Kadriya Salimova and Erwin V. Johanningmeier, eds. *Why Should We Teach History of Education?* Moscow: International Academy of Self-Improvement, 1993. Pp. 305. $16.00 U.S.

This collection of papers on the field of history of education resulted from three meetings of the Working Group for the History of Education of the International Standing Conference for the History of Education (ISCHE) held in 1991 and 1992. The articles, written for the most part around national perspectives, originate with European, North American (including one Canadian), and Asian scholars. Most authors point to the declining status of history of education as a subject of study in the field of teacher education, and being members themselves of Education Faculties they naturally lament this trend. But in view of the fact that the twenty-three contributing authors could compose twenty articles on the subject, it seems safe to assume that the subject is not quite dead yet. In fact, there are signs, especially in the English-speaking world, that as a field of academic study educational history is a very vital field indeed. In the United Kingdom, United States, Australia/New Zealand, and Canada there are thriving journals devoted to the subject appearing from twice to four times a year. Well-attended (from 100 to 200 persons) and stimulating conferences organized by the national society are held annually or biannually in each of these countries. In both the United States and Canada the conferences draw a large number of young scholars, testifying both to the vitality of the field and its prospects for the future. In North America, at any rate, one would have to conclude that since 1970 educational history has been one of the most active fields in the realm of social and intellectual history. On the negative side, however, one hastens to point to the recent serious but unsuccessful effort to close down the History of Education department at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Moreover, at my university, and I believe it is true elsewhere in Canada, fewer sections of History of Education courses are being taught. This trend in turn has reduced the number of academic openings in the field.

As is often the case in anthologies, the quality of the twenty essays varies enormously. Some, such as Brian Simon's on "The History of Education: Its Importance for Understanding" and Marie-Madeleine Compère's "Textbooks on the History of Education Currently in Use in Europe," are very much on topic. Others, such as Fritz-Peter Hager's on Plato, Comenius, and Rousseau and Keiko Seki's on "The History of Educational Reform," make one wonder why the editors saw fit to include them in a collection of this sort. The first part of Seki's article, for ex-

ample, is a consideration of how to approach the thought of "the Russian educational thinker Krupskaya (1869-1939)"! Moreover, several of the articles address the field in much the same way it was taught in the pre-Bailyn, pre-Cremin era in the United States, that is, as the history of educational thought in the Western World, or as we used to say, "from Plato to NATO." If, in fact, educational history is still being taught in this fashion in some European and Asian countries, no wonder it is a field in decline and a subject area disappearing from teacher college curricula.

Summarizing a few of the articles will serve, I hope, to offer a sampler of the book's contents. Brian Simon offers a survey of educational developments in Britain in the twentieth century with particular emphasis on the last three decades. He concludes with his well-known thesis on the relationship between education and social change and reiterates his conviction that education does matter. Despite the gloomy predictions of the social control theorists of the 1970s that education only serves to reproduce social structure, Simon maintains that education does make a difference. Another British scholar, Richard Aldrich, takes a highly personal approach by structuring his essay around a review of what *he* has published from the time of his M.Phil. thesis in 1970 to his latest 1991 publication. This takes some chutzpah, but Aldrich does attempt to set his personal academic history into the larger context of what was transpiring in the field in England in those two decades. His plea that teachers-in-training need "to acquire a map of the past in respect of education" (p. 151) by studying history of education has apparently fallen on deaf ears of late. Now teachers in England, he says, are being "trained," not "educated," in schools, not teacher-training institutions. "The training of teachers appears to be destined to become an apprenticeship system once more" (p. 152).

