1983 BOOK AWARDS PRESENTED AT 100th ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

The Great Hall of the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, D.C., was the scene on December 2 of a feast, both intellectual and gustatory, marking the 100th anniversary of the founding of the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa and the presentation of Phi Beta Kappa's prestigious book awards. Representatives from the sixteen chapters that founded the national organization in 1859 were present to share with Phi Beta Kappa senators and guests in the celebration. On behalf of the chapter representatives, James B. Ames, president of the Alpha of Massachusetts Chapter at Harvard University, delivered a congratulatory message; and Thaddeus Tate, representing the Alpha of Virginia at the College of William and Mary, presided over the unveiling of a portrait of John Heath, founder and first president of Phi Beta Kappa. The portrait now hangs in the library of the society's national headquarters in Washington.

The three Phi Beta Kappa book awards, which have been presented annually since the 1950s, are among the most enduring and influential of the society's programs to encourage writing that is both scholarly and accessible to a broad segment of the American reading public. The awards, which carry with them a prize of $2500, are given to authors of recently published books that represent significant contributions in three areas of humanistic learning: literary criticism, science, and social science.

The oldest of the prizes, the Christian Gauss Award, was presented to W. R. Johnson, professor of classics and comparative literature at the University of Chicago, for his book *The Idea of Lyric: Lyric Modes in Ancient and Modern Poetry*, published by the University of California Press. In presenting the award to Johnson, Victor Terras, of Brown University and chairman of the Christian Gauss Committee, praised *The Idea of Lyric* for its chiseled brevity, its beauty of style, its critical intelligence, and its infectious love of all Western literature. “It is indeed a pleasure,” said Terras, “to reread Sappho, Horace, Catullus, Vergil, Mallarme, Whitman, and more, in Johnson’s inspired and challenging interpretations. . . . Miraculously, Catullus and Vergil become our contemporaries; the odes of Horace not only appear in a new complexity . . . , but are also shown to be akin to modern symbolist poetry. . . . Rarely does the idea of lyric have so much substance and acquire so palpable a reality as in Johnson’s book.”

Stephen Jay Gould, professor of geology at Harvard University, was the recipient of the Phi Beta Kappa Science Award for his book *Hen’s Teeth and Horse’s Toes: Further Reflections in Natural History*, published by W. W. Norton and Company. The award was presented by the chairman of the Science Committee, John H. Steele, director of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. Noting that in a field of excellent entries for the Science Award Gould’s book was the unanimous choice of the committee, Steele commented on the dazzling range of knowledge it exhibits. “Each essay,” he said, “not only provides fascinating detail about the natural world, but brings fresh insights to some scientific problem or some human concern—and does so in prose that is easy and clear. This collection of essays on diverse topics is unified both by the
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COEDUCATION

by Eva Brann

Ask students and college teachers what they think about coeducation, and the response is unanimous, namely, "What is there to think about?" It is a settled problem.

Indeed it is a settled problem in a practical sort of way. Most colleges and lower schools are in fact coeducational, and that way is here to stay. But we should not let the fact that most schools are coeducational come to mean that all schools ought to be that way. Even if no persuasive arguments are to be formed for separate education, there is still an overriding argument for diversity, both because it is an almost absolute good to resist trends and, more substantially, because there ought to be a place for that minority of people who prefer, for a certain time in their lives, not to work and live in mixed company. Happily, the women's schools, at least, have been able to maintain themselves and are doing well, having resisted merger or conversion, thus saving their own character.

Suppose then that the question whether there should be coeducation is no longer a practical issue. That is no reason to stop thinking about it. Aristotle made a distinction between deliberation and contemplation. One deliberates to come to a practical decision, in order to make a choice and do something about it. But when no decision is called for, then is the time for contemplation, that is, for taking a step backward to look at the matter and to think. That is what I propose to do here.

Let us begin by seeing what is included in the notion of coeducation. Clearly, there are two different claims that can be made about education with respect to the two sexes: (1) that the training of boys and girls, and the education of men and women, ought to be the same and (2) that their education ought to be together.

Let me take up the second claim first, because it seems to me theoretically much less accessible, though it is probably of more practical pedagogical concern, or ought to be.

The question is whether young adults should work together in scholastic proximity and live together in personal intimacy. It is perfectly possible to learn together but to live on separate campuses. Living together on one campus, on the other hand, has many advantages, chief of which is that it allows men and women to become not only casual but also close friends.

Another advantage of being together throughout the week is that courtship becomes somewhat easier and more natural. Those who have lived in coeducational settings all their lives will have a hard time imagining the charged atmosphere during the week in women's schools—I only know about that side—in which the all-important concern was the weekend date, and the agony of not being asked, including the charades mounted to hide the shame.

