

numbers of students they attract), with the number of items professors have published, with how many psychological journals are located on their campuses, or with how many times psychologists have quoted other psychologists in such journals. Indeed, it is a chilling thought that succeeding generations of psychologists may be citing some of the superficial and specious claims contained in this particular publication.

Despite its textual weaknesses, there are some highlights. The style and overall approach of Professors Page and Clark who tell the story of Dalhousie make pleasant reading, and Morgan Wright's deft description of events at Manitoba provides a welcome relief from the otherwise dull commentaries. Thomas Nelson's description of Alberta's experiences is couched in clear scholarly language, but the treatment of the older institutions in eastern Canada, while often well written, suffers from unavoidable repetition, their stories being too much alike.

In the main, the book was neither intelligently conceived nor rigorously executed, and it falls somewhat short of being a worthy contribution to the lore of higher education in Canada. More's the pity, considering the resources that were spent on it and the wide distribution it likely will enjoy.

Gwendoline Pilkington
University of Toronto

Response to the reviewer of *Scholars and Dollars*.
Commentary from Paul Axelrod.

I am delighted that James A. McAllister finds *Scholars and Dollars* to be an "important" book. But I am disappointed that in his criticisms, he both distorts much of its contents, and makes impossible demands, consistent with what he thought the book should have been about.

On the discussion of business-university relations, which McAllister describes as the weakest part of the book, he has misread the text and misled his audience as to its substance. He observes (as though discovering a major flaw in the book's thesis) that businessmen on boards of governors played a relatively small role in the daily affairs of universities. This is precisely *my* point. The question I therefore set out to answer was why so much effort was spent by universities recruiting important businessmen to serve on boards. Surely, the book is explicit and clear on this point (see especially pp. 62-3). Because of their status, prominent businessmen legitimized universities (particularly the newer ones) in the eyes of government and the public. Business-led boards lobbied government, tapped their own connections in the corporate community for support and funding, and contributed money of their own.

Businessmen were involved minimally in curriculum and professional development largely because they had little experience in these areas, leaving these tasks to administrators and academics. Like most Canadians, businessmen believed that all investment in higher education (from engineering to fine arts) would be profitable in a time of economic growth and severe manpower shortages. (How the

reviewer can accuse me of being unaware of such shortages is mind boggling; among other things, see p. 26 where I cite a Department of Labour study on this very problem). Little planning was perceived to be necessary because every graduate got a job. Universities, therefore, were the instruments of business in that they fulfilled the function of training manpower, but corporations did not need to run the universities directly in order to ensure that this task would be carried out. In many ways this function was the *raison d'être* of the university system itself. And business leaders expected government to pay the lion's share of the cost, which explains the diminishing proportion of corporate support to higher education, a development the reviewer wrongly finds inconsistent with my analysis.

As I pointed out on p. 5, Marxists have erred in the past in assuming that because businessmen sat on boards of governors, they therefore made all the important decisions. The truth, at least in the Ontario context, is far more complex, and the book (especially in its "weakest" chapters) attempts to untangle that complexity in a way that should be of interest to both Marxists and non Marxists. The reviewer tried to fit me into an analytical straight jacket which I shed in the book's introduction.

In addition, McAllister charges that my case study of business-university relations at York was not typical of other universities. The data I include on Trent, Brock, Waterloo and the University of Toronto (pp. 55-63) indicates that the York experience was indeed representative. In any event the reviewer does not prove that the York case was exceptional. He simply asserts the point and ignores my evidence to the contrary. He wishes that I had investigated the other Ontario institutions in the same depth as I analysed York. Apart from the fact that such a task would fill an entire book, he should be aware that boards of governors' minutes and related university documents for the post-war period are generally not accessible to researchers. I had difficulty enough gathering the York material, and to my knowledge this case study is the only analysis of its kind in Canada. Not only is the reviewer's criticism on this point invalid, but his expectations are unreasonable.

He claims that I do not identify which "particular firms" gave money to universities. On p. 49, I describe precisely which corporate sectors donated the most. If McAllister sought the names of companies, he would have had no more success getting access to such confidential information on a province-wide, systematic basis than I did.

Furthermore, did he really expect a book on the development of higher education in Ontario to engage in a detailed investigation of the relations between businessmen and the Conservative Party? Leaving aside the vastness of the subject, is he aware of the enormous difficulty in gathering abundant and reliable data on this topic? Perhaps he has special access to and influence with politicians and businessmen who would show him their private correspondence and diaries, and reveal the contents of confidential conversations. Unfortunately, I had no such access. Despite this, the book contains hitherto unseen material on the issue of business-university-government relations.

The reviewer's suggestion that more information was needed on Conservative Party philosophy on higher education is bizarre. The book could not be clearer on what Drew, Frost, Robarts, Davis and their various ministers had to say about the importance of universities. My sources included parliamentary debates (contrary to the author's contention), speeches outside the House, internal ministry records and correspondence, advisory committee documents and communications with the ministry, interviews with those involved in policy making, as well as published sources. What Conservative Party convention statements, which are notoriously vague on policy issues, could have added to any of this is a mystery to me.

McAllister raises a legitimate question about my treatment of the manpower planning issue. The book's conclusion reflects my own mixed views on the subject, and I do not claim to have resolved all the problems. But if I have fallen short as a futurist, I hope I have contributed something as a historian. I described how *planning* decisions were made by universities within the context of an *unplanned* economy. This paradox was invisible in a period of economic growth, but it has plagued the universities for the past decade when the university "investment" has been in question. Other writers seeking solutions may well benefit from an understanding of the nature of the dilemma through a careful examination of the historical experience, which is what I have attempted to provide.

Should the book have been more comparative? Perhaps. I could have spent several more years of research fulfilling this demand of the reviewer. Still, he exaggerates the difference between the Ontario experience and the rest of Canada. The treatment by provincial governments of their universities, both in periods of growth and restraint, has varied in degree not in substance, and in discussing the general forces shaping those relationships, surely the book has something to offer.

There are many questions left to answer, and even books to be written about the recent history of higher education in Ontario. Perhaps the reviewer should write one. In the meantime, I hope others will read *Scholars and Dollars* more carefully, confine their analysis to what is in the book, and avoid insisting it be something it is not, and (given the sources available) could not have been.

Paul Axelrod
York University