

to explain (away) anything. For example, Kahn argues, "It is the basic thesis of this book that the Japanese differ from Americans and Europeans in many important ways" (p. 17). In other words, Japan has enterprise unions, consensus politics, and intense corporate loyalty because that's just the way the Japanese are. An equally serious fault in his discussion of Japanese values is that, although all Japanese adults (and Kahn himself) distinguish between Japanese who were socialized before the end of World War II and those who came of age only in the postwar world, his reliance on Benedict's book, which was published in 1946, compromises his assertions about the present generation.

Japan is America's leading ally in the Pacific, a nation half the size of the United States in terms of population and more significant economically than most European nations combined. The fact that a book as spurious as this and at the same time as highly influential as it is likely to be could be published in America in 1970 strikes me as ominous for the immediate future of Japanese-American relations, regardless of what happens two or three decades from now. Why is it that so many opinion-leading Americans, after two or three short junkets to Japan, go gaga over the country in one way or another? Compare, for example, Jane Jacobs's praise a few years ago of Tokyo's mixed industrial-residential areas (a transitional phenomenon, now almost entirely disappeared), or David Riesman's overly simple conclusion that the Japanese were a nation of pacifists. The distinguished critic Katō Shūichi may have a part of the explanation when he argues that Japanese themselves are today almost completely international in their architecture, music, sculpture, and even painting but that they remain extraordinarily isolated in terms of language and literature. As a consequence, the foreigner who comes to Japan with no knowledge of Japan's formidable language can be easily misled by the genuine international accessibility of Japan's economy and material culture, even though he is, in fact, crippled by his inability to engage in active verbal communication, or even to read signs and a newspaper. Kahn believes that the Japanese will soon have more success in teaching their countrymen English than they have had in the past; I believe that the United States should be doing more than it is at the present time to teach

some of its citizens to read Japanese—particularly journalists and commentators on Japanese-American relations.

Understanding Japan and its future is too important to be left in the hands of "professional futurologists." Anyone who wishes to read a competent, honest, up-to-date book on Japan today, written by an experienced journalist and with laymen as the intended readers, would do well to turn to Robert Guillain's *The Japanese Challenge*. Guillain has been the permanent correspondent of *Le Monde* in Tokyo since the 1930's, and his latest book, which is comprehensive and documented and has a good bibliography, is an English translation of his *Japon, Troisième Grand* (Paris, 1969).

CHALMERS JOHNSON
Center for Chinese Studies,
University of California, Berkeley

Quality and Equality

Free-Access Higher Education. WARREN W. WILLINGHAM. College Entrance Examination Board, New York, 1970. x, 242 pp., illus. \$6.50.

The literature of higher education has addressed itself more and more of late to the conflicting demands of egalitarianism and meritocracy. Is it possible, for example, to provide for the open enrollment of New Yorkers in their City University while preserving the impressive quality of that academic environment? Or is academic quality in higher education finally of less importance to society as a whole than absolute equality of opportunity for, essentially, all members of that society? Is it realistic to think that we can work toward both equal opportunity and high quality throughout higher education?

Warren Willingham's study is a persuasive argument for increased emphasis on the egalitarian over the meritocratic—if, indeed, a choice must be made. The findings, drawn from a near-monumental effort in demographic and institutional research, are directed primarily to those who must determine the extent of the nation's commitment to the further development of educational resources. Members of state legislatures, of governing and coordinating bodies for public higher education, and of state and federal educational agencies should consider this work required reading. It includes a full and accurate portrayal of current provisions, state by state, for "free-access" higher education. More

important, it issues a challenge to increase not only the availability of higher education but also its relevance and utility for the nation's youth.

The reportorial component of the study, utilizing most of the empirical data assembled, provides a measurement of progress toward the Eisenhower Commission goal (1960) of developing "two year colleges within commuting distance of most high school graduates." Willingham's measure takes in those colleges (whether two- or four-year institutions) that offer "free access"—that is, are essentially nonselective in admission standards and low in cost for commuting students. Nationwide, 789 colleges meet these requirements—a distressingly small percentage of the 2596 colleges examined in the study. When demographic data are added to institutional, the picture becomes even more dismal. Only two-fifths of the current population of prospective students reside within a 45-minute commuting distance of a free-access college. The picture is far worse in the major metropolitan areas; in 23 of the nation's 29 largest cities, there exists what Willingham calls a "major deficit" in accessibility of higher education.

This analysis of educational resources and demographic characteristics is designed to show how well (in a quantitative sense) the nation's colleges and universities serve a diverse and growing population. In spite of the rapid growth of free-access community colleges during the '60's, Willingham's answer is "not very well." Part of the problem is that new two-year colleges (the Carnegie Commission's recommendation calls for an additional 500 by 1976) are not always free-access and are often not located in major population centers. Perhaps Willingham is too insistent on proximity (it "attracts marginal students"), but there is no doubt that many potential students will take advantage of educational opportunity only if it is close at hand. A larger part of the problem, with these students and others, is that educational opportunity has not been "made real"—that is, it has not seemed directly relevant to individual and societal needs.