But let me leave the matter of living arrangements, which is not, after all, an educational issue in the narrowest sense, and go on to the main question: Should male and female human beings learn the same things?

Most people agree that the answer depends on whether males and females are the same or different. It seems to be a matter of observation that immediately from birth a good percentage of male babies are physically somewhat more rambunctious than female babies. Should they be handled similarly with the hope of making them more like each other, or should their congenital predisposition be emphasized by different treatment? Or suppose that the innate capacities of men and women are found to be strictly the same. It is conceivable that a social tradition of different work might somehow arise, or even that a very deliberate decision of social engineering might be made to attempt to train the sexes into different functions. I am establishing these logical possibilities to show that conclusions about the sameness or difference of their education do not immediately follow from opinions about the sameness or difference in the nature of the sexes and to show how much there is to think about before a conclusion is reached. Nonetheless, I myself think that the straightforward connection is most persuasive and that if men and women are different then they ought to be educated differently, and if they are alike then they ought to learn the same things.

I must make one more distinction: When I say "learn the same things," I am deliberately passing over an intermediate problem. It is possible to learn the same thing in different ways. For example, when children are presented with the colored shapes sometimes used to teach mathematics, girls more often use them to make flat arrangements while boys build erect structures. It might follow that we might teach girls and boys the same arithmetic skills with slightly different methods for each sex, taking account of these propensities. Nonetheless, it seems to me that in adult learning, which concerns matters beyond mere skill, learning the same thing requires essentially coming in the same way. So if men and women are the same, they ought to learn in the same way. And in that case, it follows naturally that they should do it together, in the same classrooms and with the same teachers, who should be the best available, men or women.

Let me stop here a moment to take account of a word that dominates educational discussion these days, namely, "equality." The prevailing, and quite thoughtless, opinion is that equality is desirable and that it means sameness: both having access to the same programs and being in the same classrooms.

In this country, public opinion is often not only the source of the law but also the consequence of the interpretation of the law, especially by the Supreme Court. In this case the great 1954 racial integration decision of Brown v. Topeka Board of Education, which upset the prevailing doctrine that separate can be equal, partly on the ground of sociological studies, very much set the tone in the matter of sexual equality also. For the principle that equality means togetherness and the principle that equality means likeness belong to
the same sphere of thought, namely, that equality means, in some essential way, homogeneity.

That the last is true is not at all obvious. That men and women might be truly and naturally different and yet equal is not unthinkable at all. Besides the ancient notion that women had deficient souls, had to be under male tutelage, and were incapable of public business, there was a more appreciative view that ascribed to women, if anything, a more basic role in the world than men held. Such a delineation of the differences is to be found in Hegel’s interpretation of Sophocles’ play Antigone. There Antigone, in disobeying the legitimate ruler Creon in giving burial to her brother, who had been killed while attempting to capture Creon’s city, is understood as exercising the peculiarly female function: She is a rebel against public authority in defense of the laws of the gods, the dignity of the dead, and the rights of the fruit-bearing earth. She stands for the foundations of human life, above and below. Creon stands for external law and for a—sometimes unwise—rationality. Some such understanding, which assigns a different and complementary dignity to the sexes, is an old tradition. We should not simply discard such old wisdom without at least asking ourselves about their possible truth.

The best I can do is to convey my sense that here again is a difficult and delicate matter. When all is said and done, I believe that the prevailing opinion is right and that true equality implies essential sameness, though I realize how dangerous a doctrine that is.

Let me explain. Things that are really qualitatively different are simply incommensurable; they can be called neither equal nor unequal. So if the sexes simply belonged to utterly different kinds, they would be incomparable. But since most external human goods come in assignably quantitative forms—so large a salary, so great a sphere of authority, so much free time—the claim that men and women are ultimately incomparable does not help much in assigning fairly their relative standing in the affairs of life; in fact, it would probably be used to deprive one or the other of position. Furthermore, we all know that as they carry on their daily business men and women are somehow comparable.

Yet, on the other extreme, the claim that the basis, and so also the sign, of equality must be a thoroughly sameness of function and reward—sameness of jobs (including, to cite a recent issue, going down into the mines), sameness of social obligation (including being subject to the draft), and, of course, sameness of education—holds this danger, not only with respect to the sexual aspect, but in all aspects of the question of human equality: Human beings are in fact quite different, and, furthermore, some insuperable needs of our lives depend on these differences.

The demand for an acknowledgment of exact homogeneity has the effect of devaluing these differences and pulling the rug from under those who fulfill these needs. The realization of this circumstance has been felt, for example, as a dilemma in the women’s movement: the demand for a radical equalization turned out to imply a contempt for certain ways and certain work that women had thought of as specifically their own, above all, of course, homemaking.