Among other European contributors, Marc Depaepe of Belgium concludes that history of education "can only be fruitful to the extent that it demonstrates how current thought and practice regarding child training and education has come about and thereby helps to make this thought and praxis more understandable" (pp. 35-36). Pere Sola of Spain, using a very outdated bibliography, makes a pitch for more historical research on non-formal or informal aspects of education, presumably meaning more work of the type advocated by Lawrence Cremin three decades ago. Significantly, the great American scholar is not even cited in Sola's text or bibliography. In one of the best articles in the book, Bjorg Gundem of Norway stresses the benefits of curriculum history. He seems to favour the sort of work George Tomkins did for Canada in his *A Common Countenance: Stability and Change on the Canadian Curriculum* (Toronto, 1986). This article is both well researched and up-to-date (with five citations to Ivor Goodson although not one to Tomkins). He sets his case study of Norwegian curriculum development quite firmly in its socio-economic context while all the time emphasizing the centralized nature of the Norwegian school system

until the 1980s. One of the most disappointing European articles is that by Chresten Kruchov and Ellen Norgaard of Denmark. This is not an essay in history of education nor even a historical paper. Rather it is a discussion of recent changes in schooling in Denmark at all three levels of public education since the 1960s. It concludes with a dreary list of clichés and commonplaces about public education in the 1990s.

One of the most interesting articles in the book is that by Yelena Rogacheva of Russia. She believes that in attempting to provide a teacher trainee with a perspective of the past, it is best to centre such a course on the history of educational reform "by analyzing radical notions and concepts" (p. 165). This type of study, she argues, serves to "inspire" teachers, and thus represents an updated Cubberleyan approach. For Russians she recommends studying John Dewey's educational heritage. She reminds us that Dewey was popular in pre-revolutionary Russia and the first decade of the Soviet period, when he was called "the best philosopher of the contemporary school" (p. 166). But in the 1930s Dewey came to be condemned as a "wicked enemy" and as "a reactionary bourgeois philosopher and sociologist" who worked "in the interests of the aggressive policy of the U.S. Government" (pp. 165-66). For Rogacheva to study Dewey in pre-*glasnost* 1983 required getting permission to work in the "secret archives" in Moscow and Leningrad (St. Petersburg). Rogacheva likes to have her students look at how official Soviet attitudes towards Dewey changed after his visit to the USSR in 1928 when he chaired an inquiry that exonerated Trotsky. Students now read with interest Dewey's *Impressions of Soviet Russia and the Revolutionary World* (1929). Now that Dewey is looked upon with favour again in Russia, students get a chance to observe the process of change in both education and society and how the two, as Bailyn explained, interact. Students can now draw their own conclusions about the process of change.

The Asian chapters are informative but not very exciting. Seki's piece has been mentioned. Yoshio Katagiri of Japan informs us that in that country's very centralized curriculum in teacher education, historians of education are now obliged to teach "principles of education" and social studies education. No history of education as such is taught. Toshio Nakauchi covers much the same ground as his countryman Katagiri, leaving one to wonder what the rationale was to include two similar articles on Japan. Lamenting, too, the disappearance of history of education as a teaching subject, Nakauchi proposes a new course with emphasis on the history of the family in Japan from the seventeenth century to the present. Such a course he argues might be considered to have more relevance to teachers-in-training than the course on history of education formerly taught in that country. Suresh Chandra Ghosh surveys the field in India over the last century, discusses the impact of the "new" history, and concludes that history of education "is best considered as part of the wider study of the history of society" (p. 133). Ghosh in fact is better in-

formed about the new approaches and techniques (for example, oral history) than some of the European authors represented here.

The essays by American authors are on the whole very disappointing. Erwin Johanningmeier, one of the book's editors, offers a discussion of the history of education as a teaching subject, but his chapter is distinguished by the number of truisms he employs rather than its insights. Here is a sampling: "systems of schooling are neither eternal nor inevitable" (p. 52); "the transition from one era to another is not an event but a process" (p. 53); "change may be fast or it may be slow but it always takes time" (p. 53); "societies borrow and learn from each other" (p. 54); "new concerns will lead to new inquiries in the future" (p. 64). With simplistic statements like this, what audience did Johanningmeier think he was writing for? Joan K. Smith, a former president of the International Society of Educational Biography, beats the drum for the merit of writing biographies of educators. She dwells on the talents a biographer needs and the skills he/she must develop. Like Johanningmeier, she concludes with a string of clichés about history and educational history. Perhaps the silliest study in the book is the chapter by Celia Lascarides and Blythe Hinitz, entitled "Survey of Important Historical and Current Figures in Early Childhood Education." The authors seem to think it is important to know whether students in early childhood education can recognize names like Piaget, Montessori, Dewey, Hall, Pestalozzi, Comenius, Barnard, Naumberg, Blow, and Harris. Respondents were then asked whether they knew the contribution of each of these thirty-seven figures. Elaborate tables and charts set forth the findings. The realization that this "kinglist" concept of history still survives in U.S. universities left me thoroughly shaken.

