versity, with all his talk about "uses." But (though I have not reread his lectures) he may in fact have been saying that it is no longer possible to think of the comprehensive institution as having "unity"; that while we all lament the phenomenon of "millions of unintended consequences," it may be possible to create a purposeful city of learning in which competing, even conflicting, but nonetheless *intended* purposes coexist with one another. Neighborhood redevelopment, if you will, instead of metropolitan government.

The solution, it would seem, lies not in the kind of purge or withdrawal that Barzun hopes for but in a realistic reconciliation of contending forces which, I strongly suspect, were at play long ago in Bologna and Paris and Cambridge, as they are today at Morningside Heights and Storrs.

HOMER D. BABBIDGE, JR.
University of Connecticut, Storrs

Looking for Remedies

College Curriculum and Student Protest. JOSEPH J. SCHWAB. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1969. viii + 304 pp. $4.95.

Experiment at Berkeley. JOSEPH TUSSMAN. Oxford University Press, New York, 1969. xvi + 144 pp. Cloth, $5; paper, $1.75.

The Student in Higher Education. Report of the Committee on the Student in Higher Education, Joseph F. Kauffman, Chairman. The Hazen Foundation, New Haven, Conn., 1968. 66 pp. Paper. Available free for limited distribution.

Overlive. Power, Poverty, and the University. WILLIAM M. BIRENBAUM. Delacorte, New York, 1968. xiv + 210 pp. $4.95.

We are all aware that our universities are in an acute state of crisis. Society is asking them to provide more and more specialized training to meet the needs of a technological society. At the same time they must find a place for minority group students with very different needs from those of the students they have accommodated in the past. While these external demands are increasing, the university is experiencing growing pressures from its present students for democratization, "relevance," and better undergraduate teaching. Even the faculty, usually the last to know, is beginning to realize that mass education is not succeeding and that turning out students is not the same as educating them. However, in spite of the convulsions wracking the campus, and much discussion of how to deal with these manifestations of discontent, there has been remarkably little discussion of the educational issues posed by these many demands. The faculty has been content to allow university administrators to carry the burden, while they continue to teach their conventional courses and carry on their research and outside consulting. The books under review here are some of the few attempts to confront these issues, and their weaknesses show how far we are from dealing successfully with them.

Joseph Schwab, long-time professor of natural sciences and education at the University of Chicago, has written in *College Curriculum and Student Protest* a fascinating, albeit occasionally archaic, account of what an ideal meeting between student and professor could be like. The book has an overstylized "medical" structure, offering first a diagnosis of the ills of the contemporary university and then a set of prescriptions to deal with them. The diagnosis is largely a catalogue of the faults of student activists, and the condescending tone of this section continues through the book, where phrases like "student incompetence" and "irresponsibility" abound. Although Schwab refers briefly to some of the failings of the present university structure—the deadening lecture system, the cryptic catalogue of elective courses, the powerless student government—the student movement is treated as a phenomenon that exposes the inadequacies of students rather than as a reflection upon the university or society. Further, the book is written in an opaque style which makes it difficult to pick out the specific suggestions the author is offering. But, in spite of this, it is rewarding reading for anyone interested in reviving the art of teaching in his university or his classroom.

By college "curriculum" Schwab means not only the traditional structure of courses but, even more important, the aims of teaching and the behavior of the teacher in the classroom. Indeed, this book is more a presentation of a style of teaching than of a curriculum in the conventional sense. The literary problems of the book arise in part from the fact that Schwab is dealing with the nature of the teaching/learning process, a subject which is notoriously difficult to write about and must perhaps be lived to be understood.

Schwab emphasizes (with examples drawn from his encounters with student activists) that he is more concerned with deficiencies of "competence" than with lack of information. His prime objective is the development of a teaching style which will provide students with the experience they now lack of deliberation and analysis. His approach derives from that used at the University of Chicago, relying upon a close analysis of selected readings to provide experience in making informed moral and political choices. He is critical of faculty members who feel they have performed their duty by giving sparkling lectures, while withholding themselves from their students. Instead, he urges a revival of the dialogue between student and teacher and suggests ways in which this dialogue can be shaped to provide the best training ground for the student. Here he puts aside the condescension he shows toward students as protesters, by insisting that there be adult treatment of the material studied and a joint search by the student and teacher for its meaning.

The curriculum, in his view, should have challenging intellectual content, should have a practical component (so that the student can experience the joining of thought and action), should exist within a community of which the students are a part, and should provide a common culture linking students and teachers together in the search for understanding. In a brief reference to the teaching of science, he urges that it be founded on the collection and interpretation of evidence rather than the presentation of facts and theoretical principles. In too many of our science courses, he notes, we present the subject as if it were wrapped up in a neat,

well-understood package, omitting the uncertainties and the struggles that went into our present understanding. In all areas he urges the use of original materials rather than the textbooks that talk about these materials.

Schwab is pleading here for a reestablishment of the classical style of intellectual inquiry. Is this even remotely possible with the types and numbers of students coming onto our campuses today? This approach requires small classes with a continuing dialogue between student and teacher. How can the universities accomplish this with the limited resources at their command? On the other hand, if they do not achieve this, how can they claim to be educating their students in any but the most mechanical skills?

Even if they had the funds, where would our universities find the instructors who could meet the demands of Schwab's method? Modern graduate education, with its emphasis on highly specialized, objective research, is hardly the best training for a person who will shortly be exploring difficult moral issues with a teenaged student. Yet Schwab does not deal with the departmental structure of the university, which is largely responsible for this training and for the trend toward early professionalization of the student. This institutional problem has been faced head-on by innovators at a number of universities where, through experimental colleges and other means, they are attempting to move outside the departmental structure for at least the first two years of undergraduate education.