The truth is that behind every demand for qualitative equality there lies a very exclusionary view of the standard toward which everyone is to be equalized. And that is the danger in that claim—it is anything but egalitarian in living fact.

The practical political solution in all these theoretical quandaries about equality lies in a deliberately, and theoretically founded, untheoretical approach. I mean that it is best to fudge all such questions and to act as if all decent ways of being entitle people to be considered as equals. The wisdom in this approach is that the factual truth about such things will be found out at the Day of Judgment, whereas we have to live now. Another way to put this is that we should attend more to liberty than to equality.

The whole point of my digression on equality is to suggest the difficulty in either view—that equality allows difference or that it demands sameness—and to argue that the less these problems are raised in a political context the better. But since this essay on coeducation is a contemplative enterprise, it is right, at this point, to ask: Are men and women in the important ways the same, or are they perhaps so different that they could hardly even agree on what these “important ways” are?

The answer, it seems to me, is clear and unequivocal: yes and no.

In explaining myself, let me call to aid a recent book by Carol Gilligan, a professor in the Harvard Graduate School of Education, called In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women’s Development (Harvard University Press, 1982). It deals with apparent differences in the moral perceptions of men and women—a fundamental enough issue. The origin of the study was Professor Gilligan’s observation that recent psychological theories of moral development seemed to exclude women, in that women took a small part in the case studies precisely because their responses did not seem to fit the male-established theories. I suspect that she also meant to counterbalance some of the more extreme demands by the women’s movement that women assimilate to male modes.

Her method was to interview children and undergraduate men and women and then to reinterview these same people some years later, in graduate school or professional or family life. She asked them to articulate what they thought of themselves as being and then to resolve a certain constructed moral dilemma. Her findings, in sum, were these: The boys and men defined themselves by distinguishing themselves from the rest of the world, and they resolved the moral situation by the application of articulated principles. The girls and women, on the other hand, saw themselves in terms of their human relationships and approached the moral case through considerations of care about hurting others. Professor Gilligan concludes that there is a special female moral mode, which pays attention to human context and human responsibility rather than to separation of self and abstract principle, and that it has been neglected in psychological studies.

Now there is something doubtful about the observation of a distinctly female morality. The book itself, in a chapter on women’s rights, cites Maggie Tulliver, the heroine of George Eliot’s Mill on the Floss, who is the very incarnation of standing alone and standing on principle, so it regards literary evidence as admissible. Furthermore,
George Eliot, along with the Bronte sisters and Jane Austen, is one of the great women writers of the nineteenth century and may reasonably be regarded as knowing something about female nature. Think of Jane Austen’s women, think of Jane Eyre, of Lucy Snowe. They are the uncompromising and incorruptibly independent bearers of moral principle and the teachers and correctors of the male propensity for bending the rules. One current example of the fact that some women are, after all, still cast in that role is to be found in the hilarious and poignant movie “Tootsie.” In it, Dustin Hoffman plays an actor who, in order to get a part in a soap opera, invents for himself a female role, that of a hospital administrator, a southern lady who will tolerate no nonsense with her person or her principles and whose uncompromised humanity wins everyone’s heart. The effect is the impression that the young man’s firmest and most gallant aspects are most fitly expressed in the shape of a sweet and spirited schoolmarm.

Carol Gilligan’s thesis is a contemporary version of the old typology I referred to above, in which the female is classified in terms of passion and its bonds and the male in terms of reason and its distinctions. I am very far from denying that there is something in this ancient distinction, because as I said, it is always foolish to reject ancient wisdoms out of hand. Only, rather than regarding these types as describing actual men and women, they should perhaps be seen as mythic patterns of opposition, abstracted configurations of characteristics that one may, if one likes, call the Male and Female Principle and that actual human beings partake of in varying proportions. Indeed it may well be definitive of actual men and women at their best that they have a strong admixture of the opposite principle. To be sure, in the study these contrasts were said to show up in actual people, but the recorded interviews all seem to me to bear alternative interpretations—for example, that the girls and women interviewed were more sensitive to the prevailing moral confusion of the period, which tends toward so-called situation ethics and an emphasis on relationships. In any case, I found it interesting that the women often expressed disappointment in the ineffectiveness of their supposedly female moral mode.

I would conclude that the grand question—whether men and women are different or the same in regard to fundamental matters—cannot be decisively settled by mythological, sociological, psychological, or even literary investigations. In fact, the best light on the matter seems to me to come from introspection and intimate talk among friends. There one often reaches plausible and satisfying conclusions about the nature of sexual differences—for that there are differences seems to be the usual conclusion. But were one to try to make a public profession of these private certainties, they would soon dissolve in the embarrassment of sounding at once hackneyed and useless—it would immediately appear how indefensible are such generalizations, depending as they do on a narrow sample of people in particular settings and on being seen from a special view.

