

who are agents, with social control apparently the aim and result of the emerging system. In section three, all sides act upon and benefit from the system. We are told, "In one way or another the mid-century common school movement satisfied both collective (societal) and individual ambitions" (p. 233). This last position is Gidney and Millar's, but the difference is that they argue it consistently.

Houston and Prentice's book was a decade in the writing, and as the two authors' views developed, drafts written earlier were perhaps not made adequately congruent with later ones. Regardless of how they arose, Houston and Prentice's diverse, sometimes disparate, interpretations might be negatively seen as lacking focus. On the other hand, positive verdicts can be drawn. Robert Stamp, for example, says that the book "marks the final death of the revisionist movement and the triumphant arrival of post-modernism in Canadian educational history....The book's post-modernist stamp derives in part from the authors' skill in examining issues from various points of view."⁶ Thus, while Gidney and Millar allow us to see a fixed slice of the past, Houston and Prentice may help us to unfix our reified notions of nineteenth-century schooling, getting us beyond the debates of the 1970s. However, despite Stamp's assessment, Houston and Prentice's book is still steeped in revisionist debates of past decades, especially compared to Curtis's more innovative interpretation.

Although we can identify different perspectives in the three histories, we can also pinpoint an essential topic they all share. All of them are about change and agency in nineteenth-century schooling. Furthermore, all three concur on key points. They agree that the schooling system was centralized at the expense of local autonomy. They also agree that during the second half of the nineteenth-century schooling was transformed into something radically different from what it had been during the first. However, although they agree on the significant change, they differ on the change's significance. They also present different interpretations on exactly when and how this change came about.

In Curtis's book, and in section two of Houston and Prentice's, the school promoters *act* while the school supporters *react*. The promoters are generally described as having conscious intents, often based on a clear sense of class interests. The school supporters, on the other hand, are usually portrayed in opposition; they struggle *against* the centre, but rarely *for* self-initiated goals.⁷ This portrayal is where Gidney and Millar disagree with the other historians. In their book, as in their previous work, Gidney and Millar argue that families, students, and teachers were principal agents in creating public schooling.

The authors also have differences regarding the class interests that schooling served. There is agreement among all of them that educational reform was not "always, only or unambiguously in the interests of the governing classes."⁸ They would also all agree, at least in part, that in the mid-nineteenth century the "emerging bureaucratic modes of administration were, in themselves, the necessary procedures by which the public would participate in the public schools."⁹ What rouses serious disagreement, however, is the results of that participation. Gidney and Millar describe a public who identify their own interests and who

wilfully engage in a political process to shape the bureaucracy so that some of those interests are served. With the other historians, the state, with its ruling-class interests, wins out in the end.

Thus, although all of the historians discuss resistance to the centre's encroachments, only Gidney and Millar consistently portray the resisters as achieving any of their ends. Houston and Prentice are at best ambivalent about the resisters' gains, and Curtis is pessimistic. Those that resist, he says, receive "pain" from the central authority and do not partake in the "pleasure" that is available to those who comply. But those who comply take part in their own subjectification. The school promoters thus lead people to govern themselves to act in compliance with the needs of the bourgeoisie.

By arguing that people who complied became self-governed, Curtis in a sense gets away from an external social control thesis. But the masses are controlled nevertheless, and resistance simply serves to reinforce hegemony. Thus, although Curtis is the one who acknowledges Marx, Gidney and Millar are the ones who are dialectical in their analysis. In their history, the masses and those who hold state power act upon each other, and it is the synthesis of their actions that determine outcomes. For Gidney and Millar, power is not one-sided.

Houston, Prentice, and Curtis rest much of their argument about the centralization of power on their interpretation of the school acts of 1850 and 1853. The acts supplied the keystone of Ryerson's educational mansion.¹⁰ The foundation, they argue, had been put in place by earlier acts, so that "to all intents and purposes, by the time the Provincial Normal School opened its doors in Toronto in the fall of 1847, the essential framework of what in time would be known as the 'public school system' of Canada West was in place."¹¹ Houston and Prentice contend that "the laws of the 1850s established more firmly and elaborately than ever the administrative machinery of the provincial government. If the chief superintendent of schools lost some powers in the shuffle, they were few; the upshot was a central office with a great deal of authority to interfere, to advise, and to persuade, if not to coerce" (p. 125). Curtis clearly agrees.

Gidney and Millar do not. Their alternative interpretation of the acts of the 1850s is central to their argument. Undeniably, they say, the acts of 1850 and 1853 were important to the future of schooling's administration. But it was not these acts but those of 1865 and 1871 that were the real watershed (p. 94). The acts in the first half of the century did not lay the adequate foundation that Curtis, Houston, and Prentice say were there for the acts of the 1850s to build on. The apparatus was just not available for central control to become effective (p. 102). The result was that there was "no King in Israel" in the 1850s and early 1860s, the crucial formative years of the schooling system (p. 114). This meant that the customs and habits of people in local communities (or at least the middle class among them) shaped much of the system during these years (pp. 80, 317).

Therefore, crucial to Gidney and Millar's interpretation is their argument that, when centralization began to take hold in the 1860s, certain patterns forged by local communities had already become fixed. Ryerson and his inspectors had

to work within many of these patterns. Ironically, as the inspectorial gaze was able to peer further during the mid-1860s (to borrow a metaphor from Curtis), Ryerson faced more opposition and his powers actually decreased, not increased as Curtis and Houston and Prentice would have it. Gidney and Millar are careful to point out that neither now nor earlier does their analysis conclude that it was local demands alone that determined outcomes. Their point is rather that any analysis of change has to take into account the agency resulting from these demands (pp. 104, 191).

Again, Gidney and Millar are defending a case with a history. Lawr and Gidney presented the argument in a 1980 article.¹² Curtis argued against it at the 1985 Canadian Historical Association in Montreal.¹³ Houston and Prentice echo Curtis's argument in their book, challenging Gidney, Millar, and Lawr head-on on pages 154-55. The essence of Curtis's refutation is that the local demands did not shape the state but were rather a response to state actions already undertaken. As Houston and Prentice put it: "The demand for bureaucratic regulation followed, rather than preceded, the school legislation of mid-century" (p. 155). Gidney and Lawr's mistake, according to Curtis (p. 174), is that they view educational administration "largely as technique," without paying enough attention to its connection to political socialization.

But Gidney and Millar are not convinced. They use chapters four and five to lay the groundwork for their direct rebuttal on pages 102-103. There were no teeth in the school laws prior to the late 1860s. Locals were not forced to tie in with the centre by such laws that they could easily ignore. On the contrary, it was precisely in areas where there were no regulations that, when problems arose, locals made demands on the centre to provide mechanisms to help solve them. Gidney and Millar go so far as to say that parents "*created a new role for government*, making it the direct instrument by which they could provide a suitable education for their boys and girls" (p. 70, my emphasis). Such a line will never be written by a Foucaultian pen, and probably no former social controller, no matter how mellowed by the years, will ever accept such an interpretation. The debate, therefore, is not over.

Whereas in Curtis's and Houston and Prentice's histories Ryerson becomes essentially the master designer whose will creates a system, in Gidney and Millar's he becomes a brilliant man who contributes many ideas but has only some of them accepted. And what is crucial is that among those rejected are two of Ryerson's overriding principles: the primacy of the common school and the differentiation of superior education by curriculum and gender. The beauty of Gidney and Millar's skilled craft-work comes out in how they set up this key point. Throughout the early chapters they weave in two particular strands of Ryerson's educational fabric. We begin to see a little of them here, a bit more of them later on, until it increasingly appears that these two strands form the essence of Ryerson's design. However, as the story proceeds, these two strands become entangled with many others over which Ryerson and the central office have no effective control. Slowly these two strands become unravelled. By chapter nine

they no longer form the central motif in the fabric. How, therefore, can we credit so much of the fabric's final design to Ryerson? After 213 pages of setting this argument up, Gidney and Millar deliver the punch line:

Both Ryerson and Young could point with pride to any one of a large number of their proposals which had become provincial policy. And yet in some fundamental respects what had developed under Ryerson's tutelage was something quite different from what he had intended. From the beginning of his career as superintendent he had believed that Upper Canada's system of public instruction must be organized according to two central principles....Despite his best efforts, however, both had been problematic from the beginning, and during the decades of the 1870s they steadily lost ground. Even as Ryerson reaped the encomiums of thirty years of public service, the gap between his own vision of how things should be and the schools as they actually were was already too wide ever to be closed.

Aesthetically, this type of clincher is beyond the writing style found in Curtis's book. Its unity cannot be matched within Houston and Prentice's more scattered focus. But in achieving these artistic qualities in their history, Gidney and Millar had to forego others. There are thus some things that Curtis's history or Houston and Prentice's history can offer that Gidney and Millar's cannot.

Within each of the three books' strengths, therefore, are potential weaknesses. Tyack warns against the "simple additive eclecticism" that results when historians "mix interpretations promiscuously."¹⁴ None of the Ontario histories is a strong example of such eclecticism, but of the three, Houston and Prentice's multiple views leads them to the least theoretical unity. Tyack also cautions against the reverse problem: a reductionism that would force all historical data into a single, tight theoretical mould, one that would not allow for any shaping of contours by other perspectives. Although none of the three Ontario histories is reductionist to the extreme, Curtis at times comes close, and he would benefit from incorporating parts of Gidney and Millar's analysis. On the other hand, to build their substantial case, Gidney and Millar have had to maintain a dedicated focus for a decade and a half. They have had little time, and perhaps little inclination, to do more than glance at the Foucaultian and Gramscian debates that are so central to Curtis's work.

All of these histories are alike in that they share three components: a theoretical framework, an argument, and a depiction of events. They are unlike in that each of them puts more stress on one of these components than do the others. Curtis's principal strength is in developing an overarching theory that will forge new directions in the field. Gidney and Millar provide an exemplary model for a tightly-woven argument, marshalling all the facts and walking us through point by point. Houston and Prentice, despite the assaults on narrative history levelled by their graduate-days mentor Michael Katz, hold our interest

with a variety of insightful historical episodes. In sum, each of their histories can tell us something about the past; none of them can tell us everything. Together they tell us a lot.

NOTES

- * This essay was written while on a Fellowship from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. I thank J. Donald Wilson for sharing his insights on how these books fit within the historiography of Canadian education. The opinions in this review are, of course, my own responsibility.
1. E.g. *Schooling and Scholars*, 75, 192, 266-67; *Inventing Secondary Education*, 234.
 2. Michel Foucault, *Discipline And Punish: The Birth Of The Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage Books, 1977), 170.
 3. *Ibid.*, 173.
 4. *Schooling and Scholars*, xi.
 5. Chad Gaffield, "Back To School: Towards A New Agenda For The History Of Education," *Acadiensis* 15, 2 (Spring 1986): 169-90. For other "back to school" accounts, see chaps. 4 and 8 in Curtis, and chap. 6 in Gidney and Millar.
 6. Robert M. Stamp, Review of *Schooling and Scholars in Nineteenth-Century Ontario*, *Ontario History* 81, 2 (1989): 153.
 7. E.g. *Schooling and Scholars*, 154-55; see also Bruce Curtis, "Policing Pedagogical Space: 'Voluntary' School Reform And Moral Regulation," *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 13, 3 (1988): 295.
 8. *Building the Educational State*, 14.
 9. R.D. Gidney and D.A. Lawr, "Bureaucracy Vs. Community? The Origins of Bureaucratic Procedure in the Upper Canadian School System," *Journal of Social History* 13, 3 (1981): 453. In *Inventing Secondary Schooling* (p. 105), Gidney and Millar note with obvious relish that even Michael Katz now admits, "Within a large organization, democratic procedures require bureaucratic forms."
 10. *Schooling and Scholars*, 332.
 11. *Ibid.*, 123.
 12. D.A. Lawr and R.D. Gidney, "Who Ran the Schools? Local Influence on Educational Policy in Nineteenth-Century Ontario," *Ontario History* 72, 3 (1980): 131-43.
 13. Curtis, "Policing Pedagogical Space," 295.
 14. David B. Tyack, "Ways Of Seeing: An Essay On The History Of Compulsory Schooling," in *History, Education, and Policy*, ed. Donald R. Warren (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1978), 89.

WHAT'S NEW IN THE HISTORY OF ADULT EDUCATION

Michael R. Welton

Jarvis, Peter, ed. *Twentieth Century Thinkers in Adult Education*. London: Croom Helm, 1987.

Stubblefield, Harold. *Towards a History of Adult Education in America: The Search for a Unifying Principle*. London: Croom Helm, 1988.

Stewart, David W. *Adult Learning in America: Eduard Lindeman and His Agenda for Lifelong Education*. Malabar, Florida: Robert E. Krieger Publishing Co., 1987.

Brookfield, Stephen, ed. *Learning Democracy: Eduard Lindeman on Adult Education and Social Change*. London: Croom Helm, 1987.

Historical studies in education in Canada, the United States, and abroad are flourishing. These studies, as might be expected, focus primarily on different dimensions of the formal education of children and adolescents. It is not unusual for historical studies of adult education to be marginalized within educational history in general. By that I simply mean that doing adult educational history is not deemed important. The late American education historian Lawrence Cremin is the exception to the rule: in his *magnum opus* trilogy of American educational history he sought to integrate the education of adults and children into a multiplex narrative sweeping through American time. It is, perhaps, not surprising that historical studies of schooling would prevail in the sub-field of educational history. Rigorously trained professional historians of education found employment in Faculties of Education catering to children and youth. To study adult education history made little sense, and was left to others, or the emergent (and desperately professionalizing) field of adult education. However, leaving Departments of Adult Education to pick up the slack or engage in historical studies did not help matters. During the heyday (in North America) of professionalization in adult education (from the early 1960s to the present), foundational studies, be they philosophy, sociology, or history, were hardly in vogue. At present in Canada there are only four or five graduate programmes that even include *one* course in the history of adult education, and none of these are considered to be compulsory or an integral part of the core programme.

But during the 1980s one notices—in Great Britain, the United States and Canada—an emerging interest in both historical studies and their role in the preparation of adult educators. Several events signal this interest in retrieving

our adult education past. In the U.S. Sean Courtney created the Bulletin "Historical Foundations of Adult Education" in the mid-1980s and Michael Welton launched the CASAE History Bulletin in 1985. In 1986, the first international conference on adult education history was held at Oxford University. This latter conference brought together scholars from the United Kingdom, Europe, North America, the Middle East, and Japan. In 1989, Syracuse University's Kellogg-funded project gathered twenty scholars from Canada and the U.S. to analyse the history of the relationship between workers' and adult education (the proceedings have been published—*Breaking New Ground: The Development of Adult and Workers' Education in North America* [Syracuse University, 1990]). In March 1991, another group of North American scholars met to examine Syracuse's archival holdings (the central collection in the U.S.) and discuss class, gender, and ethnic dimensions of the construction of adult education histories. There may not be as many historians working in the adult education vineyards and their products may circulate primarily amongst the broad and diverse adult educational community. But the debates are intensifying and the quality of scholarship is becoming more sophisticated and in tune with contemporary historiographic developments. One also notices that adult educational historians are searching intensely for a usable history: retrieving a past that contests the professionalization of the field of study and practice and speaks to the current debates about how the study of adult education ought to be constructed. This lends a vitality to historical work reminiscent of the heady revisionist days of Michael Katz and his followers.

The works reviewed in this essay open a window on the central concerns of historians of adult education and illustrate some of the thematic issues present in the study of the history of adult education. The central concern of historians of adult education no longer plagues historians of schooling, namely, what is the *boundary* of adult educational history? The fundamental meta-historiographic problem for historians of adult education is what Czechoslovakian historian Ivan Savicky (1987) has called the "theorization of history." The classic synthetic works on the history of adult education (Kelly 1970; Knowles 1962; Grattan 1955) presented an "outline narrative" (Kelly's depiction). But these works neither defined precisely the *object* of historical analysis nor articulated the conceptual categories necessary to construct the relationships obtaining amongst the elements within the object's boundary. More recently, historians of adult education have offered several "solutions" to the problem of the object. European historians of adult education (Leon 1983; Terrot 1983) have focused on organized adult education in the modern French state. They argue that present-day developments have been determined by the state-entrepreneur-trades union triangle. But, Savicky asks, have they not merely derived the "most conspicuous line of changes in the relatively short period of time between 1870 and 1970" (1987, p. 21)? They cannot present any theoretical justification for their selection. Another approach which appears to hold out some promise is the focused approach—constructing adult education as workers' education. The

advantage of the focused approach is that history is theorized in a “firmly defined conceptual apparatus...[with] clearly stated goals of inquiry even in practical issues” (Savicky 1987, pp. 21-22). There is considerable sympathy for this standpoint amongst British adult education historians. The problem, however, is that this construction leaves out a large part of “empirically ascertainable” adult education. Welton’s *Knowledge for the People* (1987) falls into yet another category: adult education history as the history of precedents. Here the focus is upon “progressive” forms of education—historical understanding consciously oriented to reclaiming liberatory moments from the past. But progressive elements, even critically interpreted, do not form any noticeable line of historical development. What one chooses is fully dependent on “changing contemporary frames of reference” (Savicky 1987, p. 22). Once again the sin of presentism has been committed. The meta-historiographic problem of the object has been dodged by Welton and others (Selman 1985; Law 1988; Rockhill 1985) who invent a master narrative for adult education: from social movement to professionalized practice. Other historians could just as easily offer an alternative master narrative for adult education history. And some post-modernist historians would eschew master narratives altogether. There is always more than one way of emplotting stories (White 1978). More seriously, the revisionists leave the theorization problem untouched. With this possible exception: linking adult education—its emancipatory interest—with social movements, past and present, requires a social theory of the nature of learning within these movements. And one cannot understand the historical emergence and functioning of social movements (as sites of emancipatory learning) without developing a theoretical framework specifying the function of adult learning and education in the reproduction and transformation of social systems. But no one has accomplished this latter daunting task.

Savicky claims that the “history of adult education has not yet found its theoretical plane which would help to reveal the tendencies of development of adult education in particular, in its specificity, and thus significantly contribute to understanding the present situation and prognosticating the future” (1987, p. 23). Unlike the history of schooling, adult education does not appear to have an “object...[that] is a comprehensive system, self-identical in the course of a long time” (*ibid.*). This fact is at the root of the persistent lack of clarity as to what should actually be included under adult education. Only liberal education? Vocational? Non-formal? Only institutional adult education? What about the spontaneous influence of the environment? Savicky’s paradox confronts all adult education historians: where adult education forms a “real system, it starts closely approaching initial education. Where it preserves its specificity, especially its great innovative capacities, it stops being a real and observable system” (*ibid.*, p. 23). So far, then, we do not have an adequate theorization of the object of historical studies in adult education.

Two of the books (Jarvis 1987; Stubblefield 1988) reviewed in this essay contribute self-consciously to this debate. Do they push us beyond where we

have arrived? In *Towards a History of Adult Education in America* (1988) Stubblefield recognizes that in the U.S. prior to World War I adults learned through a variety of educational forms—chautauquas, lyceum lectures, correspondence schools, university extension, agricultural programmes, women's organizations, service clubs. After World War I, he observes, many persons and institutions "made adult education their business" (n.p.), and the term "adult education" covered a multitude of activities and social purposes. During the post-war period many thoughtful individuals began to think deeply and systematically about the "question of what kind of education adults needed" (n.p.). This questioning was precipitated by the perceived threat to the social order and in response to the new economic and social conditions of the progressive era. To bring some order into this chaos, Stubblefield constructs the object of adult education history as the intellectual history of selected "first generation theorists of adult education." Once he has delineated the object of adult education history (adult education history ought to focus on the ideas of formative thinkers), Stubblefield uses the concept of a "unifying principle" to organize his historical narrative. This concept has affinities with Kuhn's notion of a paradigm: Stubblefield believes that formative thinkers ("These theorists defined, for the first time, what adult education should be as a separate sphere of action in American society") shape their views on the nature of adult education, the social conditions calling for new forms of education, aims to be accomplished, appropriate methods, relation of adult education to society, and what the curriculum should be within an organizing paradigm or unifying principle. The ideas that a thinker holds, therefore, influence what knowledge becomes valued and the course of events within adult education history. He identifies three unifying principles present amongst the first generation theorists: (1) the diffusion of knowledge and culture (James Harvey Robinson and Lyman Bryson are exemplars); (2) liberal education (Everett Dean Martin, Robert Hutchins, Mortimer Adler exemplify this principle), and (3) social education (exemplified by Joseph Hart and Eduard Lindeman).

This is an elegant answer to the problem of the object. The buzzing facticity of adult learning is brought under control. One does not have to ponder through the night wondering how one is going to conceptualize adult education in the period before it came of age from the 1920s to the 1950s. But this severely elegant formulation creates some serious difficulties. For one thing, constructing adult education history as intellectual history obviously rules out understanding how adults organized their learning in historical times and places prior to the self-conscious emergence of "adult education." In a sense, Stubblefield traps himself in the twentieth century; and if he did write about, say, the colonial period, he might be inclined to search for the seeds of the present in the past. To write about other periods in American history, Stubblefield would have to find another unifying principle: one that would not be articulated at the ideational level. Second, even if we accept his guiding premise, we immediately face numerous problems. Why has he included *these* particular thinkers? What is the theoretical justification for

his selections? No women are included in his historical narrative. Why wouldn't Jane Addams, Ruth Kosinsky, or Hilda Worthington Smith be considered as formative thinkers? Black historians would shudder at the exclusion of their seminal educators from the list of formative thinkers. Stubblefield himself could be accused of participating in the creation of the myth of the American adult education "great tradition." By so doing, he opens the way for various deconstructive moves so familiar on today's stormy intellectual scene. One need only think of the thumping given to the classic liberal humanist course of studies in our great universities by various marginalized groups. Whose tradition did you say we are talking about? Adult education history, in Canada and the U.S., is still appallingly white, male, and middle-class. Stubblefield also has to confront the question of just how one situates ideas in historical context. When we extrapolate unifying principles from historical context, we are not able to see how particular discursive practices are intimately bound up with class, gender, and ethnic interest struggles. Stubblefield does not tell us much about the conflicting interplay amongst competing unifying principles in particular periods. In spite of these limitations, Arthur Wilson (1990) argues that Stubblefield's book contains hints of an "epistemological approach to an historical issue" (p. 6). *Towards a History* can be pressed in a Habermasian direction to reveal how "adult education knowledge has been constructed differentially at various times to serve changing interests" (Wilson 1990, p. 5). Jurgen Habermas argues that knowledge production is guided by three interests: the technical interest in control, the interpretive interest in understanding, and the emancipatory interest in freedom from domination. Wilson thinks that the epistemological debates in adult education history can benefit from an understanding of which interests were "historically evident" in the construction of adult education knowledge from the 1920s through to the present. This is an important insight. But this contributes to epistemological understanding of how narratives get constructed; it does not resolve the ontological (or meta-historiographic) problem of the object.

In *Twentieth Century Thinkers in Adult Education* (1987) Peter Jarvis, editor of this collection of essays, is not simply providing practitioners with a handy overview of some of the field's key male thinkers (Mansbridge, Yeaxlee, Tawney, Thorndike, Dewey, Lindeman, Houle, Knowles, Kidd, Horton, Freire, Coady, Gelpi). Jarvis believes that by drawing upon the ideas of these formative thinkers we will come to a clearer understanding of adult education as a field of study. "Adult education," he says, "is a unique combination of elements of knowledge from the varying backgrounds and concerns of different thinkers, whose work has contributed to the body of knowledge, that may now be called adult education knowledge" (1987, p. 301). In itself, this is an interesting manoeuvre, one that historians of schooling would find surprising. Can Egerton Ryerson's ideas about schooling and children help educational historians construct their object of study? Historians of schooling would, I think, conceive of the thought and practice of particular actors as empirical data in need of inter-

pretation within an elaborated conceptual framework. For example, the now-tar-nished "social control paradigm" was constructed in the 1970s to make sense of the thought and practice of educational actors; other interpretive models have been offered through the 1980s.

What Jarvis fails to differentiate adequately is theoretical knowledge oriented to delineating the boundaries of the field (or theoretical knowledge localized in a region within the field) and the various forms of knowledge developed by practitioners like Mansbridge, Freire, or Knowles. In my view, analysing the thought of formative thinkers cannot contribute to the resolution of the problem of the object. The intellectual history of the field can only be a sub-region within the delineated field of study. And once we have established this sub-region, the intellectual fun begins: how ought we to be doing intellectual history? Jarvis is fascinated with the way thinkers like Lindeman and Freire synthesize elements from many disciplines in order to construct their vision of the purpose of adult education and, within that vision (unifying principle?), their educational projects. From these thinkers, Jarvis extrapolates the principle that adult education, as a field of study, can never be a singular discipline. I believe that Jarvis is correct, perhaps for the wrong reasons, when he argues that the study of adult education cannot be a discipline. Thinkers like Lindeman or Freire may help us think about the constituent elements of the field of study and the social purpose of adult education. However, their own work requires interpretation within an elaborated conceptual framework.

The construction of the field of study is fundamentally a philosophical-anthropological task, requiring the disclosure of the basic learning processes of the human species. Habermas's theory of knowledge-constitutive interests can also be interpreted (besides throwing light on theoretical knowledge production) as specifying the "actual structures of a species that reproduces its life through learning processes of socially organized labour and processes of mutual understanding in interactions mediated in ordinary language: these basic conditions of life have an interest structure" (1971, p. 194). Until we are able to specify these anthropologically-grounded knowledge-constitutive interests and show what forms they take in history, we will not be able to resolve the problem of the object. We need to be able to understand particular educational forms as reflected moments of the normative deep-structural learning processes at play in specific social formations within particular eco-systems as they move through time. Our philosophically elaborated framework must enable us to write histories of adult learning and education within pre-industrial and industrial societies. How would we think of adult education within traditional North American Indian cultures? What about medieval France? Or New England in the early nineteenth century?

What kind of thinkers are assembled in *Twentieth Century Thinkers*? With the exception of John Dewey (who is included for his reflections on lifelong education), none of the thinkers have achieved "great" status in the sense of systematic, philosophically-rich, sophisticated thought about the human condition. Two early twentieth-century English thinkers —Mansbridge and Yeax-

lee—are really second-rate popularizers of other people’s thought. Mansbridge’s thought is sentimental and thin; his commitment to the “educational uplift” of the working-class male is passionate and rich, however. Yeaxlee’s thought (he was an early advocate of lifelong learning) seems rather fatuous, nostalgically yearning for the lost world of spiritual values and the organic society. Yeaxlee is a kind of YMCA tractarian. Even Tawney, a more substantial intellectual than either Mansbridge or Yeaxlee, has not stood the test of time. Nothing much remains, contemporary social historians like J.H. Hexter tell us, of his work on seventeenth-century English history. To me Thorndike is a crude thinker who is comprehensible within the context of the “cult of efficiency” that overwhelmed American education thought and practice in the first few decades of the twentieth century. Modern thinkers like Houle, Knowles, and Kidd are essentially purveyors of practical insights into how adults ought to learn and how we should teach them. They are post-World War II public relations missionaries for the emergent professionalizing field. Their thought is philosophically skimpy and lacking in theoretical depth. This does not deny the deep-rooted humanism of a man like J. Roby Kidd, or his phenomenal inspirational impact on scores of adult educators.

Lindeman’s importance to American and international adult education cannot be denied. He is a public intellectual, like Dewey, a breed of thinker now almost lost in our over-academicized world. His was not a systematic mind. But he shaped his discourse for a broad audience in response to the pressing issues of his day. He mediated other’s thought to wide audiences. The meaning of adult education was only one, albeit very important, issue he addressed. The case of Miles Horton, the legendary American radical educator, is different again. He wrote very little throughout his brilliant life. One could say, in fact, that Horton’s life was his text, and what a text it was! His legacy lies not in textbooks on shelves, but in empowered poor people in America’s often desperate South. Coady’s life parallels Horton’s in many ways. His main text, *Masters of Their Own Destiny*, written in 1939, was first spoken orally at numerous town halls and community centres. One hears the echoes throughout. But his thought, either on education or theology, was by modern standards quite superficial. The Brazilian Freire has written the most philosophically-rich texts on adult education of all the thinkers assembled. But even here, one could argue that as wise as they are, they are essentially normative reflections on the moral and social purposes of adult education as well as on the need for a different method of teaching the oppressed. They are not theoretical studies of adult learning in socio-historical context.

What unifies these disparate thinkers? They are practical men of action. They, like the apostle Paul, are doers. They drift into their studies for reflection after they have fought the day’s battles (admittedly, Dewey must have stayed quite a few days in his study). Despite differing views of the purpose of adult education, they are all passionate advocates on behalf of the neglected adult learner. Jarvis draws our attention to just how many of them had Christian

humanitarian origins. This fact in itself opens up interesting scholarly possibilities. Most were thinkers on the run who believed that life was best lived when people first served. If time was left over, then one could reflect. And these reflections stayed close to the practical ground, animated by the imperative of providing guides for beleaguered adult educators. The current rift between those of us who have been trained systematically in the universities and are more at home speaking on Habermas at conferences than organizing fishermen or miners, and men like Coady and Horton who spoke the language of the dispossessed and actually taught them, is very deep. These brief reflections signal the need for a framework for studying different types of thinkers. Some of these men were scholars, some were professional specialists, others popularizers and moral philosophers. A few combined divergent thinker modes. How do we understand the linkages between the thought of these men, their times, and the contending social interests at play in society?

David Stewart's *Adult Learning in America: Eduard Lindeman and His Agenda for Lifelong Education* (1987) is the first biographical study of Eduard Lindeman, whose thought is currently being resurrected and re-examined within American and international adult education circles. Jarvis and Stubblefield include essays on him in their respective works, and Stephen Brookfield has edited a collection of Lindeman's essays (1987). Stewart casts his book as an "effort to examine Eduard Lindeman's agenda for lifelong education in the context of his life" (p. xiv). If other discussions of Lindeman tend toward disincarnated history, Stewart wants to invert this tendency so that we can see the body and feel the life. And quite a body it is—Lindeman's early life is shrouded in mystery and shadowed by dark experiences, and this restless Bohemian spirit would scarcely be held up as a role model by middle Americans. But it is not so much the body that captivated David Stewart. It was a text, *The Meaning of Adult Education*, penned hastily in 1926, that is the springboard for his biography. Stewart read this first in graduate school and, like many others, was struck by its poetic power and awkward ambiguities. This axial event sparks his search for the source of its power and meaning for our time.

Adult Learning in America is essentially an extended and complex dialogue with, and exegesis of, *The Meaning*. Stewart constructs his story of Eduard Lindeman around this landmark text. Biographical details and portraits of his circle of intimates and associates are woven in and around an explication of Lindeman's vision of adult education. He does not present us with a tidy, chronologically ordered narrative. Rather, he organizes his study thematically and shapes his narrative for an audience of contemporary professional adult educators. Stewart believes that Lindeman's life holds "lessons that can enrich the lives of persons living today" (p. xiv). This tactic of narrative construction further exemplifies the commitment of contemporary adult education historians to discover a usable past. The resulting text, in my view, is like a staged conversation amongst the living and the dead, with Stewart and other contemporary voices joining in a dialogue with Lindeman about the meaning of adult

education. But this textual ordering—making sense of Lindeman for contemporary adult educators—is achieved at a price.

