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and that the Reconstruction amendments potentially incorporated the very values he sees as so central to his thesis regarding American singularity. Again the lawyers’ history foil serves his purpose and solidifies his argument.

Hyman acknowledges that the 1944 G.I. Bill seems, initially, to be an aberration. Historians have seen it as a measure designed specifically for veterans, unlike the previous two examples. However, he argues that it was broader in its impact than simply educating veterans and granting them loans. It eventually included provisions for reemployment, unemployment compensation, social security, and loan guarantees for farms and business. Thus, in action, it reinforced and revitalized New Deal civilian legacies. This linking of peacetime to wartime public policy commitments allowed unprecedented numbers and segments of the population to enjoy improved access to education, land (housing), and legal remedies. He then argues that the sons and daughters of the beneficiaries of the G.I. Bill, particularly in education, became leaders in the civil rights movement, greatly democratized university systems, and challenged prior social stratification, so that the outcome of the G.I. Bill’s largesse was again equal access to housing, education, and legal remedies for all Americans.

Hyman sees the Reagan administration efforts to turn back the clock as validating his point that these laws were the products of our most liberating thinker-politicians, and their cumulative effect, over two hundred years of history, has both produced success and reinforced aspects of our national exceptionalism.

Hyman chooses his examples carefully and well. Critics from the far left and the far right will certainly quibble with his upbeat approach, but they will find his arguments serious and well constructed.

University of Minnesota

Paul L. Murphy


The word scholarship as used to designate the systematic investigation of some topic of interest has been with us at least since the sixteenth century. But this is not what Roger L. Geiger has in mind when he writes about the advancement of knowledge. That term suggests an ongoing, cumulative enterprise rather than the idle curiosity we associate with the traditional gentleman scholar. “To advance knowledge” implies the existence of institutional structures that give support and continuity to the scholarly activity of individuals. It also implies the ra-
tional purpose and direction characteristic of research in science and technology. How universities rather than industrial laboratories or government agencies came to be the principal sponsors of research is the central theme of this book. Although the author does not say so, another theme is the manner in which our conception of research has come to be shaped by the nature and needs of scientific research. The term “social science” speaks for itself, while even in the humanities the philological and historical studies of the early twentieth century were profoundly influenced by scientific models.

The sixteen research universities which furnish most of the material for this study include four state universities of the Midwest—Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Minnesota. All sixteen, whether public or private, are among the richest and most prestigious of American universities. Only such institutions could provide the buildings, expensive equipment, and high salaries essential to scientific research in the modern period. Research in nonscientific fields simply conformed to the pattern dictated by the sciences.

Tracing the growth of these institutions as research universities is essentially a matter of following the money trail. Donations by alumni and friends, however intensively cultivated, were simply inadequate to the need. During the period 1900–1940, the principal sources for financial support of research were the endowed funds established by wealthy individuals, notably the Carnegie and Rockefeller foundations. The leading universities were the most successful in tapping the wealth of the foundations, establishing the principle of “best science,” meaning that financial support should go where the best work was already being done, thus further strengthening the favored institutions.

Except for newer institutions, such as the University of Chicago, Johns Hopkins, and Caltech, these universities had emerged as research centers out of well-established liberal arts colleges in which teaching had traditionally enjoyed a high priority. In the research universities the graduate college research faculties and the undergraduate liberal arts faculties were virtually identical, creating a tension between the competing demands of teaching and research, a tension scarcely papered over with the hopeful assertion that the best researchers were ipso facto the best teachers. In this struggle teaching inevitably lost out. Research was a communal enterprise, with specialized journals and professional associations linking scholars in closely knit national bodies which generated hierarchies of talent and prestige. In competing feverishly for the services of the leading researchers, universities lost effective control over faculty members who could dictate their own
terms. Geiger identifies the later 1920s as the “Golden Age” in which the concentration of talent in the research universities was completed.

The book ends with World War II, a decisive turning point for the support of research. Stimulated by the imperatives of the war effort, government now became the dominating sponsor of research, a role it plays to the present. The impact of government on research remains a topic to be treated, one trusts, in a future volume.

The Iowa Testing Programs: The First Fifty Years, by Julia J. Peterson. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1983. xii, 260 pp. Illustrations, tables, appendix, notes, index. $25.00 cloth.

The Iowa Testing Programs: The First Fifty Years tells the story of student testing programs developed from 1929 to 1980 primarily through the efforts of people associated with the University of Iowa. The author also describes the related development of separate entities such as the Measurement Research Center and the American College Testing Program (ACT). The author, Julia J. Peterson, worked very closely with the Iowa Testing Program throughout most of the period covered in the book, serving in several different administrative and editorial capacities until her retirement in 1976.

The topic of Iowa testing programs is correlated very closely with similar efforts at the University of Iowa, especially by Dr. E. F. Lindquist, a recognized educational leader in the field of student testing. It is apparent that although there were many important contributors to the Iowa Testing Program, Dr. Lindquist’s contribution was critical for the continued growth of student testing programs. However, other noteworthy contributions by many dedicated and deserving individuals are duly mentioned throughout.

The book is organized chronologically. In November 1928 Iowa school superintendents were notified of a new undertaking at the University of Iowa which called for an Academic Meet to be held in Iowa’s high schools at the end of the school year. This project was the beginning of what came to be known as the Iowa Testing Programs. Following the initial growth and development of the early testing programs of the thirties, the “Vigorous Forties” was a decade of accomplishments, including the extension of the Basic Skills Program to grades three through five, the national publication of the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS), and the development at the high school level of the Iowa Tests of Educational Development (ITED). The “Electronic Fifties” saw the development of electronic scoring for the various tests. The technology