But that permanently insoluble difficulty about the public articulation of the differences between men and women also suggests the resolution of the problems with respect to education. If, as I believe, the differences all have to do with what is intensely private and subtly intimate, in short, with the region in which body and soul intersect, it is little wonder that nothing very convincing can be said about them in the public world. For it is precisely in this world, in the realm of articulation, of thought and of reflection, that the differences, from the very nature of the enterprise, vanish. There is no male or female thinking or speaking—there is only adequate or inadequate thinking and articulate or inarticulate speaking. It may be that somewhere deep in their hearts men and women value these activities differently—though I myself doubt that such valuations are made along sexual lines. It may be that people go about their activities in “gender-specific” styles—though I have never actually noticed such differences. Yet, insofar as men and women carry on these activities at all they are on the same ground—that essential human ground on which both sexes are based, namely, the desire to discover truths and to communicate them to each other.

That is exactly what liberal education is for. Its ultimate aim is to develop the human desire and ability to consider the way and the being of things in communicable terms. Therefore it is precisely this kind of education that must be in its very nature coeducational, since it is concerned with common human matters.

Let me, in concluding, put a final twist on that argument. Suppose we honestly doubted that the sexes share a simply human mode of inquiry and that the world offers objects appropriate to it. To what would we look in pursuing even that doubt if not to our simply human power of reflection?
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Marie Bonaparte: A Life. Celia Bertin. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. 1982. $17.95. A vivid, almost sufficiently profound depiction of the family background, the travels of a lonely childhood and adolescence, the travels, and especially the varied and unsatisfactory love life (including her liaison with Aristide Briand) of the gifted, beautiful, frigid, great-granddaughter of Napoleon. Although finally analyzed by Freud, whom she worshiped, she could not free herself from her own traumas; nevertheless, she managed to be productive and creative as a practicing proselytizing psychoanalyst and an author in her own right. Revealed is thus the history not only of this admirable, tragic woman but also of the European social elite to which she belonged. Freud liked her, or at least was flattered to have her as patient and disciple.

Freud and Man’s Soul. Bruno Bettelheim. Knopf. 1983. $11.95. A challenging, usually nonquibbling exposition of the thesis that “the English renditions of Freud’s writings distort much of the essential humanism that permeates the originals.” The mistranslations and misinterpretations are attributed to the pragmatism of the Anglo-American translators who sought to convert psychoanalysis (the analysis of the psyche, man’s soul) into a natural, medical science with technical jargon rather than have it remain a Geisteswissenschaft steeped in mythology and expressed in simple language. Freud himself is reported not to have been interested in the blunders because of “his general anxiety toward things American,” but now American scholars and psychiatrists, particularly those who have never read Freud in his own language, must take cognizance of this viewpoint even though they may not necessarily agree.

Literary Theory: An Introduction. Terry Eagleton. Minnesota. 1983. $29.50, $9.95. An exceedingly stimulating, intelligible, and above all lively presentation and appraisal of the numerous literary theories that, under various new banners (such as hermeneutics, poststructuralism, deconstruction), would persuade their followers and certainly their competitors that theirs is the sacred best, sometimes the only way to comprehend and evaluate literature very broadly conceptualized. Why should nonhumanists concern themselves with the seemingly opaque Jacques Derrida or other “custodians of a discourse”? Historians, social scientists, and psychologists, no matter how rigorous they would be, are dealing with texts they call archives, documents, or protocols describing their observations or experiments; therefore they are all “prisoners of [their] own discipline” and eligible to acquire new insights and to learn more about their disciplines and themselves from the topsy-turvy trials and errors of literary criticism.

Art, Mind, and Brain: A Cognitive Approach to Creativity. Howard Gardner. Harvard. 1982. $20. A skillful, but qualitative exploration of creativity ranging from children’s drawings, songs, and reactions to stories and even television to the functioning of the cerebral hemispheres as revealed by the behavior of artists and other creative persons who have suffered brain damage. Included are summaries of the most significant, relevant theories and theorists of modern times. Not the least bit self-effacing, this compendium of integrated essays provides both pleasant browsing and provocative hints.

Exploring Individual Modernity. Alex Inkeles. Harvard. 1983. $24. A meticulous, essentially statistical reanalysis of the responses made, probably in the late 1960s, to a standardized interview by 6000 men in Argentina, Chile, East Pakistan (now Bangladesh), India, Israel, and Nigeria. Few of the findings are startling, and most of the differences associated with factors like religion, ethnicity, and family are quite slight (even when statistically significant): the first word of the book’s title is not an understatement. The always sensibly cautious and tentative outcomes are useful and not disappointing, however, because documenting elusiveness is an impressive antidote to the gib gluts that plague too many accounts of modernization.