Stewart's work is carefully researched, lovingly crafted, and judiciously intoned. In fact, the author, like many biographers, identifies quite closely with Lindeman. At times authorial and subject voices seem to coincide, with Stewart moving inside Lindeman to address an American public which has yet to grasp the import of Lindeman's agenda for lifelong learning. The text divides roughly into three movements: in the opening chapters Stewart creates the backdrop for the appearance of *The Meaning*; in the middle section he probes its meaning in its time and ours; and in the final chapters he examines Lindeman's linking of adult education to democracy, national, and global crises. The final chapter, "Eduard Lindeman's Agenda for Lifelong Education in America," summarizes in codified form Lindeman's contribution to our thinking about the adult learner, curriculum, and other concerns. *The Meaning*, then, functions like a lodestar to Lindeman's life and work. Wherever we happen to be travelling in the narrative, Stewart will point us to the star in the heavens.

Through the course of *Adult Learning in America* we learn much about Eduard Lindeman's peripatetic life and restless striving for self-realization, his scrabble poor family origins, his work with voluntary associations, his linkage with *New Republic* intellectuals like Herbert Croly, his endless public lecturing, his career at the New School for Social Research where he taught a course on Adult Education for many years, his dozen books and hundreds of articles (most cast in popular style). Lindeman embodied C. Wright Mills' "sociological imagination." He helped Americans link their personal misfortunes to larger structural changes. He was an educator of the public. It adds up to a career worthy of narration. But Lindeman has not drawn the attention of American social or intellectual historians. Christopher Lasch does not mention him either in his early work, *The New Radicalism in America: 1889-1963* (1965) or his recently published *The True and Only Heaven* (1991). American intellectual life from the 1910s to the 1950s was host to numerous thinkers, like Herbert Croly, Randolph Bourne, Walter Lippmann, Lewis Mumford, John Dewey, and Reinhold Niebuhr, who probed American culture and politics more deeply than Lindeman. Many of the writings collected by Brookfield (1987) are tonally flat, politically naive, and analytically unsophisticated. What sense can we make of a statement such as "The only reliable instrument for establishing confidence among nations is adult education" (Brookfield 1987, p. 123)? But what marks out Lindeman for historical significance, Stewart argues, is his call for a "new kind of education" (p. 1) and his anticipation of ideas about adult learning that have since entered into the mainstream of American adult education thinking and practice.

When Lindeman wrote that "education is life" and insisted endlessly on the importance of education in social change and for citizenship, he was inhabiting a universe shared by Croly's *Progressive Democracy* (1914), Dewey's *Democracy and Education* (1916) and Lippmann's *A Preface to Politics* (1913).

Progressive thought laid great emphasis on “moral suasion” and “organized intelligence.” At their best, progressives understood that political reform required moral reform. In Croly’s words, “The ultimate value to civilization of any social project...depends less upon the desirability of the particular end which the project seeks to achieve than upon the quality of the individual men and women which participation in it tends to bring to the surface” (cited, Kloppenberg 1986, p. 416). Lindeman shared his friend Croly’s emphasis on the educative dimension of political life. Over and over again Lindeman would argue that a democratic culture and society required a democratic process. Democratic goals could never justify non-democratic means.

Lindeman believed that education was life, that adult education revolved around non-vocational ideals, that the most powerful learning was grounded in life-situations and that the adult learner’s experience was of highest value. These four basic assumptions, Stewart says, provided the “conceptual framework for Lindeman’s philosophy” (p. 4). In one sense, Stewart’s text is an extended commentary on how Lindeman elaborated upon, and applied, these axial assumptions in differing contexts. Stewart draws a line of continuity between Lindeman and contemporary American adult education practice, exemplified by Malcolm Knowles. But this interpretive move opens the author to the charge of presentism, of seeing Lindeman primarily as the *forerunner* of contemporary mainstream adult education thought. Other readings are possible. One might argue that Lindeman shifted the focus of analysis of learning away from the formal education site to the processes of the organization of our common life—interpersonal relations, family, work, culture, politics. Do the processes and forms (always changing) of our institutional life enable or disable human beings to develop their capacities and potential? Lindeman challenged us to scrutinize every structure, movement, and association in terms of their nurturing or blocking of human development, learner-centredness, and freedom. Along with Dewey, he advocated the creation of a developmental culture and politics. Lindeman believed that the organization of politics could be evaluated in terms of whether policymaking transactions enabled citizens to develop political knowledge, enhance political competence, and deepen their ability to act prudently. But this interpretive move, which suits my present interests, could also be accused of presentism. I am “reading” him as the *forerunner* of a post-liberal critique of advanced capitalism. Who’s right? How many Lindemans are there? Presently Lindeman is claimed by the professionalized mainstream and radical social activists alike. Knowlesian specialists in the techniques of adult education as well as community-based educators working with the disempowered both lay claim to Eduard Lindeman.

Stewart’s desire to understand Lindeman as a prescient thinker (“The Lindeman assumptions are manifest in the work of nearly every American adult educator.” [p. 110]) forgets that one of the historian’s tasks is to render the familiar unfamiliar. Where does Lindeman fit in American intellectual history of the first half of the twentieth century? If we think of Lindeman as a progressive

thinker, we would want to know to what extent his thought shared the assumptions of the progressivism of the 1900s and 1910s. Did he share the pre-World War I progressive's (like Jane Addams and the social gospeller Shailer Mathews) optimistic view of human nature and social evolution? In *The True and Only Heaven* Lasch distinguishes two fundamental types of progressives—those committed to a distributive view of democracy, and those committed to a participatory view. The participatory view, with its deep affinities with American populism, emphasized the renewal of personality through a revitalized democratic life. The distributive view, with its emphasis on the democratization of culture and not work, Lasch argues, contains the seeds of technocratic, anti-populist liberalism. Were these two conflicting conceptions of progressivism at play within Lindeman's view of the world? Does Lindeman's commitment to the non-vocational ideal of adult education suggest that he did not really believe very strongly in the workplace as a developmental learning site?

After the débâcle of World War I a formidable liberal thinker like Walter Lippmann believed that the idea of an educative democracy (the centrality of virtue to political life) lay in ruins. This old ideal was obsolete and any notion of an "omnicompetent citizen" was part of the lost world of the "self-contained community." A complex industrial society now required expert officials who would carry on with their own idea of the "common interest" increasingly shaped by public opinion. Lippmann, in a word, bid adieu to virtue (Lasch 1991, pp. 364-65). How did Lindeman relate himself to an increasingly pessimistic liberalism now attuned to human suffering and despairing of the very idea of enlightened masses? Did Lindeman share in the "tragic ethos of much intellectual life in the 1930s" (Fox 1990, p. 324)?

How would we situate him in the debates of the 1930s and 1940s that ripsawed through American life and letters? The old progressive ideal of human society as boundless arena for the realization of human potential had collapsed on the battlefields of Europe in World War I. Beginning in the 1920s, American letters rekindled its interest in the subject of tragedy. Radicals in the 1930s and 1940s became more attuned to the limits on human development. There were many contending "social philosophies" vying for hegemony during these decades: democratic socialists, communists, populists, managerial (or administrative) liberals, pragmatic realists. How did Lindeman shape his thinking about adult education for social change within this fermenting intellectual milieu? It is not that Stewart does not contribute hints of answers to these questions. He does. But he chose not to situate Lindeman's thought securely and deeply within American intellectual culture of these formative decades. The latter task is necessary, I believe, to understand fully Lindeman's usability for the present.

Since Lindeman's death in 1953, American liberalism has become brutally managerial, technocratic, and anti-populist. Can Lindeman provide us with the intellectual and spiritual resources to help us build a post-liberal society? Was Lindeman captive to the increasingly discredited ideology of progress? Does he help us to ask the right questions of our current situation? To answer these

queries, we need to know more about how Lindeman thought about the ends of democracy—the kind of social institutions and cultural foundation necessary to realize democratic values. Without understanding Lindeman's progressive-liberal views of the problems and promise of American life, contemporary adult education practitioners will appropriate Lindeman's insights into group dynamics and democratic pedagogical process without any deep reflection upon the structural and personal preconditions for a revitalized cultural and public life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Coady, Moses. *Masters of Their Own Destiny*. New York: Harper and Row, 1939.

Croly, Herbert. *Progressive Democracy*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1914.

Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education*. New York: Macmillan, 1961 [NY, 1916].

Fox, Richard. "Tragedy, Responsibility, and the American Intellectual, 1925-1950." In *Lewis Mumford: Public Intellectual*, ed. Thomas P. Hughes and Agatha C. Hughes. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Grattan, Hartley. *In Quest of Knowledge: A Historical Perspective on Adult Education*. New York: Arno Press and The New York Times, 1955 [reprint 1971].

Habermas, Jurgen. *Knowledge and Human Interests*. London: Heineman, 1971.

Kelly, Thomas. *A History of Adult Education in Great Britain*. Liverpool: University Press, 1970.

Kloppenber, James T. *Uncertain Victory: Social Democracy and Progressivism in European and American Thought, 1870-1920*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Lasch, Christopher. *The New Radicalism in America, 1889-1963: The Intellectual as a Social Type*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965.

Lasch, Christopher. *The True and Only Heaven: Progress and its Critics*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1991.

Law, Michael. "An Elephant's Graveyard or Buried Treasure?" The Syracuse Adult Education Collection: An essay report to the Kellogg Project, unpublished manuscript, 1988.

Leon, A. *Histoire de l'éducation populaire en France*. Paris: F. Nathan, 1983.

Lippmann, Walter. *A Preface to Politics*. Reprint Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1962 [1913].

Rockhill, Kathleen. "Ideological Solidification of Liberalism in University Adult Education: Confrontation over Workers' Education in the U.S.A." In *University Adult Education in England and the USA*, ed. Richard Taylor, Kathleen Rockhill, and Roger Fielhouse. London.

Rohfeld, Rae, ed. *Breaking New Ground: The Development of Adult and Workers' Education in North America*. Kellogg Project: Syracuse University, 1990.

Savicky, Ivan. "Toward a Typology of European Adult Education Historiography." *CASAE History Bulletin*, May 1987.

Selman, Gordon. "The Adult Educator: Change Agent or Program Technician?" *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, vol. 11 (2), 1985.

Terrot, N. *Histoire de l'éducation des adultes en France*. Paris: Edilig, 1983.

Welton, Michael, ed. *Knowledge for the People*. Toronto: OISE Press, 1987.

White, Hayden. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.

ERRATUM

The author of the review of John N. Miner, *The Grammar Schools of Medieval England: A.F. Leach in Historiographical Perspective*, published in our last issue (Vol. 3, no. 1) was *Joan Simon*. We apologize for the error.

Ruth Compton Brouwer. *New Women for God: Canadian Presbyterian Women and India Missions, 1876-1914*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990. Pp. xi, 294. (The Social History of Canada, No. 44) \$40.00 cloth, \$18.95 paper.

This is the first published monograph on the involvement of Canadian women in the late nineteenth and early twentieth-century Protestant missionary movement. Within the growing literature on missions and missionaries it makes its own contribution to the toppling of stereotypes. In purpose and scope it invites comparison with Jane Hunter's fine account of American women missionaries in China, *The Age of Gentility*, and does not suffer thereby.

Following a succinct outline of the origins of the missionary movement in the "North Atlantic triangle," Brouwer devotes a lengthier chapter to the foreign missions of Canadian Presbyterians, especially of the Woman's Foreign Mission Society, Western Division (WFMS), established in 1876. From the beginning, the legitimization of missionary activity by women rested on the view that only women could carry the gospel to the isolated and oppressed women of Africa and Asia. The commonly held belief that Christianity was the source of the higher status of women in the

western world compared to non-Christian lands carried with it the corollary that Christian women had a unique responsibility to minister to their "heathen sisters."

The Foreign Missions Committee (FMC) of the Presbyterian Church of Canada directed the mission work of the whole church and the WFMS was authorized only to raise money and support the work of women missionaries; the women had no mandate to participate in shaping policy. In the women's missionary societies established in most congregations, thousands of women were engaged in activities new to them, such as serving on the executive, or giving a talk on missionary activity in some faraway land. In 1898 the WFMS held the first of its annual national meetings, where several hundred women conducted the business of the society with an efficiency that astonished male observers already amazed by the women's prowess as publicists and fund-raisers.

The expansion and success of the WFMS inevitably complicated its relations with the FMC. The women naturally wanted more influence, especially in the selection and preparation of women missionaries, and this they secured in effect before the turn of the century when the men made some informal concessions to avoid a more direct attack on their authority.

After describing the marshalling of missionary zeal at home, Brouwer

proceeds to discuss the content of the missionary calling presented to Canadian Presbyterian women and to analyse the characteristics of those who responded. Clearly the motives of volunteers were mixed, including desire for adventure and for the prestige of the missionary at home. Acknowledging that "romantic fantasies and self-serving ambitions" played a part, the author assigns primary significance to the religious imperatives presented to Protestant church-going women in the late nineteenth century, who were constantly reminded of the unique obligations of educated single women to obey Christ's commandment: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature."

Brouwer analyses the backgrounds of the 122 Presbyterian women who went overseas before 1914 and presents the details in a useful appendix. Women from modest rural communities or small towns were more likely to answer the call than those in larger and wealthier urban congregations, whose membership included the leading WFMS executives; their daughters rarely found their way to the mission field. Some areas in Nova Scotia and southwestern Ontario, usually where the population was mainly of Scottish origin, produced a disproportionate number of volunteers. Compared with their contemporaries, women missionaries had a significantly higher level of education. By far the largest group had been teachers, but unlike most Ontario teachers a substantial majority had been to Normal School. Ten were nurses, fourteen were university graduates, while fifteen had taken

medical degrees, often specifically to qualify as medical missionaries.

Canadian Presbyterians sent their emissaries, including women, to other areas, notably Trinidad, Formosa, Korea, and China, but it was in Central India that "woman's work for women" was most visible. From the founding of the mission (1877), women outnumbered men and grew more dominant with the years, the usual pattern on the mission fields of North American churches. Initially in Central India the women missionaries devoted much of their time and energy to visiting Muslim and high-caste women in the seclusion of their zenanas. Before long it became evident that zenana visiting would yield few conversions, partly because a large majority of the women of Central India were not zenana women as the early missionaries had mistakenly believed. Brouwer is skilful in tracing the process by which women missionaries in Central India came to emphasize institutional and social services over direct evangelism, thus giving a distinctive character to their work.

In a society where there was virtually no education for women, schools for girls were the first priority, followed by hospitals, clinics, and dispensaries. When a great famine and then cholera swept through Central India at the turn of the century the resources of the medical missionaries were pushed to the limit. For awhile famine relief and the establishment of industrial homes for widows, and orphanages for boys and girls, became missionary pre-occupations. These rescue homes proved to be more effective instruments of evangelism than

any other, for the combination of social service and religious instruction dispensed to captive audiences produced a gratifying number of converts.

One of the best chapters in the book shows that "gender politics" was a constant factor in the mission field. Although the foundations of the Central India mission were laid by two very able women, the ordained male missionaries who arrived later and failed to "put them in their place" eventually secured their dismissal on a variety of charges ranging from sexual misconduct to resistance to the authority of the all-male Mission Council. In the ensuing years a majority of women missionaries contended that they ought to have direct control over their own work, their trump card being that the men could have no close knowledge of life in zenanas, women's hospitals, and girls' schools. When an ordained missionary, for his own political reasons, made himself the women's spokesman, a joint "equal-rights" council was created by the FMC but opposition from the male missionaries and a minority of the women ensured it a brief life. Subsequently, for the sake of relative peace everyone concerned reluctantly accepted the establishment of a separate Women's Council.

As Brouwer notes, the vocabulary acceptable to Christians of that day prevented them from speaking of "self-fulfillment," but many single women had highly rewarding careers on the mission field. Their satisfaction rested on the belief that their work expressed God's will for their lives, and often on the realization that within certain limits, which most of them ac-

cepted, they enjoyed careers more independent, adventuresome, and honoured than any open to well-educated spinsters at home. Although converts might be few, they could find satisfaction in the knowledge that they were laying the foundations for educational and medical services and for career opportunities in those fields for Indian women. In the vicissitudes of missionary life they were sustained by close female friendships, often lifelong, a few of which Brouwer comments on at some length. Further, more frequently than their male counterparts, female missionaries established supportive friendships with Indian families and in the world of British officialdom.

Finally, Brouwer demonstrates that "new women" in India, and their home supporters, so single-mindedly devoted to a "woman's sphere" overseas, were scarcely "new women" in Canada. Despite the fact that Presbyterian men were often strong advocates of women's suffrage, members of the WFMS were rarely associated with the suffrage movement, and declined affiliation with the moderately reformist National Council of Women; nor did they press for formal representation in church courts.

A review cannot do full justice to this thoroughly researched and closely argued, yet well-written and readable book. For both content and style it deserves better than the stereotypical "missionary drab" cover of the cloth edition.

Margaret Prang
University of British Columbia

Marguerite Van Die. *An Evangelical Mind: Nathanael Burwash and the Methodist Tradition in Canada, 1839-1918.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1989. Pp. viii, 280. \$32.95.

At the end of a long and illustrious career, Nathanael Burwash was working hard to complete his autobiography. Like so many other religious figures from the Victorian era he assumed that the life story of a pious man confirmed the power of God working through history and, if properly presented, could serve as an inspirational guide for young men who were embarking on the journey that Burwash himself had begun in earnest some seventy years before. *The Life and Labours of Nathanael Burwash* would undoubtedly have found a comfortable place among the scores of books written by Canadian religious leaders about other Canadian religious leaders. Clothed in romance and didactic to the core, these lives of the Protestant saints form a distinct historical genre that makes a powerful statement about the theological assumptions of the age in which they were written.

The values that commended the writing of biography to the Victorians have tended to have the opposite effect upon contemporary scholars. No longer secure in the knowledge that God works through the lives of men and even less assured that the writing of history is a grand exercise in moral instruction, young scholars often regard the well-entrenched tradition of

Canadian religious biography as an obstacle to be overcome if they are to address successfully a long agenda of social and cultural concerns.

Marguerite Van Die's excellent book, *An Evangelical Mind*, restores biography to an important place in Canadian historical writing by recognizing a fact that many scholars have simply overlooked. The very assumptions that have so unnerved contemporaries also provide critical insights into the very heart of Canadian religion. If people in the nineteenth century read the life of a man as a novel in which God was the novelist, then they must have believed that the whole of life was infused by the spirit of God. For them religion was not an abstract category of social and cultural analysis but a lived experience—part of an ongoing dialogue between God and creation.

By treating religion as a lived experience Van Die is able to use the life of Nathanael Burwash as a framework for discussing the important issues in which he played a leading role. As a child in a devout evangelical household, as a student in a Methodist school, as a teacher of theology, and as a leader of the Wesleyan Methodist church, Burwash played a major part in almost every significant religious issue between Confederation and the First World War: the nature of children, the role of laity in the church, the impact of evolution and higher criticism on the teaching of theology, university federation, and church union.

This approach provides an insightful picture of Canadian Methodism in the late Victorian

period. Although Methodism changed in this period it was able to maintain the core evangelical traditions that John Wesley had bequeathed to his followers: repentance, conversion, perfection, and the importance of the scriptures for salvation. Burwash is presented as an intelligent and wise conservative: open to social change but determined to hold on to what was at the centre of Methodism and his own religious experience.

He did this by being open to intellectual change and at the same time working to accommodate new currents of thought to what he regarded as the essence of evangelical religion. For example, he responded to the challenge of evolution and higher criticism not by rejecting these modern ideas out of hand but by reformulating his theology on an inductive basis and then applying the lessons of Baconian science to the study of Biblical texts. In this way he set out to remove the false incumbrances that had built up in the past and so reduce the texts to their primitive essence. Intellectual progress, Burwash seemed to assert, came about by using science to return to primitive truth. The same pattern is evident in the debates over university federation and church union where Burwash was continually trying to discover the core of common truth that would secure progress towards newer and larger institutional structures. Like Ryerson before him he drew religion and education together and saw in their union the key to both social stability and progress.

This interpretation challenges directly the assertion that Methodism in Canada was changed dramatically

by its contact with the forces of the modern world. According to a number of historians, most notably Professor G.R. Cook, the religious leaders of this period contributed directly to the decline of religion and the secularization of society. In their haste to make religion relevant to the new secular age, religious leaders in the early twentieth century substituted sociology, the science of society, for theology, the science of religion. By loosening the ship of Protestantism from its doctrinal moorings, these men increased the pace of secularization and so contributed to the very process they fought so hard to oppose—the marginalization of religious belief and religious institutions.

Van Die offers three important criticisms of this thesis. First of all the evidence provided by the life of Burwash (and others) does not support the charge that the leaders of the church abandoned religious systems of thought for secular ones. They prided themselves on their orthodoxy and maintained their beliefs intact during a period of profound intellectual turbulence. Second, the assertion that religious change increased the pace of secularization is based upon a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature of Methodist theology in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Burwash taught his students to see theology not as an unchangeable corpus of theological doctrines but as an organic body of beliefs that was continually developing in the light of scientific examination and personal experience. To criticize his generation for abandoning a prescribed set of doctrines is to put the Methodist move-

ment in a fundamentalist straightjacket. It saw adaptation not as a sign of weakness but of strength. Third, the crisis of religion in the early twentieth century was not one of secularization. Following the insights of H. Richard Niebuhr, Van Die argues that religion has always been part of a dynamic relationship with society and social change. Profoundly affected by social developments, religion also seeks to explain and transcend the society of which it is a part. Burwash and his generation were worthy of this task, articulating a religion that tried to harness social change and turn it towards positive religious goals. Their problem was not that religion became secularized but that the pace of social change exceeded the grasp of religious explanation. The crisis that haunted Burwash at the end of his life was cultural. He assumed his religious synthesis would hold for all times—it only lasted for a few generations. When he took his leave from Victoria College it was not over a major theological issue but over the rules of behaviour for women in the students' residence.

An Evangelical Mind deserves a wide audience.

William Westfall
Atkinson College
York University

Harold Silver. *Education, Change and the Policy Process.* London: The Falmer Press, 1990. Pp. 230.

In the introduction to his book Harold Silver says, "The essential pur-

pose is to put historical tools to work on some contemporary and recent educational phenomena. The incentive in all cases is an interest in penetrating current debate and policy, the processes, practices and vocabularies in which they are embodied, and which they reflect and engender" (p. 1).

Silver believes that in general historians have been reluctant to commit themselves to policy research because of its demand for an orientation towards the future, its high level of generalization, threatening tyranny of concepts, clash of methodologies, and proximity of ideological conflict. As a result social and political scientists doing policy research either neglect its historical dimensions or become their own historians of policy. Silver sees a two-sided problem with such an outcome. On the one hand, historians who hesitate to do policy research fail to understand that history is always "substantively about the future" (p. 7) and it is inevitably theoretical. On the other hand, policy analysts who delve into historical studies often fail to appreciate the implicit doubts and question marks affecting historical descriptions and interpretations—"What history *is*, and how it is defensible, are questions never settled once and for all, to the satisfaction of its proponents and its critics" (p. 5).

The first two and the concluding chapters of the book focus on this general argument for historical policy analysis and the problems that may be anticipated for historians of education adopting such an approach. The intervening chapters illustrate Silver's own approach to historical policy analysis.

They cover the evolution of standards in British higher education from the nineteenth century to the 1980s, a comparative analysis of the changing concepts in Britain and the United States of what comprises the public sector in higher education, the change in political attitudes ("from great expectations to bleak houses") toward British higher education from the mid-1960s to the 1980s, the postwar development of the concept of "vocationalism" in British further education, the history of Britain's international educational relations, and changing views on "disadvantaged children in school" from the 1920s to the 1980s. One further, and very useful, chapter explores the directions, approaches, and methodologies of contemporary historians of education in the United States who have been more willing to become committed to historical policy analysis than their British counterparts. As this list of subjects perhaps makes clear, this is not a book of closely linked chapters in which a thesis is developed step by step. Rather it is a collection of essays which are related by their perspective but which can be read separately.

Silver's advocacy for historians to do more policy studies is persuasive. Similarly important for social and political scientists doing policy research is his reminder that "like any form of social or political analysis, history means versions of history, may be radical or conservative, may be engaged in the confident pursuit of a reality or in reassessing the sources of confidence" (p. 184). Questions begin to arise, however, in the middle chap-

ters as we see what Silver makes of historical policy analysis in practice.

Silver cites approvingly the Canadian political scientist Keith Banting's conception of policy making as "both an intellectual activity and an institutional process" (p. 34). Silver does indeed describe the flux of institutions and ideas in policy areas such as higher and further education, but little sense of the patterning of policy and policy making emerges from these chapters. Perhaps this is the intended result. Certainly, the best expression of Silver's approach to policy analysis lies in his statement that with regard to recent history "I found intriguing areas of research in the processes, forums and interpretations of what I termed 'opinion', to distinguish these from the processes differently approached in terms of ideology" (p. 217). "Opinion," however, affects policy when it is held by people with power and used to guide their actions. Policy making is a process based on power: ideas that have power to influence and persuade, institutions that have power to enable or constrain, and actors who have power to reward and coerce.

In Silver's work as an historian of education one applauds his insistence that "it would be mistaken to trace the fortunes of higher education from the early 1960s to the late 1980s as a linear descent" (p. 81) and his conclusion that "from the 1960s through to the late 1980s there were considerable zig-zags of attention" and "clearly no simple trajectory to describe and analyze for the concept of disadvantaged children or for the systems of schooling or the classroom process

they experience" (p. 200). Such attention to the profusion of educational opinion and political events is surely the professional concern of historians of education and no doubt one of the special contributions they can make to policy research. But they owe us also their judgements on the hegemony of ideas, the domination of institutions, and the possession of power. Silver recognizes this obligation in his theorizing, but in this book at least he does not realize it in his practice.

Ronald Manzer
University of Toronto

Maria Tippett. *Making Culture: English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts before the Massey Commission.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990. Pp. 253. \$40.00 cloth, \$17.95 paper.

Like many aspects of the Canadian experience, the history of our cultural producers and institutions is woefully inadequate. A constant in all the successive waves of fashion in historical investigation—from constitutional to political to economic to biographical to social—has been the neglect of the history of our ideas and our arts, whether "high" or popular. To correct this lacuna in one major area—with respect to painting, theatre, music, and (to a lesser extent) literature in English Canada from 1900 to 1950—is one of Maria Tippett's primary goals in this work, and one in which she has been admirably success-

ful. Piling example upon example, she creates a dense and detailed portrait of a cultural life which, if not exactly vibrant, was certainly much more significant and ubiquitous than the previous historical record has revealed. Far from being totally preoccupied with the material development of the northern half of the continent, English Canadians clearly possessed "a serious and deeply founded interest in cultural pursuits" (p. xii) in the first half of this century.

The main argument constructed is that this "long lineage" of artistic activity was an essential precursor to the very different—and better-known—cultural life that has flourished since the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences (the Massey Commission) reported in 1951 and a cultural funding agency along the lines it recommended, the Canada Council, was set up in 1957. Ironically, Tippett points out in her Epilogue, precisely because post-Canada Council culture has been so government-dependent and so professionally oriented, it has tended to turn aside memories of the tradition out of which it grew. Nevertheless, she argues, that heritage was "an important part of what led to the shaping of a coherent cultural policy," and "the council itself was a product, as much as it was a creator, of a distinguished history of cultural activism" (p. 187).

Tippett examines English-Canada's cultural tradition under five main headings: professionalization, education, government patronage, private patronage, and foreign influences. A number of important issues are covered. While some are very familiar

to students of Canadian society, such as the tendency to centralization of cultural activity in Toronto and Montreal and the eternal emphasis on the development of a distinctive Canadian identity, others are less well known. Tippet points out, for example, the important function women performed in participating, organizing, and fund-raising for little theatres, musical groups, and many other cultural organizations. She also clearly explains why private and corporate philanthropy in the arts was so weak, and reveals in contrast the central role played by the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Foundation in this country, not only in encouraging cultural education and supporting individual artists but in backing such broadly based lobby groups as the Federation of Canadian Artists after 1941. While not glossing over the problems inherent in the deep involvement of these American foundations in Canadian cultural life, she concludes by highlighting the perception of "most observers" of the time that as a result "things were being done which would otherwise not be taking place, a fact which was, they thought, enough to excuse a multitude of deficiencies" (p. 153).

A similar emphasis is evident in Tippet's discussion of the nature of English-Canadian cultural expression in the period. She readily admits that it was for the most part traditional, British-oriented, and derivative. The Canadian identity sought by English-Canadian artists was one rooted in Anglo-conformity and traditional morality, far from the cutting edge of international artistic developments.

But for Tippet, that is less important than the fact that it existed at all. For example, she argues that the patronage of the arts by volunteer groups like churches and middle-class women and by individuals like Vincent Massey helped ensure that the product was a conventional one, reinforcing the world view of these essentially conservative bodies. "But even at that," she concludes,—"and this is the real point—a forum and a framework for cultural activity were provided where, otherwise, there would have been none at all" (p. 108).

For readers of this journal, the chapter on educating performers and their audiences will be of particular interest. Here Tippet discusses two main endeavours: the development of programmes and institutions to train specialized cultural performers, and the education of amateurs and audiences by means of exhibitions, festivals, university extension courses, and so on. For the most part individuals with a particular interest in or talent for painting, music, or drama studied with private teachers or at private conservatories. Most of the tutors, and most of the students, were women. The teaching tended to be of doubtful quality, according to Tippet, and conservative and traditional in models and styles. Any really serious student had to leave Canada to pursue his or her education. This was one of the means by which foreign standards, and foreign quality, entered the Canadian cultural scene—with consequences both good and ill. As to the artistic education of the general public, Tippet focuses on the role of the critic and the growing involvement of univer-

sities in mounting extension courses in the arts. Canadian critics—of whom there were far more than is usually assumed—tended to avoid tough commentary in a misguided attempt to encourage indigenous production. Like patrons and teachers, their standards were conventional and patriotic. Most importantly, they and other like-minded commentators placed upon Canadian artists the multiple burden of stimulating national feeling, integrating an increasingly diverse and urbanized population, and replacing traditional religious values. Artists were called upon to be the nation's teachers, and, accordingly, were expected to act as role models and to behave and produce in an "acceptable" and unchallenging manner. Universities became increasingly involved in sponsoring artistic education for a similar reason—a felt need to respond to the social problems of the whole community. In both cases, however, for Tippet the significance lies not in the sometimes doubtful results but in the underlying assumption that an awareness of culture was "a key element in the building of a society" (p. 62).

A major theme throughout is the role—or lack thereof—of the federal government in the cultural field in Canada. Before 1957, Ottawa's only major institutional involvement was with the National Gallery, although some patronage of individuals, particularly by participation in patriotic ceremonies or the design of memorials, did occur as well. According to Tippet, the principal reasons for the federal reluctance to get involved were the belief that art belonged in the

private sector, the lack of viable models from Britain, and the inability of the artistic community itself to agree on what aid it wanted. Typically, the federal government also brushed aside culture with the excuse that it was educational and therefore a provincial responsibility.