It is here that the emphasis swings from an essentially quantitative consideration of the amount and nature of free-access higher education to a substantive and qualitative critique of academic programming within the current educational establishment. A "much larger task," writes Willingham, than simply to provide free-access colleges

is to develop academic programs that have "personal relevance and economic utility for diverse populations under different conditions." The need is to recast some existing institutions and to develop new ones in such a way as to foster comprehensive, utilitarian, and socially contributive education. Willingham admits to the incompatibility of "teaching a currently useful skill while emphasizing a liberal education to protect the individual from intellectual obsolescence." He does not underestimate, either, the conflict between the "academic-professional" and the "sociopolitical" interpretation of the role and function of higher education. There is no doubt, however, that a societal rather than a purely scholastic philosophy must prevail in more higher institutions of the free-access type, if the accelerated public expectation of equal educational opportunity is to be satisfied.

No one will be surprised to learn that a massive increase in the public funding of higher education will be necessary if the nation is to have more free-access colleges offering programs of optimal relevance to a diverse and ever-growing student population. Since there will certainly be limitations in such funding, should the choices that have to be made emphasize the egalitarian or the meritocratic? There is no doubt that developing public institutions, in their successful emulation of the disciplines-oriented "prestige" colleges and universities, do not serve adequately the needs of their primary and tremendously diverse constituencies, many of which see no relevance in the liberal arts. These institutions must be encouraged and aided to do so, in short, to become more egalitarian. Surely, however, it is not in the public interest to deprive the able and highly motivated student, and the institution *he* chooses, of the opportunities that merit has earned, in order to extend opportunity instead to young people who have no apparent motivation or potential for higher education. When choices must be made in the use of public funds for higher education, first priority must go to subsidy of the individual student on the basis of demonstrable need and demonstrable merit. The real barometer of equal opportunity in higher education is the availability of financial aid rather than the accessibility of colleges.

Free-Access Higher Education affords, to the reasonably informed and sophisticated reader, an eminently useful reference and resource for an understanding of the current status of educational op-

portunity. The author and his publisher, the College Entrance Examination Board, have made a significant contribution to the long-range planning, both state and federal, that must continue to support new levels of achievement in higher education.

BERNARD S. ADAMS
Ripon College, Ripon, Wisconsin

Unhysterical Antipollution

Advances in Water Pollution Research. Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference, Prague, April 1969. S. H. JENKINS, Ed. Pergamon, New York, 1969. xii, 936 pp., illus. \$48.

This is the official record of the fourth conference of the international sanitary-engineering—waste-water-treatment—stream-improvement, and water-quality specialist jet set. It is an earnest and dutiful account and a monument to the determination of its instigators. It can't be guessed what the account would have been like if the original plans for the conference had been carried through and the rebellion of August 1968 had not occurred. As it turned out, the get-together was delayed about eight months, international hostelry and organized transportation prevailed, and nearly everybody that could be spared from the shop during the following spring turned up.

Engineering conferences tend to be hyperorganized, but this accounting indicates a degree of control that probably did not prevail at the Prague meetings. The proceedings represents a massive editorial effort to be fair to 102 authors of 55 papers from 18 countries—delivered and transmitted. Because of the international nature of the conference about a third of the authors represented American institutions and organizations, but everybody pitched in with formal discussions, roughly four discussers per paper. So the treatment was thorough. The edited version indicates that it was also orderly and polite.

Reorganizing and bringing on schedule a disrupted scientific program of this kind requires firmness. Generally, this can be regarded as an improving force since the papers have been pruned to the limit, translations brought into uniformly clear English, and discussions kept to pertinent matters. But the net effect is that of a long trip with all meals at the same chain of restaurants. Only the British seem to have been allowed their identities.

The papers have been arranged somewhat arbitrarily into sections on stream pollution (18 items), wastewater treatment (18 items), and lakes, reservoirs, and the marine environment (19 items). But study interests mix and overlap to make this separation a fiction—the biologists concerned with ocean disposal are as likely to break out with mathematical models as are the engineers working on the treatment of refinery wastes.

There are no breakthroughs in this series—there is the same search for improvement, measurement, and control of waste-water treatment processes and concern with the loading, management, and administration of receiving streams, more efficient aeration, biological and process indicators of success and grief, tracing of waste-waters, bits of eutrophication and effects of runoff-borne nutrients, and heat dispersion. All very sober and completely free of hysteria—not an inspiring political document.

The conference itself was undoubtedly worthwhile in bringing people of comparable interests and responsibilities together under amiable conditions. And the record completes a moral commitment. But it is a bit difficult for one who did not get to Prague to use this record as a professional book. He can only read every word and underline. There is no index and no abstracts. This is a minor matter. But a research man or engineer looking for ideas and information beyond that reported would have to do a great deal of international searching to reach the authors. A roster of the principals with their organization addresses would have been very useful—telephone numbers would be dandy, too.

CHARLES E. RENN
*Department of Environmental
Engineering Science, Johns Hopkins
University, Baltimore, Maryland*

Food and Numbers

Animal Populations in Relation to Their Food Resources. A symposium, Aberdeen, Scotland, March 1969. ADAM WATSON, Ed. Blackwell, Oxford, 1970. xx, 478 pp. + plates. \$17.50. British Ecological Society Symposium No. 18.

This symposium considered the influence of quantity, quality, and availability of food on the regulation of animal numbers, and it tried to relate behavioral interactions to these effects.