

given about their formation or activities. Yet Cody's character clearly shines forth in this work, and it is a bold depiction of Cody and his era.

J. D. Purdy  
University of Western Ontario

William H. Nelson. *The Search for Faculty Power: The History of the University of Toronto Faculty Association, 1942–1992*. Toronto: University of Toronto Faculty Association and Canadian Scholars' Press, 1993. Pp. 176.

William Nelson's *The Search for Faculty Power* is an adequate introduction to the activities of one group of agents in the university who so far have been largely overlooked in historical literature: the faculty, and in particular the professoriate. The book outlines the evolution of the faculty association at the University of Toronto since the middle part of this century, offering the reader a straightforward account of the successes and failures of the organization in its drive for a collective say in administrative policy making. Over time, the association agitated for salary and pension reform, more formal faculty input and power in administration, collective bargaining, and binding arbitration.

*The Search for Faculty Power* is a strangely attractive little book (you rarely have to wade through any annoying minutiae), probably because it doesn't pretend to be something it is not: Nelson merely attempts to give an outline of how an institutional structure tried to make itself heard. He successfully relates the political inner tensions of the university characterized by faculty against students, faculty against administration, and most absorbing, faculty against itself. The triad of participants—faculty, students, and administration—come across as perennial antagonists. Nelson asserts that this is the kind of history that will “undoubtedly . . . develop rapidly in the years ahead” (p. 1).

The fact that Nelson was so involved in the association for so long cannot help but make the read somewhat one-sided. The administration clearly comes across as the enemy. The view offered is how the Association valiantly tried over the years, despite derision from politicians and the press, and inside disputes which threatened the very representation of the association, to “[slay] the dragon of Simcoe Hall paternalism” (p. 139). We get a strictly chronological series of forays against administration in a faculty attempt to define its role as both a collection of individual scholars and teachers, and as integral employees of the university with rightful claims to appropriate compensation and security.

Nelson uses sources that, apart from some personal recollections and a memoir, are mostly dry, administrative, and faculty-based. This itself generates one of the most significant irritants of the book: little in-depth effort is made to relate political, social, or economic conditions from outside of campus to help explain faculty/administration stand-offs. Occasionally, the book turns to what other universities are doing or have done, cost of living statistics are provided in reference to the faculty pension and salary grievances (tables would be helpful here), and a newspaper account or two suggests the often poor reputation of faculty as ensconced in overpaid sinecures. But these are given secondary status only; the real story remains the narrative of association action and reaction through various crises. From chapter to chapter, the Haist rules, Duff-Berdhal Report, Governing Act of 1971, Memorandum of Agreement in 1977, and the Burkett Report, all milestones in faculty/administrative history at the University of Toronto, are left frustratingly just that: something on which to pin relatively minor dramas in a larger story.

The complete lack of referencing in the book is another concern. Any interest in particular sources and in an objective historical treatment is extinguished early, only adding to the problematic tone of a book characterized by unanswered questions. Why, for example, were some science departments and professional schools opposed to faculty activism? Why did the association change its name from the Committee to Represent the Teaching Staff to the Association of Teaching Staff to the Faculty Association? Why did the public harbour lingering animosity towards university faculty? And, importantly, why is there typically dismissiveness towards women faculty, both historically and by the author? This latter question is approached infrequently (and in the early years, not at all), with mere descriptions revolving mostly around gender discrepancy in salary structure, and the efforts to redress the imbalance. Surely a book which purports to outline an association representing the entire teaching and research staff at such a large university must tackle questions of gender in far greater detail. Nelson describes the faculty association in the 1950s as "very much a man's world" (p. 19) and rarely revisits that thought, apart from a few parting observations towards the end. This particular myopia in the book also applies to fleeting analyses of multiculturalism, pragmatism, and ageism, and of the debate over the protection of academic freedom, all of these for the 1980s and 1990s.

In spite of its flaws, *The Search for Faculty Power* is at times surprisingly exciting as a modest historical account of a group of academics striving to deal with various inconsistencies and injustices in their workplace.

Paul J. Stortz

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at University of Toronto