The Second World War, however, led to some major changes that ended the government's isolationist stance. One important step was the creation of the Canadian Arts Council (CAC) and other widely representative lobby groups with a fairly clear sense of what they wanted. More significant, however, according to Tippet, was the growing perception of the St. Laurent government that cultural activity was *useful*—both at home and to spread "civilized" values worldwide. Moreover, the federal government finally recognized that in fact it was already quite heavily involved in many cultural endeavours and that better coordination would be beneficial. Finally, and crucial in focusing all these feelings, was the fear that the burgeoning CCF would steal the Liberals' thunder in this influential area. Thus St. Laurent was persuaded (principally by Brooke Claxton) to set up the Massey Commission to investigate the whole cultural arena from the federal perspective, the "first step in the direction of a coherent, state-supported, federal policy for culture and the arts" (p. 184).

To some extent the logic of Tippet's argument breaks down at this point. Her own evidence suggests that the reason the federal government finally became involved in a manner that eventually transformed English-

Canadian cultural activity had very little to do with previous cultural experience, and much to do with particular political circumstances. She herself points out that cultural lobby groups like the CAC had no discernible success in getting their message accepted until other factors induced the Liberal government to act. Where then is the link between the pre- and post-1950 situations? The "long lineage" did not, it seems to me, cause the eventual move to federal government intervention in the cultural field; the real push for that came from other roots, including not only those Tippetts mentions but also such factors as growing concern in the late 1940s over the potential of television for further seducing the Canadian public toward mass culture and Americanization, and generally altered notions about the responsibility of the state in fields previously considered private.

Tippetts's book is best when it sticks to the description of the multitude of cultural endeavours engaged in by ordinary English Canadians, amateurs and professionals, who shared an instinctive sense that this type of activity is an important aspect of the human experience. What she describes so effectively is truly the "making" of culture—and a culture—by its lived practice.

Mary Vipond
Concordia University

Kendall E. Bailes. *Science and Russian Culture in an Age of Revolu-*

tions: V.I. Vernadsky and his Scientific School, 1863-1945.

Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990. (Indiana-Michigan Series in Russian and European Studies). Pp. xii, 238. \$29.50 U.S.

This is very much a book for the 1990s. First, its subject, Vladimir Vernadsky, was "one of the first scientists to emphasize the basic unity of earth, humans, and the cosmos through the exchange of matter" (p. 181); his work is therefore of major importance to environmentalists everywhere. Second, the rediscovery of Vernadsky's writings in the Soviet Union was a significant part of the intellectual origins of the move towards "glasnost." Third, its author learned that he himself was suffering from AIDS, and completed the book in a desperate race against time that ended with his tragic death in 1988. His first book, *Technology and Society under Lenin and Stalin: Origins of the Soviet Technical Intelligentsia* (Princeton, 1978) became an instant classic. Incisive, generous, stimulating, yet unassuming, Bailes was the brightest star in his generation of American scholars of Soviet history; it is sad to realize that these are the last words we shall have from his pen.

The first half of the book deals, brilliantly and thoroughly, with Vernadsky's childhood and education, his early scientific work, and his social and political activity up to the outbreak of World War I. The second, less satisfactory half, traces Vernadsky's work

during the period of war and revolution from 1914 to 1922, describes the influence on Soviet science of the Vernadsky school, and offers an assessment of Vernadsky's legacy as a scientist and philosopher of science.

According to Bailes, family life and school experience taught Vernadsky patterns of interaction with authority that help explain his behaviour as an adult in both Imperial and Soviet Russia. From his family he received a tradition of scholarship, his intellectual curiosity, liberal political sympathies, and an interest in Slavic languages and literatures. Family and schooling also provided a warm, supportive childhood environment and sense of confidence that led him to repudiate revolution as a means of improving society.

While other university students were becoming radicals and revolutionaries, Vernadsky was devouring Darwin and von Humboldt. He and a handful of well-off friends constituted a special group at St. Petersburg University—the so-called *kulturniki*—who took attending classes seriously, and saw it as their duty to raise the scientific and cultural level of Russian society. Bailes portrays them as trying to forge a “middle way” between the narrow careerism of the conservatives and apoliticals on the one hand, and “the revolutionary impatience they considered so wasteful and superficial” (p. 16) on the other. Here Vernadsky met his lifelong friend Sergei Oldenburg, who became Secretary of the Academy of Sciences. This “Oldenburg circle” was “an important seedbed of Russian liberalism” (p. 28); its members—unlike the

revolutionary terrorists or the early Russian Marxists—went into education, research, local self-government, and eventually the Constitutional Democratic (Kadet) party.

No popularizer himself, Vernadsky nevertheless believed deeply in the importance of educating the people: “practical knowledge and a scientific world view, he felt, went hand in hand with the establishment of a popular government” (p. 30); however, it would take time and work to make scientific knowledge part of the Russian popular consciousness. Socialism troubled him deeply: he feared for the future of education and science under a socialist regime; as a strong nationalist, he also feared that if socialism came to a country as uncultured as Russia, it might prevent it from becoming strong. (In 1990 it is difficult not to describe such thinking as prophetic.)

Always more a theorist and a generalist than an experimentalist, Vernadsky throughout his life jumped from one theme to another, always working on new scientific frontiers; he tended to leave the detailed work and the narrow specialization to others, especially his own pupils and associates. When he entered the earth sciences in Russia, where they were undeveloped, in the 1890s, he was able to get in on the ground floor; during the rapid industrialization of that decade, the field quickly grew in importance. Among his students at Moscow University, his moral authority and scientific competence were revered; they also held him in great personal affection: “a man of rare purity and beauty,” as his famous student

Fersman put it (p. 74). In 1901, Vernadsky formed the Mineralogical Circle at Moscow University, a group of about twenty carefully chosen colleagues, graduate students, and even undergraduates, who "shared a common direction and common goals in mineralogy" (p. 77). The common direction was their shared emphasis on explaining the origin of minerals as parts of the history of the earth, and the physical and chemical processes by which minerals had been created. This emphasis reflected both the growing sophistication of chemistry and the influence of Darwinism; later on the discovery of radioactivity also profoundly affected the Vernadsky school. Vernadsky soon realized that he was learning as much, if not more, from his students and colleagues than they were from him.

Although he wrote to his wife that "science will always be more important than social service" (p. 68), he became increasingly involved in social and political activities. Bailes claims that Vernadsky was "a master of the politics of mobilizing moral indignation among his colleagues" (p. 80). By 1905 he was a national political figure, one of the Kadet inner circle, although how this happened is not well explained. For him, the progress of science was intimately related to the progress of democracy and humanitarianism; hence he took time (too much?) away from his research to help organize the Union of Liberation ("a popular front of change-oriented intellectuals"), the Academic Union, and the Constitutional Democratic party, all of them key players in the liberal movement of 1905. Vernadsky

emphasized the special moral responsibility of university professors to "act as guardians of the interests of science and knowledge...our first duty is not to let the higher educational institutions suffer during this period of great social upheaval" (p. 99).

When the Revolution of 1905 ended in failure, a disappointed Vernadsky went back to science, but he soon fell foul of the regime and resigned from Moscow University during the 1911 purge of radicals and liberals. He then moved to St. Petersburg as Director of the Mineralogical Museum. Bailes is particularly interesting on Vernadsky's intellectual development during these years; an unusual interest in mysticism combined with fresh questions about the nature of the cosmos led to a new environmental awareness. After a visit to the nickel and cobalt mines at Sudbury, Ontario, Vernadsky wrote movingly of the desecration of nature by technology.

The chapter covering the years 1914-22 is the least satisfactory in the book. There are, for example, only two skimpy paragraphs on the crucial period between the fall of the autocracy and the Bolshevik revolution, during which time Vernadsky was a member of the Kadet Central Committee. What did he think of its change of direction—amply documented by William Rosenberg—away from intellectual liberalism to the defence of commercial and industrial interests? All we are told is that he did not like the Whites and was "fed up with politics" by 1920. Why? On page 145, we are told that the Civil War was a period of great scientific creativity

for Vernadsky, but on page 147, we are told that it got in the way of his work. We are given little sense of what he was doing in St. Petersburg after the Bolsheviks took power, and no explanation at all of his decision to go to Paris in 1922. Most alarming of all is a nine-page section on relations between the Academy of Sciences and the Bolsheviks in which Vernadsky is lost entirely. It is here, especially, that one recalls the trying circumstances under which the manuscript was completed. Nevertheless the overall approach is sound: like other recent writers on this period, Bailes stresses the extent to which pragmatism rather than ideology guided the Bolsheviks in their early dealings with scientists and technologists.

In 1925, convinced that communism was no longer a dangerous ideology, Vernadsky returned to the USSR. As under the Tsars, he criticized the regime for its failings; he spoke out against the purges, and criticized the state of Soviet science under Stalin. Yet he was not imprisoned, and both he and his school survived. Bailes attributes his survival to several factors: he had returned from abroad voluntarily; he was a strong Russian nationalist who emphasized the importance of applied science for defence and the economy; he was a scientist of international renown; and perhaps most important in Stalin's eyes, he was not a plotter. Later, Vernadsky deplored the slowness with which the USSR began to pursue research in atomic energy, and called for co-operation with American scientists.

The book ends not with a conclusion but with a final chapter on Vernadsky's legacy. Unfortunately but perhaps understandably, there are some structural problems here. It may well be that the war and the revolution were responsible for a major shift in his work and thinking, from an exclusive concern with non-living matter before 1914 to a concern with the relationship between living matter and the rest of nature from the mid-twenties onwards; it must be said, however, that no adequate basis for this claim was laid in the appropriate chapter. Also there are hints here that Vernadsky's decision to return to the USSR may have had a good deal to do with his inability to secure support either in France or America for the establishment of a laboratory to study the chemical relations between living and inert matter. Here again, one wishes that this information had been supplied at the proper moment. Had Bailes been able to work for a few months longer, the book would surely have had a more satisfying conclusion. None of this should take away any of the credit due to his research assistant for helping to bring the project to completion despite what must have been an enormous emotional strain.

John F. Hutchinson
Simon Fraser University

Terry Crowley. *Agnes Macphail and the Politics of Equality*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company,

Ltd., 1990. \$35.00 cloth, \$16.95 paper.

I know I do not look a day over forty-five, but in 1931, I think, when I was nine or thereabouts, I saw Agnes Macphail. Mother pointed her out to me when she boarded the Owen Sound car at Medonte. She spent most of the trip chatting with the brakeman. The important thing was the recognition factor. Mother would not have known any other M.P. in those circumstances, not R.B. Bennett, not Mackenzie King, still less what's-his-name, her own federal member.

Agnes Macphail was our first and often our only female M.P., but her importance in Canadian history went far beyond that and it is fitting that there is a new biography, asking contemporary questions from a contemporary viewpoint and contemporary values, to supplement the breezy, discursive, highly partisan, and still readable *Ask No Quarter*, the Margaret Stewart and Doris French biography of 1959.

Agnes Macphail grew up on a Grey County farm where she learned to hate housework and had the usual, in those years, difficulty in persuading her parents to incur the useless expense of sending a girl, who would inevitably get married anyway, to high school. She won, and went to Owen Sound Collegiate. Then it was Stratford Normal and ten years of teaching in rural schools during which she became more and more involved in the farmers' movement. These were the years of post-war radicalism in Canada

when the United Farmers of Ontario went into politics and formed the one-term Farmer/Labour government under E.C. Drury. Agnes Macphail moved into executive positions with the United Farm Women and began a column in the *Farmers' Sun*. Like all farmers and most Liberals she knew all the arguments against tariffs and became a compelling platform speaker in the 1919 provincial election and in federal by-elections. She earned the nomination in the winnable federal riding of South Grey though her success then and in the subsequent election in 1921 shocked many of her constituents and some of her family.

In the House she encountered problems from hostile columnists and patronizing fellow M.P.'s, and early on showed her propensity to shoot from the hip, making gaffes on the platform and in debate which could embarrass her though she was apparently reluctant to either apologize or explain. During her first term she found the concerns which were to preoccupy her politically, peace and penal reform. She circulated peace material to the schools, which got her into difficulties, and inveighed against cadet training, which got her into more difficulties. She travelled to women's peace conferences and was a Canadian delegate to the League of Nations Disarmament Conference. It was with great sorrow that she brought herself to the conclusion that the Fascists might have to be opposed by force, and she shared the trauma of her CCF colleagues at having to separate from J.S. Woodsworth on the declaration of war. By then Agnes Macphail had travelled widely in Canada and Europe, was in

great demand on the U.S. lecture circuits, and had expanded her political range. Peace, and still less penal reform, were not preoccupations of her farmer constituents. She had lost none of her love for her people but she had grown out of touch. In 1940 she was defeated. The twilight of her political career was spent representing urban East York in the Ontario legislature during the short CCF upsurge in the forties. Here she had some opportunity to continue her work for penal reform. In Parliament her agitation had been fundamental in getting the Archambault commission established, though its fruitful recommendations were a long time being implemented. In the Legislature she continued to try to visit institutions and keep the subject alive. After her death her concern was continued by Donald C. MacDonald who persisted doggedly and single-handedly till he finally badgered the government into bringing Ontario into the twentieth century.

Professor Crowley adds little to our understanding of Canadian politics in the period. His concern is with Agnes Macphail's political development and especially with her role in Canadian feminism. She began in politics pugnaciously devoted to the progressivism of J.J. Morrison and Henry Wise Wood, the thesis that parties were inherently corrupt and that the way of the future was with representatives of occupational groups, kept under constituency control by referendum and recall. She had learned about industrial problems fairly early during a trip to Cape Breton at one of its most desperate times, and had shared the task of failing to persuade labour of the

value of free trade and farmers of the virtue of the eight-hour day. But her background made the move to party politics difficult. However, the UFO was withering and most Progressives were relapsing into Liberals, a fate which did not attract her. She attended the CCF convention in 1933, but the party in Ontario was in such a chaotic state that she was probably relieved to be able to run in her fifth and last successful federal election as an independent, sitting in the CCF caucus only as an associate.

An example to Canadian feminism she certainly was, but not quite the complete feminist herself, maybe not quite as much of a feminist as Professor Crowley would wish. She occasionally wondered out loud whether she had been wise to choose a career instead of home and children. She fell in love easily and men fell in love with her very easily. Her warmest and most enduring friendships were with women, but she liked men, sometimes men whose politics she despised, like R.B. Bennett, Leslie Frost, and even the Kingfish, Governor Huey Long of Louisiana. She urged women to be more aggressive in politics, but recognized the structural and economic difficulties that stood in their way. Home making would have to be a lot less arduous and husbands a lot more accommodating before two careers could get equal domestic billing. Her last and most absorbing love, for Robert Gardiner, had to be abandoned because his constituency was in Alberta, hers in Ontario. In the Legislature she worked hard for pay equity, but for most of her career her heart was more

with the unpaid homemaker and child-rearer than the low-paid industrial or retail worker. She raged when she was patronized as a woman, and one may suspect that patronizing is what she would have called the current policy of the Ontario Ministry of trying to persuade school boards to appoint more women principals.

There are some areas of her life that it might have been interesting to see further developed. She was brought up a Presbyterian, was early influenced by the Latter Day Saints, which gave her some trouble in politics, and taught United Church Sunday School. Professor Crowley begins each chapter with a marked passage from her bible, but gives us little more. She revered J.S. Woodsworth but there is no indication that her socialism derived from the social gospel. But Canada was a long way from secular in the twenties or even the thirties; religion was important to most people and could be a political minefield. Another was "temperance." Owen Sound, in a neighbouring constituency, was the last place in the province to abandon "local option." Another matter that might have been discussed was her health. Many of her ailments were quite specific, but modern medicine might throw more light on her collapses from overwork.

To succeed in a man's political world a woman had to be twice as good; a left politician in conservative Canada had to be twice as good; so a left-leaning female politician had to be four times as good! Despite her occasional tantrums and depressions, despite her verbal indiscretions and

her frequent debilitating bouts of ill health, Agnes Macphail made that level with capacity to spare. She will deserve another biography in thirty-five years, when there are new values and different questions. I hope Professor Crowley writes it and I hope he gets a better production job. Some of the misprints are quite fun, but, call me old-fashioned if you will, I would like to see "coop" revert back to being "co-op."

Tom Miller
Thunder Bay

Richard J. Altenbaugh. *Education for Struggle: The American Labor Colleges of the 1920s and 1930s.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990. Pp. 339. \$39.95 U.S.

Although not without successes (e.g., the Pittston strike), it is clear that the American labour movement has felt beleaguered for the past decade or so. Ten years ago, for instance, unions represented almost one-fourth of the workers; today, they represent barely one-sixth. At least in part this has been a result of the rhetoric and policies of the Reagan Administration, which, while extolling the virtues of "the American worker," accelerated the erosion of organized labour's strength and influence. Indeed, what is particularly noticeable in Michael Moore's recent film, *Roger and Me*, is

the virtual absence of substantial resistance by national and local labour officials to the closing of General Motors factories in Flint and surrounding areas.

And yet during the last twenty years, as Clyde Barrow has pointed out, labour education has witnessed a renaissance of sorts, with the number of programmes and centres almost doubling. Moreover, labour studies within academic circles have also proliferated; the recent focus on the working conditions of teachers is indicative of this trend. While the combination of increased activity and scholarly attention to the education and plight of workers may seem "ironic" during the recent downturn in the fortunes of the American labour movement, it can also be viewed as in fact directly related to the setbacks experienced by organized labour.

The weakened state of the labour movement, along with its relatively conservative stance toward anti-war and civil rights movements and the exaggeration and caricature of this conservatism by the popular media, has helped to shape our view of workers in the United States. Consequently, it is perhaps difficult for many of us to imagine a time when labour colleges and extension programmes were initiated, not primarily for the purpose of assisting individual workers to better their own lot and in essence rise out of the working class, but rather to provide the labour movement with well-informed leaders and activists who would promote a radical transformation of the social order for the benefit of all workers. (One prominent participant, A.J. Muste,

called the schools and programmes "the instruments of a militant labor progressivism." Another supporter, Arthur Gleason, referred to them as providing "training in the science of reconstruction.") Similarly, it may be difficult to imagine the education of workers being organized not just by the institutional apparatuses of the university and the union, which is overwhelmingly the case now, but by grass-roots labour activists and their supporters. Historical work can help us with such "imaginings," that is, with helping to counteract our tendency to reify current social and educational realities. Relatedly, as Raymond Williams suggested, some of the best sources of counter-hegemonic practice may in fact be historical in nature.

In *Education for Struggle: The American Labor Colleges of the 1920s and 1930s*, Richard J. Altenbaugh provides rich documentation of three prominent American residential labour colleges of the twentieth century, educational institutions founded on the belief that workers could and should play a leading role in the promotion of economic and industrial democracy (i.e., the eradication of capitalism and the realization of the Cooperative Commonwealth). Despite the subtitle of Altenbaugh's book, this is not really an extensive investigation of all (or many) of the "labor colleges" that existed during this period. After all, as Richard Dwyer estimates, there were over 300 labour colleges and programmes of many different kinds during the post-World War I decades (e.g., party schools, trade union colleges, independent residential labour colleges, and university-affiliated summer

schools). *Education for Struggle* instead focuses primarily on the establishment and evolution of the Work People's College (1904-41) in Duluth, Minnesota; Brookwood Labor College (1921-37) in Katonah, New York; and Commonwealth College (1923-41) near Mena, Arkansas.

Perhaps the greatest difficulty in studying past radical educational experiments of any kind, and grass-roots American radical activity in general, is the relative paucity of data available to the researcher. It is often necessary to rely heavily on the radical press, which Joseph Conlin contends is only a fully reliable source of information before the devastating split in socialist ranks in 1919-20. Fortunately, in the case of these three labour colleges, Altenbaugh was also able to make excellent use of important archival sources and interviews with several former participants, as well as being able to draw on previously written accounts of the schools. His treatments of the three colleges are a bit uneven, in the sense that he tells us much more about one of the schools (Brookwood) than the other two. But by weaving together discussions of all three, he helps to clarify the most important aspects of American workers' education during the 1920s and 1930s, including its intersection with the politics of the left and the politics of the labour movement, even if the histories of the individual schools themselves (especially Commonwealth and Work People's) remain somewhat sketchy.

The main title of the book is well chosen because it is evident that not only did the colleges educate their students for the "struggle" of fundamen-

tal social change, but throughout most of their histories they also engaged in a momentous "struggle" to survive. Exacerbating the typical fiscal and other practical problems that plague such educational experiments, two of the schools experienced debilitating doses of both internecine battles and harassment from a variety of outside forces. For example, Brookwood, because of its growing popularity and its critical stance toward the hierarchy and policies of the mainstream labour movement, was eventually undermined by the increasingly conservative (and defensive) leadership of the American Federation of Labor. Commonwealth experienced constant threats from investigating committees of the Arkansas state legislature and from groups like the Ku Klux Klan and the American Legion, which served to drain the money, energy, and interest of radical and liberal supporters. The third college (Work People's) seems to have suffered in large part from its close affiliation with a militant labour organization, the Industrial Workers of the World, that over the course of several decades experienced a precipitous decline within the ranks of labour. This served to isolate the Minnesota labour college from its Finnish radical constituency and to narrow considerably its base of support.

Altenbaugh is insightful in his analyses of the schools' histories, their relations with left and labour cultures, and what he refers to as the "ironic twists" of their efforts. Of the latter, the ones that make the most sense involve accusations by conservatives that the schools were dens of "red" iniquity, when in fact no "den" could

have held together all the squawking leftists involved for any significant length of time; and the relatively independent nature of the three schools assuring a high level of academic freedom at the same time that it contributed to their financial and political vulnerability. Less convincing of these "ironic twists" is Altenbaugh's point that the labour colleges were on the descent at the same time that industrial unionism was on the ascent. This may be less of an irony than an indication of the propensity of the American left to "rush to revolution" and downplay the long-term strategies of educational institutions. In addition, Altenbaugh suggests that "success...was never a serious prospect for either the socialist movement or the labor colleges." Presumably, this is because "bourgeois society expects ideological conformity and views non-conformists with suspicion, if not outright hostility" and because "the power of state coercion serves as the ultimate mechanism to ensure compliance with bourgeois hegemony" (pp. 265-66). This is an overly fatalistic argument that presupposes a reductive view of hegemony (which the author seems to argue against in his introductory chapter), a perspective of the state as absent of contradictions, and a kind of all-or-nothing conception of "success."

Some of the most interesting sections of the book focus on the teaching methods, curriculum, and social relationships of the three labour colleges. It is fascinating, for example, to learn about the various informational (background) and instrumental ("tool") courses offered by the colleges, as well as their use of drama,

field work, and informal programmes such as summer sessions, youth camps, correspondence courses, and even a "museum depicting the decline of capitalism" (p. 127) to supplement the formal curriculum. However, what is unclear is whether or not the schools truly "avoided traditional, authoritarian teaching methods and relied heavily on progressive, democratic pedagogy" (p. 4) because such lecturing and rote learning "is anathema to radicals" and participants recognized that it serves "as a form of oppression" (pp. 129-30). Available documentation may be part of the problem here but the history of leftist education is replete with examples of the transmission of radical tenets being viewed as acceptable educational practice. It would be surprising if none (or even so few) of the educators involved in these colleges, many of whom had no formal educational training, adopted a more traditional approach. Indeed, on occasion Altenbaugh provides hints of evidence that contradict his own conclusion. For example, when discussing briefly the many students at Work People's College and Brookwood for whom English had to be taught as a foreign language, he mentions that as a result "teaching methods were traditional or innovative, depending on the subject matter and the abilities of the students" (p. 131). Elsewhere he states that "many classes included lectures, like Brookwood's 'History of Civilization' course," quotes Fred Thompson of Work People's College as admitting that he lectured "every once in a while," and describes a dean of faculty at the same college as earning "a

reputation as a taskmaster in the classroom" (pp. 133-35 and 144).

The larger point here is that the book could have given more attention to another sense of "struggle," that is, the struggle to develop curriculum and pedagogy best suited for the labour colleges. Was it simply the case that "the ideology of the labor colleges and the backgrounds of the students dictated the classroom pedagogy" (p. 132)? Did students in fact respond in the actual classroom in the participatory way that was desired? If not, did teachers tend to abandon the discussion method for the lecture format? Were creative curriculum materials readily available for non-traditional teaching? In his recent study of the Highlander Folk School (1932-62), John Glen informs us that the staff perceived Commonwealth College as too doctrinaire; were there no arguments within Commonwealth itself (besides those that emerged during a student strike in 1932) over the educational approach that was taken? These are important questions, I think, that could be addressed more clearly.

But such concerns should not serve to obscure my high regard for *Education for Struggle*. It is a wonderfully detailed, insightful and well-written account of a significant chapter in the histories of American education and American radicalism. It reminds us that the current debates about the canon are hardly new, that more than half a century ago groups of American workers and their supporters established their own labour colleges, extension programmes, and other educational activities to contest those

knowledges and values of American culture (including public schooling) that serve to reproduce the inequities of working-class life. Although they may not have been successful in attaining their goals, their efforts help us to clarify the political nature of education and to imagine the possible. Finally, it is important to remember, as Altenbaugh argues, that "while the outcome was disappointing, the cause was not" (p. 268).

Kenneth Teitelbaum
State University of New York at
Binghamton

Donald G. Wetherell with Irene Kmet. *Useful Pleasures: The Shaping of Leisure in Alberta 1896-1945*. Regina and Edmonton: Canadian Plains Research Centre/Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism, 1990. Pp. xxiv, 432, illus.

For several years Western Canadian historians have known that a book on the history of leisure in Alberta was in preparation. This is it, and a one-word reaction to it is—"satisfactory." Students of the history of education will not discover in it very much information on their own subject. Still, they should find *Useful Pleasures* stimulating and, well, useful.

The authors waste little time defining their subject. They seem comfortable with a description of

charged—were the then “new” social histories, quasi-legitimate parents to the new revisionist histories of education.

September, 1970 was a heady time to enter graduate studies in history. Path-breaking works rained upon us: Thompson’s *The Making of the English Working Class* in 1963, Thernstrom’s *Poverty and Progress* in 1962, Moore’s *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy* in 1966, Laslett’s *The World We Have Lost* in 1965. Ariès’ *Centuries of Childhood* was translated in 1962. Natalie Zemon Davis, then at the University of Toronto, published landmark *Past and Present* essays in the 1960s. Charles Tilly, at Toronto in the 1960s, published *The Vendée* in 1964 and continued his historical sociology. For historians of education, split between or across history departments and schools of education, there was Bailyn’s 1960 *Education in the Forming of American Society* as well as Cremin’s books. Astoundingly, North American and other English-speaking historians began to read in the literatures of social theories and social sciences, and also in French—the journal and the books of the *Annalistes*.

In 1970, almost simultaneously came Greven’s *Four Generations*, Demos’ *The Little Commonwealth*, and Lockridge’s *A New England Town*, as well as Macfarlane’s *The Family Life of Ralph Josselin*. Thomas’ *Religion and the Decline of Magic* and Stedman Jones’ *Outcast London* appeared the next year; Anderson’s *Family Structure* in 1972. Landes and Tilly’s proclamation, *History as Social Science*, and the two landmark *Daedalus* issues came in 1970-71. The basic journals were new: *Journal of Social History* (1967), *Historical Methods* (1967), *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* (1970), and in Canada, *Histoire sociale/Social History* (1968). Historians and history students were prominent among the founders, contributors, and readers of such vital organs as *Studies on the Left*, *Radical America*, *Radical History Review*, *New Reasoner*, *New University*, *New Society*, *New Left Review*. In Canada, this included *Canadian Dimensions* and *This Magazine*.

To some of these emerging currents I was introduced as an undergraduate. I knew, if unclearly and incompletely, of their presence at the University of Toronto. In 1970, I did not find them in my intended field of British history, nor in Canadian studies at Toronto. For me, at least, discovering a lesser presence and interest in these emphases in the Toronto history department was one of several factors that propelled my move to OISE, an odd new high-rise on the University of Toronto’s northern boundary just beyond Varsity Stadium.⁹ There I found not only the history of education and its revision, but also “new” social and quantitative histories, among a number of other persons and other things.

The “new” history of education, especially at OISE/University of Toronto, arose in this broad context. The crucible of change took its shape from intellectual and scholarly, political and ideological, and cultural forces of an international order. OISE provided one special container, due to its own peculiar history. There were others elsewhere, too, at the Universities of British Columbia and Western Ontario. Chance played a substantial role; more generally, so did Canadian institutional and politico-intellectual conditions.

leisure as "pleasurable non-work activity" (p. xvi). Aside from an Introduction and a Conclusion, there are eleven chapters. The first three make up Part One and they address the "technological, social, and institutional components of leisure" (p. xxiv). The last eight chapters are contained in Part Two, and they focus on particular leisure activities, with one chapter devoted to each of the following subjects: sports; hunting and fishing; outdoor recreations (camping, touring, visiting resorts); theatre and music; films; radio; agricultural fairs and rodeos; hanging around bars, pool-rooms, and cafés.

The volume is filled with interesting facts. Most of them reveal or suggest the growth in popularity of different activities. A few details can be mentioned here. In 1921, about 23% of farm families in Alberta owned a motor vehicle; in 1931, about 42%; in 1947, just over 90% (p. 17). In 1921 there were 118 licensed movie houses in Alberta; in 1930 there were 85; in 1940 there were 140 (pp. 252-53). Albertans owned about 2,800 radios in 1923-24, about 21,500 in 1929-30, about 81,200 in 1939 (pp. 281-82).

These facts and others are marshalled in such a way as to document the authors' main point. This is that from 1896 to 1945 Albertans frequently engaged in leisure activities, but they fully embraced only those which "refreshed" (p. 8) people so that they could work more effectively, and which fostered or reinforced the "virtues of industriousness, diligence, orderliness,...and Britishness" (p. 375). Leisure activities were supposed to be

enjoyable, yes, but they were also supposed to be useful.

The book is marred by three major shortcomings. The first is that the dates at which the story begins and ends are not well defended. The "philosophy" of leisure that prevailed between 1896 and 1945 was really brought to Alberta by British Protestants in the 1870s and 1880s, and when the authors say that "Protestant English-speaking settlers had established...their culture as the dominant one" by the "mid-1880s" (p. xvii) they nearly acknowledge that they should have begun their survey at least a decade before 1896. The terminal date, 1945, is justified more convincingly. The authors correctly point out that after World War Two a new Alberta emerged, one which compared to the old featured greater economic prosperity, more ethnic tolerance, larger urban centres, and greater receptivity to government expenditures on cultural and leisure activities. However, changes in attitude toward leisure after 1945 are only briefly identified and they are not explained. The authors argue that leisure behaviour between 1896 and 1945 was determined in a large part by a particular philosophy, so if behaviour changed after 1945 a new attitude must have appeared. The authors should reveal more about this new attitude.

The second shortcoming is that information on minority ethnic and religious groups is drawn from only a few basic sources, mainly the essays in the Palmers' *Peoples of Alberta*. One sympathizes with the authors here, because to carry out a thorough examination of leisure activities among

minority groups would require linguistic skills that few scholars possess. But near the beginning of the book in a confusing paragraph the authors seem to say that ethnicity was the "most important" factor in determining the "framework for leisure" in Alberta (p. 3). Some readers will not agree with this statement. Those who do agree with it will be disappointed with the brief discussions that follow of leisure among the Japanese, the Native peoples, and other groups, and with the failure even to mention Mormons or Mennonites.