The Psychology of Physical Symptoms. James W. Pennebaker. Springer-Verlag. 1982. $19.95. A resume of the empirical and experimental studies, especially those ingeniously conducted by the author, of our ability and proclivity to report, accurately or not, the sensations originating within our bodies. How, for example, do we communicate distressing symptoms to an attentive physician? Individual and cultural differences, as might be expected, loom large: for instance, “high symptom reporters” tend to differ from people reporting few symptoms with respect to eating habits, self-image, and social as well as health-related behavior.

LAWRENCE WILLSON

The Republic of Letters in America: The Correspondence of John Peale Bishop and Allen Tate. Ed. by Thomas Daniel Young and John J. Hindle. Kentucky. 1981. $17. Although neither the content, the quality, nor the tone of this correspondence is likely to charm old men from their chimney-corner or children from their play, it nevertheless a document of some worth in charting the course of Tate’s “republic of letters” (the only kind of republic I believe in, a kind of republic that can’t exist in a political republic). The two poet-novelists, highly self-conscious and sensitive, professional Southerners, eager to exchange ideas on the craft of writing, think of themselves as the last defenders of the old humanistic tradition, prepared to relax like the gentlemen they are in the warm sentimental wash of defeat and failure, after the gauzy fashion of their forebears. Always alert for slurs from “the old N.Y. and Sat. Review gang” and “the old Chicago school of book-reviewing,” whose “attack on us (in reviews of American Hannah) is really part of the general campaign to lower standards,” they can also cast a slur or two—in the direction of Hemingway, Fitzgerald, Bunny Wilson (“Dr.” Wilson when the mood is mean), MacLeish, and Pound (“a man of intuitions and insights, but he has never had any intellectual power . . . integrity”)

DICKINSON AND THE ROMANTIC IMAGINATION. John diehl. Prentice. 1982. $16.50. Diehl is concerned with the problem of the poet who writes “within the context of Romanticism” but who must diverge from it because of her “powerful sense of herself as a woman” struggling toward self-definition as “woman-poet,” fearful that “the passivity a woman poet had banished may return if the sphebe must prostrate herself before a masculine muse” whose “priapic power” frightens her even “as she simultaneously seeks to woo him.” Small wonder that Emily spent most of her life behind the barricades of her ancestral home in Amherst.

City Scriptures: Modern Jewish Writing. Murray Baumgarten. Harcourt. 1982. $15. Here is a book for the gayom, and they should read it, for the emergence of Jewish writing as an integral part of the literature of the United States has been perhaps the most significant development in recent years. Our literature would be much the poorer without the tales of Philip and Henry Roth, Bernard Malamud, Sholom Aleichem, and Isaac Bashevis Singer. Here is a few of the most notable of these writers. In their “scriptures” the opposition of “classic” American writing between village and wilderness is succeeded by an opposition between “home-as-ashkel” and the city. They are City Scriptures because it is in the city that the Jewish immigrant comes and for whom it is the “bridge from tradition to modernity.”

Kruse assembles objective evidence to dispute the judgment of Leo Marx and other critics that Life is "a disorderly patchwork," a conclusion that Wren and others have taken, declaring that it is one of Twain's "three great contributions to American literature." This is a model of a scholarly monograph, its "primary emphasis" resting "on fact rather than interpretation."

Johnson, too, sticks to facts, or at least to texts, as he traces cultural correspondences between Emerson's thought and Twain's. Like Emerson—like most Americans of their day, indeed—Twain was "profoundly reliant on the prospect of a free Self," "an empowered Self who . . . could control and even create his human environment." Yet he ran up against, however, was the intruding experience of the "real" world; in that world the Self becomes "more and more morally suspect as it is portrayed in action," duplicitous, subject to "a mean and destructive egoism." Only a child can beat the odds, for he can assume any Self he wishes; but woe betide him if he grows up into the world's corruption. In notes compiled for a book about Tom Sawyer and Huck Finn grown old, Twain wrote that "both are desolate, life has been a failure, all that was beautiful is under the mold." Yet to remain a child is no better: "the refusal to accept adulthood and death only means a death of another sort: a moral annihilation that results in a tranquil but terrible refuge beyond good and evil."

Of Miller's seven chapters, the first briefly sketches Twain's biography. The tone is somber, for "in many respects his life was a litany of regret" colored by guilt over his father's death, his son's death, his wife's death, and the deaths of two of his three daughters. "My life is a bit- terness," he said, and his books are illustrative of his fundamental unease. "Only the mad can be happy," Satan tells the boys of Eseldorf in the novel over which Twain labored for the last dozen misanthropic years of his life."

