February 1944. Offered appointment to the Supreme Court of Canada, he declined because, with the invasion of France imminent, he wished to remain with his men. He was wounded at Louvigny in July 1944, was awarded the CBE, and did not again see action, being discharged as medically unfit early in 1945.

For the next few years Lett served his profession, his university, his city, and his country in a variety of ways. Most important of these was a year's service (1954-55) as a member of the International Supervisory Commission in Vietnam. This body, created by the Geneva Agreement of 1954, had three Commissioners. Lett was often irritated by the Polish representative, P. Ogrodzinski, who clearly was working to advance the interests of the Soviet Union, but liked Manilal Desai, the Indian chairman of the Commission. Lett was impressed by Ho Chi Minh, General Vo Nguyen Giap, and the North Vietnamese Foreign Minister, Phan Van Dong.

Soon upon his return to Canada he took office as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of British Columbia. His most important judgement was in the case that originated in Premier W.A.C. Bennett's high-handed Power Development Act of 1961 and the 1962 amendments to it. Lett ruled in favour of BC Power. The provincial government did not appeal this judgement, instead joining BC Power in asking Lett to fix the final compensation due to the shareholders. "It is difficult to imagine a greater tribute to the Chief Justice's integrity than this request" (p. 166). In August 1963 he became Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal, the highest judicial post in British Columbia. Unfortunately, he died within a year, a victim of cancer.

His one regret, Roy writes in introducing the book, is that he never met Sherwood Lett. He evidently was a man of great ability, energy, probity, courage, and decency. His only major failing seems to have been that he too often and too easily neglected his roles as husband and father in favour of his work and his sense of duty.

My one regret is that this biography is so brief. We learn a good deal about Lett's life but little about his times. One might have wished for more information even about his life. For example, Roy cursorily discusses Lett's interest in politics but fails to deal with an obvious question: why did he never become a candidate for public office? (Perhaps the answer rests in a cartoon I have on my office door. An older man says to a younger: "One day you'll realize that the people capable of running the country are too smart to get into politics.") All the same, it is no small tribute to a book to say that one wishes it were longer.

Michiel Horn
Glendon College of York University

James M. Wallace. *Liberal Journalism and American Education, 1914-1941*. New Brunswick and London: Rutgers University Press,

1991. Pp. xiv, 237. Cloth $40.00 U.S., paper $15.00 U.S.

This study provides an account of the educational views contained in two of the most famous periodicals in the United States, *The New Republic* (hereafter *TNR*) and *The Nation* (hereafter *TN*), during the period from the beginnings of World War I to the early stages of World War II. The year 1914 was chosen as the initial point of the study, not because of the pending war, but because it was the year in which *TNR* was founded. The other journal, *TN*, began publication in 1865. Both journals continue to be published in the 1990s. They were famous in the years covered by Wallace as the two leading journals of liberal opinion. Today, they are not as clearly the only dominant voices of political liberalism. In fact, one searches to find a dominant or representative voice of a political liberalism in the 1990s that reflects the values and concerns of these journals in the first half of the twentieth century. *TNR* has moved somewhat to the right of where it was and *TN* has moved a similar distance to the left. A quick, though not to this reviewer unfair, sense of their contemporary positions may be discerned when one learns that *TNR* has taken a consistently pro-Israel position in middle-eastern affairs while *TN* has exhibited much more sympathy for the Arab populations and nations.

Wallace states four "central messages" (p. 9) as guideposts for his volume in his introduction: 1) that for these two liberal journals education was a major part of their political theory and their reform programme; 2) that their educational discussions set forth an important part of the vision that guided their ideas and programmes; 3) that the journals both believed in, and practised, coalition building in educational and other affairs; and 4) that the contributors to the journals functioned as "connected critics," a term borrowed from Michael Walzer. What distinguishes a connected critic is the commitment of that individual to the practical dimension of the policies being criticized and the criticisms being made.

Wallace develops these central messages through a basically chronological treatment divided into three major periods. The first comprises the years of progressive reform from 1914 to 1921. The second period contains the conservative 1920s, a decade of Republican presidents Calvin Coolidge, Warren Harding, and Herbert Hoover. The final era is the Depression and its aftermath, roughly the decade of the 1930s. In the first period, the major topics covered are the efficiency movement, academic freedom, and the role of education in reform. In the middle years of the book, workers' education, child centredness, and anti-intellectualism receive attention. In the final period, the impact of the Depression on the schools, teacher unions, militant college students, and federal youth programmes are the objects of concern.