The third major problem with the book is that it does not clearly suggest the ways in which Albertans' behaviour and attitudes were typical or unique. There should be more glances at what was happening in Saskatchewan, British Columbia, Montana, Eastern Canada, the United Kingdom. Evidently the lack of comparative information stems from the authors' unfamiliarity with important secondary sources on different leisure activities, an unfamiliarity that contrasts sharply with their thorough awareness of sources dealing specifically with Alberta. Their discussion of sportsmanship or etiquette among hunters, for example (pp. 165-80), would have benefited from the use of insights found in recent work by John M. MacKenzie, and their discussion of film censorship in the 1930s (pp. 265-66) would have been more complete and more accurate had they consulted *Banned Films* or other publications which suggest that in the mid-1930s Hollywood movies became "cleaner" than they had been earlier in the decade.

Despite these flaws, *Useful Pleasures* is a book well worth reading. It incorporates a convincing description of general attitudes and values in early twentieth-century Alberta, and one suspects that the same attitudes and values prevailed across Western Canada. These facts should mean that historians of education will find the book valuable even though developments in public schools are mentioned only briefly, and even though most of the information on educational institutions concerns the University of Alberta's Extension Department.

The publishers of this book deserve credit for an unusually attractive production. There are more than 100 illustrations, each one placed either in or very near the part of the text to which it relates. The painting reproduced on the cover is delightful.

Morris Mott
Brandon University

Jo Burr Margadant. *Madame le Professeur: Women Educators in the Third Republic*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Jo Burr Margadant's *Madame le Professeur: Women Educators in the Third Republic* is a history of the careers of 213 pioneering professional women, the first decade of graduates

of the *École des Sèvres*, who became women *professeurs* in the newly established public secondary schools for girls in France. Although lay women had been teaching in public elementary schools since the Revolution, girls' secondary education had remained the preserve of the Church until the Camille Sée Law of 1880 provided for the founding of girls' secondary schools; the following year the Third Republic established the *École des Sèvres*, a normal school for women. The Republic's institution of secondary schooling for girls owed more to a desire to reduce the influence of the church in education (it came at the same time as anti-clerical legislation restricting the operation of religious orders in primary schools and in boys' secondary schools) than to a commitment to the instruction of girls. Its choice of a separate track for girls rather than merely opening boys' high schools to girls reflected a long tradition of separate schooling for the sexes in France, although there were co-educational elementary schools in small villages, and the predilections of the middle-class clientele. Thus, separate but "equal" secondary schooling (*l'égalité dans la différence*) was born. Ms. Margadant's book goes beyond a prosopography of the *sévriennes* to present insights about the place of women in France, professionalization, and schooling. Because she follows the course of these careers over forty years, we can discern changes in French society from the *belle époque* to the post-war environment.

Ms. Margadant writes primarily from the perspective of women's history. While she concedes that dis-

crimination and subordination formed an integral part of the experience of these women, she rejects as "inadequate and misleading" "feminist polemics [that] assume that women were hapless victims of conditions imposed on them by men within a patriarchal social order." Rather, she allies herself with the historiographical school that maintains that "women in the past had considerable influence over their own destinies, albeit in ways that society circumscribed" (p. 5). In this study, Margadant analyses interactions between the private sphere of family and the public sphere of community and work for these career women. Most histories of nineteenth-century French women from both the working class and the bourgeoisie have determined that family obligations took precedence over occupations and public activity. Margadant sensitively shows how female teachers pursued professional careers while balancing familial concerns.

An insufficient grounding in the historiography of French education leads to a few unfortunate statements within a fine book. The Falloux Law did not "restrict girls' education to an elementary level" (p. 21). It promoted girls' education at the elementary level and left girls' secondary schooling to the Church, which expanded their schools. Only historians who uncritically accept contemporary anti-clerical claims that nuns' teaching was useless reach this interpretation. That claim was made in order to bar nuns from schools at a time when middle-class families believed that nuns provided a safer environment for their daughters. That separate secondary

schooling for boys and girls remained the norm in France until the last two decades indicates that the traditions of the nuns were hard to break. Similarly, the Church did not in 1878 have a "virtual monopoly over primary schooling for girls and the training of women elementary teachers" (p. 21). By then half of the girls in France were taught by lay people (some by men in the co-educational *écoles mixtes*), the majority of the normal schools were lay, and many received their *brevets* (a teacher certificate) through *cours normaux* rather than in teachers' colleges. The author, like republican historians generally, who are the ones she cites, exaggerates the suddenness of the shift from the Church to the State in education and the uniqueness of the girls' secondary schools of the 1880s. The uniqueness was that they were public, not that they existed, or were lay, or had distinctive methods. Margadant's greater contribution lies in her tale of the *sévriennes*.

About two-thirds of the entrants to the earliest class at Sévres were teachers from the elementary level. It took great courage for these women to leave secure jobs and their parents, with whom most lived, for this adventure which necessitated residing in Paris for a year and then transferring to a distant town elsewhere in France. Half had been born on a farm, although half of those eventually taught in a small town. Sévres required geographical mobility and allowed for social mobility. Almost all of the students were of middle-class origins but not the upper middle class. Most of their fathers were salaried employees who could not guarantee a "good mar-

riage"—the aim of the high bourgeoisie. As other studies of French education have shown, the demarcation line in schooling was between the *petite bourgeoisie* and the lower classes, not within the wide middle class. The few from the working classes outperformed their social betters in the *agrégation* examination but were rated below average in their teaching. Margadant points out that this fits the Bourdieu/Passeron model of cultural inheritance. She correctly avoids their vague reference to "class bias," attributing the rankings to the verbal agility and social graces of urban, upper middle-class women. Fathers could influence the placement of their daughters only in the rare instances when they were part of the educational bureaucracy. If at first the government had to scramble in order to find matriculants, this career opportunity quickly proved attractive to women. By 1890 two hundred were competing for a mere eighteen places at Sévres, the only professional school for women in France.

Social graces were important, for schools were expected to be bastions of middle-class respectability as well as to instruct. Margadant imaginatively uses schools' advertisements to show that physical setting and moral education was stressed more than instruction. This dual purpose put great pressure on teachers. On the one hand, they were expected to be deferential to their superiors and the epitome of respectability in public while maintaining professional standards and authority in the classroom. They had replaced nuns and were expected to foster some of that ascetic tradition.

Teachers were admonished to lower the hems of skirts and to raise necklines. Friendships with men were discouraged unless there was a promise of marriage. Preoccupation with sexuality actually increased after Catholic schools were closed by law and their upper middle-class clientele was forced into the public sector. The greatest sin that a teacher could commit, however, was insubordination, which would bring transfer or, more rarely, dismissal.

Amidst such pressures, these teachers were able to preserve some autonomy in both public and private life. Nearly half married, at a median age of 28, and two-thirds of those continued their career. Unsurprisingly, half married a male *professeur* and nearly all of those continued teaching. What is surprising is that half of those who married outside their profession persisted in their career. They maintained contacts with their parents and siblings and, when possible, chose posts near them, at the same time advancing their careers and forming alumnae organizations and teachers' associations. Because these associations were not permitted to join with male organizations and women could not advance into the inspectorate, a feminine consciousness surrounded their organizations. This consciousness helped preserve separate rather than androgynous schooling in France, for neither male nor female teachers wanted to sacrifice their independent spheres. Margadant concludes that a separate but equal women's profession evolved after the war, which is a rather optimistic conclusion. Women *professeurs* did achieve greater inde-

pendence and equality and the schools achieved curricular parity with boys' schools, but they remained excluded from the higher administration, their professional organizations were unrecognized by the State, and only a small minority of their students entered other professions. A majority of teachers suffered "serious" health problems by mid-career, many of the afflictions stress-related. The picture of the aging *sévrienne* is a rather sad one, brought up to espouse a maternal role, in later life facing new curricula without supplemental training, ambitious young teachers, and a post-war generation of rebellious teenagers. Upon retirement, many moved back to their place of origin as their role in the community had depended on their teaching post.

If the author's focus is on teachers, she also presents a discerning look into the schools themselves, which have been little studied. Although the regimen was strict, they did not have the military discipline of boy's *internats* nor the asceticism of the convent. They appear as happy places with a familial atmosphere. With the demise of Catholic schools, they were forced to introduce religion to appease the middle class and, with the war, attention shifted from home to community and state. That this public focus remained after the war indicates changing social values, which needed the catalyst of the war to imbue the schools. As in society, individualism and ambition gradually overcame the original familial values that described the early schools.

This book is an important study of "real people confronting opportunities

and dilemmas of their times" (p. 322). Women's education is emphasized in the context of social duties rather than individual rights. The idea of gender differences remained in France, but the parameters of bourgeois femininity came to include professional as well as married bourgeois women. The *sévriennes* were harbingers of change whose influence outweighed their numbers because of their focal position and their influence on the young.

Patrick J. Harrigan
University of Waterloo

Anne M. Boylan. *Sunday School: The Formation of an American Institution, 1790-1880*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988. Pp. xii, 225. \$30.00 U.S. cloth, \$10.95 paper.

In enlarging the range of a discipline that was once largely restricted to politics, diplomacy, and war, historians have turned on the one hand to the measurement of economic trends, on the other to the examination of cultural pursuits such as education, the arts, and even religious revival. They have been slow to discover the Sunday school, although a great many of them must have had prolonged exposure to it. This book, by Anne M. Boylan of the University of Delaware, goes a long way toward repairing past neglect. The author disclaims any intention of writing "a history of the

Sunday school" (p. 4), seeking only to establish its place among the influential American institutions of the nineteenth century, but she comes closer than any of her predecessors to providing a thorough, analytical history of this particular institution.

The nineteenth-century Sunday school was essentially a creation of evangelical Protestantism, and the basic story Boylan tells is of two major transitions in its nature. During its first incarnation, which in the United States was short-lived and marked by meagre success, its chief purpose was to make literacy available to children with little other access to it. A large proportion of those enrolled were working children, blacks, and girls. The emergence of a very different type was virtually complete with the formation in 1824 of the undenominational American Sunday School Union, which would dominate the field until after the Civil War. The Sunday school now came to be regarded as essentially a means of evangelical outreach, leaving secular education to the concurrently emerging public school. The union, urban-based and dominated by prominent Episcopalians and Presbyterians, paid agents to establish new schools throughout the country and maintained control over these schools as closely as it could. It saw children as infected by the depravity of original sin and therefore needing to be softened up by discipline, a quiet atmosphere, and a great deal of memory work for the conversion experience that would eventually set them on the right path. Regarding evangelical religion as a cure-all for the ills of society, the officers of the union were

The enterprise that took shape at OISE attracted defensive condemnations—on self-proclaimed grounds of nationalism (importation of inappropriate American ideas and methods); humanism (opposition to quantification and other social scientific elements); ideology (opposition to what was perceived as excessive emphasis on social control, social class, inequality, even ordinary persons in the past—this was “history from the bottom up,” of the “inarticulate,” the “anonymous”); and sometimes on grounds of mode of expression and elements of style. These charges obscure far more than they facilitate understanding. Little was especially American; English and French influences combined, as the principal sources of influence were multi- or cross-national as well as cross- or inter-disciplinary.¹⁰ That lines blurred between influences and between, say, histories of society and those of education, was no accident; among many instances of heuristic blurring, that marked the field. The delineations of English social historians Gillian Sutherland and Lawrence Stone of “new” histories of education were more often cited than the essay in *Daedalus* by an American historian of France, John Talbott, and almost as often as the softer dictas of Bailyn and Lawrence Cremin.¹¹

By the end of the 1960s, a new readership for Bailyn’s 1960 *Education in the Forming of American Society*, from multiple stimuli, far exceeded the audience at first publication. Bailyn’s book was a symbol; for good reason, it was far more often cited than followed. In the milieu of the early 1970s, we read and discussed the work of the Simons—Joan and Brian—and Stone at least as often as that of Cremin, Bailyn, or other U.S. historians. Much new work came to us in draft. With my developing interest in literacy, I closely followed research in France, Sweden, and England, and the U.S. Katz’s *The Irony of Early School Reform*, appearing in 1968, had a dramatic impact on us (and others elsewhere, too). For those in Toronto, there was also his personal impact.

By 1970 too, the rejuvenated *History of Education Quarterly*, newly under the editorial direction of Paul Mattingly, became for a decade the journal of record for the field in North America and a major site for revisionist scholarship and its best criticism. The *HEQ* sought greater representation from outside American borders, including Canada. Its 1972 special Canadian issue, reprinted in book form, publicized internationally the “new” Canadian history of education, not all of it revisionist, regardless of the definitions employed. That issue, we know, became an icon—for better and for worse—over which rhetorical, and other, battles were fought. Too close an identification of it with either an “OISE era” or revisionism is inaccurate.¹² Journals from England and Australia/New Zealand developed later, but also sought Canadian contributions.

What became clear to reviewers writing fifteen years later was just taking form in 1970. Retrospectively, we see the roots of what Gaffield summarized in 1986:

Research on education has been a central part of the new historiography of the past two decades....In Canada research on education has reflected

the general historiographical developments as modified by the particular features of the Canadian context....A great deal of the most exciting research on education has been inspired by basically non-educational questions. Many scholars since 1970 have studied the history of education primarily for what it can reveal about subjects such as family, class, ethnicity, and gender. In Ontario, scholars of social structure, of family and social class, were primarily responsible for the energy and excitement of the early to mid-1970s....The history of education has become in some ways a field of social history which is both more than and less than other fields such as the history of the family. Educational history attracts researchers from a wide variety of social history fields who examine schooling as a dimension of those other fields.¹³

This concise statement does not address the institutional and intellectual locations of the beginnings by 1970, in Toronto, and elsewhere. How the “new” history of education came to be conceptualized, taught, disseminated, and popularized comprises one set of typically missing links. Ironically, as historians our sense of outcomes is clearer than that of historical process!

Entering the field as it transformed itself, I did not experience the “prehistory” that Sheehan, for example, in contrast to what she retrospectively identifies as the positive qualities of revisionist histories, frames so negatively: narrow, unexciting, uncritical, uncontroversial, with children, women, rank and file teachers absent. (Entering the field from history, rather than education, may have made other important differences. I did not suffer from a legacy of scholarly inferiority that others did.) Donald Wilson, a critic of revisionists, follows Laurence Veysey’s writing about the U.S. in deeming the great transformation of the field no less than “true liberation,” emanating from “the influence of the ‘new’ social history and its concern with theory and method.”¹⁴ No writing about the period captures well the inchoate and emergent qualities of Canadian educational—and social—history on the point of change.

What is noteworthy for Canada c. 1970, in comparison with the U.S., is the strong presence of scholars, including graduate students, from elsewhere who relocated to Canada and who newly researched and wrote Canadian history. Along with younger Canadian scholars, such persons, especially those from schools and departments of education compared to those from history departments (excluding cross-appointments), evinced stronger interest and participation in the new history. Young and migrant, they were less bounded by traditions of scholarship and more open to new influences. They were more affected by the contradictory, powerful forces of the 1960s. Marginality felt by some in

education schools likely cut both ways. For those in the “new” history of education, no such feelings, or structural relations, seemed to obstruct.

As a problem in the history of our profession—and the sociology of knowledge more broadly—these issues merit serious attention, which might then replace ageing, myth-making, but erroneous charges of “Americanizing” and “radicalizing” Canadian history. The latter do not speak well for the profession. Ironic are those criticisms that condemned new or revisionist history while simultaneously declaring that Canadian history itself was boring, lacking in great events and persons! Such proclamations, so sorry in their own right, failed to grasp the “new” histories’ promise for inclusion of “ordinary” persons. That hints at the “dark side” of what otherwise may be viewed as an open and often receptive context.

Such distorted views do considerable disservice to the original players and to those who followed. They distract attention from more important and subtle intellectual developments. Without clear sense of context, the threads of Donald Wilson’s account, for example, are unconnected. To Wilson, in addition to Katz’s “brilliant leadership,” primary factors include the “new” social history (with its “systematic use of concepts and the application of intellectual constructs”); influence of “Marxism and the New Left”; “feeling of being *engagé* with the bitter social protests of the mid and late-1960s”; and a “conviction that history could serve reform ‘by emancipating it from dependency upon an idealized past’ [that] led [revisionists] to conclude that schools as institutions grew over the years ‘more and more exploitative, more and more repressive, more and more an impediment to change’.” This he terms “radical” as opposed to “moderate” revisionism.

On the one hand, this view reduces the “new” revisionism to little more than an emphasis on social control, class, race, and bureaucracy. On the other hand, Wilson finds only “a sense of the inevitability of decay and a worsening of conditions over time,” as opposed to “traditional” history’s “sense of progress.” To Wilson, this represented a great danger: “past ideas and actions may be combined with the moral and social prejudices of the historian to produce a work that distorts the past in an attempt to castigate the past and to lecture the present”.¹⁵ Moreover, for Wilson, Katz’s charismatic leadership held sway over impressionable graduate students and others. “Canadian graduate students, especially those working under Katz at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, were not unaffected by the excitement of ideological commitment and an accompanying sense that history had its part to play in the current debate on public policy and in particular educational policy.” The consequences of such commitment, in Wilson’s view, were not those apparently sought. Nor were they positive ones for the profession:

Camps began to form and name-calling ensued....Although the controversy over revisionism never became as deeply politicized as in the United States, there was certainly an awareness of ideological differen-

ces among the various writers as well as differences in research strategy....In the process [of writing revisionist histories of education] the persistent language and religious issues, so fundamental to Canadian educational history, were almost completely overlooked. [Revisionists'] bitterness about past injustices combined with their pessimism about the likelihood of effecting any real changes in the school system led the radical revisionists to quite different conclusions from the moderate revisionists.

Not surprisingly, such further difference did not help matters: "This element had the decided effect of heating up the debate, and a period of vital critical self-analysis within the sub-field was launched."¹⁶

When and where that period of "vital critical self-analysis" took place, or what its products and its consequences were, I do not know. I no better recognize it than I can locate myself and my peers as participants in the revision of the history of education as told by Wilson. Little more can I find in print and accessible to students the conduct of the "debates." One lesson, an enormously important one, I think, is that for all the heat and deep, sometimes bitter divides over the terms and terrain of the history of education and its historiography, and over the politics of scholarship, remarkably little light was shed. Few real debates took place. Indeed, part of my moral is that self-analysis, whether individual or collective, though definitely needed, never generally took place across the field. Its absence is one reason for our blurred, indistinct vision of our own formative past, our relative drift of recent years, and our lack of an agenda for the 1990s and toward 2000.

Revisionists, whether radical or moderate, were never so homogeneous as cast. Divisions and distinctions—approach, method, interpretation, ideology—as the reviews and conference papers of those years indicate, score each so-called "camp."¹⁷ Nor were "radical" revisionists ever so influential or numerous as to be held responsible for the negative impacts on schools, policies, or historiography sometimes attributed to them. Their threat, perceived or otherwise, lay elsewhere.

On either side of the border, more is lost by gross "splitting and lumping" (though long among historians' trusty tools), false homogenization, and educational apologetics. As my example—and I am not alone—shows, Katz's OISE and Toronto students were not solely Canadians; Australian, British, New Zealand, Caribbean, and American students studied beside the Canadian-born in a rich international mix which constituted something of an independent variable in creating the "OISE era." Among such a group, the newly developing revisionist history of education plied its attractions complexly and differentially. No single strand of ideology, political commitment, historical method, or social theory united us, nor were we as one concerning social-class analysis, social-control arguments, quantification or theoretical inclination, or in our own admixtures of pessimism or optimism. It is increasingly my belief that the imposition of such

categories fundamentally defeats the effort to grasp the phenomenon. With tremendous irony in retrospect, the common terms of discussion, and condemnation, may be little more than the importation of American commentaries and their imposition on the Canadian scene!

Towards 2000, with hopes for the history of education and its agendas, I begin an outline "toward a (re)new(ed) past." My conviction, perhaps unlike others today, *reemphasizes* the power of the past. Whereas I do believe in alternative pasts and indeterminate historiographies, I also regard getting the history "right" as an inescapable need. As I construct this schematic, I struggle to mediate what my "mind's eye" captures moving between the first half of the 1970s and 1990.

Avoiding over-abstractation, I emphasize the intersections of three domains as especially important: 1) the intellectual and ideological context of the moment—considered above; 2) the place—with narrowing focus, Toronto, the University of Toronto, OISE, the Department of History and Philosophy (DHPE); 3) the players—faculty, students, and staff in residence, those who passed through, and some whose impact came at a distance. Among the many critical forms and relationships that these interactions took were formal seminars and reading courses; thesis supervision; the Hamilton Project, later called the Canadian Social History Project, with its seminar, research, visitors, and publications; myriad kinds of less formal student and student-faculty interaction, not the least of which were those around a table-tennis table!

Open to us beyond the high walls of OISE were the city, and the University of Toronto and its facilities. There was the library, and on a more selective basis, there were also the Toronto historians, some of whom were very receptive to and supportive of history of education students. Some were not. Also largely beyond OISE's walls were the means of financial support, typically the Canada Council (as it was then known) and CMHC Urban Affairs Fellowships. OISE's legendary financial munificence is largely legend. (The building's comforts, however, were not.)

So hard to convey at this remove is the essential human context in which this took place: a truly exceptional atmosphere of humanity, creativity, camaraderie, collaboration, criticism, and collegial support. Communalism (for lack of a better term) bound students in particular, but also faculty and staff. Like the nineteenth-century cities some (but not all) of us studied, it withstood—or perhaps depended upon—the comings and goings of students. Its connections crossed differences of personality, nationality, age, sex, educational and other background, and goals, scholarly and other. Bridges between history and philosophy and some of their subfields, between school people and others, sometimes linked us. Our numbers were small, on either side of the desk. That contributed to intensive "small group dynamics" among students, faculty, and research and support staff, and among

students themselves. I make no effort to recapture the rich personalities. Classrooms had only a small part in the reciprocal learning that linked us. I believe the extent, depth, and dynamism of these relations was distinctive to the time and place. The intersection of the intellectual and political elements of the historical moment with the self-selectivity of the heterogeneous cast studying educational history at OISE made for that difference.

Equally intense were the strivings to question and learn, and the deeply shared sense of the significance, the relevance, and currency of our enterprise. We believed that learning and research, and their communication, mattered. We believed that the history of education was a central field for a vast arena of historical—and contemporary—questions, not a sideshow. That was a sign of the times, hardly revisionist alone, and of the OISE era. To label it as political or ideological only partly conveys its force. I have not since encountered the intellectual or personal equivalent of this conjunction of people and animating factors. Given the many elements that under-girded its delicate balance and defined its context, it was as singular as it was temporally limited. Along with the subjects we studied, it was the outcome of a set of specific historical transformations that usually and inadequately are deemed “the Sixties.”

“Unique” is a much abused word that I use very sparingly. I have no better way to encapsulate the human environment that developed around the Department of History and Philosophy in the early 1970s. First, there is OISE itself. Opening in 1965, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education stood as tribute to late-blooming Progressivism in Ontario and a deep faith in educational experts’ abilities to transform learning and its concomitants. Perhaps only in the Ontario of the 1960s could such a public institution, chartered both as an autonomous research institute and as the University of Toronto’s Graduate Department of Educational Theory, be erected. Internationally, it stood among countless products of that great age of higher educational expansion.

Vis-à-vis the university establishment, at least in Ontario, OISE stuck out. Often criticized, not always fairly, it appeared to stand in “opposition” to the University of Toronto. The usual academic jealousies and competitions in their usual petty forms grew more exaggerated in confronting the new prominence of “education” as discipline and institution. OISE’s spanking new, stylish highrise provided a symbolic—and all too concrete—lightning rod for professors and administrators who felt that each dollar for the Institute somehow meant one less for their programmes. A superficial fear of disciplinary duplication added fuel to the fires. OISE, of course, with its own departmental structure, *looked* like more than one university department. Awkwardly, it stood between the potential of interdisciplinary innovations and great fragmentation. With opposition from entrenched school interests and sometimes from government bureaucracy and legislature, OISE on occasion was quite embattled. From these and other sources, OISE took on certain aspects of an “oppositional culture,” among its many conflicts and contradictions.

Within OISE, second, is the Department of History and Philosophy, another hybrid form. Student service on the department's governing assembly (along with staff) and on many committees, parts of the "OISE era," provided shared experiences and stood as one of several bases of a "community." OISE's stated mission, of course, was practical and applied. To this charge, DHPE fit uncomfortably, unevenly at best. Within OISE, it took on elements of an "oppositional culture." Unlike other disciplines like sociology accorded their own departmental status, history and philosophy, of the traditional "foundations" fields, remained joined at the hip, although students typically concentrated on one side or the other. Nevertheless, the presence of both enriched the environment. Students so influenced deepened interests, and exercises, in the epistemological and theoretical dimensions of historical research design, explanation, criticism, and interpretation: another characteristic of the era. In this case, as others, seeds planted originally continue to flower in revisions of revisionism, in Canada, Australia, the U.S.

The history faculty, small in number, offered expertise and instruction across a wide canvas, geographically and topically. Course work and supervision encompassed not only the U.S. and Canada, the British Isles and the European continent, but also Africa, the Caribbean, Australia, and on occasion Russia-Soviet Union, China, and special subjects. Most students acquired substantial historical background and comparative perspective. This allowed me, for example, to continue the interest in British and European studies that prompted my graduate work while I began to study anew the U.S. and Canada.¹⁸ Such a programme was simply ill-conceived, virtually impossible, without ready access to University of Toronto courses and professors. All DHPE students did substantial work in relevant Toronto departments and included those professors on thesis committees. Combined with the cross-national stimuli and examples of the "new" histories, this kind of breadth, disciplinary and interdisciplinary, empirical and theoretical, marked the revisionist histories of the OISE era.

DHPE faculty regularly offered formal seminars in subjects of their specialization or current research interests, as well as in areas more typical to the history of education. Across the department, representing histories "new" as well as older, this included working-class history, immigration history, political and economic development, women's history, and for Katz's students of the early 1970s, what was then termed "the historical analysis of social structure," in which schooling and literacy were ingredients. These seminars were not only central intellectual events in our programmes, but proved to be formative early encounters with social history topics, questions, theories, and methods. Required papers employed quantitative data, usually drawn from the expanding banks of the Hamilton Project and primitively analysed by sorting IBM punched cards. The roots of dissertations on literacy and school attendance, to take two examples, and of greater technical and theoretical sophistication haltingly lay here.

As I peruse, for the first time in many years, the syllabus for this seminar and that in "Education and Social Change: the American Experience," I am struck

by several qualities. Not least of them is the breadth *and* depth of our twelve-to-thirteen-week seminar journeys. I recall the simultaneous sensations of intellectual excitement and new discoveries, from readings, class discussion, and research papers; the burden of the sheer quantity—and the quality—of work demanded of us in those “ancient days”; and the graduate student anxieties. In the social structure seminars, we read from the histories of England, Ireland, France, the U.S., and Canada; from the disciplines of sociology, geography, anthropology, demography, education, economics, and history. Weekly topics ranged from social class in theory and history to social ecology, workers, families, sexuality, schooling, life cycles, and violence. In the educational history seminar, where documents public and private joined *The Hoosier Schoolmaster*, no special provenance privileged revisionists, who were just beginning to be categorized as a group. These courses, a virtual core, functioned as two parts of a larger whole, with unmistakable implications for historical practice. Taking these seminars also bound students to one another.

In either class, we wrote weekly briefs, reported orally, and conducted primary research for seminar papers. We read the newest work—sometimes still in draft form—as well as the classics. In departmental and social history project meetings, occasionally at seminars at Toronto or York, we met a number of the authors. We were pushed to question and conceptualize widely and innovatively, while mastering defined fields and learning to criticize fairly. We engaged in this rigorous process collectively as members of an “educational cohort” defined by historical moment and common location—intellectually and physically, a privileged cohort, we later realized. We were taught well, criticized sharply and directly, and encouraged humanely. The peer group mediated professorial or institutional excesses or failings. At least as important, we advanced with a clear sense that we were part of a larger number across the continent and the oceans, a loose grouping not yet labelled, who collectively remade the history of education and important areas of social and cultural history. That was central to the era and the OISE experience.

For Katz and his students, the study of social structure, principally—but not exclusively—urban social structure, in course work but far more intensively in the form of the Hamilton and then Canadian Social History Project, was central. A leading development of the new histories, the “project” was home to a core group of students, staff, and faculty, from funded graduate research assistantships to regular informal seminars at which Katz, one of us or a regular from Toronto or York, or one of the many visitors might present work in progress or air research problems. Drafts of *The People of Hamilton* and *Education and Social Change* received critical, sometimes fierce response, as did our dissertation work and much more, in what was one of the best continuing seminars any of us encountered. Along with project-related publications, courses, and pioneering work with high school students in social and demographic history, incessant interchange with fellow toilers, some of them quite eminent, was incalculably stimulating, shaping, and nurturing. Reflecting the then-innovative conception

of a "new" educational history within a "new" social history, and the resulting conceptual and methodological imperatives, the project experience reinforced other key elements.

Whereas the impetus unabashedly fell on new, socially critical approaches in historical research, it was never faddish, uncritical, or forced on students. An impressive, likely necessary, range of opinion met all notions or formulations; in seminars in particular, dissent often appeared. Squarely in terms of its own charge to advance always from stated assumptions, tutelage in the emerging revisionist history of education equally was direct and unbiased. Historical research was problem-oriented, question-driven. Interpretation and ideology were explicit, necessary objects for analysis. Engaged interpretation, seeking to etch the lines of historical development that connected past with present—for the better understanding of both—was the goal, the impetus for raising new questions and seeking new modes of answering them. Long before the recent rage of critical theory, which poses challenges for history as usually practised, the "new" or "revisionist" history of education was critical in conception and execution, in origin and in consequence. "New" historians viewed historical and historiographic work critically, cast critical eyes on the lines found to join past and present, and deemed historical interpretation one neglected but extraordinarily important form of social criticism. That emphasis at once underlay some of our oversimplifications and excesses perhaps (social control, for example), but also the new emphasis on theory, method, explanation, and interpretation that had such momentous consequences for our craft.¹⁹ It also underlay our conceptions of our task as scholars, teachers, members of communities, citizens—as intellectuals. Is it surprising that it sometimes led to overenthusiasms and excesses? Could it have been otherwise? More seriously, can "progress" within intellectual communities and paradigms otherwise develop?

What came universally to be termed "revisionism," sometimes "radical revisionism," within the "new history of education," was in the first years of the 1970s very much in formation, still plastic, not set in stone by its adherents' practice (or some of its practitioners' pronouncements) or its critics' (mis)constructions.²⁰ Its formativeness and dynamism, its sense of possibility and openness, its sense of necessity within contemporary historical circumstances, its experiments with historical approach, its collective quests for *large* answers to what seemed to be *the* questions of an age characterize what might be fairly deemed an "OISE era" perhaps as well as any other elements.

