strategies and the impact of the life cycle. Naturally, scores of Loyalist family records abound in this guide. The Chipmans, Hazens, and other famous Loyalist families are represented, giving an opportunity for a collective biographical approach. More recent families are also here. Premier Louis Robichaud appears twice. There are the official records of his administration in the PANB and a smaller collection in the Centre d'Études Acadiennes at the Université de Moncton. Here are letters he wrote to his parents while he was a student at the Juvenant Saint-Jean-Études and at the Université du Sacré-Cœur in Bathurst. What might these youthful epistles disclose about the impact of his educational experiences on his choice of a vocation and the development of his political ideas. Church archives are numerous in this province. Many deal with the Roman Catholic Church's involvement with schooling, especially the Acadian aspect. Similarly, there is a wealth of information on the development of the Methodist educational activities in the very impressive archives at Mt. Allison University.

In the field of New Brunswick historiography there are probably no more famous names than John Clarence Webster, W.F. Ganong, and W.O. Raymond. (The latter is not listed in the index). All three laboured diligently in the early part of the twentieth century to put New Brunswick historical writing on a sound basis. They ferreted out and compiled various types of documentary collections which generations of students have profitably used. Each is represented in this bibliography for they all collected material on the province’s early educational history.

And so it goes on, page after page and entry after entry—as delightful as a lobster feast on a warm summer’s evening. For a former native New Brunswicker, as this author is, it was like visiting old friends. As the old cliché states, this bibliography is a veritable treasure trove. It has 548 entries drawn from 24 separate archives. Each entry has a short, clear description of the repository’s contents and there is a very useful index. New Brunswick historians of education can no longer complain that they do not know where the sources are located.

Judson D. Purdy
University of Western Ontario


This book is the product of the author’s doctoral dissertation which received the National Prize of Research and Educational Innovations in Spain in 1985. After a preface by Julio Ruiz Berrio, from the prestigious Universidad Complutense in Madrid, there is an introduction, nine chapters, and a conclusion, including a lengthy
and well-organized bibliography and historical sources, and an index of names. These sections are all packaged in 454 pages, for the most part written in elegant and clear prose.

The selection of Madrid as the site for the study of working-class education in Spain is not accidental. The author explains in his introduction that Spain is a country with “multiple realities” (p. 16), and very often people have generalized too quickly, providing similar explanations for phenomena that resulted from heterogeneous processes. Thus, his attempt to identify and study just one social ecosystem that is quite homogeneous (such as Madrid), and in which the integration of education with other educational factors can be appreciated as affecting the social dynamic, makes sense. Furthermore, the choice of Madrid results from the author’s conscious view that it is imperative to write local histories to expand the horizons of Spanish historiography.

Tiana Ferrer identifies three groups/ideologies connected with the education of the working class: social reformism, social Catholicism, and socialism. He wonders why they decided to promote popular education—generically defined as the education of the working class or popular classes. And he inquires into the educational ideas these three ideological groups defended, the institutions they started, and the influence they had in the development of the working class in Madrid.

In terms of literacy rates, the population of Madrid was, at the turn of the century, well above the national average. Public schooling, however, could not provide placement for all eligible children. A great number of those in attendance dropped out after two or three years because of family and work demands. Figures, although unreliable, show that by 1900 the 144 public schools operating in Madrid with 11,600 students served only 18.7% of the total school-age population. In contrast, the private system (run largely by Catholic religious orders), with 368 schools and 27,200 students, served 43.8% of the school-age population.

Private education was quite heterogeneous, with a number of elite schools, but also including schools for profit, charity schools, and schools for religious indoctrination. Curiously enough, the curriculum of private and public schools may not have been too different. For instance, Christian Doctrine and Sacred History were included as mandatory courses in public schools.

One of Tiana Ferrer’s central claims is that social reformism developed a more extensive network of popular education projects for the working class in Madrid than Catholicism or socialism. Social reformism was one of the responses of the bourgeoisie to growing workers’ unrest. It reflected the views of the liberal wing of the Spanish bourgeoisie. It can be defined as social organicism based on notions of social harmony and consensus, strict morals, political liberalism, and strong faith in the power of education. It was implemented through four projects: first, social legislation for welfare promulgated after 1900, attempting to ameliorate the excesses of capitalism; second, “associationism”
implemented through the creation in 1908 of the National Institution of Social Provision, which sought to establish minimum levels of welfare for the total population; third, growing arbitrage of capital and labour disputes; and fourth, the education of the popular classes.

The reformist notion of popular education, in turn, was based on four principles, namely a) the education of the working class constitutes an indispensable requisite to the workings of the democratic system; b) education is the key to the prevention of a growing conflict between capital and labour; c) popular education is an efficient instrument for social integration; d) popular education shall form the “New Person” that is needed.

Among the key instruments for popular education from a reformist perspective was the Escuela Central de Artes y Oficios (Central School for Arts and Trades) founded in 1871, and oriented to the teaching of artisans rather than industrial workers. In 1900, however, it changed its name to the School for Arts and Industries. The author estimates that during the period 1896-1918, it enrolled a total of 17,117 workers and artisans. Other similar educational instruments were the School for Apprenticeship of the Municipality of Madrid, the Centre for Commercial Instruction, the School for Home Economics and Professional Training of Women (Escuela del Hogar y Profesional de la Mujer), the Iberoamerican Center for Feminine Popular Culture, and night classes for adults operating in public schools. In addition, private institutions such as the Institute for Free Teaching, the Association for the Teaching of Women, and the Spanish League for Popular Education were all sustained by private initiative. Finally, some political parties had their own educational institutions devoted to popular education such as the Republican Party’s Centros Instructivos de Obreros Republicanos (Centres for the Instruction of Republican Workers). While the liberal and conservative parties couldn’t compete with the Socialist, Communist, and Republican parties in establishing these centres for workers’ education, at least seven centres controlled by liberal and conservative parties were identified by the author as being in operation in Madrid during the period under study. Another important instrument of popular education animated by reformism was to bring the university to the workers through university extension. Two experiences are highlighted, the Ateneo and the Popular University of Madrid. While these two experiences started with tremendous vigour by the turn of the century, in less than a decade they were languishing away.

