in academic affairs," this hardly is proof that the "greater the degree of faculty control, the greater is likely to be the intellectual superiority and distinction on the part of the whole university." In short, it does not follow that a scheme which works well at Harvard or Michigan will work equally well in making a lesser place into a distinguished university.

Although it is not clear for whom this monograph was intended, it should be useful to the uninitiated in explaining the role of a faculty senate, how academic and nonacademic positions may be classified, the meaning of tenure, mechanisms for handling promotions in grade and in salary, and a variety of other matters having to do with orderly governance. At times we may need to remind ourselves, as Robert Hutchins once remarked, that many academicians prefer anarchy to any form of government in their own affairs.

Some of the information given (for example, on salaries) is neither the latest nor the most comprehensive available to the author before the book went to press. Supporting detail is excessive in some chapters (teaching load, space utilization) and skimpy in others (planning, administrative red tape). In general, the treatment is long on procedures and short on insightfulness of the kind required by departmental chairmen, deans, provosts, and presidents to handle really knotty administrative problems. Since the natural inclination in many places is to approach such problems on an *ad hoc* basis, the procedural guidelines set forth by Williams should be widely useful. Administrative ground rules or procedures are structural rather than functional in their main import, however, and everybody needs to realize that they are the beginning rather than the end of effective educational leadership.

LOGAN WILSON
American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.