Of course, there never was an "OISE era" in any exclusive or autonomous sense. Nor did OISE monopolize developments. No more did innovation cease with the "end" of this "era." Those engaged together stood only as one part, albeit an exceptional one, of a larger, transcontinental and trans-Atlantic enterprise. At the key juncture, that moment, however, was inclusive. On the one hand, in an historiographic effort open to all serious contributions, the very sense of progress toward new research and interpretation was itself energizing and compelling. On the other hand, the emerging conceptualization of "new" social

histories and educational histories mutually transformed both fields. That is one absolutely critical lesson of the OISE experience. Among the larger intellectual strides were those derived from the direct study of societies in which education, broadly defined, represented one of the many important elements examined, rather than the study of education by itself or only implicitly or loosely set in historical context. In that respect, DHPE's relatively small number of courses along with its size, location, cast of characters, and research projects that located "education" differently—"decentred" and reconfigured traditional educational research—together speak clearly and articulately. Such was the "OISE era," short-lived and perhaps a necessary historical fiction but no less significant for that.

To conclude, I look "towards 2000." Very briefly I raise questions about the direction and vitality of the history of education from approximately the mid to late-1970s to the present, and about its future agenda. In both cases, I am especially interested in the fate of the "new" or revisionist histories, and their legacies and meanings for today and tomorrow. I shall sweep speculatively and widely, not only for reasons of space, seeking to be contentious.

In his 1982 assessment of American educational history, Veysey offered a mixed review of the revisionist and immediate post-revisionist eras. On one hand, "The study of the history of education has not achieved the degree of coherence or of burgeoning support (beyond the initial impetus) to allow it to generate its own clearcut intellectual focus." This included a lack of comparative research, despite its promise, as well as writing on areas other than the history of public school systems. On the other hand, Veysey admitted, "Only in this area is there the richness of accumulated scholarship that leads to significant schools of thought and the excitement of sustained debates."²¹ Writing in 1986 about Canadian scholarship, Gaffield concurred. "The talk is now of synthesis, of integration, of coherence. In the 1970s, the development of new fields of social history represented an expanding historical consciousness....The 1980s has become a decade of nostalgia, of longing for a time when writing about the past seemed a lot simpler and the results more fun to read." He proposed to "focus on the history of education *as education* and to analyze the changing ways in which this aspect of the historical process has interacted with related elements of social change." This he deemed going "back to school."²² Not unrelatedly, a year later, Ian Davey wrote,

One of the more interesting aspects of the writing of the history of education in the past decade has been the retreat from grand theory. In contrast to the decade before, we historians of education have become much more circumspect about our generalizations. In part, this reflects our uneasiness about sociological theories of causation and our penchant

for the particular and the narrative form. In part, it reflects our increasing theoretical sophistication and disenchantment with the explanatory power of the various social theories employed to explain educational change. This disenchantment is especially apparent in recent discussions about the origins of nineteenth-century school systems....A decade later, we are much less sanguine about the efficacy of theories of social control and class domination....If we attempt to generalize at all our theories are more tentative and our explanations are more pluralist.

Davey was wary. Although "current modesty more accurately reflects our state of knowledge," he also feared "that we will retreat too far," in the face of the interpretive problems that persist.²³ Davey proposed more sophisticated approaches to the intersecting histories of capitalism, state-formation, and patriarchal—gender and generational—relations as a new heuristic. He also agreed with Michael Katz that no serious or persuasive challenge to revisionist interpretation has appeared from its critics.²⁴

Furthering these assessments, I conclude in 1990 that the history of education thus far has failed to achieve the promise of the "new" or revisionist histories (plural). Failure to assimilate its own critical tradition, recent history, and their legacies explains much of this circumstance, regardless of the attribution of responsibility, whether to revisionists or their critics, fragmentation, or lack of coherence, etc. To be sure, I do not claim that important new work has stopped—it has not—and that no progress is made empirically or interpretively. The histories of women, working and middle classes, literacy, children and youth, families, among others contradict such a claim. Rather, I point specifically to the past decade's decided diminution of intellectual energies and attractions, whether expended in seeking new research areas, developing new methodologies, making new connections, asserting new interpretations, gaining new practitioners. The programmes of conferences, pages of the major journals, books published, and faces among our crowd—notably the lack of new adherents—all testify to a period of declension.²⁵ The excitement, the spirit of engagement in a collective and important enterprise, are decidedly diminished. The lack of a shared problematic or agenda, reduction in innovative approaches or methods, decline in quality of published work, rise in overly descriptive and even naive studies—sometimes justified by false claims of "return to narrative" or search for that elusive "synthesis"—stand among many signs. Major debates are rare and rarely instructive. Creative, richly constructive criticism, which once propelled vigorous new research and thinking, has also declined. An institutionalized critical tradition failed to develop. To take another tune from the "ancient" days, "the thrill is gone." This is one legacy of the negative response to the "new" histories.

"Towards 2000," the history of education demands new visions. Some recent work evidences new vitality, for example, that of Katznelson and Weir, Davey and Miller, Curtis, Hogan.²⁶ What I find especially striking about this

work is that it stands more or less directly as legacies of the new, revisionist histories of education of the 1960s and 1970s. Turning to new venues, responding to new influences, it also renews and may reinvigorate that critical tradition and advance it. It has the potential to reduce imputed fragmentation and build synthetically.²⁷

New approaches to gender, generation, family; ethnicity, race, class, culture; the state, politics, hierarchy, order, authority; ideology, discourse, rhetoric; institutions, teachers, learners; specific sites and relations of "schooling," in places non-urban as well as urban—in precisely specified temporal and material contexts—while not completely neglected in earlier new histories, offer unfulfilled or untapped possibilities, for a compelling *revised* agenda. In sophisticated formulations and intricate relationships, they join the rosters of capitalist development, systematization and bureaucratization of schools, class, race, and structural inequalities. Recognition and appreciation of complexities and multiplicities of factors does not reduce imperatives for interpretation and demands for explanation. For me, for example, emphasis on conflict, contradiction, continuity too, makes for a richer and still "useful" past for literacy, and now for growing up.

Equally importantly, as this new work also shows, historians of education have much to learn from major intellectual developments in other historical fields and elsewhere in the human and social sciences. Not since the early to mid-1970s has the history of education been a leading sector in historical or educational scholarship. In today's clouded atmosphere of crises of literacy and schooling, "back to basics" and "excellence in education," and their ever-narrowing, rigidifying, unequal consequences for the young around the world, the need for a renewed, engaged, but ever-wiser history of education is as acute as ever before. Dare we fail to seize the time?²⁸

NOTES

- * The reference of course is to Raymond Williams, *Towards 2000* (London: Verso, 1983). My appropriation is but one measure of my appreciation and gratitude to Williams and the scholarly tradition he fostered. The appropriation of the remainder of the title perhaps less obviously stems from Henry George and Stephan Thernstrom, also fittingly, I think. This is the text on which my Invited Plenary Address to the Biennial Conference of the Canadian History of Education Association, Ottawa, 12 October 1990, was based. I thank the CHEA, especially Chad Gaffield, for the honour of the invitation, and the Editorial Board of *Historical Studies in Education* for their editorial advice. I also thank Gaffield, Alison Prentice, Ian Davey, and Michael Katz for comments. All sins of commission and omission are of course my own. I do ask readers to judge the paper in specific reference to my assigned topic and approach to it.
1. Graduating from Northwestern University in 1970, I came to the University of Toronto to study modern British and comparative Western European and American history, on a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship. As an undergraduate I had concentrated on non-North American history and in sociology. I chose to pursue graduate work

in history and at Toronto for a variety of reasons, intellectual, personal, and political. I had not then heard of either Katz or OISE, and knew little about the history of education. As one who grew up in the 1960s, I was intensely interested in contemporary education and its travails. As a "child of the 1960s," I encountered revisionist history of education with an immediate sense of its importance and substantial correctness! I learned about and encountered directly both OISE and Katz that fall. That led to my shifting my scholarly base from the Toronto history department to OISE's department of history and philosophy of education, a strange hybrid of the times. In retrospect, the scholarly distance I was to travel was far less clear at that time than the geographic; the intellectual distance far exceeded the physical, and that first intuitive reaction. The U.S.-Canadian border was but one of the many I crossed.

2. Letter from Gaffield to Graff, 10 September 1989.
3. Review essays provide one revealing indicator here. The so-called Diane Ravitch "debate" in the U.S.—which unfortunately never led to the kind of debate that might have contributed positively to the field—spurred by her 1978 *The Revisionists Revised* (New York: Basic) and its earlier circulation by the National Academy of Education—stand as an especially notorious example of the politics of scholarship and of common efforts at their denial. See in general Michael B. Katz, "The Politics of Educational History," chap. 5 in his *Reconstructing American Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987). More generally, see Laurence Veysey, "The History of Education," *Reviews in American History* 10 (1982): 281-91. For Canadian comparisons, see J. Donald Wilson and David Charles Jones, "The 'New' History of Canadian Education," *History of Education Quarterly* 16 (1976): 367-76; Wilson, "Historiographical Perspectives on Canadian Educational History," *Journal of Educational Thought* 11 (1977): 49-63; Wilson, "Some Observations on Recent Trends in Canadian Educational History," in *An Imperfect Past: Education and Society in Canadian History*, ed. Wilson (Vancouver: CSCI, 1984), 7-29. For different tone and approaches, see Chad Gaffield, "Back to School: Towards a New Agenda for the History of Education," *Acadiensis* 15 (1986): 169-290; Ian Davey, "Rethinking the Origins of British Colonial School Systems," *Historical Studies in Education* 1 (1989): 149-59. An exceptionally revealing statement was made by Nancy M. Sheehan at the moment I began to draft this presentation; see her review of Houston and Prentice, "Schooling and Scholars," in *History of Education Quarterly* 30 (1990): 94-96.
4. My decade-and-one-half long involvement with the history of literacy began in my first seminar, on "Urban Social Structure: Modes of Historical Analysis," with Katz at OISE; that paper led to my M.A. thesis. My current project on the history of growing up has its origins in a course taken the next semester, Fall 1971, "Education and Social Change: The American Experience." Both course papers led to early articles, one hallmark of the training at OISE.
5. Sheehan, review, 94. Houston's and Prentice's book was published by the University of Toronto Press in 1988.
6. Sheehan, review, 94, 96.
7. In the sense of a bounded, if artificial chronology, any such "era" likely dated from c. 1968 to c. 1975. Having arrived in 1966 directly from graduate studies, Katz left OISE for York University in 1974; he left York for the University of Pennsylvania in 1978. My departure came in 1975; Ian Davey returned to Australia later that year. An "internationalization" took place. With Alison Prentice taking her post at OISE at about the same time, a new era was forming with feminist approaches to

educational and women's history at its centre. Since this was not strictly part of the "OISE era" I was instructed to discuss, I do not attempt to do it justice. Having asked Prentice to write her first paper on women teachers for a conference session I chaired in 1974 (as she kindly reminds me from time to time) and also having collaborated with her on "Children and Schools in Nineteenth-Century Canada" for the National Museum of Man's Canada's Visual Past series, I more or less straddled that transition. Ian Davey and Wendy Bryans also presented papers at that panel in Ottawa; Prentice's and Davey's were published in *Histoire sociale*. I accept Alison Prentice's and others' criticisms for my lack of explicit attention to this key area. As Davey's work underscores, working-class or labour history also claims recognition. Limits of space alas preclude additional discussion.

8. For an interesting recent view and responses, see "A Round Table: What Has Changed and Not Changed in American Historical Practice?" *Journal of American History* 76 (1989): 393-478, a discussion of Jonathan Wiener's "Radical Historians and the Crisis in American History." See also the debates on the "Synthesis" question; for the U.S., see especially *Journal of American History*; for England, see *Past and Present*.
9. New work was represented in the Toronto department by Natalie Davis in early modern European and women's history, Edward Shorter in European social and quantitative history, and Jill Conway in American cultural and women's history. They were all on leave in 1970! I subsequently studied with them.
10. See note 4, above. An early interest in comparative history was one of a number of promises of "new" histories that have never developed broadly. In my studies of literacy, I have attempted to retain this thrust; Ian Davey's current interests do too. It is worth mentioning here that much of the "new" social history in the U.S. also was stimulated by French and English research. See, for example, Davey, "Capitalism, Patriarchy and the Origins of Mass Schooling," *History of Education Review* 16 (1987): 1-12, and "Rethinking the Origins of British Colonial School Systems," 149-59.
11. Sutherland, "The Study of the History of Education," *History* 54 (1969): 49-59; Stone, "Literacy and Education in England, 1640-1900," *Past and Present* 42 (1969): 67-139; Talbot, "The History of Education," *Daedalus* 100 (1971): 133-50.
12. Consult, for example, Wilson and Jones, "The 'New' History"; Wilson, "Historiographical Perspectives" and "Some Observations," and note the shifting emphasis over time.
13. Gaffield, "Back to School: Towards a New Agenda for the History of Education," *Acadiensis* 15 (1986): 169, 179, 171. See also Wilson's review essays cited above.
14. Wilson, "Some Observations," 7-8. See also Gaffield, "Back to School." Note more generally Wilson's adaptation of Veysey's "The History of Education."
15. Wilson "Some Observations," 9-10. Wilson quoted Sol Cohen on Katz; Cohen's statement originally appeared in "New Perspectives in the History of American Education, 1960-1970," *History of Education* 2 (1973): 89. Wilson also quotes from Katz's preface to *Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools* (New York: Prager, 1971), xxvi: "by emancipating...change." After praising revisionist achievement, Wilson followed Veysey in declaring revisionism "over" by the late 1970s (a "couple of years" later than in the U.S., overwhelmed by an "onslaught of new findings and interpretations in related sub-fields of social history, such as urban, working class, ethnic, women, and family history"): "Some Observations," 12-13.

16. Wilson, "Some Observations," 9-10. See also his other review essays, cited above. Marvin Lazerson was, to the best of my knowledge, the first to distinguish in print between "radical" and "moderate" revisionists; see his "Revisionism and American Educational History," *Harvard Educational Review* 43 (1973): 269-83.
17. Katz makes the same point in his response to Ravitch; see his *Reconstructing*, chap. 5.
18. In this way, among others, for example, I see the roots of *The Legacies of Literacy: Continuities and Contradictions in Western Culture and Society* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1987) and the comparative parts of my current work on the history of growing up in my Toronto years.
19. When I look over the writings of the late 1960s and 1970s, it seems to me that critics' claims about revisionists' excesses and simplifications not always but often are exaggerated or distorted. This issue bears re-examination historiographically, I think, at least rhetorically or discursively. Discussions of "social control" provide one good example.
20. Useful here is Katz, *Reconstructing*. Compare with Wilson, "Some Observations"; but also with Gaffield, "Back to School"; Davey, "Rethinking" and "Capitalism." See, too, Ira Katznelson and Margaret Weir, *Schooling for All: Class, Race, and the Decline of the Democratic Ideal* (New York: Basic, 1985). The classic review essays of Marvin Lazerson and Carl Kaestle grappled seriously and sincerely with this issue. Overview or "perspectives" pieces that followed typically did not, as *misconstrual* and distortion came to dominate the practice that passed as "criticism." Ravitch's *Revisionists Revised* stands as the culmination of one line.
21. Veysey, "History of Education," 282-83.
22. Gaffield, "Back to School," 169, 190.
23. Davey, "Capitalism," 1, *passim*. He reiterated his point a year later at the 1988 CHEA meeting; see his "Rethinking the Origins."
24. Davey, "Capitalism," 5 *et passim*; Katz, *Reconstructing*, 136-37, *passim*. Davey construes patriarchy in terms of gender and generational subordination, a usage that I for one question. A particularly exciting recent U.S. work is Ira Katznelson and Margaret Weir, *Schooling for All*. See more recently, Bruce Curtis, *Building the Educational State: Canada West, 1836-1871* (London, Ont.: The Althouse Press, and Basingstoke: Falmer, 1988); David Hogan, "The Market Revolution and Disciplinary Power: Joseph Lancaster and the Psychology of the Early Classroom System," *History of Education Quarterly* 29 (1989): 381-418. The latter two works reflect historians of education's recent if tardy "discovery" of major intellectual trends of the last quarter-century. See also the first two issues of *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation*, 1, 1-2 (Spring and Fall, 1989), which suggest a richer mix in terms of approach and geography than either the U.S. *History of Education Quarterly* or the *English History of Education*.
25. Admittedly, the signs I read in making these sweeping statements are more diffuse, complicated, and amenable to multiple and opposing readings than my statements reflect. I offer no empirical support in this essay. For purposes of discussion, I explicitly take the risks incurred and am prepared to accept qualifications. Obviously, the issues demand careful study in depth.
26. For citations, see notes above. These examples are illustrative, hardly exhaustive or definitive. For feminist scholarship, they do not do justice. For the history of literacy for example, see my "Whither the History of Literacy? The Future of the Past?" *Communication* 11 (1988): 5-22; for "growing up," see my "The History of

Childhood and Youth: Beyond Infancy?" *History of Education Quarterly* 26 (1986): 95-109.

27. These few paragraphs make no pretense as programme or outline of an agenda for new research and questions or as elements of synthesis. Among the influences, clearly, are those of feminism, state and reproduction theory, cultural and class studies, and recent work in legal and political studies. Current literary and philosophical emphases begin to influence this work, too. Historians of education face great intellectual challenges, especially when we confront the implications of post-structuralist and post-modern theories.
28. See, for example, Katz, "The New Educational Panic," in *America in Theory*, ed. Leslie Berlowitz, Denis Donoghue, and Louis Menard (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988): 178-94. This is hardly a problem only in the U.S.

CONFÉRENCIÈRES INVITÉES

DISTINGUISHED SPEAKERS

LA POINTE DE L'ICEBERG

Micheline Dumont

Nadia Fahmy-Eid

L'HISTOIRE DE L'ÉDUCATION

Micheline Dumont

Pendant plusieurs générations, les Québécois se sont bercés de l'illusion qu'ils possédaient le *meilleur* système d'éducation du monde. C'est du moins ce que leur répétaient leurs élites et il faut dire que les principaux ouvrages en histoire de l'éducation contribuaient à entretenir cette illusion. On n'y trouve principalement que des panégyriques, des plaidoyers *pro domo* et des récits souvent apologétiques sur la clairvoyance et le dévouement des initiateurs. Dans ces ouvrages également, il existe une myopie flagrante face aux lacunes d'un système d'enseignement qui n'avait ni *voulu* ni *réussi* à se démocratiser.

Les réformes de la révolution tranquille ont eu pour effet de marteler au contraire un discours *absolument* différent: notre province se méritait le championnat des *mauvais* systèmes d'éducation. Le Frère Untel, qui «travaillait à la hache», exigeait de tout sabrer. Les membres de la Commission Parent proposaient des réformes radicales. Les technocrates du nouveau ministère de l'Éducation se chargeaient de compléter le réquisitoire¹. De sorte que nous sommes maintenant aux prises avec deux interprétations manichéennes qui ont bien des chances de n'être vraies ni l'une ni l'autre. Au demeurant, elles ne sont *scientifiques* ni l'une ni l'autre.

En fait, ce n'est que tout récemment qu'on a fait publiquement le constat de l'indigence de ce champ de recherches, et ce, même si quelques travaux novateurs ont commencé à paraître depuis quelques années. Lise Bissonnette écrivait dans *Le Devoir* en 1986: «Quarante pour cent des recherches en éducation sont spécialisées en didactique de tous genres et le reste se répartit au petit bonheur avec des trous immenses: l'histoire de l'éducation par exemple est un champ

ouvert de même que les études systématiques sur l'organisation de l'enseignement, ses politiques, ses impacts sociaux»². En 1987, au *premier* congrès des Sciences de l'Éducation de langue française, tenu à Québec, on notait l'absence d'ateliers consacrés à l'histoire de l'éducation. C'est justement durant la conférence inaugurale de ce congrès que Pierre Bélanger affirmait: «Les études féministes ont probablement davantage contribué à l'histoire de l'éducation que les facultés des Sciences de l'éducation»³. Cela serait-il possible?

Après avoir exposé les principales causes du sous-développement de l'histoire de l'éducation au Québec, je voudrais plus rapidement mettre en relief quelques caractéristiques de l'histoire constituée, identifier les courants majeurs de la production récente et établir l'agenda des recherches trop nombreuses qui restent à entreprendre. Après quoi je céderai la parole à Nadia Fahmy-Eid qui aura des propos un peu plus encourageants à vous communiquer.

1. Causes du sous-développement

L'histoire de l'éducation est apparue en Allemagne sous le nom d'«Histoire de la pédagogie», et cette expression explique à elle seule les types de recherche qui ont d'abord été entreprises sous ce vocable: recherches sur les théories, recherches sur les idées des éducateurs, recherches sur les méthodes d'enseignement. On était loin, à cette époque de ce que nous nommons maintenant la *nouvelle histoire de l'éducation*. Il est certain qu'au XIXe siècle, on ne comprenait pas l'histoire de l'éducation comme on la comprend maintenant et qu'on lui donnait une signification étroite liée davantage à l'acte éducatif lui-même qu'aux processus de scolarisation massive qui se produisaient alors.

Au même moment, on retrouve cette discipline dans le curriculum des institutions ou facultés universitaires chargées principalement de la formation des enseignants. C'est donc dans le secteur des facultés d'éducation qu'elle s'est développée, notamment dans l'Amérique du nord anglo-saxonne.

Or, au Québec, les universités ne se sont dotées de véritables facultés d'éducation que très tardivement, après 1960. La plus ancienne, à Sherbrooke, a été créée en 1961 et les autres ne sont apparues qu'après la réforme de 1965. En effet, la formation des maîtres s'est développée au Québec dans le réseau des écoles normales et y a été maintenue en dépit de quelques tentatives de l'intégrer à l'université comme cela s'était produit à McGill en 1907 pour le secteur anglo-protestant. De plus, ce réseau n'a eu que peu de lien organique avec les universités. Avant 1960, on ne trouve dans les universités francophones du Québec que des écoles affiliées, des programmes isolés rattachés à des instituts variés, le tout dans une atmosphère de lutte pour le contrôle de la formation des maîtres⁴.

Inutile de dire que dans toutes ces institutions, il n'y a que peu de place pour l'enseignement de l'histoire de l'éducation. Il n'y figure le plus souvent qu'un

cours sur le système scolaire québécois où le survol historique cède rapidement la place à l'étude de la législation scolaire⁵.

Quand ces facultés se sont constituées à la fin des années 1960, lorsque la Réforme Parent eut pris la décision de confier la formation des enseignants aux universités, on dénotait l'absence de toute tradition dans ce champ de recherche et d'enseignement. Encore aujourd'hui, cet enseignement est pour ainsi dire absent des programmes variés.

Quant aux recherches proprement historiques, elles ont été le plus souvent suscitées par les diverses conjonctures de l'évolution scolaire, commissions d'enquêtes, projets de législations, et se sont trouvées fortement tributaires de cette situation, ayant été effectuées le plus souvent par des fonctionnaires ou par des chercheurs qui n'avaient pas été formés en histoire⁶.

Au Québec, donc, l'histoire de l'éducation relève des départements d'histoire. Point d'historiens et d'historiennes dans les facultés d'éducation où, en principe, rien n'empêche les personnes de s'intéresser à la dimension historique des problèmes étudiés. Mais il demeure que dans les faits, cet intérêt pour l'histoire est sporadique ou, le plus souvent, inexistant. Dans les recherches menées dans les facultés d'éducation, on tend à considérer les problèmes d'un point de vue actuel, et, de ce fait, les analyses menées relèvent le plus souvent d'une approche sociologique, psychologique, didactique ou encore économique. Dans ce panorama, les problèmes historiques sont souvent considérés comme d'un intérêt secondaire, ou encore comme un luxe que seule l'histoire peut se permettre.

Ceci pour dire que les spécialistes en histoire de l'éducation se retrouvent le plus souvent isolés dans plusieurs départements d'histoire où ils ou elles sont sollicités par des champs historiques multiples: histoire des mentalités, histoire sociale, histoire des idéologies, histoire religieuse. On peut même noter un manque de support institutionnel, d'où la nécessité d'une collaboration inter-universitaire entre les chercheuses et chercheurs intéressés/es à l'histoire de l'éducation. Mais on sait qu'il faut traverser bien des barrières, à la fois personnelles et institutionnelles, pour arriver à instaurer ce type d'association entre personnes d'universités différentes. Sans compter qu'au Québec, il existe des barrières linguistiques qui ne facilitent pas la communication. Nous sommes bilingues certes, (du moins on le prétend) mais vraisemblablement pas au point de connaître vraiment ce qui se fait à McGill, à Concordia ou à Bishop's...

On peut ajouter que le modèle français a pu constituer un autre facteur pour expliquer le sous-développement québécois. L'histoire de l'éducation, très dynamique au XIXe siècle dans ce pays, y a subi une éclipse significative après 1914. «Après la première guerre mondiale, [ce dynamisme] fit place à une surprenante léthargie, sans doute liée à des facteurs politiques et sociaux encore mal expliqués»⁷, nous dit le premier directeur du service d'Histoire de l'Éducation, service créé en 1977 à l'INRP74. A cette date également, l'histoire de l'éducation ne figure plus aux programmes qui contribuent à former des maîtres⁸. La première revue française *Histoire de l'Éducation* date de 1978

seulement et on constate, dans chaque numéro, les efforts des responsables pour concerter des informations venues de tant d'horizons divers: chercheurs en sciences humaines, administrateurs, enseignants, fonctionnaires. D'ailleurs, les ouvrages majeurs en France sont venus de la sociologie ou de la philosophie (on pense à Bourdieu, à Baudelot et Establet, à Donzelot, à Foucault, à Isambert-Jamati), et l'histoire de l'éducation ne figure que rarement au palmarès de la dite «École des Annales». C'est dire que c'est par le modèle anglo-saxon principalement, que chercheuses et chercheurs québécois ont appréhendé les problématiques de la «New History of Education». Pour une province francophone, qui a fonctionné pendant près de deux siècles dans une culture et des structures *distinctes*, c'est *peut-être* un handicap.

Mais ces raisons, structurelles en quelque sorte, sont peut-être moins importantes que d'autres explications de nature politique et idéologique. L'importance de la réforme de l'éducation suscitée par le Rapport Parent entre 1964 et 1970, a littéralement polarisé l'ensemble des recherches sur cette rupture majeure de notre système d'enseignement. C'est donc la sociologie qui s'est constituée le maître d'oeuvre théorique de la recherche en éducation. L'année 1960 est devenu le point de départ obligé de la majorité des recherches et rares sont les travaux qui reculent au-delà cette date. On a scruté les structures de l'éducation au Québec, dix ans après le Rapport Parent, vingt ans après, et tout récemment, vingt-cinq ans après⁹.

Cette rupture a affecté même la constitution des archives. Les séries documentaires *commencent* en 1965 et le fonds du défunt Département de l'Instruction publique a peu mobilisé les archivistes qui manquaient pour ainsi dire de catégories cohérentes pour classer des documents provenant de ce que d'aucuns ont nommé un chaos structurel. Souvent, les articles sont classés sous le nom du fonctionnaire responsable du service...

Dans la réalité québécoise, la notion même de travaux *historiques* est plutôt ambiguë. L'accélération des réformes et leur remise en question incessante font rapidement tomber dans le domaine de l'histoire des efforts à peine ébauchés. La seule mise à jour des trente dernières années constitue souvent un sérieux casse-tête de sorte qu'on trouve dans la production pédagogique une sorte de généralisation d'introductions dites *historiques* qui ne reculent guère au-delà de cinq ans ou prétendent au contraire résumer en quelques pages la *grande noirceur* qui a précédé la Réforme Parent.

Le syndrome du Rapport Parent influence jusqu'au cadre théorique de certaines études plus poussées qui cherchent à identifier, dans les périodes antérieures, les signes avant-coureurs du cataclysme structurel et idéologique qui a stigmatisé l'éducation au Québec après 1965. Cette hantise des origines oblitère souvent la compréhension globale de phénomènes importants qui se sont produits avant 1960 et qui ont constitué des ruptures significatives, en dépit de structures apparemment inchangées du système scolaire entre 1841 et 1943.

La période pré-1960 ne saurait être correctement évaluée si on la juge *exclusivement* en fonction de son point d'arrivée. «Tout ce qui était dans la

société ancienne et qui ne préparait pas à la modernité ou ne s'y opposait pas, ou n'en était pas assez différent tend à être dévalué.... On refuse la possibilité d'autre issue que le *choix de l'Histoire*, et après tout, ce choix nous aveugle a posteriori»¹⁰. Ces propos de Philippe Ariès sur l'avènement de la modernité en France après la période féodale semble s'appliquer singulièrement à la société québécoise, surtout depuis que la problématique de la modernité a commencé à s'imposer dans l'historiographie québécoise. «Ou bien un seul sens à l'histoire, une sorte de déterminisme qui s'impose comme une loi historique. Ou bien plusieurs sens successifs, chacun allant dans une direction propre, sans que le passage de l'un à l'autre soit déterminé par un modèle ni d'ailleurs explicable par une théorie»¹¹. Il est peut-être temps au Québec d'examiner les périodes précédant la Réforme Parent avec un angle d'approche plus centré sur la *complexité* et l'*originalité propre* de ces périodes. Peut-être l'anthropologie historique serait-elle en mesure de nous proposer des instruments d'analyse plus opérationnels.

Toutefois, on aurait tort de passer sous silence l'importante contribution de la sociologie de l'éducation, qui constitue, à n'en pas douter, le pilier principal de la recherche. Pierre Dandurand et Emile Olivier ont exposé dans un article éclairant «Les Paradigmes perdus»¹², les diverses phases traversées par la sociologie de l'éducation, tour à tour interpellée par le fonctionnalisme, le structuralisme et le marxisme, suivant en cela les modèles américains et français. Après avoir mis en évidence les maîtres-mots de la conjoncture des années 1960, *développement et justice sociale*, les études sont passées à une critique acerbe de l'institution scolaire au moment où cette dernière entrait (encore une fois!) en crise: critique de l'appareil scolaire dans la reproduction des rapports de pouvoir, des rapports de classe, et, plus timidement, des rapports de sexe. Les sociologues ont mis à jour les mécanismes de ces rapports de domination culturelle, politique, économique. Il semble toutefois que depuis une décennie, «on tente de ramasser les morceaux de paradigmes éclatés pour présenter un nouveau regard sur l'école en mettant l'accent sur l'individu pendant que sur la scène publique s'impose une nouvelle économie de l'éducation à travers la promotion du libre choix et de la privatisation»¹³. Serait-ce le retour insidieux de ce bon vieux libéralisme? Un ouvrage récent, *L'école détournée* de Louis Balthazar et Jules Bélanger, en est un exemple éloquent¹⁴.

Toujours est-il que c'est l'influence déterminante de la sociologie qui a imposé ses cadres d'analyse et que peu d'historiens ou d'historiennes ont contribué à nourrir la réflexion théorique sur cette institution. Mieux, ainsi qu'on le verra plus loin, ce sont souvent des sociologues qui entreprennent des recherches à caractère historique.

