

I cannot recommend this book for the ordinary newsstand buyer of science fiction who wants merely an hour's fast-paced escape reading and cares nought about the genre from the literary or historical point of view. He would find some of these tales, exhumed from bound volumes of century-old magazines, pretty hard going. On the other hand, the serious reader, the collector, and the student of literature will find it a worthy addition to his library.

L. SPRAGUE DE CAMP  
278 Hathorpe Lane,  
Villanova, Pennsylvania

## Imitative or Innovative?

**New Universities in the Modern World** (Macmillan, London; St. Martin's Press, New York, 1966. 200 pp., \$5), edited by Murray G. Ross, is concerned with ten new universities that range geographically from India and Pakistan to Australia, Nigeria, England, and North America. Three of Great Britain's new seven are included, and two from the United States—the University of South Florida and the University of California at Riverside. The authors of the various chapters in this most useful book are presidents and vice chancellors who have played key roles in planning, building, staffing, organizing, and operating these new institutions.

One naturally expects this volume to be enspiriting and provocative—a chronicle of far-sighted planning to meet the educational needs of a new age. Such is not the case. The new universities have generally trailed after rather than led the social forces that called them into being. Breathlessness rather than prophetic foresight seems to be the climate of their birth.

The universities were often forced to develop much faster than their original plans envisaged. East Anglia opened earlier than planned; at the University of York eight colleges opened a year early in 1963 instead of 1964. And, says the president of York University, "if we were to start again, I think most of us at York would ask for more time, more staff, more money." Nowhere throughout the volume is there any indication that educational and social leaders in England were even aware of the population explosion, the impact of which could have been foreseen 15 to 18

years earlier. Only pressure from the surrounding society pried open the narrow doors to higher learning. In the United States projections were made as early as 1946 by President Truman's Commission on Higher Education. Because the problem was not imminent, few gave the report serious attention. The case histories in this volume provide ample evidence that societies throughout the world wait for the time of crisis to act.

Even more dispiriting than the lack of forward planning is the unenterprising character that most of the new universities adopted once they did get off the ground. "Pressures of time forced on the University a structure that, by and large, is rather conventional," writes the vice chancellor of Monash University.

At the University of California at Riverside, the designers of the curriculum were hedged about by certain traditional university practices characteristic of higher education in the United States. Even in East Pakistan University the pattern of the administration's structure was similar "to that found in other British Commonwealth Universities."

As far as methods of instruction are concerned, these new universities might just as well have been established in the medieval period, or even

in the third century when the rabbis prescribed in the *Talmud* the fixed teacher-pupil ratio. No means of communication other than by word of mouth in a small group is even recognized.

Nowhere in these "new" universities, for example, can one find any reference to the use of television for instruction, language laboratories, work-study programs, thoroughgoing curriculum revision, or other modern procedures rather thoroughly tried by older universities.

Can it be that the new universities are so much concerned with being recognized by the old that they become imitative and not innovative? Are the old new and the new old? As far as the accounts in this book are concerned, the new universities merely represent "old wine in new bottles." What a pity! Student populations are skyrocketing; not enough able faculty members are available to maintain quality in higher education; and exciting new resources and aids to learning are available. Perhaps what is needed now is a truly *new* new university, sponsored by an *old* university that can lay the groundwork for higher education in the 21st century.

ALVIN C. EURICH  
*Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies,*  
*Aspen, Colorado*

## The Freud-Abraham Correspondence

For historians this volume of correspondence, **A Psycho-Analytic Dialogue: The Letters of Sigmund Freud and Karl Abraham, 1907-1926** (Basic Books, New York, 1965. 423 pp., \$7.50), edited by Hilda C. Abraham and Ernst L. Freud, between the founder of psychoanalysis and one of his ardent disciples, may be of some interest; *l'affaire Jung* and other political problems of the early psychoanalytic movement are candidly discussed in their letters. For psychoanalysts the volume will undoubtedly provide a basis for still more speculation on the alleged deep libidinal relation between Freud and his disciples: thus, in the introduction, one finds Edward Glover speaking of the transference and counter-transference relationship between Freud and Abraham.

However, for those interested in the scientific status of psychoanalysis this volume can only be a disappointment.

Neither Freud nor Abraham ever questions the basic assumptions so implicit in the correspondence: (i) that psychoanalytic clinical evidence is reliable; (ii) that psychoanalytic theory is capable of empirical tests; (iii) that psychoanalytic therapy is better than no therapy at all. But, of course, there is now good experimental evidence which suggests that psychoanalytic clinical evidence may be unreliable; there is good reason to suppose that psychoanalytic theory is not capable of empirical tests; and there is no positive evidence which indicates that psychoanalytic therapy is better than no therapy at all. Thus the claim on the dust cover that this volume gives "a close-up of a science in the making" is hardly justified.

What we do see primarily in this close-up of a "science" in the making—once political and personal matters are put aside—is Freud congratulating Abraham and Abraham congratulating