maintained that Moynihan had condemned the Negro family and was thus a subtle racist; others felt the report took the emphasis away from the important problems of equal rights and Negro economic development; still others felt the report required either too great a federal investment, or, on the other hand, required the Negro to pull all the weight. It is no small wonder that during the opening meeting of the planning session the executive director jokingly announced, "I want you to know that no such person as Daniel Patrick Moynihan exists."

When the actual White House conference, attended by over 2400 representatives, was held during the spring of 1966, the Moynihan report had faded almost completely into obscurity. From Rainwater and Yancey's point of view, the recommendations developed at the conference failed on several counts. Not only did they not reflect the views of the representatives, but they contained few real departures from current government policy. The strong advocacy of local action also made it appear that, because of its Vietnam commitment, the government was attempting to avoid any heavy financial expenditures. In effect, the conference had not met Moynihan's challenge.

At this point in the book, which may seem premature to many readers, the historical analysis is brought to a close, and the authors turn to the task of drawing conclusions and developing recommendations. The 24 issues treated here are broad in scope, and in fact sometimes seem to have only remote connection with the preceding material. The authors' point that the government needs much more extensive liaison with civil rights leaderships and that civil rights organizations should attempt to develop expertise in social science is particularly well taken. A pointed discussion also appears concerning the problematic position of the social scientist confronted simultaneously with his data, the pressures of various social groups, and his own personal convictions. Less convincing, however, is the authors' moral dictate that social scientists have a "responsibility" to study social problems, monitor the use made of the findings, and comment publicly on the applications. One might argue that an individual should be free to reject any of these imperatives in order to pursue his own intellectual goals. This issue of the social and moral responsibility of the scientist has not been satisfactorily resolved in the scientific community, and a good airing of the problem is long overdue.

In spite of the enlightenment the book provides about the controversy, it does have its shortcomings. If one applied the criteria traditionally used in a number of intellectual disciplines, the work would not pass muster. As a sociological study, the methodology can be faulted on a number of counts. Not only are there grave problems with the method of sampling employed, but the questioning of the participants in the controversy was apparently quite unsystematic. In addition, the investigators often allow their own biases to dominate their stand or interpretation of events. Their sentiments are decidedly pro Moynihan. For those who aren't content with the authors' interpretation of various issues, however, over a third of the volume consists of reprints of the major documents of relevance. As political science, the work has much to recommend it on a descriptive level. On an analytic level, the offering is thin. There are few generalizations that could allow one to penetrate other, conceptually similar, problems. As a historical account, the book is enlightening but not thorough. Qualifiers such as "presumably," "apparently," "perhaps," and "probably" abound in the text and cause the reader often to wonder about the authors' success in obtaining "inside" information from several of the groups under study.

And yet, the fact that the volume does not attempt to measure up by traditional yardsticks may at the same time be one of its greatest assets. In sidestepping the standard approaches, the authors are able to shift easily from one perspective to another to provide a document of considerable insight and broad significance. In essence, they are striving for a new form of intellectual endeavor, a form which cuts across standard intellectual domains to engage the scientist, political official, and civil rights worker alike. This is no simple task, and though this book may not represent the end point, it is a giant step in a challenging and important direction.

KENNETH J. GERGEN
Department of Psychology,
Swarthmore College,
Swarthmore, Pennsylvania

A Battle Ended, An Issue Unresolved

The California Oath Controversy. DAVID P. GARDNER. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1967. 343 pp. $6.50.

This study of the oath controversy of 1949–1952 at the University of California is an impressive addition to the literature that deals with the long and largely futile effort between 1940 and 1960, at both national and state levels, to find a workable, constitutional balance between the demands of national security and the interests of individual freedom. Its author, David P. Gardner, is assistant professor of higher education and assistant to the chancellor at the University of California at Santa Barbara. Gardner has had access to previously unavailable papers and records, such as those of the regents of the university and President Robert Sproul. His research and writing are marked by a thoroughness, objectivity, and style that make this volume a model of good scholarship in the social sciences. One senses that Gardner has a deep concern for the people and the issues that figured in the controversy, but his book is singularly free of the coloration that mars much contemporary writing by social scientists who have made strong personal commitments to political and social causes.

In March 1949, the regents of the University of California, on the recommendation of President Sproul, voted to add to the oath of allegiance already required of all employees of the university a disclaimer of belief in, or membership in any organization advocating, overthrow of the United States government by force or other illegal means. Thereafter, for three years regents, faculty members, administrators, alumni, the legislature, and the courts in California were drawn into an ever-widening circle of disagreement, conflicting actions, and frustration. Eventually the regents voted to dismiss 31 teachers who had refused to sign the revised oath; the state legislature passed an act requiring a similar oath of all state employees, including university professors; all professors who had not been dismissed signed the legislative oath; and the courts overruled the dismissal of the 31 and the regents' oath requirement on the ground that the

legislature had fully occupied the field.