On se trouve donc devant ce paradoxe: pléthore d'études sur la période très récente et unanimité factice sur l'interprétation à donner à la période précédente. Une sorte de consensus tacite s'est établi autour d'un scénario univoque, essentiellement institutionnel et constitué principalement des dates des principales lois; d'un cadre d'analyse récurrent: l'opposition entre l'Église et l'État; d'un constat

désolé d'une situation jugée archaïque, inefficace et chaotique. Mais trêve d'excuses! Il est temps d'examiner rapidement le passé, le présent et l'avenir de l'histoire de l'éducation au Québec.

2. L'histoire de l'éducation au Québec: passé, présent, avenir.

La publication de *L'Histoire de l'enseignement dans la province de Québec*, en 1971, par Louis-Philippe Audet, marque certainement l'événement majeur de ce champ de recherche¹⁵. Cette première synthèse venait à point nommé et elle avait été rédigée par le secrétaire de la Commission Parent. Mais cette étude a dangereusement vieilli, et depuis, aucun nouveau travail de synthèse n'est venu renouveler nos perspectives. La synthèse de Roger Magnusen, publiée en 1980, ne fait que reprendre le scénario univoque évoqué plus haut et ne propose aucune perspective nouvelle¹⁶.

Nos collègues «canadiens» sont souvent portés à nous demander de nous situer dans les principaux débats historiographiques. Il nous est souvent très malaisé de le faire. Force nous est de constater chez nous l'absence de débats théoriques éclairants, spécifiques à la réalité québécoise en histoire de l'éducation.

Chez nous, aucun Michael Katz n'est venu ébranler les certitudes intériorisées depuis si longtemps sur la valeur de l'éducation. Aucune Alison Prentice, aucune Susan Houston n'ont contribué à rattacher la généralisation de l'instruction publique avec les impératifs de la révolution industrielle, n'ont élargi le sens à donner au mot éducation, ou n'ont examiné les rapports de l'école avec la famille. Aucun Bruce Curtis n'est venu proposer un cadre d'interprétation sur les rapports entre les nouvelles formes de gouvernement et les cadres sociaux imposés par la loi de l'instruction obligatoire. Mais en même temps, je m'interroge sur la pertinence de tenter d'appliquer à la réalité québécoise, une grille d'analyse si bien emboîtée au modèle ontarien. Commentant, à la demande du collectif Clio, une section du manuscrit de *L'Histoire des femmes au Québec* qui mentionnait la loi de l'instruction obligatoire, adoptée en 1943 seulement, une collègue ontarienne écrivait: «It seems so late!». Je ne veux pas critiquer ici les thèses de nos collègues ontariens. Je me pose simplement la question: Que devient la théorie lorsque les tempo sont si différents?

À cette même tribune, Ian Davey s'interrogeait, en 1988, sur la lenteur avec laquelle les historiens anglo-saxons s'étaient appropriés les cadres d'analyse de Foucault et Donzelot, dont les ouvrages, *Surveiller et Punir* et *La Police des familles*, étaient déjà traduits depuis la fin des années 1970¹⁷. Mais que dirait-il de la réticence des chercheurs québécois à introduire de telles perspectives théoriques dans leurs travaux? Et croyez-moi, je mets le chapeau la première dans l'urgence où je me sens de simplement faire l'inventaire des problèmes à résoudre.

Un pédagogue français estimait en 1857 que l'histoire de l'éducation était laborieusement inutile. Il soutenait: «Veut-on connaître à toute force l'histoire de l'éducation: qu'on lise avec attention l'histoire politique et sociale, on y trouvera ce qu'on cherche. Il est clair, en effet, que partout ceux qui ont élevé les enfants ont obéi aux nécessités de l'époque. Les hommes qui instruisent les enfants n'ont pas eux-mêmes une telle importance qu'il leur soit permis ou possible de faire autre chose que ce que les lois et les mœurs de leur siècle exigent d'eux»¹⁸. L'éducation, au Québec, a-t-elle obéi à des «exigences» et à des «nécessités» différentes? Question troublante qui nous renvoie sans cesse aux concepts éculés du «retard» ou du «cléricalisme de la société», ou au contraire, aux concepts nouveaux de la «modernité» ou de la «sociabilité». Poursuivant cet examen critique de l'histoire constituée, je note également une propension à répéter des affirmations qu'aucune recherche n'est venue étayer ou que des recherches particulières ont infirmé ou contredites. On pourrait ici en énumérer une longue litanie. Les exemples suivants suffiront:

- l'Institution Royale a été un échec;
- l'enseignement de la religion occupait un espace important de l'horaire;
- l'Église a nuï au développement de l'instruction publique;
- autrefois, les filles étaient plus instruites que les garçons;
- seuls les enfants des classes privilégiées fréquentaient les collèges et les pensionnats variés;
- les filles n'avaient droit qu'à des écoles ménagères.

Au demeurant, l'absence de synthèse, capable d'intégrer toutes les nouvelles recherches, se fait de plus en plus sentir. Au fond, l'énigme s'approfondit à mesure que progressent de nouvelles recherches.

Si on tente maintenant d'examiner la production récente, on note d'abord un ensemble de recherches sur l'histoire de la tradition scientifique québécoise, notamment dans ses rapports avec le pouvoir. *L'Histoire des Sciences au Québec*¹⁹, publiée en 1987, est sans contredit un ouvrage important qui vient en partie combler une lacune de taille: celle de l'histoire des universités québécoises francophones. Plusieurs articles dans ce champ de recherches²⁰, dus pour la plupart à des sociologues, viennent en confirmer la vitalité.

Les études sur l'alphabétisation se multiplient depuis quelques années et mettent en application de nouvelles approches méthodologiques sur cette difficile question. Gérard Bouchard avance qu'il pourra, à l'aide des données du gigantesque fichier de SOREP, améliorer notre connaissance de l'alphabétisation masculine²¹, qu'il nomme bien entendu l'alphabétisation tout court²², pendant que de nombreuses thèses viennent nuancer notre connaissance globale pour des régions ou des périodes circonscrites²³. La question de l'alphabétisation supérieure des femmes, durant la seconde moitié du XIX^e siècle, reste cependant encore inexploquée.

Par ailleurs, trois thèses de doctorat, celles de Thérèse Hamel, Ruby Heap et Dominique Jean, ont permis de faire avancer nos connaissances sur le débat entourant la question de la fréquentation scolaire obligatoire et de quelques débats connexes: la centralisation scolaire, la bureaucratisation des appareils d'état, le travail des enfants et les allocations familiales²⁴.

Ces thèses devront obligatoirement être complétées par des études sur les processus de scolarisation. Pour l'instant, on peut consulter les recherches d'Andrée Dufour sur le réseau scolaire de l'Île de Montréal au XIXe siècle²⁵; de Ruby Heap et de Wendy Johnston, toujours sur Montréal, durant la première moitié du XXe siècle²⁶, et attendre celles de Jacques Ouellet sur le réseau du Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean²⁷. Cependant, les statistiques récentes sur l'analphabétisme des scolarisés des dernières cohortes scolaires posent des problèmes théoriques inédits sur lesquels on n'a pas vraiment réfléchi.

L'histoire de la formation des enseignants a donné lieu, de son côté, à de nombreuses recherches dont quelques unes seulement ont été publiées jusqu'à ce jour. L'ouvrage de M'hammed Mellouki, *Savoir enseignant et idéologie réformiste*²⁸, propose un aperçu intéressant dans la problématique des racines historiques de la Réforme Parent sur la question de la formation des enseignants. Paul-André Turcotte, de son côté, a publié des travaux importants sur les frères éducateurs²⁹ dans le cadre plus large des rapports ambigus et paradoxaux des congrégations religieuses avec la société globale. Ces deux auteurs, on doit le noter, sont des sociologues. Dans le même champ d'études, on ne peut qu'attendre la publication de la thèse de doctorat de Marie-Paule Malouin, une historienne passée à la sociologie, sur les écoles normales.

C'est à la sociologie également que l'on doit la publication de quelques ouvrages sur l'enfance et la jeunesse. On pense ici à l'ouvrage de Denise Lemieux, *Les petits Innocents: L'enfance en Nouvelle France*,³⁰ encore que la majorité des études s'attardent bien davantage aux époques plus récentes³¹. L'enfance au XIXe siècle demeure une question complètement ignorée.

L'enseignement lui-même commence à être étudié dans une perspective historique. On remarque des études sur la pédagogie universitaire³², sur l'enseignement de certaines disciplines, sur l'histoire notamment³³, dont les courants anglophones et francophones ont été comparés très souvent; ou sur les manuels scolaires, étudiés principalement dans la problématique des stéréotypes basés sur le sexe ou concernant les Amérindiens³⁴.

La formation professionnelle a été étudiée dans son versant masculin³⁵ et Nadia pourra vous parler bientôt des nombreuses études en cours du côté de la formation professionnelle des filles.

Quant à la Réforme Parent, elle a donné lieu à la publication de quelques ouvrages plus académiques que polémiques (mais la frontière ici est très fragile!). On songe à *La population québécoise face à la restructuration scolaire*³⁶, à *La Réforme scolaire au Québec*, due à un anglophone, Henry Milner³⁷, et à l'ouvrage d'Arthur Tremblay, *Le Ministère de l'Éducation et le Conseil Supérieur. Antécédents et création*³⁸. L'ouvrage de Milner s'appuie sur les synthèses

précédentes pour situer le débat, mais propose une approche intéressante sur les rapports difficiles des questions linguistiques et des questions religieuses. La question de la confessionnalité des écoles se trouve ainsi à être présentée dans la problématique des enjeux du pouvoir: forces en présence, stratégies de pouvoir. «On peut suivre l'action de l'association des parents catholiques du Québec depuis 1966. (...) Ainsi est mis à jour un des paradoxes de l'histoire scolaire récente: l'alliance des commissions scolaires protestantes, habituellement définies comme progressistes, au mouvement des parents catholiques, l'un des éléments les plus conservateurs de la société québécoise»³⁹. Doit-on ajouter que ces ouvrages ne sont pas dus à des historiens?

Force nous est de conclure que nous avons du pain sur la planche. Une énumération rapide pourra convaincre la jeune génération de l'importance des tâches qui l'attendent.

1. Un inventaire adéquat des sources disponibles se fait sérieusement désirer. Les archives nationales sont encore un champ vierge pour l'histoire de l'éducation.
2. Les aspects théoriques de l'éducation pourraient donner lieu à des études indispensables sur l'influence de la pédagogie américaine, sur l'influence de la pédagogie française, notamment par le biais des nombreuses congrégations françaises émigrées ici, sur les quelques théoriciennes et théoriciens locaux, sur la philosophie de l'éducation qui se dégage des manuels et des théories.
3. Les aspects généraux de l'éducation constituent sans doute la question la plus négligée. Politiques scolaires, économie scolaire, démographie scolaire, géographie scolaire sont des champs en friche pour la période précédant 1960. Les débats sur la confessionnalité, sur les conflits linguistiques, sur l'allongement des études n'ont jamais été situés dans des problématiques différentes de celles du conflit entre l'Eglise et l'État. La résistance de la population à l'établissement d'un système scolaire n'a donné lieu qu'à des études ponctuelles (vg, la guerre des éteignoirs) envisagées uniquement dans une perspective politique.
4. L'enseignement des disciplines offre également son éventail de recherches à entreprendre. Par ailleurs, la question de l'enseignement secondaire doit être éclairée, ayant suscité des débats incessants qui n'ont jamais été étudiés systématiquement dans une perspective d'ensemble.
5. La question de l'apprentissage et celle de la formation professionnelle extra-scolaire constituent à elles seules de redoutables défis, notamment durant la période charnière de la proto-industrialisation. Le caractère

résolument privé des réseaux de formation professionnelle ajoute des difficultés supplémentaires pour la bonne connaissance de cette formation. Que dire du rôle éducatif des associations de jeunes qui commence à peine à être examiné?

6. L'organisation scolaire présente également sa liste de questions qui exigeraient des études approfondies: le système de taxation, le fonctionnement des commissions scolaires, la constitution des structures administratives du Département de l'Instruction publique, le système d'inspection, la sanction des études, les processus de centralisation scolaire et du transport des écoliers, les écoles de rang, l'espace et l'équipement scolaire, sans oublier l'enseignement supérieur et l'enseignement spécialisé: enseignement auprès des handicapés, éducation physique, éducation artistique, musicale, etc.

7. Le personnel scolaire a donné lieu à quelques études, notamment sur les processus de syndicalisation et la professionnalisation, mais des questions importantes restent entièrement ouvertes: recrutement et sélection de personnels variés, question des pensions scolaires, le Bureau des Examineurs catholiques, qui a été le principal distributeur de brevets de 1857 à 1939, sans compter la question des nombreuses congrégations religieuses, dont la multiplicité pose de redoutables problèmes de méthode et de sources. On aimerait également que paraissent des biographies d'enseignant(e)s de toutes les catégories.

8. Les méthodes et les techniques d'enseignement ont donné lieu à trop peu d'analyses, notamment pour la période du XIX^e siècle. Par contraste, la période récente a suscité tellement d'études qu'on se prend à douter de leur utilité. L'analyse des performances scolaires et des résultats effectifs de la scolarisation sur les connaissances de base de l'ensemble de la population n'a jamais été effectuée. Mais cette question, je pense, reste la grande inconnue pour tous les pays occidentaux. Depuis l'interrogation fondamentale suscitée par Yvan Illich en 1970, dans *Une société sans école*, on a peu progressé sur cette question. L'analyse de la didactique et du matériel fait partie des questions qui doivent être étudiées.

9. Le milieu et la vie scolaire ont donné lieu à quelques études très partielles. Mais on ne dispose pas encore d'études générales sur le système d'internat, notamment sur le fait qu'il se soit maintenu si longtemps au niveau secondaire mais n'ait donné lieu à aucune structure d'accueil pour le niveau universitaire; sur les différences entre les écoles de garçons et les écoles de filles; sur la mixité scolaire, beaucoup plus répandue qu'on ne le pense généralement; sur la mobilité interscolaire;

sur les déterminants institutionnels qui ont contribué à l'allongement des études; sur la sociabilité étudiante; sur les activités parascolaires; sur le sport. Les rapports entre la famille et l'école n'ont véritablement jamais été étudiés pour les périodes antérieures à 1960.

10. Enfin, les aspects sociaux de l'éducation, qui ont été beaucoup étudiés pour la période très récente, devraient susciter des études pour les périodes antérieures à la réforme Parent: la socialisation des enfants, la mobilité sociale, les rapports entre éducation et emploi, la reproduction des rapports sociaux de classe et de sexe, etc.

Mais pourquoi ne pas terminer ici cette interminable litanie qui ne vient que confirmer l'état d'indigence où se trouve l'histoire de l'éducation au Québec. Mais, ainsi que vous le dira ma collègue Nadia Eid, dans l'océan sans horizons que constitue le champ de l'histoire de l'éducation, flotte un iceberg: c'est l'histoire de l'éducation des filles. Ce secteur pourrait-il constituer une avenue privilégiée pour examiner l'ensemble des structures scolaires et éducatives? Après tout, n'a-t-on pas procédé longtemps à l'histoire de l'éducation en examinant exclusivement son versant masculin? C'est peut-être le défi que les chercheuses veulent relever.

NOTES

1. Jocelyn Létourneau, de l'Université Laval, poursuit en ce moment une recherche sur l'impact idéologique de la révolution tranquille sur l'historiographie et l'identité québécoise. Voir J. Létourneau, «The Unthinkable History of Quebec», *Oral History Review*, vol. 17, no. 1 (1989): 89-115.
2. L. Bissonnette, «D'un Dieu à l'autre», *Le Devoir*, 1er mars 1986.
3. P.W. Bélanger, «Rétrospective de la Recherche en Éducation en milieu francophone canadien», *Recherches et progrès en Éducation. Bilan et Prospective*. Actes du 1er Congrès des Sciences de l'Éducation de langue française au Canada (Université Laval, 1987), 27.
4. M. Mellouki, *Savoir enseignant et idéologie réformiste* (Québec: I.Q.R.C., 1989), 240-41.
5. *Ibidem*, 141-44.
6. Voir notamment les rapports de recherches suscités par la Commission Tremblay sur les problèmes constitutionnels en 1953 et ceux qui ont été préparés par la Commission Parent sur l'enseignement en 1961.
7. G. Caplat, «Le service d'histoire de l'éducation. Historique et Mission», *Histoire de l'éducation*, no. 1 (décembre 1978): 4.
8. J. Vial, «Histoire de l'Éducation et de la Pédagogie», *Revue Française de Pédagogie*, no. 42 (1978): 93-105.
9. On peut citer ici: *Le rapport Parent, dix ans après* (Société Royale du Canada, Académie des lettres et des sciences humaines, Bellarmin, 1975): 161 p.; Fernand Dumont et Yves Martin, (ed.) *L'éducation, 25 ans plus tard! Et après!* (Québec: I.Q.R.C., 1990), 432 p.

10. P. Ariès, «Une nouvelle éducation du regard», *Le Magazine Littéraire* (no. 164 consacré à l'Histoire): 18.
11. *Ibidem*, 19.
12. P. Olivier et P. Dandurand, «Les paradigmes perdus», *Sociologie et Société*, vol. XIX, no. 2 (1987): 87-101.
13. *Ibidem*.
14. L. Balthazar et J. Bélanger, *L'école détournée* (Montréal: Boréal, 1989), 214 p.
15. L.-P. Audet, *L'Histoire de l'enseignement dans la province de Québec* (Montréal: H.R.W., 1971), 2 vol.
16. R. Magnuson, *A Brief History of Quebec Education: From New-France to Parti Québécois* (Montréal: Harvest House, 1980), 147 p.
17. I. Davey, «Rethinking the Origins of British Colonial School Systems», *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation*, vol. 1, no. 1 (1989): 156.
18. Théodore Barreau, «Une science laborieusement inutile: L'Histoire de l'éducation et de l'enseignement», *Revue d'histoire de l'éducation*, no. 30 (1986), 70. (Cet article est une reproduction d'un texte paru en 1857 dans le Manuel Général de l'Instruction Primaire).
19. L. Chartrand, R. Duchesne et Y. Gingras, *Histoire des sciences au Québec* (Montréal: Boréal, 1987), 485 p.; R. Duchesne, *La Science et le pouvoir au Québec* (Québec: Éditeur officiel, 1978), 126 p.
20. F. Descarries, M. Fournier et L. Maheu, «Le Frère Marie-Victorin et les petites sciences», *Recherches Sociographiques*, Vol. 20, no. 1 (1979): 7-40; J.-M. Desroches et R. Gagnon, «Georges Welter et l'émergence de la recherche à l'école Polytechnique de Montréal, 1939-1970», *Recherches Sociographiques*, vol. 24, no. 1 (1983): 33-54; M. Fournier, «Un intellectuel à la rencontre de deux mondes: Jean-Charles Falardeau et le développement de la sociologie universitaire au Québec», *Recherches Sociographiques*, vol. 23, no. 3 (1982): 361-85; M. Fournier, «Edouard Montpetit et l'Université moderne ou l'échec d'une génération», *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, vol. 36, no. 1 (1982): 5-30.
21. G. Bouchard et J. Larouche, «Une nouvelle mesure de l'alphabétisation à l'aide de la reconstitution automatique des familles» *Histoire sociale*, Vol. XXII, no. 43 (1989): 91-120. Voir également G. Bouchard, «Évolution de l'alphabétisation (masculine) au Saguenay: les variables géographiques, 1842-1971», *Communications Historiques/Historical Papers* (Québec 1989), 13-35.
22. M. Dumont, «L'alphabétisation masculine», *Histoire Sociale*, vol. XXIII, no. 45 (1990): 129-31.
23. M. Verrette, «L'alphabétisation de la population de la ville de Québec de 1750 à 1849», *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, vol. 39, no. 1 (1985): 51-76. Des thèses de maîtrise existent sur le comté de Portneuf (Laval, 1981), la Côte du Sud (Laval, 1982) et plusieurs autres sont en cours.
24. T. Hamel, *L'obligation scolaire au Québec: lieu et enjeu de la lutte des classes*. Thèse de 3e cycle, Paris J., (René Descartes), 1981; R. Heap, *L'Église, l'État et l'enseignement primaire public catholique au Québec, 1897-1920*. Thèse de doctorat, Université de Montréal, 1986; D. Jean, *Familles québécoises et politiques sociales touchant les enfants, de 1940 à 1960*. Thèse de doctorat, Université de Montréal, 1987.
25. A. Dufour, «Diversité institutionnelle et fréquentation scolaire dans l'île de Montréal en 1825 et en 1835», *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, Vol. 41, no. 4 (1988): 507-36. L'auteure prépare aussi une thèse de doctorat sur le sujet.

26. R. Heap, «Urbanisation et éducation: la centralisation scolaire à Montréal au début du XXe siècle», et W. Johnston, «Keeping Children in School. The Response of the Montreal Roman Catholic School Commission to the Depression of the 1930s», *Communications Historiques/Historical Papers* (Montréal, 1985), 132-55 et 193-217.
27. J. Ouellet, *La famille face à l'école secondaire de garçons au XIXe et XXe siècles* (thèse de doctorat en cours, Université Laval).
28. M. Mellouki, *op. cit.*
29. P.A. Turcotte, *L'éclatement d'un monde. Les Clercs de Saint-Viateur et la révolution tranquille* (Montréal: Bellarmin, 1981), 366 p.; *L'enseignement secondaire public des frères éducateurs* (Montréal: Bellarmin, 1988), 220 p.
30. D. Lemieux, *Les petits Innocents: L'enfance en Nouvelle-France* (Montréal: I.Q.R.C., 1985).
31. M. Cusson, *Délinquants, pourquoi?* (Montréal: Armand Colin et Hurtubise, 1981), 170 p.; M.-A. Deniger, J. Gamache, J.-F. René, *Jeunesse: des illusions tranquilles* (Montréal: VLB, 1986), 230 p.; T. Hamel, «Obligation scolaire et travail des enfants», *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, Vol. 38, no. 1 (1984): 39-58; J. Gaudreau, *De l'échec scolaire à l'échec de l'école: les sacrifices* (Montréal: Québec/Amérique, 1980): 280 p.
32. A. Lefebvre et G. Racette, «La pédagogie universitaire au Québec depuis le Rapport Parent: éléments d'un historique», *Revue Repères*, no. 3 (1983): 95-122.
33. Un grand nombre de thèses et d'ouvrages ont été écrits sur la comparaison entre l'enseignement au Canada anglais et au Québec. Il serait trop long de les citer tous ici.
34. S. Vincent et B. Arcand, *L'image de l'Amérindien dans les manuels scolaires au Québec* (Montréal: HMH, 1979), 326 p.
35. J.-P. Charland, *Histoire de l'enseignement technique et professionnel au Québec* (Québec: I.Q.R.C., 1982), 485 p.; M. Fournier, *Entre l'école et l'usine* (Montréal: Éditions coopératives Albert Saint-Martin et C.E.Q., 1980), 128 p.
36. G. Pelletier et C. Lessard, *La population québécoise face à la restructuration scolaire* (Montréal: Guérin, 1982), 214 p.
37. H. Milner, *La réforme scolaire au Québec* (Montréal: Québec/Amérique, 1984), 212 p.
38. A. Tremblay et R. Blais, *Le Ministère de l'Éducation et le Conseil Supérieur, Antécédents et Création, 1867-1964* (Québec: PUL, 1989), 427 p.
39. P. Dandurand et R. Ouellet, *Les grandes orientations de la recherche en sociologie de l'éducation au Québec: un bilan bibliographique*. Québec, Les Cahiers du Labraps, Vol. 6 (1990), 41. On consultera avec profit ce bilan très utile.

L'HISTOIRE DE L'ÉDUCATION DES FILLES AU QUÉBEC, LA POINTE DE L'ICEBERG

Nadia Fahmy-Eid

Si quelqu'un me demandait aujourd'hui comment se porte l'histoire de l'éducation des filles au Québec, j'aurais tendance à répondre spontanément qu'elle se porte bien merci. Je le dirai à la fois avec une réelle fierté, mais aussi avec une certaine humilité (en étant bien consciente, d'ailleurs, que l'humilité dans ces circonstances aiderait probablement à faire pardonner la fierté). Mais revenons à plus de sérieux pour expliquer le jumelage de la fierté et de l'humilité en ce qui a trait à ma réponse. C'est que les résultats dans le secteur de la recherche sur l'histoire de l'éducation des filles au Québec s'avèrent, en effet, fort encourageants depuis une dizaine d'années et continuent à être très prometteurs. Aussi, malgré le dicton voulant que «les gens heureux n'aient pas d'histoire», nous nous disons heureuses malgré le fait que nous nous trouvons à afficher aujourd'hui, sous forme de bilan historiographique, une histoire déjà vieille de dix ans.

Mais alors pourquoi l'humilité nous dira-t-on? C'est qu'il s'agit, cependant, d'une histoire sur laquelle nous avons à peine commencé à lever le voile. S'il y a un peu de chemin parcouru, celui qui reste à parcourir est encore immense. Il l'est à la fois en termes *quantitatif* et en termes *qualitatif* (mais nous reviendrons plus loin sur cet aspect). Aussi est-ce dans ce sens qu'on peut dire de l'historiographie de l'éducation des filles qu'elle constitue, à l'heure actuelle, un champ de recherche à peine entamé. Elle représente, en fait, la pointe visible, mais relativement petite, d'un énorme iceberg sur la nature et la configuration duquel on connaît encore relativement peu de choses.

I. Le Bilan du travail accompli depuis dix ans

Je peux affirmer, comme je le disais tantôt, que ce bilan reste pour nous une source de fierté, mais, je voudrais préciser tout de suite que Micheline et moi partageons cette fierté avec plusieurs personnes. Il s'est agi en effet, et ceci dès le départ, d'un travail d'équipe. Nous avons abattu toutes les deux un énorme boulot, certes, mais nous l'avons fait en étroite collaboration avec d'autres chercheuses, des assistantes de recherche et des étudiantes, dont l'enthousiasme, le dynamisme et la ténacité n'ont jamais fait défaut. J'insiste donc sur le fait que le travail accompli en fut véritablement un d'équipe.

Cette collaboration dont nous avons bénéficié a été tout d'abord fructueuse parce qu'elle a été à la source d'un «brain storming» dans le sens d'une fécondation mutuelle de nos hypothèses de travail autant que de nos conclusions. Cette collaboration a été indispensable également pour nous donner la force

d'aller de l'avant lorsque nous faisons face à des obstacles qui risquaient de nous décourager et, parfois même, de paralyser momentanément nos recherches.

Quant aux communautés religieuses enseignantes, leur attitude face à l'accessibilité de leurs fonds d'archives a été très variée:

— certaines communautés nous ont ouvert généreusement leurs portes, derrière lesquelles se trouvaient parfois des trésors d'informations, mais parfois aussi très peu de choses (archives disparues ou dispersées etc.). Parfois, il s'agissait de documents qu'il nous fallait nous-mêmes classer et mettre en ordre afin de s'y reconnaître le moins possible. Bref, un grand ménage archivistique auquel autant nous-mêmes que nos assistantes de recherche n'étions pas nécessairement préparées...

— d'autres communautés ont gardé leurs portes résolument closes et dans certains cas—rares heureusement—ces portes ne se sont jamais ouvertes. Je pense en particulier aux Ursulines de Québec, dont nous n'avons jamais vu même le profil extérieur de leurs archives. Nous n'étions pas seules, il est vrai, à faire face à un tel déboire, mais je dois avouer que cela ne suffisait pas à nous consoler. À cet égard, ni des amis de la communauté, ni des autorités religieuses, ni même le ministère des affaires culturelles ne sont venus à bout de la résistance de l'archiviste des Ursulines. Il s'agissait, à l'époque, d'une religieuse de quatre-vingt-trois ans qui m'avait expliqué, fort gentiment d'ailleurs, qu'elle avait dépensé bien trop d'argent pour mettre en état ses archives pour les laisser ensuite se détériorer entre les mains des chercheurs...

— certaines communautés, enfin, ont accepté, non pas d'ouvrir carrément leurs portes, mais plutôt de les entrouvrir. Je crois bien que cette catégorie a été la plus importante, non pas nécessairement en termes numériques, mais plutôt en termes d'ampleur de l'information concernée. Et c'est peut-être cette catégorie-là qui pourrait alimenter un jour la petite histoire de notre recherche. C'est en effet ce type d'accès mitigé aux archives qui a été souvent à la source des anecdotes multiples et des frustrations de toutes sortes que nous, et surtout nos assistantes de recherche—qui y faisaient face dans la quotidienneté de leur travail en archives—accumulions d'une réunion de travail à l'autre.

Nous avons dû, comme équipe, nous épauler mutuellement pour faire face à certains déboires: documents photocopiés mais avec des parties masquées, boîtes d'archives interdites d'accès, documents livrés au compte-gouttes, etc. Nous avons pu, fort heureusement, bénéficier des conseils et même, pourquoi pas, des «recettes» que l'une ou l'autre de nos collaboratrices avait réussi à mettre au point pour franchir des barrières, surmonter des résistances ou encore affronter des situations délicates (même la mise vestimentaire pouvait entrer en ligne de

compte). Si enfin nous n'avions pas pris individuellement, et surtout collectivement, le parti de considérer ces difficultés, et les retards qui en découlaient, avec une certaine philosophie, et aussi beaucoup d'humour, je crois bien que nous aurions eu tôt fait de baisser les bras de découragement. C'est donc ce travail d'équipe qui, sur le plan aussi bien intellectuel que psychologique et affectif, nous a permis d'aller de l'avant.

Tableau d'ensemble des sujets de recherche et des publications qui constituent le bilan: des dix dernières années (1981-1990)

Il s'agit de deux ouvrages collectifs déjà parus, d'un autre en chantier et de trois brochures dont l'une, parrainée par la Société historique du Canada, offre une perspective d'ensemble sur l'éducation des filles. Il s'agit aussi de vingt-huit articles et communications publiées, de quarante-sept communications dans le cadre de colloques et de congrès divers, d'une bibliographie de près de mille titres, d'une quinzaine de mémoires de maîtrise et de deux thèses de doctorat produits par les membres de notre équipe de recherche. Précisons toutefois que cette équipe a compté par moments plus d'une douzaine de membres actifs. Une sorte de PME, en fait, dont la gestion administrative et académique nous a laissé parfois, Micheline et moi, à bout de souffle.

On peut regrouper les publications évoquées plus haut autour de sujets et de thèmes assez diversifiés qui traitent aussi bien de l'enseignement public que privé, des niveaux primaire et secondaire mais aussi universitaire, de l'enseignement général mais, de plus en plus, de l'enseignement professionnel aussi. Il est à noter, enfin, que l'histoire institutionnelle n'a pas eu plus droit de cité que celle des programmes et des clientèles. Bref, le panorama traduit jusqu'ici un équilibre relatif entre les secteurs à explorer.

Nous demeurons bien conscientes toutefois qu'il s'agit non seulement d'un tableau inachevé mais, en vérité, d'une esquisse à peine ébauchée d'une histoire de l'éducation des filles au Québec. Or, si certains des sujets non explorés figurent dans nos programmes de recherche actuels, beaucoup risquent de demeurer dans les limbes tant que d'autres équipes de recherche ne viendront pas planter leur tente aux côtés de la nôtre, afin de prendre un jour la relève.

