"basic" or "pure" social science, as imputed to the early CSSRC by Fisher. What this indicates, perhaps, is that the dispute about the nature of the social sciences should not be framed in terms of "pure" versus "applied" research. What was at issue, rather, was how and to what extent the direction and application of social scientific investigation was to be determined by those holding political power. The terms "pure" and "applied" may indeed have been deployed by those involved in the debates about the direction of social sciences in Canada. But these notions could be understood best not as statements reflecting particular policy positions, but rather as rhetorical devices having a specific political intent.

In attributing the stance of "purism" to the early CSSRC, Fisher also misconstrues its relation to the American philanthropies that contributed heavily to the development of the Canadian humanities and social sciences during the 1930s and 1940s. Given that the CSSRC, according to Fisher, was a staunch advocate of "basic" research, detached from practical relevance, he implies that its major benefactor, the Rockefeller Foundation, had a similar commitment. This implied convergence of interests might explain why Fisher fails to explore what lay behind the Foundation decision to offer massive support for the development of the humanities and social sciences in Canada beginning in the early 1940s. He ignores the Rockefeller shift towards a "regional-continentalist" policy through which it sought to cultivate distinct cultural regions in North America that were to extend across the border from the United States into Canada. Given that Fisher has elsewhere persuasively demonstrated the practical underpinnings of Rockefeller philanthropy, it is disappointing that he has not provided a comparable analysis of its involvement in Canadian social science.

If treated as a concise and synoptic account of an important (and previously neglected) set of issues, Fisher's book makes an outstanding contribution. However, if taken on its own terms as a work of historical sociology, it is found to be lacking in both analytical rigour and interpretive insight. Indeed, the ambitious task that Fisher sets for himself is virtually unattainable, given the book's brief compass. All the same, the task itself is a worthy one, and *The Social Sciences in Canada* provides a very helpful and suggestive point of departure for those wishing to examine further how the social sciences have developed in Canada.

William Buxton
Concordia University

John Willinsky. *The Triumph of Literature/The Fate of Literacy: English in the Secondary School Curriculum*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1991. Pp. 240. $47.95 U.S..

John Willinsky's latest book provides much that will be of interest to scholars of education in general, as

well as promptings and perspectives of specific value to historians of education. Willinsky's book is part of a painstaking and protracted personal project (and one deserving of literary alliteration) to uncover the place of English in the high school curriculum.

The triumph of literature that Willinsky refers to in his title is a particular historical episode: "English literature's capture of the centre, the compulsory core, of the school curriculum at the very inception of state schooling" (p. 2). As with many subjects in the school curriculum we tend now to take for granted "English" as a "given," normative category, timeless and continuing. But, as with all subjects when scrutinized by historians (a scrutiny all too seldom undertaken by historians I might add), we find that the particular character of the subject is the result of specific historical struggles. To understand the givens of today, we need to explore the struggles of yesterday.

In a strikingly well-achieved section (mostly in chapter 2), Willinsky describes the "crisis" which set off the process whereby literature consolidated its place within English. He contends that this crisis was "sparked by the spread of a subversive and provocative print culture among the unschooled masses of the working class" (p. 6). This he argues was an "urgent literacy" which might be employed "to question, rage against, and mock the powers that be" (p. 6).

In the next four chapters Willinsky explores this process through studies of four teachers "who I hold responsible for fashioning, in good part, the triumph of literature in the English curriculum" (p. 1): Matthew Arnold, F.R. Leavis, Louise Rosenblatt, and Northrop Frye. To sustain detailed historical studies through such personal vignettes is a difficult task and there are times when Willinsky undoubtedly shudders on the tightrope. Once or twice I felt the need for a much more closely woven historical safety-net. But generally he carries the task off with great virtuosity; it is an audacious and stimulating achievement and makes very exciting reading.

Broadly, this is an historical story of the displacement of popular literacy by academic literary studies. Here I might have hoped for a more general sense of connectedness to the literature of curriculum history. For Willinsky's tale is echoed in most subject histories—the displacement of vivid and contextually rich courses of study by decontextualized "academic" or "scientific" discourses.

This is, however, a minor caveat. *The Triumph of Literature* should be widely read by historians of education and by scholars generally. By focusing on historical episodes and studies Willinsky profoundly illuminates the landscape which literature and literacy uneasily cohabit.

Ivor Goodson
The University of Western Ontario

Rolf Torstendahl. ***Bureaucratisation in Northwestern Europe, 1880-1985: Domination and Governance.***