Tiana Ferrer shows how the emergence of Social Catholicism around the turn of the century led to several church-sponsored educational initiatives. Among these was the creation of the Circles of Catholic Workers of Madrid, an institution that could be found in virtually every Catholic country after World War I. The author links many of the Catholic initiatives in popular education to an emerging social democratic movement, and to Catholic trade-unionism which counted often (but not always) on support, advice, and encouragement from
the hierarchies of the Catholic Church in Madrid.

In 1888 the first Congress of the Socialist Worker Spanish Party (PSOE) in Madrid created the socialist party which rules Spain today. Many people within the PSOE disagreed with the reformist position, proclaiming the inevitability of revolution. Therefore, there were conflicting positions on whether the party should set up any educational institutions for workers. For instance, an important intellectual of the party argued that “we don’t deny the goodness of instruction. What we deny is that, within the capitalist regime, the productive class, in its entirety, can acquire true instruction” (p. 368).

These critical views of the role of education before the revolution, and the lack of financial resources, explain the absence of a precise programme of popular education in the origin of the party. But this quickly changed. In 1895, a leading intellectual, Pablo Iglesias, published articles expressing the necessity for reforms but without displacing the revolutionary focus. At the turn of the century, the socialists created the conditions for debate on the public schools, and promoted the socialist-inspired law of public instruction in 1918—sponsoring values such as humanitarianism, solidarity, and pacifism. The law, however, was never enacted.

A number of socialist initiatives flourished including the Centre of Workers’ Societies, the House of the People, the Socialist Circles, and the Asociación Artístico-Socialista (the Association of Art and Socialism). Among the most important were the lay socialist schools inaugurated on January 2, 1905 for children of workers at the Centre of Workers’ Societies. There were also vocational training experiments (professional societies) developed by the socialists, but the most important resulted from an alliance between socialists and republicans in what was known as the New School (Escuela Nueva), created on January 12, 1911 with the collaboration of a large number of intellectuals living in Madrid, not all of them of socialist affiliation. The New School resulted in a number of activities, from courses on socialist culture to the creations of museums, to advise workers of their legal rights and obligations.

The author concludes that during 1898-1917, Madrid witnessed the end of the demobilization and repression of the working class, and a new faith in their integration into democratic life. Popular education was seen as a fundamental tool for this integration. After 1917, the crisis shifted the debate to political rather than educational or ideological grounds. With the limited historical evidence at hand, it will be difficult to judge the outcomes of the different initiatives of popular education described in this book. However, the author seems confident that popular education programmes have affected the consciousness of the working class in Madrid in many ways, and this will show in the events of the future.

In short, this is an informative, well-written, well-researched and documented book. Perhaps the only complaint I have is that the title may lead the reader to think that the focus of the study is on teachers rather than
on the more institutional and ideological focus adopted. This is, however, a venial sin. Historians of education who can read Spanish will definitely benefit from this book.

Carlos Alberto Torres
University of California, Los Angeles


One aim of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century North American middle-class progressivism was to make good boys and girls of the wayward by rehabilitating, and not criminalizing and punishing them. As S.L. Schlossman explained in Love and the American Delinquent, a new ethos of caring eventually reformed the reformatory, forcing a gradual shift from the congregate to the cottage institution headed by parent role models. It also established a juvenile court and alternatives to the reform school. Thus, probation officers made home visits and judges passed down a suspended sentence, or delivered a "little talk" to a boy or girl.

Normal Bad Boys is rooted in that progressive movement. It brings together two case studies of the policies affecting the disposition of delinquent, neglected, and emotionally disturbed anglophone youth in Montreal between 1912 and 1984. In Parts One and Two, Prue Rains employs provincial reports as well as a rich archive to construct a history of recruitment policies of one private reform institution, the Boys’ Farm and Training School (hereafter BFTS), from 1912 to 1971 when Quebec legislation transformed it to a public institution. For decades, BFTS’ Board of Directors, comprising prominent and well-connected Montreal anglophone businessmen such as E.W. Beatty, president of CPR, fought to maintain the reform school’s non-prison image. BFTS clung stubbornly to the ideal of providing boys with abundant fresh air, wholesome food, and a lack of fences and closed doors on its two hundred and fifty acres of forested land forty miles northwest of Montreal.

Rains features BFTS’ struggle for control over its population. When the reform school faced its first population crisis around the time of World War I, it did two things. First, its Board of Directors lobbied the province for the “indefinite sentence,” winning, instead, a significant increase in the length of term boys would serve. Second, BFTS began recruiting its own clients through advertisement, and for a time was especially successful. From 1924 to 1928, for example, about half of its population (in 1924 a quarter of the population of Quebec reform schools) were “voluntary boys” (p. 22).

Rains argues that BFTS, conscious of its traditional non-prison orientation, and with a view to specializing in youth populations it felt best able to handle, continued to resist having inappropriately placed clients