II. Bref aperçu des recherches en chantier dans nos équipes de recherche respectives

Le Groupe de recherche en histoire de l'éducation des filles (le GREF), créé en 1981, avait pris des proportions très grandes au bout de cinq ans. Le nombre

croissant des étudiantes et des assistantes de recherche impliquées, ainsi que la diversification des sujets abordés dans les mémoires et les thèses en cours rendaient de plus en plus difficile le fonctionnement à partir d'une seule équipe. Aussi le GREF s'est trouvé à faire des petits....Depuis près de quatre ans, Micheline et moi dirigeons chacune un GREF, mais nous continuons à maintenir entre nos deux équipes une collaboration étroite et, j'oserais dire, bien fructueuse.

Les Recherches en cours dans l'équipe de Micheline

Ces recherches se situent globalement dans quatre secteurs:

1. *La fréquentation scolaire au niveau secondaire* dans le secteur public, ainsi qu'une comparaison entre filles et garçons, lorsque les sources le permettent.

2. *La formation professionnelle des filles*, au niveau secondaire en particulier. Il s'agit d'un secteur relativement vierge où, à part le secrétariat et l'économie domestique qui ont commencé à être explorés, on ne connaît pas grand'chose encore.

3. *La formation artistique des filles*. La formation artistique intègre, dans ce cas, la formation musicale également. Cette dernière est d'autant plus importante à connaître qu'elle a occupé depuis le siècle précédent une place privilégiée dans l'éducation des couventines, surtout dans les couvents qui visaient à un certain raffinement sur le plan culturel.

4. *Le financement de l'instruction des filles*. Il s'agit présentement d'un chantier qui occupe une grande place dans les travaux de l'équipe de Micheline. On sait qu'au Québec, l'instruction des filles francophones a été longtemps laissée à l'initiative des congrégations religieuses enseignantes. L'examen du financement de cette instruction a mené l'équipe à identifier plusieurs pistes de recherche, dont, en particulier: 1) la différence entre le financement des institutions destinées aux filles par rapport à celui destiné aux garçons, 2) la variété dans le coût des études selon le milieu géographique, le programme scolaire, la congrégation religieuse et aussi le milieu social concerné, 3) les politiques de l'État et, le plus souvent, l'absence concertée de politique étatique lorsqu'il s'agit du financement de l'enseignement supérieur féminin.

L'équipe avance l'hypothèse que l'instruction des filles au Québec a fonctionné en marge de l'État pour son financement, qu'une clientèle a pu être

assurée pour l'ensemble du réseau éducatif féminin grâce à une différence de coût et de prestige entre les institutions du réseau public et celles de réseau privé et qu'enfin, cette structure de financement a constitué l'élément majeur d'une marginalisation permanente de l'instruction des filles au sein du système scolaire.

Les recherches entreprises jusqu'ici ont permis d'établir plusieurs hypothèses relatives aux fondements économiques du financement des congrégations enseignantes (mémoire de Lucie Champagne).

1. Au 19^e siècle, les congrégations sont obligées d'ouvrir des pensionnats privés pour pouvoir se maintenir dans les écoles.

Après 1905, le financement de l'instruction publique augmente et les congrégations s'établissent dans les écoles sans la contrainte que représente la création de pensionnats.

Cette nouvelle conjoncture leur permet de procéder à la transformation et à la spécialisation de leurs pensionnats dans le développement d'avenues post-primaires pour les filles: écoles normales, écoles ménagères, cours Lettres-Sciences, écoles supérieures de musique, collèges classiques féminins, etc.

2. Le financement de certains pensionnats pouvait être assuré jusqu'à 75% par des fonds d'origine privée, et ce, jusqu'en 1968 (mémoire de Marie-Josée Delorme). Ainsi, la présence d'un pensionnat dans une municipalité dispense souvent la commission scolaire locale de développer l'instruction secondaire pour les filles, alors qu'au même moment, on multiplie les investissements pour les écoles de garçons.

3. Le financement des séminaires diocésains (et probablement de tous les collèges classiques masculins) présente des différences contrastées avec celui des pensionnats féminins. Les principales différences résident dans le montant des subventions reçues, les salaires versés au personnel enseignant et les frais encourus pour l'entretien ménager (le plus souvent confié à des congrégations religieuses).

4. L'importance des propriétés foncières reste la variable la plus importante pour expliquer le dynamisme des congrégations religieuses en termes d'investissements éducatifs, parfois coûteux. À ce sujet, l'équipe de recherche procède en ce moment à l'établissement de la proportion de ces valeurs foncières pour une cinquantaine de congrégations distinctes.

Les Recherches en cours dans l'équipe de Nadia

Les travaux de recherche dans mon équipe se situent également dans le *secteur professionnel*, mais il s'agit de programmes de niveau universitaire, plus particulièrement dans le champ du paramédical, où j'étudie la formation en *technologie médicale* (qui a été enseignée à l'université jusqu'en 1970), en *physiothérapie* et en *diététique*.

Dans son mémoire de maîtrise, il y a quelques années, Johanne Collin avait déjà examiné la fréquentation scolaire des filles dans les facultés professionnelles

de l'Université de Montréal entre 1945 et 1975. Elle l'avait fait d'ailleurs dans une perspective comparée avec la fréquentation scolaire des garçons dans ces mêmes facultés. Aujourd'hui, au niveau de sa thèse de doctorat, elle étudie la féminisation de la pharmacie. Johanne Daigle, quant à elle, vient de déposer une thèse sur la formation des infirmières, à partir du cas type de l'École d'infirmières de l'Hôtel-Dieu de Montréal. Elle montre, entre autres, comment les infirmières ont accédé à une formation et un statut professionnels à partir d'un investissement énorme de travail gratuit, travail qui a longtemps constitué le fonctionnement de base de l'institution hospitalière jusque vers la fin des années soixante. Il s'agissait en fait d'une forme d'apprentissage sur le tas où les étudiantes se trouvaient à payer par du travail gratuit et un dur labeur l'univers professionnel—mal rétribué d'ailleurs—où on leur permettait d'accéder.

Quant à mes propres projets de recherche, ils m'ont amenée, depuis cinq ans, sur la piste de la formation professionnelle des filles en technologie médicale, physiothérapie et diététique, tant à l'Université de Montréal qu'à l'Université McGill. Depuis 1935 et jusqu'au début des années 1970, il s'agissait en fait de trois secteurs très majoritairement, sinon exclusivement, féminins. Dans ce champ très vaste du paramédical, où les recherches ne font que commencer, nous avons élaboré un certain nombre de questions et d'hypothèses qui nous ont paru cruciales pour comprendre et tenter d'expliquer le statut particulier de ce secteur dans l'univers du savoir scientifique. Il s'agit en effet d'un univers de connaissance qui gravite dans l'orbite du savoir médical sans bénéficier pour autant des avantages ou des privilèges attribués aux détenteurs de ce savoir. Nous avons élaboré à ce sujet un certain nombre d'hypothèses de travail, qu'il serait trop long d'énumérer ici (on les trouvera exposées d'ailleurs dans le cadre d'articles publiés récemment dans *Recherches féministes*, *Histoire sociale* et la *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*. Nous nous contenterons dévouer seulement quelques-unes des questions auxquelles nous avons cherché à répondre au cours de notre recherche. Ainsi nos interrogations ont porté successivement sur:

- 1) le rapport entre la dimension soignante (le «care»), comportant des caractéristiques traditionnellement attribuées aux femmes, et la dimension curative (le «cure») dans la formation en technologie médicale, physiothérapie et diététique.
- 2) l'importance accordée au savoir théorique par rapport au savoir pratique et technique (laboratoires, stages, etc.) dans les trois programmes concernés.
- 3) la place du savoir scientifique — bio-médical surtout—par rapport au savoir général (y compris la culture générale).
- 4) et enfin la proportion qu'occupe le savoir scientifique général dans les programmes par rapport au savoir spécialisé; ce dernier regroupant

les matières qui s'inscrivent dans le champ immédiat de la discipline concernée (ex.: cours de physiothérapie ou de diététique, cours de physiologie ou de nutrition).

5) Nous formulons l'hypothèse que chacune de ces variables avait une certaine incidence sur le statut des programmes du paramédical, tant en termes de statut académique qu'en termes d'autonomie institutionnelle, surtout par rapport au tout puissant corps médical.

Nous avons cherché à saisir également le rapport entre la formation académique et le niveau de diplômation des enseignantes, d'une part, et le rang qu'elles occupent, d'autre part, au sein du corps enseignant et du personnel dirigeant de chacune des trois écoles concernées. Ce rapport s'est avéré en fait déboucher le plus souvent sur un bilan déficitaire pour ces professionnelles de la santé.

6) Notre recherche nous a enfin amenées à nous interroger sur le rôle ou le degré de contrôle qu'avaient pu exercer les corporations professionnelles de technologie médicale, de physiothérapie et de diététique sur la formation scientifique de leurs membres, ainsi que sur leurs luttes pour asseoir la scientificité de cette formation sur des bases académiques solides.

Cet ensemble de questions et de pistes de recherches nous a permis de dresser un profil de la formation professionnelle des filles dans des secteurs encore peu explorés du paramédical. Des secteurs où l'on se rend vite compte que le savoir et le pouvoir se conjuguent très étroitement, même s'ils le font sur un mode différent pour chacune des disciplines professionnelles concernées.

En guise de conclusion: Le chaînon manquant

Au terme de ce bref tour d'horizon qui dresse un bilan de recherche positif et parle de l'avenir en termes prometteurs, nous continuons toutefois à nous poser la question: l'éducation des filles constitue-t-elle un angle d'approche privilégié pour parvenir à une perspective globale et signifiante de l'histoire de l'éducation? Ou ne serait-elle plutôt qu'un secteur spécialisé qui risque au contraire de produire une vision partielle, et de ce fait étriquée, de la réalité éducative? En somme, s'agit-il là d'une voie d'avenir pour la recherche ou bien d'un chemin étroit qui risque de rétrécir nos horizons en se perdant dans des méandres inutiles? Ces questions ne sont pas seulement d'ordre théorique; elles ont aussi une portée pratique que nous évoquerons un peu plus loin.

Mais commençons tout d'abord par la *dimension théorique*. Nous ne dirons pas, quant à nous, que l'éducation des filles constitue le seul angle d'approche

valable pour comprendre la nature et le fonctionnement du système éducatif. Ce serait là une perspective à la fois unidimensionnelle et terriblement réductrice. Elle aboutirait tout simplement à inverser les termes de la vision masculiniste qui avait prévalu jusqu'à ces dernières années dans le champ de l'histoire de l'éducation. Or dans l'univers des théories explicatives, comme dans celui des régimes politiques, remplacer un impérialisme par un autre ne résout pas les problèmes. Loin de là. Ce que nous affirmons, quant à nous, c'est que l'histoire de l'éducation des filles constitue, à l'heure actuelle, le chaînon manquant dont l'absence a empêché jusqu'ici de comprendre bien des aspects du système éducatif. Or certains de ces aspects demeurent indispensables pour non seulement restituer une vision globale de ce système, mais aussi pour interpréter correctement son fonctionnement à travers le temps.

Nous pourrions illustrer par quelques exemples la thèse qui consiste à affirmer la centralité d'un angle d'approche à partir de l'éducation des filles. Prenons en premier lieu l'exemple du *financement du système éducatif au Québec, depuis le 17^e siècle jusqu'à la fin des années 1960* (ce qui coïncide avec la mise en application des recommandations de la Commission Parent). Ce n'est qu'en réussissant à comprendre les bases de fonctionnement du financement de l'éducation des filles qu'on a pu vraiment saisir les mécanismes en jeu qui ont permis à l'État d'investir de plus en plus dans l'éducation des garçons. Il en est de même du *rapport entre l'école publique et l'école privée*, un rapport qui n'est vraiment intelligible que si l'on fait intervenir dans l'analyse les stratégies éducatives des communautés enseignantes féminines et leur politique d'implantation de pensionnats (privés) aux côtés d'écoles (publiques) des commissions scolaires dont elles acceptent de prendre la charge. Le même constat s'impose en ce qui concerne la formation professionnelle dans l'univers de la santé. L'analyse de l'instruction offerte aux futures femmes professionnelles du paramédical a pu dégager quelques-unes des stratégies éducatives qui ont permis d'expliquer sur quelles bases s'est effectuée une division du savoir biomédical entre la médecine et les autres disciplines professionnelles qui gravitent dans son orbite. On est alors en mesure de mieux comprendre les mécanismes à partir desquels l'institution médicale a pu asseoir un contrôle très efficace sur la formation académique de l'ensemble du paramédical. On pourrait en fait multiplier à l'infini les exemples faisant la preuve que la connaissance de l'éducation des filles constitue, à l'heure actuelle, un angle d'approche privilégié pour parvenir à reconstituer une perspective globale de la réalité éducative. Non pas, encore une fois, à cause d'attributs magiques sortis d'on ne sait où et attachés à ce secteur de connaissance, mais parce qu'il s'agit de tout un pan de l'histoire qui a constitué jusqu'ici le chaînon manquant, celui sans lequel la vision de l'éducation avait toutes les chances d'être aussi bien partielle que partielle.

Qu'en est-il maintenant de la *portée pratique* de la thèse affirmant la centralité d'une approche à partir de l'éducation des filles? Cette question pose en fait la place de ce champ d'étude dans l'ensemble de nos programmes éducatifs. Nous savons toutes et tous que le domaine de la recherche ne peut se

développer longtemps en vase clos et qu'il doit, tôt ou tard, s'appuyer sur des formes d'enseignement. Or si déjà les cours sur l'histoire du système éducatif occupent un espace minuscule, sinon parfois nul, dans nos programmes du baccalauréat en histoire, ceux concernant l'éducation des filles sont carrément inexistants (excepté à l'UQAM depuis près de cinq ans, un cours est offert mais son existence demeure fragile). Quant à nos facultés des sciences de l'éducation, elles se tournent plus volontiers vers la sociologie que vers l'histoire; la première apparaissant plus ancrée dans les problèmes immédiats du présent. Nous avons beau affirmer qu'il s'agit là d'une perspective à courte vue, c'est encore celle qui prévaut à l'heure actuelle.

Que faut-il faire au terme d'un tel constat? Nous affirmons, quant à nous, qu'il ne faut surtout pas baisser les bras. Il faudra aller de l'avant et continuer à multiplier les recherches dans le domaine de l'histoire de l'éducation des filles, en espérant que le dynamisme de ce champ finira par avoir des répercussions positives dans le domaine de l'enseignement. En demeurant un secteur de pointe, l'histoire de l'éducation des filles pourra ainsi espérer constituer une voie d'avenir pour les futures chercheuses et chercheurs et éviter d'être, de façon camouflée ou non, une simple voie de garage.

**LISTE DES PRODUCTIONS ISSUES
DU GROUPE DE RECHERCHE EN
HISTOIRE DE L'ÉDUCATION DES FILLES
AU QUÉBEC (1981-1991)**

LIVRES

Maîtresses de maison—Maîtresses d'école. Femmes, famille et éducation dans l'histoire du Québec. Montréal, Boréal, 1983, 413 p. Recueil d'articles sous la direction de Micheline Dumont et Nadia Fahmy-Eid.

Les Couventines. L'éducation des filles au Québec dans les congrégations religieuses enseignantes, 1840-1960. Montréal, Boréal, 1986, 315 p. Micheline Dumont, Nadia Fahmy-Eid avec la collaboration de Johanne Daigle, Lucia Ferretti, Ruby Heap, Claudette Lasserre, Marie-Paule Malouin, Danielle Nepveu.

La formation clandestine. La formation professionnelle des filles au Québec avant la réforme Parent. (En préparation, sous la direction de Micheline Dumont)

BROCHURES

Micheline Dumont, Nadia Fahmy-Eid, *L'éducation des filles au Québec, 1840-1960. Bilan provisoire de la recherche.* Bulletin du GIERF, no. 1, 1985, Université du Québec à Montréal, 32 p.

Marie-Josée Delorme, Micheline Dumont, Jean-Marie Thibault, *La fréquentation scolaire au Québec au début du 20^e siècle.* Bulletin de recherche du Département d'histoire, nos 3-4, Novembre 1986, Université de Sherbrooke, 21 p.

Micheline Dumont, *Histoire de l'instruction des filles au Québec.* Brochure de la Société historique du Canada, no. 49, 1990. Traduit en anglais: *Girls' Schooling in Quebec.*

ARTICLES

1. HEAP, Ruby, «La Ligue de l'enseignement 1902-1904. Héritage du passé et nouveaux défis», dans *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, 36, 3: 339-373 (1982).

2. FAHMY-EID, Nadia et Micheline DUMONT, «Recettes pour la femme idéale. Le rapport femme/famille/éducation à travers deux journaux libéraux du début du 20^e siècle: «Le Canada» et «La Patrie», 1900-1920, dans *Atlantis*, 10, 1: 46-59 (1984).
3. DUMONT, Micheline et Marie-Paule MALOUIN, «Évolution et rôles des congrégations féminines enseignantes au Québec, 1840-1960», dans *La Société Canadienne d'Histoire de l'Église catholique, Sessions d'étude 1983*: 201-230 (1984).
4. HEAP, Ruby, «L'évolution des rapports Église/État dans le domaine de l'éducation au Québec: 1875-1920», dans *ibidem*: 183-200.
5. DANYLEWYCZ, Marta, Nadia FAHMY-EID et Nicole THIVIERGE, «L'enseignement ménager et les «home economics» au Québec et en Ontario au début du 20^e siècle: une analyse comparée», dans *An Imperfect Past. Education and Society in Canadian History*. (J.D. Wilson ed.) CHEA/ACHE and Center for the Study of Curriculum and Instruction, UBC, 1984: 67-119.
6. DUMONT, Micheline, «L'instruction des filles avant 1960», dans *Interface*, 7-3: 22-29 (1986).
7. COLLIN, Johanne, «La dynamique des rapports de sexe à l'université 1940-1980: une étude de cas», dans *Histoire sociale/Social History* 19-2: 365-386 (1986).
8. HEAP, Ruby, «Urbanisation et éducation: la centralisation scolaire à Montréal au début du XX^e siècle», dans *Historical Papers/Communications Historiques, Montréal 1985*, Ottawa, Société historique du Canada, 1986: 132-155.
9. DUMONT, Micheline, «Le défi des religieuses enseignantes d'aujourd'hui», *Canadian Woman Studies/Les cahiers de la femme*, 3: 51-54 (1986).
10. HEAP, Ruby, «Les femmes laïques au service de l'enseignement primaire public catholique à Montréal: Les écoles des «dames et demoiselles», dans *ibidem*: 55-60.
11. LASSERRE, Claudette, «Du masculin au féminin», dans *ibidem*: 61-64.
12. LEBRUN, Josée, «Des charmantes petites perruches... les étudiantes de sciences-lettres 1916-1960», dans *ibidem*: 65-67.
13. MALOUIN, Marie-Paule, «Idéologie et pratiques scolaires», dans *ibidem*: 68-72.

14. DUMONT, Micheline, «Une tradition de gestion féminine en éducation», dans *Actes du Colloque «Gestion de l'éducation au féminin»*, Université du Québec à Chicoutimi: 7-21 (1987).
15. DUMONT, Micheline et Lucie CHAMPAGNE, «Le financement des pensionnats de jeunes filles au Québec: le modèle de la Congrégation des Soeurs de Sainte-Anne, 1850-1950», dans *La Société Canadienne d'Histoire de l'Église Catholique, Sessions d'étude 1986*: 63-92 (1987).
16. FAHMY-EID, Nadia et Aline CHARLES, «Savoir contrôlé ou pouvoir confisqué? La formation des filles en technologie médicale, réhabilitation et diététique à l'Université de Montréal (1940-1970)», dans *Recherches Féministes. À propos d'éducation*, 1-1: 5-30 (1988).
17. DUMONT, Micheline et Nadia FAHMY-EID, «Bilan des recherches en histoire de l'éducation des filles», dans *Recherches et Progrès en éducation. Bilan et perspectives*. Actes du Congrès des Sciences de l'éducation de langue française au Canada, Québec: 57-63 (1988).
18. DUMONT, Micheline, Nadia FAHMY-EID et Ruby HEAP, «Bilan des publications et recherches en histoire de l'éducation au cours des quatre dernières années», dans *Bulletin de l'ACHE/ICHEA*, 5-2: 59-69 (1988).
19. FAHMY-EID, Nadia et Ruby HEAP, «Le Couvent Rideau et les couvents du Canada français face au défi de la modernité (fin XIXe siècle - début XXe siècle)», dans *Cultures du Canada français*, Ottawa, Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa: 98-118 (1989).
20. FAHMY-EID, Nadia et Johanne COLLIN, «Savoir et pouvoir dans l'univers des disciplines paramédicales: la formation en physiothérapie et en diététique à l'Université McGill, 1940-1970», dans *Histoire sociale/Social History*, XXII-43: 35-64 (1989).
21. DUMONT, Micheline, «La gestion financière des religieuses», dans *Féménisation et masculinisation de la gestion* (C. Baudoux, éd.). Cahiers de Recherche du GREMF, no 29: 107-142 (1990).
22. FAHMY-EID, Nadia, «Le sexe du savoir. Aspects de l'éducation des filles au Québec (19e-20e siècles)», dans *E/Ancragesféministes*, Cahiers de Recherche du GIERF, Université du Québec à Montréal: 51-70 (1990).
23. FAHMY-EID, Nadia et Lucie PICHÉ, «Le savoir négocié. Les stratégies des Associations de technologie médicale, de physiothérapie et de diététique pour

l'accès à une meilleure formation professionnelle (1930-1970)», dans *Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française*, 43-4: 509-534 (1990).

24. DUMONT, Micheline et Lucie CHAMPAGNE, «La gestion financière d'un séminaire diocésain. Comparaison avec le financement des pensionnats de religieuse», dans *Revue d'histoire de l'éducation/Historical Studies in Education*, 2-2: 339-352 (1990).

25. DELORME, Marie-Josée, «Les rapports entre le Pensionnat Sainte-Marie et la Commission Scolaire de Yamaskaville, 1930-1960», dans *Revue d'histoire de l'éducation/Historical Studies in Education*, 3-1: 49-74 (1991).

THE LINGUISTIC TURN: THE ABSENT TEXT OF
EDUCATIONAL HISTORIOGRAPHY*

Sol Cohen

What is omnipresent is imperceptible. Nothing is more commonplace than the reading experience and yet nothing is more unknown. Reading is such a matter of course that at first glance there is nothing to say about it.

Tzvetan Todorov, "Reading as Construction," in *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, ed. Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crossman (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980), 67.

I

"What do you read my lord?"

"Words, words, words."

This exchange between Hamlet and Polonius might be echoed by the historian of education who is asked to state the basic material of his study. Yet we don't pay much attention to words, language, or reading.

This should be an exciting time for historians of education. During the past fifteen years or so some of our best scholars in fields as diverse as linguistics, philosophy, sociology, and literary theory have been re-examining conventional ideas about language and re-thinking the relation between language and thought, language and action and language and history. The emphasis on language has led one group of historians to develop a new framework for doing history in which language is considered as an event or form of action as real or material as any non-linguistic event or action; in which codes, or paradigms, or systems of language become the basic unit of historical investigation; and in which language generally, its use, production, diffusion, and appropriation over time is moved to the centre of the historian's concern. The radical focus on language as event not

only adds a whole new category of historical "facts," a whole new family of historical "acts" to the historians' traditional concern with laws, wars, and changes of political administrations, but calls attention to new methods for understanding the problem of social and cultural change and new methods for gauging the extent of such change. This approach, pioneered by the English historian of political thought, J.G.A. Pocock, is currently being pursued by historians Keith Baker and Lynn Hunt among others.¹ The "linguistic turn" has at the same time led another group of historians to explore the relevance of modern literary theory for history. It is this latter development which is the primary focus of this paper.²

It might be assumed that as a species of non-fiction, history is free from the entanglements and limitations posed by the nature of language and which condition all writing. But in recent years, thanks largely to the work of historians Hayden White, Hans Kellner, Dominick La Capra, and F.R. Ankersmit, it is now possible to discuss the relationship between history and language, and history and rhetoric, in ways that would have been deemed outlandish ten or fifteen years ago. White's is the most fully and carefully articulated theory of a poetics of historiography.³

White construes history-writing as pre-eminently a literary or poetic activity. That is, historical writing is writing, a form of prose discourse, a piece of literature first of all, and thus possesses the same linguistic properties as any other kind of literature. Consequently, literary theory must be at the centre of modern historiography. A work of history is to be read with the tools and concepts provided by literary theory, for the art of its composition, the rhetorical demands required by its particular mode of emplotment, and the rhetorical means by which it claims to represent historical truth or reality. White's project is to correct the epistemological innocence of most historians, namely, their reluctance to consider the fabricated quality of histories, "the contents of which are as much *invented* as *found* [sic] and the forms of which have more in common with their counterparts in literature than they have with those in the sciences."⁴ In short, the historian is a story-teller. Historians make stories out of mere chronicles, shaping their materials, choosing what is a fact, an event, and then arranging the selected events into a particular narrative plot structure. Indeed, priority must be given the plot structure, the historian's "prefiguration" of a sequence of events "as a story of particular kind."⁵ Historians give the past meaning by telling now one and now another kind of story about it. However, the number of possible story forms or emplotments available to us for endowing events with meaning are not infinite but are "coterminous with the number of generic story types available in a historian's own culture."⁶

As White depicts the field of prefigurative narrative structures available to historians, he allocates historical plot narratives to genres just as one would a novel or a play. Following literary critic Northrop Frye, White identifies a stock of four inherited story forms or archetypal plot structures which constitute the historian's initial dramatic resources: Romance, Comedy, Tragedy, and Satire,

which, within limits, can be mixed or combined. Briefly, the essential plot element in Romance is the "adventure quest," characterized by a progress or evolution, ending in ultimate triumph, or the promise of ultimate triumph. The characteristic plot trajectory of Comedy is U-shaped, with the action sinking from grand beginnings into potential catastrophe, then a sudden upward turn to a transformation or happy ending. The pre-generic plot element of Tragedy is that of the death of the hero, or the demise of the heroic. The essential plot element of Satire is that of a decline and fall from grand beginnings and (authorial) criticism, or "attack from a high moral line."

Further, these four *mythoi* correlate in a general way with four principal modes of ideological implication: Anarchist, Liberal or Progressive, Conservative, and Radical. That is, how one emplots history engages larger social and cultural questions. The historian's choice of story form or plot structure is an index of a particular ethical or moral and political sensibility and as such accounts for the generation of different interpretations of history. From this perspective, disputes among historians are not so much about what "really" happened or about "objectivity" versus "distortion" as much as they are disputes about different emplotment strategies; "what one historian may emplot as a tragedy another may emplot as a comedy or romance," each of which possesses its own ideological implications. Moreover, the historian's choice of plot structure and rhetorical devices have a "performative" dimension in the sense that written history is history *for* as well as *of*. Written history is "for" in the sense of being written for a specific audience or social group or community of discourse and performs a certain function in some particular discourse of its time; it is "for" in the sense of being written with some political or ideological aim in view. Moreover, histories are structured for purposes of persuading readers that one version of the past is truer or more correct or more objective than another one and thus to persuade readers to assume a particular attitude towards the past and thus towards present reality.⁷

Certainly there are serious theoretical issues raised by White's approach, many of which he himself has addressed.⁸ Nonetheless, the value of White's topological or poetic theory of historiography is this—it enables us to read historical texts by reference to the mode of emplotment and rhetorical strategies that predominate in them in addition to or as an alternative to our usual way of reading which focuses on a "content" which exists outside or prior to its form or structure, the supposed neutral or transparent container in which that content is transmitted. This approach to historical writing as pre-eminently a poetic or literary enterprise has led Hans Kellner, following White, to elaborate a rhetorical or "crooked" way of reading histories which most economically makes the point. To avoid misunderstanding we should quote Kellner:

Getting the story crooked means looking at the historical text in such a way as to make more apparent the problems and decisions that shape its [rhetorical] strategies.... It is a way of looking...at the *other* sources of

history [sic], found not in archives or computer databases but in discourse and rhetoric.⁹

By reminding historians of the irreducible rhetorical or poetic nature of historical discourse, White and Kellner challenge us to domesticate ourselves in the poetic world and to become more reflective about the nature and problematics of writing and reading history. Their challenge, so far as historians of education are concerned, has largely fallen upon deaf ears.

One must be concerned with the current state of educational historiography. An unseemly provincialism, a singular lack of intellectual curiosity even, has in the last decade or so settled over the historiography of education.¹⁰ White is the most interesting if not the most talented of historians in the field today. Whether one agrees with him or not, his work cannot be ignored. It is astonishing that in the seventeen years since the publication of his *Metahistory* (1973) White has had so little visible impact on historians of education. With the exception of Richard Angelo's fugitive essays, historians of education have shown no interest in theory of narrative or in the rhetorical sources of historical knowledge, understanding, or practice.¹¹ This is the absent text of educational historiography referred to in the title of this paper.

What follows is an exercise in the application of historiographical poetics and narrative theory to the reading of a recent work of American educational history. I have chosen David F. Labaree's *The Making of an American High School: The Credentials Market and the Central High School of Philadelphia, 1838-1939*, the winner of the (American) History of Education Society's Outstanding Book Award for 1989, for the exercise.¹² With its particular narrative formulae, particular ideological implications, and particular rhetorical strategies, *The Making of an American High School* represents one of the two main competing and alternative genres, modes of emplotment, or prefigurative moves in American educational historiography today, the other being the Romantic or Comedic genre as represented, for example, by the late Lawrence A. Cremin's *The Transformation of the School* or Diane Ravitch's *The Troubled Crusade*.

This exercise is intended as illustrative and suggestive. There is no one right way of reading Labaree's book or of reading any historical work, only ways of reading.¹³ What I hope to demonstrate is that a rhetorical reading, one which focuses on the rhetorical tactics Labaree employs, how he attempts to establish the credibility of his version of the past reality of American education and to persuade readers his is the "true" or "correct" version, may yield novel insights, discover meaning in unexpected places, and increase the pleasures of "reading between the lines."

II

The mythopoeic titles of many histories of education are revelatory of their mode of emplotment, e.g., Cremin, *The Transformation of the School* (Romance);

Diane Ravitch, *The Troubled Crusade* (Romantic Comedy); Michael Katz, *The Irony of School Reform* (Satiric Comedy); Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (Tragedy); Ira Shor, *Culture Wars: School and Society in the Conservative Restoration, 1964-1984* (Satiric Comedy). *The Making of an American High School* is emplotted in the mode of Satire, an unrelenting critique, the reverse or a parody of the idealization of American public education which, for example, characterizes the Romantic/Comedic tradition in American educational historiography. The political and educational ideology implicated in *The Making of an American High School* is Progressive.