As far as Wallace's major claim for the two journals he studies, he states his argument clearly in his con-

cluding section. "During the 1914-41 period, *TN* and *TNR*, as the foremost liberal journals, played a constructive role in American education. They conveyed information and ideas between educators and political liberals, while criticizing many of the practices and ideas that were being transmitted (p. 169)." The significance of the journals' educational work was twofold: information dissemination relating to the cause of educational reform on the one hand, and analysis, evaluation, and occasional advocacy of that information on the other. As part of their evaluative effort, Wallace compliments the journals for their refusal to swallow the naive belief, favoured by many educators, that "education was *the* key to progress and reform" (p. 169).

John Dewey plays a prominent role in Wallace's analysis, since he was a long-time editor of *TNR* and a frequent contributor to *TN* in most of the years covered by Wallace. The analysis of Dewey is quite positive. Wallace uses Dewey's journal writings, often neglected by other scholars, to defend him from unfair criticism such as the charge that Dewey was responsible for much of the anti-intellectualism that pervades American life. In addition to Dewey, the full panoply of progressive educators of various stripes graces Wallace's book: Boyd Bode, John Childs, George Counts, Agnes DeLima, William Heard Kilpatrick, and Caroline Pratt are some of the many whose ideas are mentioned, analyzed, and occasionally criticized.

Generally speaking, Wallace's analysis is supple and subtle and his argument is convincing. I have a few mild reservations, however, that I would mention briefly. One is foreshadowed in a few of my earlier remarks. Wallace's tendency is to support rather tenaciously the position of the liberals, such as Dewey, against their opponents. A more critical view does not have to be unfriendly to Dewey et al. For example, Alan Lawson's *The Failure of Independent Liberalism* (1971) presents a sympathetic analysis of Dewey and several like-minded thinkers that still calls them to account for their failure to persuade others to adopt their ideas and programmes in the 1930s.

Second, Wallace is better at distinguishing his two journals from each other in the first of the three periods he studies than in the other two. In the treatment of the 1920s and 1930s, *TNR* and *TN* are almost interchangeable in Wallace's analysis. While the two journals were closer together in the latter periods, if they were as identical as Wallace depicts them, this in and of itself deserves serious comment. On the other hand, if there were distinctions between the two periodicals in these latter years, they deserve explication and analysis.

Less important than the previous points, there is a minor problem in the secondary literature used by Wallace. The book dates from his dissertation in the 1960s and, while he has updated the analysis in many respects, he still has a tendency to rely on and to engage the interpretations of scholars from that earlier decade at the expense of those of recent years. For example, while Richard Hofstadter's *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* (1963) in-

forms Wallace's discussion of the issue of anti-intellectualism, a more contemporary analysis might start from E.D. Hirsch's *Cultural Literacy* (1987) and consider a very similar set of issues.

Finally, when Wallace comes to the concluding section, he leaves the focus of his liberal journals to address the issue of the present and future of American liberalism. His treatment of this issue is stimulating, but the faithful reader wonders what has happened to the two journals studied in the book that detaches them from Wallace's sense of contemporary educational and social reform. It is not that Wallace does not discuss the journals in his conclusion, but that he takes them offstage for his final analysis of liberalism, a place that they do not inhabit anywhere else in the book.

None of these reservations should preclude readers from a study of Wallace's volume. If you have an interest in the history of progressive educational reform, in the relations between educational reform and reformers and other social and political reforms and reformers, or in the possibilities and pitfalls of contemporary educational reform, Wallace has things to say to you that will cause you to reflect on these problems in novel ways. For example, one point raised in the conclusion by Wallace was particularly provocative for me. He notes there that educational criticism is now frequently encountered in professional journals such as the *Harvard Educational Review* or the *American Journal of Education*. In earlier decades, these journals functioned mainly as outlets for technical studies or for analyses that took for granted the benign character of the educational enterprise. Since the 1960s, however, criticism of the design and conduct of the educational enterprise has invaded the pages of these and many other educational journals. While this has given a new vitality to these "professional" journals, it also has taken away from the possibility that educational critics might look outside of their professional circles to places such as *TNR* or *TN* for an audience for their ideas.

Unlike Wallace, I believe that these two journals have deteriorated in the amount and quality of their educational criticism. His explanation of the existence of professional outlets for educational critics and criticism surely is one cause of the situation, a cause that I had not considered before reading his book. Probably it is also one reason that he leaves a discussion of the journals when he considers contemporary educational liberalism. I look forward to the chance to discuss this with Wallace. I am sure that I will have that chance. Wallace is one of the few authors I know who invites readers to discuss issues raised in the reading of his book (p. xiv). This invitation to dialogue is surely one of the genuine strengths of the historical liberalism that Wallace studies and the contemporary liberalism that animates his own work.

Wayne J. Urban
Georgia State University