Joseph Tussman, professor of philosophy at the University of California at Berkeley, describes in *Experiment at Berkeley* such a program which he has been directing for three years. He has abandoned the conventional departmental and course structure and has invoked instead a pattern introduced by Alexander Meiklejohn in the 1920's. For each quarter a student's whole program is oriented around a particular period in human history—first, Greece during the Peloponnesian War, then 17th-century England, then America since the Revolutionary War—and the literature, culture, and politics of each period are examined. This plan has a coherence that is lacking in the conventional program, which drives the student from one subject to another without providing either the structure or the time he needs to gain an integrated view of himself and the subject matter.

Books Reviewed in This Issue

The Berkeley experiment uses a combination of lectures, seminars, and individual tutorials, along with readings from original sources. Tussman presents his view of the roles of students and teachers in such a program, and he reproduces his reports to the Berkeley faculty, which give a sense of the problems he encountered in creating and sustaining the program. In particular, he makes clear that the central problem has been that of staffing. After the first two years, he has found it impossible to obtain faculty from within the university and has had to hire visiting faculty from outside. The institutional structure of the American university, in which promotions are determined by academic departments and based primarily on research output, simply does not allow faculty members—especially the younger and presumably more innovative ones—the "luxury" of concentrating on lower-division students in a program such as this.

Tussman has carried out this radical experiment in a conservative context. He, like Schwab, tends to view student activists as misguided and immature, and he suggests that their desire to exercise authority over course structure is a "feeble joke." In his program the curriculum is laid out with a firm hand by the faculty, an approach which seems unlikely to appeal to the very students who would be most attracted to an innovative program. He has presented one possible scheme of education, but it is hardly consonant with contemporary student attitudes, nor does it provide the students with either the experience of shaping their own lives or the opportunity to explore subject matter that meets their personal concerns. Other plans should certainly be tried, and anyone wishing to attempt experimental programs can learn much from Tussman's experience, even if he does not wish to follow the authoritarian pattern Tussman has adopted.

Those interested in a clear, incisive examination of the attitudes of contemporary students would do well to read *The Student in Higher Education*, a study chaired by Dean Joseph Kauffman of the University of Wisconsin and supported and published by the Hazen Foundation of New Haven, Connecticut. This report describes with compassion and sensitivity the attitudes and hangups of contemporary students and provides a number of useful suggestions for an educational process that can meet their needs, especially in the critical (and at present dismal) freshman year.

These books all deal with reforms within the university as it is now constituted, and they tend to ignore the world outside the university. William Birenbaum, president of Staten Island Community College, in a provocative book entitled *Overlive* seeks the roots of student protest in the society that surrounds and envelops the university rather than in its internal structure. He charges that the university itself is an anachronism in our urbanized society, that in spite of revolutionary changes in our society the university has not changed its essential style since medieval times.

He uses the somewhat pretentious term "overlive" to describe a society in which a substantial number of citizens do not share in the affluence enjoyed by the many and in which even the affluent fail to discover any meaning in their success. To Birenbaum the inequities and discontents of the society have led to the obsolescence of our university system but have been caused by it as well. Many of our universities either are in major cities or are moving toward them, and yet they seem wholly disconnected from the critical problems that distress urban America and trouble our students. He believes that the university has retained a structure which may have been appropriate when its student body was an elite but is totally inappropriate in an era of mass education. Just as the society is spreading out, with the growth of suburbia and the decentralization of industry, so, he suggests, should the university disperse into the community. Even the idea of "campus" seems to him archaic in the modern urban setting, and he suggests that universities house themselves in temporary structures (he calls them "tents") which can change as the society changes, rather than be frozen into monumental anachronisms.

Birenbaum believes that the university can survive only if it learns to treat its students as adults, recognizing that in this technological age no one knows very much and that the students have at least as good a view as their teachers of what they need to know to survive the future. He observes that there is persuasive evidence that students have a greater educational impact on each other than do their teachers and that designers of higher education who think only of the classroom and the lecture hall and not of the dormitory and the campus are omitting from consideration the most important part of the educational process.

Birenbaum also raises, by implication, the issue of whether the education we provide today is really appropriate for the students now entering the university. While many of us like to think that all students can, with proper encouragement, taste the joys of intellectual life, it seems apparent that many are in the university simply to obtain their union cards, not because they find academic life especially agreeable. If the university becomes engaged in the reconstruction of society, it can provide other paths a young person can follow in making the transition from adolescence to mature participation in the society.

Although, as Birenbaum says, our universities seem organized to resist change, change they must if they are to survive as viable institutions. They must encompass alternate paths for the variety of students descending upon them, they must enable students to gain the understanding that will sustain them in a changing society, and they must provide continuing education for older people returning for refreshment and revitalization. Perhaps these books will be followed by others which will explore in a creative way the new directions American universities must take to satisfy these needs.

LEONARD S. RODBERG
Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Maryland, College Park, and *Institute for Policy Studies, Washington, D.C.*

Recalculation

Crosscurrents in College Admissions. Institutional Response to Student Ability and Family Income. HUMPHREY DOERMANN. Teachers College Press, Columbia University, New York, 1968. xii + 180 pp. $5.75.

In 1954 Ronald Thompson, of the Ohio State University, published a demographic study—"College Age Population Trends, 1940–1970" [*College and University* **29** (Jan. 1954)] that announced an impending tidal wave of secondary school graduates battering at the gates of the nation's colleges and universities. All institutions of higher education, public and private, were to be swamped by applicants; higher tuition charges would reduce only slightly the massive flow, and each entering class would be measurably stronger academically than its immediate predecessor. Hundreds of new four-year colleges were to be needed to handle the larger numbers