

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. *Bureaucratization in Northwestern Europe, 1880-1985: Domination and Governance.*

London: Routledge, 1991. Pp. x, 339. \$90.00.

The author of this work has attempted a comparative analysis of the process of bureaucratisation over a hundred-year period in four countries: France, Germany, Sweden, and Britain. After two "theoretical" chapters spent outlining various approaches to the phenomenon and enumerating pertinent analytic factors, Torstendahl demarcates four distinct phases of the process of bureaucratisation in terms of stages of capitalist development: classical industrial capitalism (pre-1880), organized capitalism (1880-c.1930), participatory capitalism (1935-c.1970), and corporative capitalism (post-1970). Each stage is said to present a distinctive combination of four variables: technological change and the labour process, the nature of the distinction between white- and blue-collar workers, the structure of the market, and finally, the organization of labour and capital. The second section of the book consists of a series of brief sketches, country by country, and period by period, of the development of bureaucratic organization. This is followed by chapters in which Torstendahl attempts to trace the growth in numbers of bureaucratic workers and in which he sketches the differences in the education, the political loyalties, and the professional organization of civil servants in the four countries with which he is concerned. A summary of the argument concludes the book.

Insofar as he presents a general analysis of the process of bur-

cauratisation, Torstendahl claims that the state has taken the lead in propelling bureaucratic organization in the first and third of his stages, while private corporations have taken the lead in his second and fourth stages. Yet this position is not elaborated or defended in the body of the work. Indeed, we hear very little at all about the first of these stages. For the second and fourth, Torstendahl supports his position by cursory discussions of organizational changes in a small number of private firms and of efforts by producer groups to form associations. For the third stage, he presents a similarly cursory comparative description of the emergence of the "welfare state."

There are a number of intriguing ideas offered in the introductory section of the book. Torstendahl highlights the growing importance of bodies of knowledge in systems of governance and distinguishes among legal-normative, scientific-technical, and social-technical forms of expertise. In the concluding chapters, Torstendahl makes several interesting observations about the differences in the political involvements of civil servants in various countries.

Educational institutions are not seen to have played any particular role in the forming of state bureaucracies or in the elaboration of a bureaucratic ethos in society generally. While Torstendahl describes the education of civil servants, he scarcely mentions public education, and when he does, it is in terms of a simplistic sociological functionalism.

Are books about bureaucracy bound to be boring? Perhaps. The

shoddy copy-editing allowed by Torstendahl's publisher has not helped matters. We read here that "a category...were" (p. 174), that "statistics...is complicated" (I'll say they is! p. 182), that things fall "outside of this investigation" (p. 156), and that political parties have "their time at the power" (p. 139). Misplaced negatives make some statements nonsensical (p. 141). Worse, the reader is belaboured repeatedly with passages of leaden prose: "Doubtless, private initiative led the development into its new organisational era under Organized Capitalism. Industry organised work and federations of industries in order to dominate markets and market relations, while workers organised themselves to protect their interests against employers, and professionals tried to cartelise the supply of certain knowledge. It is not just a play with words to call all this organisation. There is a common denominator. Organisation asked for administration and thus bureaucratisation got an unprecedented impetus in the countries where Organized Capitalism got a foothold" (p. 119).

Is Torstendahl or his editor responsible for this typically lucid "analysis"? A moot question, and one to which this reviewer easily preferred that of finding the shortest route to page 339.

Bruce Curtis
Wilfrid Laurier University

Reginald H. Roy. *Sherwood Lett: His Life and Times*. Vancouver: UBC Alumni Association, 1991. Pp. 180, illus. \$29.95.

Few if any people who are associated with the University of British Columbia will fail to recognize the name of Sherwood Lett. They may not know who he was, however, or why one of UBC's residences carries his name. This sensitive, well-written biography by the University of Victoria's Reginald Roy makes abundantly clear why Lett deserves to be remembered not only by UBC alumni and faculty but by Canadians generally. As well as being a lifelong friend of UBC, he was a distinguished soldier, lawyer, and jurist.

Sherwood Lett arrived in Vancouver from the Ottawa Valley in 1912 as a teenager, fifth among the seven children of the Reverend Frank Lett, a Methodist clergyman, and his wife Dana Sherwood. Later that year Sherwood registered in Vancouver's McGill University College, soon afterwards absorbed by the new University of British Columbia. He was bright, athletic, and friendly, with "a driving energy, a determination to succeed, and a charming and attractive personality" (p. 10). A very popular young man, he was elected in 1915 president of the Alma Mater Society, whose constitution he had helped to draft.

Even before graduating, Lett signed up as a lieutenant in the 121st battalion. He was short and looked younger than his 20 years; his fellow officers later called him "Kewpie." He