The last six of Miller's chapters are finely balanced critical assessments of Twain's major works, refreshingly far from the madding crowd of structuralist-deconstructionist-semiotic theories that would have confirmed Twain's lowest opinions of misguided human ingenuity. It is salutary to be reminded that Huck and Jim are not "related to the demigods of the river . . . and . . . to the archetypical primitives of the Golden Age, instinctively good, uncorrupted." Much as we admire the loyalty of Huck, it is only an occasional loyalty, and "the heart of a fourteen-year-old boy provides an index to the best."

But Jim is simply an ignorable country boy, and Jim is an ignorable black slave.

RONALD GEBALLE


Popularly known for his architectural legacy, Wren began his career as a mathematician and physical scientist welcomed as a peer by the greats of the seventeenth-century Royal Society. Suddenly, so it has seemed, in the late 1660s, he gave up his scientific work to become commissioner and then surveyor for the rebuilding of London. Bennett examines the transition carefully, showing that in his earlier days, Wren's interests had been directed to concrete manifestations of mathematics and science. Wren maintained his Savilian Astronomy Professorship at Oxford until 1673 and his devotion to the Royal Society, which he served as president from 1680 until 1682. His philosophy of architecture was unconventional, befitting a man whose scope led him even into studies of respiration and of the brain and to the first attempts at intravenous injection.


At this point in modern's development it has become possible for respectable physicists, by juxtaposing data ranging in scale from the cosmic to the subatomic, to muse over a surprising number of physical coincidences that seem crucial for the existence of life. The universe seems to have been surprisingly "fine-tuned" in many ways in order to bring about the conditions that make us possible. Is it all a matter of chance, or in some sense are we necessary for the existence of the universe? Davies sets out in simple terms the physical basis for the musings about an "anthropic principle" that a few years ago would have lain far outside the pale of polite scientific discourse.


Twenty experiments, selected from biology, chemistry, and physics, that played key roles in the development of science, have been selected by Harré to illustrate the several roles of experiment in the advance of knowledge. He sets this in the context of their times and comments briefly on the future to which they led. The selections range from Aristotle's chick embryos to Jacob and Wollman's transfer of genetic material, from Théodore of Freibourg's water bottle model of the rainbow to Otto Stern's third quantum number.


Described by the editors as "a mosaic of bits of the past," this collection of letters and other documents offers an informal survey of the scientific and nonscientific, often quite personal, concerns and interactions of the generation we of today did not quite know as persons. We see their names sprinkled through our textbooks and treatises, and they figure prominently in legends we like to retell. No doubt useful to the professional historian of science, this book will be fascinating to anyone brought up on these names who wishes to put a little flesh on them.


This book exemplifies the complementary uses of profound knowledge of a special subject and breadth of interest. In this selection of essays, Smith relies on his deep understanding of the properties of materials and of materials technology to probe with sympathy and sensitivity the creation of ceramic and metallic works of art. He shows how exquisite control of their materials enabled artists millennia ago to produce works unsurpassed today. The symbiosis between technique and art, the indistinctness of the border between art and artisanship, indeed the oftentimes leading role of materials technology in altering art and science, are major themes. Few others, if any, have the background to and outlook needed to treat this subject so satisfyingly.


The general outlines of the theory of continental drift have become part of television and magazine science, covered in many fine productions. The grand vision to which we are usually treated rests not only on flashes of insight but just as critically on painstakingly detailed work of paleo and laboratory and the adaptation of scientific equipment originally developed for purposes far removed from study of the earth. Glen traces carefully the way in which unrelated communities of earth scientists, some working on the argon-potassium dating technique and others on paleomagnetism, came to interact during the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s.

The cast is large, international, and diverse in style, and his treatment of their relationships forms a significant feature of the book. Their new techniques generated volumes of data, evidence of differing kinds began to converge, and the history of paleomagnetism, foreseen by some of these people at early stages, sprang out to startle most of us.


Tangles and knots surround us. They can be subjects for scrutiny and study rather than for vituperation or mere utility. Holden has an unusual capacity for explaining in simple language how to recognize and appreciate their aesthetic qualities and to begin to understand through the branch of mathematics called "topology." With characteristic skill he has constructed and photographed easily traceable models to illustrate the points he makes.