Gardner demonstrates conclusively that all parties to the controversy acted at times unwisely and inconsistently and that responsibility for the tragic episode was widely shared. All concerned were slow to achieve a mature understanding of the situation and the issues pertaining thereto; all were slow to take a considered and firm stand. The controversy took shape out of an effort to implement a policy which all parties, with varying degrees of understanding and assurance, seemed to accept, namely, that membership in the Communist Party disqualified a person from membership on the university faculty. The controversy in its final stages, as Gardner sees it, became a struggle between the regents and the academic senate for control of the university, particularly in relation to the appointment, promotion, and dismissal of faculty members.

Part of the injury to the university occurred in 1956, when, very belatedly, the American Association of University Professors censured the administration of the university. This token censure was removed two years later and is probably to be understood as expressing the desire of the AAUP to underscore the discrepancy between the position of the regents, the president, and the senate of the university that a disciplined Communist was automatically lacking in the objective and scholarly qualities expected of a member of the academic profession, and the AAUP position that no professor, not even a Communist professor, should be dismissed except on an explicit showing that his teaching or his scholarship was unsatisfactory.

Even though this reviewer was a participant in the AAUP discussions and decisions in 1956, he now believes that the AAUP must be included in the judgment that all parties to the oath controversy acted with something less than adequate understanding and wisdom. In retrospect he feels that the position taken by so many intelligent and honest people in California that proved membership in the Communist Party was inconsistent with objective scholarship cannot be said to have been so unreasonable as to have justified the censure sanction invoked by the AAUP. The basic AAUP position that a faculty member must not be dismissed except where adequate evidence is adduced proving an absence of professional fitness cannot be said to be unreasonable either. But the record suggests that no university has yet been able to devise and follow in practice a satisfactory system of "adducing evidence" of professional unfitness. This failure is not difficult to understand. For one thing, such a system would appear to require more "police work" by a university in collecting evidence than is either practicable or tolerable. The choice may be between giving up on the idea that a tenured teacher can be dismissed when professional unfitness is proved and automatic application of certain standards, such as dismissal for proved membership in an organization like the Communist Party that is known to subject its members to a measure of intellectual discipline inconsistent with acceptable scholarship. Our knowledge and experience in the academic profession to date suggest that, if these are in fact the only alternatives, the former is the more attractive one. But is it too much to expect the profession, perhaps led by the AAUP, to establish and implement expectations of teacher-scholars with respect to such personal qualities as integrity, civility, and decency, and such scholarly qualities as objectivity? Failure to move in this direction may well prove to be a factor undermining the rationale for academic tenure.

ROBERT K. CARR
Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio

Geological Papers

Source Book in Geology, 1900–1950. KIRTLEY F. MATHER, Ed. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1967. 453 pp., illus. $12.50.

In 1939 Mather and Mason published their well-known *Source Book in Geology*, which was reprinted in 1964. In that book "contributions originating since 1900 were not considered, nor has the work of living geologists been included," a sound historical principle. Now, at the end of the second third of the 20th century, we have sufficient perspective from which to view some of the "spectacular advances" in geology since 1900, and of necessity the work of some still-living men must be included. The new *Source Book in Geology, 1900–1950,* edited by Mather, contains excerpts on 28 broad topics from 65 articles by 63 authors, of which 41 are American, six British, four Russian, three each German and Swedish, and one each Austrian, Canadian, Finnish, Japanese, Dutch, and South African. All the articles are important, and many are basic to current thinking in both the main and the peripheral branches of geology.

Every reader will have his own list of "fundamental" papers or books since 1900, and one of the pleasures of reading the book will be comparison of his own choices with those of Mather. Geologists and others will find in no other book such a source of original information on current bases of geological thinking.

GEORGE W. WHITE
Department of Geology,
University of Illinois, Urbana

Guide to the Animal Kingdom

The Larousse Encyclopedia of Animal Life. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1967. 640 pp., illus. $22.50 until 31 Dec.; thereafter, $25.

It is extraordinary how many laymen still imagine that zoology involves the study of animals. It is for them, and for a few old-fashioned or nostalgic "zoologists," that this magnificent volume has been put together. The work is arranged in a strictly taxonomic order, which is made easier to follow by the inclusion, at the end of the book, of a guide to the classification that is followed in the text. The first 200 pages are devoted to invertebrates and the last 300 to birds and mammals, while the unfortunate fish, amphibia, and reptiles are squeezed into 130 pages in the middle. It is probably inevitable, in a volume so lavishly illustrated, that photogenicity should thus win out over numerical importance.

A dozen authors, all located in British institutions, have contributed to the text, with the largest share belonging to Maurice Burton of the British Museum of Natural History, who is also responsible for revising and adapting Léon Bertin's text on the reptiles, birds, and mammals, which is all that remains, except for some illustrations, of the French original. These authors have, however, bent over backwards to use North American examples and North American common names; this presumably reflects the policy of Robert Cushman Murphy, who has written a foreword and who is the only contributor to be acknowledged on the title page.

The 1000 illustrations, including 50 color plates, are for the most part ex-