The final U.S. contribution is another survey, a useful one this time made of History of Education Society members about the courses they teach in the subject, including the textbooks used, the emphasis in courses, and sample course outlines. The authors, Rita Saslaw and Ray Hiner, admit that no pattern of course offerings could be found, but whiggism à la Cubberley and Monroe is certainly dead and the impact of 1970s revisionism very evident. The texts in use clearly reflect this: Spring, Tyack, Ravitch, and Edward McClelland, supplemented most often by monographs by Tyack, Cremin, Kaestle, Ravitch, and Katz. The inspirational story told by Cubberley has now been replaced by one of pessimism and disillusionment. The authors assert "our educational present may increasingly be viewed as a past gone corrupt, as a betrayal of the noble traditions established by those who sought to extend educational opportunity to all citizens" (p. 255). Consensus about the past has disappeared, replaced by "intellectual chaos"; "the field appears not to have a canon" (p. 256). The survey underlines the diversity of approach, not to mention the strength of the field, in North America as contrasted with the very traditional approaches to the subject reported in some of the European and Asian articles, such as Seki, Hager, Majorek (on Poland), and Salimova (on Russia).

The authors conclude that the primary purpose of teaching the subject should be to inform about education, both formal and informal, in the past, not to inspire or disillusion students. The diversity in the field "reflects the current state of culture in the United States," namely, "we value diversity and revel in our differences" (p. 257).

The sole article devoted to Canada was written by Kas Mazurek of the University of Lethbridge. Mazurek asserts that Canadian educational historians are divided into camps where they are not "committed to the same rules and standards for practice" and there is no one "single, unifying paradigm" (p. 114). This situation he describes as "unfortunate" because it leads to the "Balkanization" of the profession and to courses being taught from different perspectives, a feature which by contrast Saslaw and Hiner (and this reviewer too) regard as both commendable and desirable. Mazurek laments the demise of the survey course, which has been replaced, he maintains, by courses taught from a particular perspective, such as class, feminist, or ethnic. But this does not describe the current situation in my department at U.B.C., where the survey course still pertains at the B.Ed. level. Mazurek anticipates the happy day when these "fierce ideological battles" abate and "one orientation succeeds in imposing its hegemony" (p. 115). His language here is reminiscent of the battles in the 1970s between moderate and radical revisionists, the latter propounding a social control approach to the writing of educational history. To assert that these battles continue into the 1990s sounds very anachronistic to me. While the field is diverse in both subject matter and methodology (oral history to Foucault and Gramsci), all approaches are respected and accorded due consideration in courses. The dominance of one over another is neither sought nor anticipated. Graduate students turn to those advisors whose approaches as reflected in their work the students favour. The various approaches often complement each other and are therefore sometimes used selectively in an integrative fashion by graduate students. To this reviewer the field is not at all characterized by the bitter battles of the seventies but rather by an openness to new theoretical and methodological approaches. Herein lies the strength of the field in Canada today, not in the absence of ideological contestation cited recently as a problem by the likes of Harvey Graff and Ian Davey.

The diversity and vitality of the field is evident when one considers the various approaches represented by Bruce Curtis, Jean Barman, Brian Titley, Alison Prentice, Neil Sutherland, Bob Gidney and Wyn Millar, Nadia Fahmy-Eid, Paul Axelrod, and Chad Gaffield. One paradigm will not triumph in the field nor should it. Diversity is to be applauded not condemned.

J. Donald Wilson
The University of British Columbia

Bruce Curtis, D.W. Livingstone, and Harry Smaller. ***Stacking the Deck: The Streaming of Working-Class***