MADELINE R. ROBINSON


This fascinating volume—the diary of Beatrice Potter before her marriage to Sidney Webb in 1892—reads like a novel. It is brilliantly written, and is as critical of Webb herself as of others. And the others were the important figures of the day, all of whom she knew personally: prime ministers and cabinet members; leading thinkers as diverse as Herbert Spencer, Frederic Harrison, and George Bernard Shaw; people interested in ameliorating the condition of the poor, including her cousin, Charles Booth, and Octavia Hill; and trade union leaders. The core of the diary is, of course, the growing up of Beatrice, as she argues with herself, analyzes her own thinking and emotions, and tries to find herself and direct her reading and self-education toward the noble end of life she wished to play. Witty, descriptive, and analytical, the diary brings into focus the life of the upper classes of Victorian England, particularly of those members of the upper classes who were concerned with the problems England then faced.

THE KEY REPORTER
Commemorating the seventy-fifth anniversary of the Historical Association in Britain, this slender volume is a valuable survey of English institutions at the peak of British power and influence. Chapters on the Constitution, the Cities, the Church, Poverty, Socialism, the Empire, Disarmament, and the coming of War are written by specialists. Easily comprehensible to laymen and very useful for students.

What Sheldon Rothblatt did in The Revolution of the Dons: Cambridge and Society in Victorian England for Cambridge, Engel does for Oxford, writing the history of the professionalization of university teaching. The central issue was the secularization of teaching, its conversion into a secular career from a clerical career held by men in holy orders who began as celibate teaching fellows of colleges somewhat akin to monastic corporations. The debates on the problems of the profession, if not the solutions, that accompanied this transformation—the conflict between teaching and research, the relationship of the college to the university, the relationship of "liberal" to professional education, the form of teaching (that is, lectures, small classes, or individual instruction), methods of dealing with cutbacks due to financial exigencies, and the opening of the university to a wider audience—have a contemporary ring.

The intellectual background of the Whitehall Conference of 1655, which Cromwell had summoned to discuss the desirability of the return of the Jews (who had been expelled in 1290), is here explored. The emergence of the study of Hebrew, the impact of the emphasis on the Old Testament among the Puritans, which led some into strange paths of Sabbatarianism, some into Millenarianism, and others into discussions of the Mosaic Law and Christian-Jewish relations, culminated in a growth of toleration and in some cases philo-Semitism. Although the conference failed to resolve the issue in face of the opposition it aroused, the lawyers determined that no additional legislation was needed to readmit the Jews and that in theory there was no legal bar to their resettlement.

Richard III, the evil genius of history and fiction, has also had his defenders. Charles Ross, the biographer also of Richard's brother, Edward IV, has done a masterly job in dealing with the controversies surrounding Richard and in putting his actions into historical context.

As McNeill says, this is meant to be the "twin" to his earlier book Plagues and People. Beginning with antiquity and including a chapter on China from 1100 to 1500, McNeill traces the "busyness of war" in the West from 1500 to the present, constantly correlating the changes in technology and organization with the changing mechanics of warfare and relating their mutual impact. Provocative and imaginative, but judgments based on evidence and extensive reading are clearly distinguishable from hypotheses.

As Wright states: "Historical studies . . . evolve in response to changing tastes or altered social conditions. . . . It was the questions that led to study how the French have grappled with the problem of crime and in particular with punishment and prison reform in the past two centuries. An analysis of theory, practice, and effectiveness.

VICTORIA SCHUCK
Baker uses the rippling effect of the Supreme Court's controversial decision in the Miranda case—entitling any accused under the Bill of Rights to counsel before interrogation by police in station houses—to write a dramatic history and penetrating analysis of almost a half-century of criminal justice. She divides her story into four "books," each around a central figure. Ernest Miranda's book encompasses antecedent cases, the crime, trial, and appeal; Earl Warren's, a portrait of the Court, his 1966 opinion, and law enforcement; Richard Nixon's, law and order issues of the 1968 and 1972 campaigns, his judicial appointments, and omnibus crime bills; Warren Burger's, judicial politics and the later attempts to emasculate the decision. Baker's book concludes with the death of Miranda from a stabbing incident in 1976. The results is an absorbing account of the interrelationships of men and women, issues, values, states, presidents, Congress, and the courts. A mammoth study destined to become a classic.

In this biography, an indomitable frontier woman (1834–1915) emerges as an important feminist whose story helps to fill a gap in the knowledge of the suffrage movement in the Pacific Northwest. Born in Illinois, Duniway, at 22, rode horseback along the entire route as her family joined the great migration to Oregon in 1852. Self-educated, she became farmer, entrepreneur, lecturer, poet, mother of six children. She translated family events into novels and fictionalized her philosophy. As founder and publisher of a newspaper, New Northwest, for 16 years she publicized her Republican views, opposed Prohibition, supported cooperatives. Acquainted with Anthony and Stanton, Duniway held office in the national suffrage organization. Her strident, inflexible ways led to acrimonious infighting. Yet when victory finally came, Duniway was suffrage in Oregon in 1914, it was in no small measure hers.

A treasure trove of almost one thousand pages of information about states and cities. The authors, who have visited every state during their many years of study, begin with an overview chapter. They tell us of trends, the counterrevolution to long-time federal dominance, new constitutions, new professionals, new answers to age-old economic and social problems, strong urban revival, and the amazing interregional migration from the Frostbelt to the Sunbelt. Chapters on each state follow, beginning with the East Coast and moving to the Pacific, including Alaska and Hawaii. Contents: demography, history, political dynamics, labor and industrial developments, the arts, and culture. Nor are corruption and reform omitted. In a fast-moving style, they bring out the unique character of cities as well. A requisite to understanding America.


A systematic field study of the effects of the Reagan administration's domestic policy shifts designed to reduce the scope of federal role in policies, and to increase the grants going to state governments while limiting grants to cities. A team of 46 social scientists whose data are derived from 14 state governments, 14 large cities, and 26 suburban and rural governments found that the states wanted still more flexibility in regulations. The greatest changes have come from Reagan budget cuts, which have fallen most heavily on the working poor. States have rarely made up for grant losses in AFDC (Aid to Families with Dependent Children), food stamp, and Medicaid programs. The authors explain why more cutbacks from federal funds (highways, mass transit, housing) benefiting the middle class is more often replaced.
brilliance of the writing and by the breadth and depth of Stephen Gould’s vision of biological processes in the general context of our evolutionary history.”

The Ralph Waldo Emerson prize was awarded to Daniel Joseph Singal, assistant professor of history at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, for The War Within: From Victorian to Modernist Thought in the South, 1919–1945, published by the University of North Carolina Press. Hayden White, of the University of California, Santa Cruz, and chairman of the Emerson Committee, recalled that the members of the committee were one in their judgment that The War Within is an impressive achievement, the more so for being the first book published by its author. “Singal’s book,” said White, “richly documents and tactfully analyzes the myth of the cavalier, the southern gentleman who supposedly embodied qualities of civilization and gentility opposed to the presumed savagery of negro slaves, on the one side, and the rapacity of an alien capitalism, on the other. Singal exposes the falsity of the gentlemanly perspective on southern reality. . . .” He shows how novelists, poets, and critics mainly, but also figures in a different dimension—sociologists, a historian, an economist, an editor-publisher—negotiated and led the transition from Victorian to Modernist consciousness.”

The 1984 Phi Beta Kappa book awards will be open to qualified books published between June 1, 1983, and May 31, 1984. Entries must be submitted, preferably by the publishers, by May 31, 1984. Inquiries and entries should be addressed to the appropriate award committee at 1811 Q Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009.

INAUGURAL ROMANELL LECTURE SET AND 1984–85 AWARD ANNOUNCED

Herbert Fingarette, first recipient of the Romanell—Phi Beta Kappa Professorship in Philosophy, will deliver the inaugural lecture of the three-part series on May 10, 1984, in Lotte Lehmann Concert Hall at the University of California, Santa Barbara. Fingarette, whose designation as the Romanell Professor for 1983–84 was announced last year, is known for the impressive breadth of his work in philosophy. He has written extensively on philosophical psychology, ethics, and religion: forensic psychiatry and law; Confucius and Chinese philosophy. His lecture on May 10 at 4 p.m. will be open to the public; members of Phi Beta Kappa living in the Santa Barbara area will be especially welcome.

The Romanell—Phi Beta Kappa Professorship in Philosophy for 1984–85 has been awarded to Robert Paul Wolff, professor of philosophy at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. In nominating Wolff for the Romanell Professorship, the Nu Chapter of Massachusetts noted that his “entire professional career has been devoted to the task of bringing sophisticated philosophical reflection to a nonprofessional audience. His political philosophy, which spoke directly to the concerns of citizens in the sixties, seventies, and eighties, has been translated into more than a dozen languages. . . . His book on the philosophy of university education . . . opened up to a large nontechnical audience some of the perennial questions of the nature of education, the justification of the life of the mind, and the relation between thought and action.” Wolff is currently doing research on the philosophical foundations of modern economic theory, an enterprise that has brought him into contact with new audiences and has considerably broadened the public significance of his work.

KEY REPORTER TO GET NEW EDITOR IN THE SPRING

Effective as of the next issue, Priscilla Taylor will become editor of The Key Reporter. Roseanne Price, who has edited the newsletter since 1979, is leaving in order to be able to devote more time to her family. A Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Agnes Scott College, Priscilla Taylor was a Fulbright scholar at the London School of Economics, where she earned an M.A. in international history with a mark of distinction.

Since 1976, she has been senior editor-writer for Editorial Experts, Inc., of Alexandria, Va. For the past two years she has also edited an award-winning newsletter, The Editorial Eye, which focuses on editorial practices and standards.