The narrative trajectory of Labaree's book is a downward spiral. Its predominant mood is one of anger and disillusionment with the deterioration or subversion and fall from grace of American public secondary education. The story line of *The Making of an American High School*, though the reverse of Romance, is equally formulaic: from democratic origins, conflict and decline and fall. The conflict is between egalitarianism and "market values," between the early democratic aspirations of Central High School to produce a virtuous and informed citizenry for the new republic and its latter-day function as an elitist "credentials market" controlled by a middle class whose goal is to ensure that their sons receive the "credentials" which would entitle them to become the functionaries of capitalist society.¹⁴ The decline and fall of American public secondary education, according to Labaree, begins in the 1890s, not only at Central High School (CHS) of Philadelphia but throughout the United States; Labaree egregiously extrapolates from the former to the latter throughout the book.¹⁵ The metaphor of the "credentials market," by which Labaree means to signify a vulgar or profane and malignant essence of American secondary education, is one of the main rhetorical devices deployed in *The Making of an American High School*. Labaree stresses the baneful effect of "market forces" and "market values" on every aspect of CHS and American secondary education: governance, pedagogy, the students, the curriculum. As befits his Satiric mode of emplotment, Labaree attacks the "market" conception of secondary education from a "high moral line," that of democracy and egalitarianism. The lugubrious downward narrative trajectory of *The Making of an American High School* unexpectedly takes a Romantic or Comedic upward turn at the very end of the book, when Labaree mysteriously foresees the coming transformation of the high school. We have to quote Labaree's last paragraph. "As a market institution," he writes, "the contemporary high school is an utter failure." Yet "when rechartered as a common school, it has great potential." The common public high school "would be able to focus on equality rather than stratification and on learning rather than the futile pursuit of educational credentials." Stripped of its debilitating market concerns, "the common high school," Labaree contends in his final sentence, "could seek to provide what had always eluded the early selective high school; a quality education for the whole community."¹⁶ The End. Labaree's ending is underdeveloped and implausibly optimistic, even utopian, in

stark contrast to his previous chapters. It is an ending which poses a fascinating historiographical problem.

The problem of beginnings and endings of histories is a fascinating one because beginnings and endings are not *givens* and they demonstrate in an obvious and fundamental way, once one is made aware of it, how our decisions to start and stop writing at a certain point are literary or rhetorical decisions, and how these decisions affect the stories we tell.¹⁷ Suppose we take a closer look at Labaree's ending. The last line of his book suggests that we may be at the dawn of a new age. This ending is a piece of pure literary design, a hoary convention of the Romantic genre. That is not the problem. The problem is that Labaree's ending conflicts with the Satiric mode of emplotment which characterizes *The Making of an American High School*. That is, the Satiric trajectory of Labaree's narrative should lead inexorably to the conclusion that we must resign ourselves to the world of secondary education as it is—alas, we live or rather go to school unhappily ever after—or to the conclusion that radical action must be taken to change the educational system or some catastrophe will occur which will destroy our schools or our lives. Instead, *The Making of an American High School* ends with reference to the world of desires and dreams; the dreamer says "Let There Be Common High Schools."

The high school may presently be a servant of the marketplace, but it can be transformed, as in a wish-fulfillment dream or fantasy, into the kind of high school its democratic advocates always envisioned. But the underlying thrust of *The Making of an American High School* is that nothing has changed in American secondary education between the 1890s and 1939 or the 1890s and the present; yet Labaree would have us believe that things will be different in the future. Everyone will live or learn happily ever after. The "market forces" will be overcome. The public high school will in the future be transformed. How might this come about? How will the dark forces of the market be overcome? One can only make happen what one dreams about first.

Diane Ravitch, in another but related context, criticizes histories of American education that define American public schools as institutions which simply "preserve the status quo and parcel out credentials." Such "hard-edged cynicism," she goes on, "has less truth than the 'myth' it is intended to debunk."¹⁸ We have no quarrel with the Satiric tradition of doing educational history or, more specifically, with Labaree's Satiric mode of emplotting his story. His is a legitimate way to create meaning from the profusion of meaningless "sources" on education we find about us as the Romantic mode of emplotting histories of education. Labaree's ending, however, lacks one of the key ingredients of a good story: a credible ending, a plausible and convincing culmination, closure, moral. Labaree's concluding statement of hope and promise does not follow from what precedes. His ending requires more bite, a call to take up arms, a call for an educational revolution. Labaree's Satiric mode of emplotment calls for a cataclysmic transformation type of ending, not a wish-fulfillment dream type of

ending. Labaree's happy ending lacks "rightness of fit," to borrow a term from Nelson Goodman.

Labaree's problem seems to have been this. The future of the American public high school is very much at the centre of the contemporary debate in American education. Labaree is committed to the ideal of public secondary education. *The Making of an American High School* could not end with a call for revolution in the public high school; Labaree is a Progressive, not a Radical or Anarchist. Nor could it end on a note of resignation or despair (readers cannot be left without the hope that somehow, sometime, change will be effected in the public high school or else they might flee to the private school sector, the *bete noir* of American Progressives). Labaree's egalitarian political and educational sensibilities will not permit an unhappy ending, although nothing in his narrative justifies anything else.

Labaree employs two major rhetorical devices in *The Making of an American High School*: one is that of the "market" metaphor, the other is his utilization of the technical apparatus of Quantitative Research Methodology. Labaree's utilization of the "market" as his central, governing metaphor, at least since the publication of *The Shopping Mall High School: Winners and Losers in the Educational Market-Place* and *Selling Students Short: Classroom Bargain and Academic Reform in the American High School*, no longer has much force as revelation.¹⁹ And his use of the metaphor is mechanical and simplistic. Labaree refers hazily to "markets," "market values," "market pressures," "market forces," and the "intrusion of the market." Readers are supposed to understand what Labaree intends to signify by the metaphor and to agree with him that public secondary education in America is undemocratic and inequalitarian. Labaree takes all this for granted, never explaining, never justifying. That the "market" might also stand for deregulation, freedom of choice, empowering parents, or accountability, for example, none of which would seem to infringe adversely on democratic ideals, and all of which might possibly advance the goal of egalitarianism and quality in education, seems not to have crossed his mind.²⁰ Nevertheless, the "market" metaphor is an heuristically useful device which enables Labaree to reveal an aspect of American public education that is completely ignored or omitted in Romantic emplotments of American educational histories.

There is something more significant going on in Labaree's book, however, than his emplotment of the history of American secondary education in the mode of Satire and the formulation of his argument in terms of the metaphor of the market. Thus, the most prominent rhetorical device Labaree utilizes in *The Making of An American High School* is actually not that of the market metaphor, but that of the terminology and apparatus of Quantitative Research Methodology. Labaree confronts the reader with no less than fifteen statistical tables in what is a very brief work (only about 180 pages of text), as well as four statistical Appendices. Two samples from the latter will serve to give the flavour of the whole.

From Appendix B:

Table B. 1, "Wealth of Central Parents by Class, 1860 and 1870 Combined" (with columns for "class," "mean," "N," and "S. D."), Table B. 2, Occupational Distribution of Household Heads, CHS vs. Philadelphia, 1880. (With columns for "Central High (%), Philadelphia (%), Index of Representativeness (%)"²¹)

From Appendix C:

The primary technique used in analyzing student achievement was multiple classification analysis (MCA), a form of multiple regression using categorical predictor variables (called factors). MCA constructs a beta for each factor as a whole rather than for each level of this variable as is done in regression with dummy variables.

There is one assumption of both regression and MCA which was violated routinely during my analysis, the assumption of homoscedasticity....²²

What stance are we to take before these Tables and Appendices? What is their meaning or function? What do they do? How do they work? How shall we read them?

We will assume, with White, that histories have a performative dimension; to persuade an audience to act, feel, or value in a particular way. And that they are structured to have that particular effect: *all* their constituent parts, from title to dedication and acknowledgements, from foreward to footnotes to bibliography, index, and appendices, etc., may be thought of as rhetorical strategies. And that is how we intend to read Labaree's Tables and Appendices. One can applaud Labaree's diligence in finding and mining a trove of empirical data ("based on a sample of two thousand students drawn from the first hundred years" of CHS).²³ But there is a kind of rhetorical overkill here. For all his figures and statistics, we are not much wiser than before; they are actually redundant. They give us no new information. What is their function in the text then? Labaree's utilization of the nomenclature and technical apparatus of quantitative research methodology is to be understood as no more (or less) than a rhetorical strategy in the service of "realism."²⁴

Within the conventions of its genre, *The Making of an American High School*, though lacking in grace as a piece of writing, possesses some complexity and depth, if not breadth: it is an acceptable story. But as if Labaree were dissatisfied with the credibility and persuasiveness of a mere story, or with that story's formal rhetorical properties, its Satiric mode of emplotment, its metaphoric mode of explanation, its fairy-tale ending, or were aware of its writerly deficiencies, he puts on scientific or Positivist airs. Labaree's piling on

of inessential detail and his deployment of the arcane vocabulary and symbols of quantitative research function as a rhetorical device to counteract or efface the discursivity, the textuality, the obvious literary-ness of *The Making of an American High School* and to reinforce or enhance the authority of his book and the ideological thrust of his argument. As if the language of "mean," "standard deviation," "regression analysis," "beta factors," "dummy variables," and "homoscedasticity," vis-à-vis ordinary language, were a transcendent, epistemologically superior or privileged language: rigorously scientific, impartial, objective. From this perspective, the Tables and Appendices in *The Making of an American High School* are not actually there to be read; they are, in fact, unreadable. They are simply there to be seen; their sheer presence in the text is what "counts."

As we learn from White and Kellner, among others, historians are engaged in the reading and writing of stories. Writing history is in essential ways analogous to writing a story. Reading history is in essential ways analogous to reading a story. As writers what we produce are stories or models of story-telling, representations of historical reality, or manifestations of the historical imagination; in our field, what we produce is a way of conceptualizing the reality of American education. As readers, the stories our colleagues tell cannot be compared with the educational past as "it really was," since there is no basic, canonical version of that past to compare them to. However, we can judge history writing within its own conventions, and we can compare histories of education or "stories" about education to each other (and with other representations of educational world-making). *The Making of an American High School*, within the conventions of its genre, is a modest and minor work, so thin the last chapter has to be fleshed out by a review of the past decade's literature on the American high school. But the point is not to reprove or criticize Labaree. *The Making of an American High School* is a first book. It is or was a competent doctoral dissertation, with all the flaws of even a competent dissertation. That it was awarded the Outstanding Book Award for 1989 by the History of Education Society simply shows which way the historiographical winds are currently blowing in the United States.

III

By way of summary, one direction the "linguistic turn" has taken in recent years is toward history-as-narrative or history-as-story. Historians are tellers and readers of "stories." To say that history is a "story" does not imply falsity; it is simply to assert that histories are constructions of language and rhetoric. It is to underscore White's point that "any representation of history has to be considered a *construction* of language, thought, and imagination rather than a *report* of a

structure of meaning presumed to exist in historical events themselves" [sic].²⁵

Kellner puts it this way:

The processes of the historical imagination... are everywhere [not just in the final stages] *linguistic*, shaped and constrained from the start by rhetorical considerations that are the "other" sources of history. [sic]²⁶

Within the frame of this model of historiography, to ask of a history of education whether it is "true" is not a useful question, although how one views the history of education matters, since history is frequently summoned in order to influence or justify attitudes or actions in the present.²⁷ What we can do is to acknowledge the multidimensionality of historical reality and point out that those who have no sense of *histories* of education can believe any history of education. And we can acknowledge that since historians themselves are forced to choose among competing modes of emplotment and narrative strategies, the best grounds for a reader's choosing one interpretation of history of education rather than another are ultimately aesthetic and moral rather than epistemological, which is to say the reader's choice is "part of a larger cultural discourse of which historical understanding is a part, and not apart."²⁸

Where does that leave us? Historians of education, like other historians, once forsook rhetoric for science in order to present the truth unadorned and to privilege our specialty. The nineteenth-century paradigm of scientific method we emulated was almost outmoded at the very moment of our appropriation of it. Now, thanks to the pioneering work of White and Kellner among others, we can rediscover the rhetorical sources of our historical understanding, of our practice of history, and of our authority as historians. Finally, as tellers and readers of "stories" we have much to learn from our colleagues in literary theory.²⁹ That is, as tellers and readers of "stories" we all of us possess an initial stock of rhetorical resources which can be expanded the more we learn about "stories." And that is *my* story.

NOTES

- * An earlier version of this essay was presented at the CHEA Biennial Conference, University of Ottawa, Oct. 14, 1990.
1. Pocock's seminal "Languages and Their Implications: The Transformation of the Study of Political Thought" appeared in his *Politics, Language, and Time: Essays on Political Thought and History* (London: Atheneum, 1971). Pocock has influenced the thinking of a handful of American intellectual historians. See the essays by Gordon S. Wood, David A. Hollinger, Thomas L. Haskell, and Thomas Bender in John Higham and Paul K. Conkin, eds., *New Directions in American Intellectual History* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979). See also the essay by Keith Michael Baker on the ideological origins of the French Revolution in

- Dominick La Capra and Steven L. Kaplan, eds., *Modern European Intellectual History: Re-appraisals and New Perspectives* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982). My review of Lawrence A. Cremin, *American Education: The Metropolitan Experience, 1876-1980*, has clearly been influenced by Pocock: *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation*, vol. 1 (Fall 1989): 307-26.
2. For the several directions the "linguistic turn" can take see Martin Jay, "Should Intellectual History Take a Linguistic Turn?" in La Capra and Kaplan, *Modern European Intellectual History*, chap. 3.
 3. The essential texts are White's *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973) and his two collections of essays: *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978), and *The Context of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987). See also Hans Kellner, *Language and Historical Representation: Getting the Story Crooked* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989); two collections of essays by Dominick La Capra: *Rethinking Intellectual History: Texts, Contexts, Language* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983), and *History and Criticism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985); F.R. Ankersmit, *Narrative Logic: A Semantic Analysis of the Historian's Language* (Boston: Martinus Nijhoff, 1983). A handful of philosophers, e.g., Alisdair MacIntyre, W.B. Gallie, Paul Ricoeur, and Arthur Danto have also turned their attention to the relation between narrative theory and history.
 4. White, *Metahistory*, 7.
 5. White, *Tropics of Discourse*, 82, 58, 22.
 6. White, "Historical Pluralism," *Critical Inquiry* 12 (1986): 488.
 7. See White's *Metahistory*, 7-38, for a full discussion. See also the following by Northrop Frye: *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957), esp. sec. 3, "Archetypal Criticism; Theory of Myths"; and *Fables of Identity: Studies in Poetic Mythology* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1963), esp. chap. I, "The Archetypes of Literature."
 8. E.g., White, "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality," in *On Narrative*, ed., W.J.T. Mitchell, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), 1-24, and *passim*. And see Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The Objectivity Question and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 599-607.
 9. Kellner, *Language and Historical Representation*, VII. La Capra suggests that "in a sense, historians are professionally trained not to read." La Capra, *Re-Thinking Intellectual History*, 339. La Capra describes the historian's traditional form of "documentary" reading as an excuse for taking a detour around texts and not really reading at all. La Capra's call for a "dialogical" or "worklike" reading of texts as opposed to a "referential" or "documentary" reading of texts complements Kellner's notion of a "crooked" reading.
 10. But see J. Donald Wilson, "The New Diversity in Canadian Educational History," *Acadiensis* 19 (Spring 1990): 148-69.
 11. E.g. Angelo's "Myth, Educational Theory, and the Figurative Imagination," *Philosophy of Education Proceedings, 1978* (Urbana, Ill., 1979), 227-38, and "The Freedom We Have in Mind," *Educational Theory* 28 (1978): 177-83. And see the intriguing effort to employ narrative theory in curriculum and teacher studies by two Canadian scholars: F. Michael Connelly and D. Jean Clandinin, "Stories of Ex-

- perience and Narrative Inquiry," *Educational Researcher* 19 (June-July 1990): 2-14.
12. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
 13. Compare Lazerson's review of *The Making of an American High School* in *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation* 2 (Fall, 1990): 375-77.
 14. *The Making of an American High School*, 1.
 15. Labaree's aim in choosing to study CHS was "not to pick a typical high school" but "to choose one that is exemplary." *Ibid.*, 2.
 16. *Ibid.*, 182.
 17. See Keilner's discussion of the rhetorical problems posed by beginnings and endings of histories in *Language and Historical Representation*, 2, 7-8, and chap. 3, "Boundaries of the Text: History as Passage."
 18. *The Troubled Crusade, American Education, 1945-1980* (New York: Basic Books, 1983), xii.
 19. A.G. Powell, E. Farrar and D.K. Cohen, *The Shopping Mall High School: Winners and Losers in the Educational Marketplace* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1985); and Michael Sedlak et al., *Selling Students Short: Classroom Bargains and Academic Reform in the American High School* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1986).
 20. There are useful discussions of the problems involved in the use of metaphors in William Taylor et al., eds., *Metaphors of Education* (London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1984).
 21. *The Making of an American High School*, 186.
 22. *Ibid.*, 187.
 23. *Ibid.*, 2.
 24. See the discussion in "From Realism to Convention," in Wallace Martin, *Recent Theories of Narrative* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986), chap. 3, and Philip Wheelwright, "The Sense of Reality," *Metaphor and Reality* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1968), chap. 8. And in general see White's discussion of Ranke and historical realism in *Metahistory*, chap. 4.
 25. "Historical Pluralism," *Critical Inquiry* 12 (1986): 483.
 26. *Language and Historical Representation*, 24.
 27. In continually rearranging our knowledge of reality, the historian helps to determine "how we wish to act on it." Ankersmit, *Narrative Logic: A Semantic Analysis of the Historian's Language*, 250.
 28. Keilner, *Language and Historical Representation*, 24.
 29. For example, see the essays in the following collections: Josue V. Harari, ed., *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism* (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1979); Jane P. Tompkins, ed., *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980); Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crossman, eds., *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980); and Mario J. Valdes and Owen Miller, eds., *Identity of the Literary Text* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985).

CHURCH TEEN CLUBS, FEMINIZED ORGANIZATIONS? TUXIS BOYS, TRAIL RANGERS, AND CANADIAN GIRLS IN TRAINING, 1919-1939*

M. Lucille Marr

By the beginning of the twentieth century, the Methodists and Presbyterians faced a crisis. Many youth, especially boys, were leaving the churches. In the hopes of encouraging their young people to stay involved, officials from these denominations adopted a new educational programme for youth. For boys, they used the YMCA's Canadian Standard Efficiency Training (CSET) and for girls, the YWCA's Canadian Girls in Training (CGIT). Religious educators found that the CGIT worked well as a church programme, but they were disappointed with the CSET. Indeed, expectations that the Trail Rangers and Tuxis boys' clubs, which used the YMCA's CSET, would keep young men active in the churches remained unfulfilled. Clergymen felt discouraged as they observed United Church boys joining non-church groups such as Scouts. At the same time, they looked with envy at the success of the CGIT.

Take for instance Rev. Normal Coll's 1929 report to the United Church Board of Religious Education. At that time, Coll was religious education field secretary for the Montreal and Ottawa conference of the United Church. From his perspective as overseer of religious education in that conference, he was pleased with the progress made by the female leaders in charge of the girls' clubs. In his view, the CGIT's success was largely due to the work of Mary Allison and Bona Mills, the national officials hired to oversee United Church girls' organizations.

Coll was uneasy, on the other hand, with what he perceived to be the weak leadership of the boys' clubs. In 1929, Frank Langford, Associate General Secretary of the United Church Board of Religious Education, was in charge of boys' work along with his other administrative duties, as he had been since church union in 1925. It would be seven long years before the United Church would recognize that Langford's administrative duties precluded his programme work and find funding to hire a national boys' secretary. Coll, worried about this gap in national leadership, knew that with his varied responsibilities as field secretary, he had neither the time nor the energy to devote to boys' work in Ottawa and Montreal. In his mind, the Montreal YMCA and the Scouts were examples of organizations which had taken seriously their opportunity to train boys. Coll was certain that the boys' workers hired by the YMCA and the Scouts explained why United Church boys and their leaders found these groups so appealing. Indeed

Boy Scouts claimed the loyalty of nearly 700 United Church boys, almost twice the number involved with the Trail Rangers and Tuxis programmes. In addition, over 50% of the 2,300 boys enrolled in Montreal's YMCA programmes were United Church.¹

Coll's observations illustrate the relative success of the girls' and boys' clubs in the Methodist, Presbyterian, and United Churches in the interwar decades. Clergymen watched the CGIT mature as a church organization, all the while asking themselves why their boys' programme failed to grow in similar proportions. It seems ironic that the men who held authority in the institution had difficulty meeting their goal of keeping boys in the church. In contrast, in spite of their lack of formal power, women nurtured and mentored a future generation of female church workers.

Male religious educators like Coll were convinced that national leadership was at the root of the problem. While the Methodist and Presbyterian Sunday Schools Boards had hired professional women specifically to promote CGIT as early as 1918,² it was left to the already overworked administrators to promote the CSET for boys. Not until 1936 did the United Church hire its first boys' work secretary. From the historical retrospective, however, the leadership only symbolized a much broader issue which had been at work in the liberal Protestant denominations since the early nineteenth century. As Ann Douglas has ably demonstrated in her provocative study, *The Feminization of American Culture*, these churches had become "feminized." In large measure they were feminine institutions run by a handful of male ministers. The difficulty of interesting laymen and their sons in the church had social and cultural causes beyond the clergy's control.³

The teen clubs offer an ideal context from which to analyse this phenomenon, for while the high proportion of girls was typical also of children's clubs and the societies for post-teens, the CGIT and the Trail Rangers and Tuxis boys stand alone as parallel male and female church organizations.⁴ Until now, most histories of the CSET and the CGIT have been written in a secular context, but by 1920 these programmes were adopted by the churches and the CGIT fit better into the church structure and theology than did the CSET.⁵ In this paper I propose to analyse the agenda of the CGIT and the CSET, showing that the female approach was more compatible with church life than was male technique. The success of the girls' clubs is striking. The CGIT was slower in getting started, but soon outnumbered the boys' clubs and by 1939 boasted 33% more groups.⁶

The Canadian Standard Efficiency Tests

Clerical reformers, along with other reformers, were concerned with the "young boy problem," for great numbers of boys had been leaving the Sunday schools since the late nineteenth century.⁷ Not only were most young people's

societies predominantly made up of girls, but many of the leaders were women. Thus by 1900, work with middle-class boys had become central to the YMCA's task of saving young men, and local YMCAs began to employ salaried boys' workers.⁸ By 1920, fifty-four Canadian YMCAs were doing boys' work, forty-two with secretaries hired specifically for the task.⁹

Scholars have suggested that the exodus of boys from the churches may be explained by the "feminization" of religion that had occurred in mainstream Protestant churches by that time. These studies argue that with industrialization, the masculine sphere had moved to the world of business and the nurture of children and things of the spiritual realm were left to the women and clergy in the domestic environment of their homes and the churches.¹⁰ This "feminization" is best illustrated by a theological shift that had taken place in these churches by the late nineteenth century. By mid-century, church leaders had begun to recognize that children reared in the church were their most likely source of future members.¹¹ Thus a new means of evangelism evolved. The old idea that children were depraved human beings and that by adulthood a crisis conversion experience was necessary before becoming a church member, began to give way to the concept of Christian nurture. Respected Methodist and Presbyterian ministers including Henry Bland, Egerton Ryerson, and John Thompson advocated views which had already been made popular in the United States by Horace Bushnell. The new theology held that children were loved by God right from birth and it was the responsibility of the churches to educate them and to nurture them gradually into church fellowship.¹²

The new focus on children was strongly associated with maternal nurture. Women came to be preferred as Sunday-school teachers both in their obvious role as child-rearers and also for their moral influence on society. It is doubtful whether the advocates of Christian nurture recognized the "pedagogical control" that women would come to exert over the young. As Ann Douglas put it, "children who had once been required to sit, no matter how restlessly, through the adult service, might now receive their earliest religious instruction from a woman rather than from a minister."¹³ Ultimately, women's role in Christian nurture would mean that most girls would follow in their female teachers' footsteps, while boys would be more likely to look outside of the domestic realm of their homes and the churches for role models.¹⁴

Scholars have suggested that the phenomena of absentee fathers, and of mothers "teaching boys to be men," created feelings of inadequacy in adolescent boys which resulted in the need to prove their masculinity.¹⁵ In their quest for manliness, boys became preoccupied with an endless need to prove their strength and independence. This led to an obsession with the physical and a concentration on personal success, rather than the Christian emphasis on community service and cultivation of the inner man which had been characteristic of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.¹⁶ In David McLeod's words, by the twentieth century "manliness" had changed meaning, "coming to signify less the opposite of childishness than the opposite of femininity," and "an enduring fear of

anything effeminate accounted for much of the...obsessively muscular Christianity" touted for young men.¹⁷

Reformers and churchmen were concerned for the future of twentieth-century manhood. In 1914, the Canadian Methodists and Presbyterians, who had been unable to achieve their objectives of creating denominational boys' programmes, had begun to cooperate in a formal way with several other denominations and the YMCA. Although some ministers worried about competition with the churches and "questioned the...quality of the religious work" of the YMCA, others recognized it as "the handmaid of the church."¹⁸ Initially church and YMCA leaders had been enthusiastic about Boy Scouts, but the groups soon parted ways because Scout leaders were not primarily church-oriented. Furthermore, Scouting failed to recruit the older boys in whom the churches and the YMCA were interested.¹⁹ Thus Presbyterian and Methodist religious educators, namely John Robertson, Charles Myers, and Frank Langford, along with Anglican, Baptist, and Salvation Army church leaders joined with the YMCA to establish the Canadian Advisory Committee on Cooperation for Boys' Work to promote the YMCA's new plan for boys.²⁰

The YMCA's new programme was the CSET which had been published in 1912. Taylor Statten, who had become national boys' work secretary of the YMCA that year, had worked with a planning committee of YMCA laymen and such Sunday-school leaders as Charles Myers to create the CSET. The programme followed the YMCA's old four-fold formula, clustering a series of tests and awards under the four categories of living defined by the YMCA as intellectual, spiritual, physical, and social. Before 1920, separate manuals were ready for Trail Rangers (ages 12-14) and Tuxis boys (15-17).²¹

The YMCA's ownership of the CSET was short-lived, however. A variety of circumstances resulted in the CSET being turned over to the churches by 1921. Not only had the war left the YMCA in severe financial straits, but the churches were interested mainly in working with Sunday-school youth and the YMCA was unprepared to limit its work to young men with specific church affiliations.²² By this time, there was a new ecumenical structure in place whose primary purpose was to promote religious education in the churches. The Religious Education Council of Canada (RECC), as it was called, had been formed by the Methodists and Presbyterians, along with several other groups, in 1919. The National Advisory Committee for Cooperation in Boys' Work became an arm of the RECC, separate from the YMCA, which was also represented on the new council.²³ By this time the CSET boasted 1155 organized groups with some thirteen thousand boys as members and clergymen anticipated that the programme would continue to grow under their leadership.²⁴ Throughout the twenties and thirties religious educators, particularly those from the uniting churches, promoted boys' work and encouraged those local congregations who had not yet tried the new programme, to give it a chance.

Though the programme, as Statten and his committee had planned it, focused on the intellectual, physical, social, and religious aspects of boy life, the CSET

emphasized the "muscular" aspects of Christianity, physical prowess and intellectual maturity, over the spiritual and the social. To be "strong socially" had little to do with bettering the community; it meant that a boy would make his "leisure time profitable" and acquire "a strength of personality" which would enable him "to achieve that which he little dreamed lay within his power." Likewise, to develop religiously had little to do with cultivation of the inner spirit; it focused on the organization, urging boys to centre their lives around the Tuxis Square which met twice weekly, on Sunday and once during the week.²⁵

Probably the most innovative aspect of the CSET, as Statten envisioned it, was the Boys' Parliaments. South of the border, this aspect of the Canadian programme won the praise of Professor J. M. Artman, the Director of Religious Education and Vocational Training at the University of Chicago, which was the heart of North America's religious education movement. Describing the CSET as one of "the most significant developments in religious educational procedure now in existence," Artman further depicted the Boys' Parliaments as "the high point of a Religious Education movement worth watching."²⁶

Provincial Boys' Parliaments were held annually across the Dominion in every provincial Parliament building except Quebec's. In each province, boys who were declared by their ministers to be church-members and "not addicted to the use of intoxicants, narcotics, or tobacco," were elected from several districts. These boys then campaigned to win election to the Provincial Boys' Parliaments and they were also eligible to run for National Parliament.²⁷ The boys travelled from church school to church school, often speaking to entire church groups, presenting their various platforms of activities for Canadian youth. Sometimes they further strengthened their case by writing articles for their local newspapers, showing why they should be elected. The elections culminated in three days in Parliament. After the pomp and ceremony of formal opening procedures, the boys followed parliamentary rules discussing, debating, amending, passing, and defeating bills aimed at further developing the boys' movement.

From his perspective as a religious educator, Artman found it exciting to observe Manitoba boys spending several days during their 1925 Christmas vacation grappling with moral and religious issues in Parliamentary sessions:

It is spiritually exhilarating to share with boys seeking to eliminate professionalism in athletics and pledging themselves to eradicate such evils in their districts by themselves refusing, sometimes at great financial sacrifice, to have any part in such practice, and by campaigning throughout their districts for all youth to do the same. The movies, belittling amusements, cheap reading, lack of church attendance, stronger programmemes for Father and Son week...all come in for debate.²⁸

Although the boys were being trained in moral values, parliamentary procedure prepared the men of the future for positions in the world of politics and business, not for the lay positions which comprised the essence of church community life.

Nor did the other outstanding feature of the CSET, a system of badges, prepare boys for spiritual life in the church community. Trail Rangers and Tuxis boys could win up to twenty-four sweater badges by attaining certain standards of expertise in areas such as first aid, public speaking, astronomy, Indian life, and Christian heroes. They could earn badges also by displaying signs of discipline in their choices of entertainment and by developing proper health habits such as swimming or cycling regularly. Frequent attendance at church worship services, helping at home, and doing well at school also merited badges.²⁹ While it should not be overlooked that these goals were set with the intent to foster godliness and a community spirit, it is important to recognize that a programme calculated to develop a competitive mindset would have worked against the very spiritual values it set out to instil. As the clergy noticed these contradictions, they looked to the CGIT as a model, altering Statten's CSET to emphasize the relational and spiritual aspects of life.

Canadian Girls in Training

Much as Statten and the CSET committee had attempted to develop a "muscular Christianity" which would appeal to boys, the women who envisioned the CGIT based their programme on what they perceived to be the naturally feminine instincts of girls. Winnifred Thomas, Olive Zeigler, and Una Saunders created the CGIT programme squarely in the "maternal feminist" tradition of their time.³⁰ While clergy and other male social gospellers were preoccupied with the "young boy problem," these women insisted that there was an equally significant "young girl problem." The girl problem was different from the boy problem, however. It was not that girls were leaving the church in the same proportions as their brothers; it was more a question of equal time for girls. Insisting that training tomorrow's mothers was as essential for the future of Canadian society as was work with the prospective male leaders, the YWCA experimented with a variety of strategies which included girls' clubs, summer camps, and Girl Guide companies.³¹ Similar to the YMCA's relationship with Scouts, the YWCA's connection with Guides was short-lived. Although the YWCA sponsored a number of Guide companies when Guiding was introduced into Canada in 1910, by 1917 the YWCA workers decided that the Guide programme was too competitive. Nor was Guiding devoted to religious education.³² The YWCA was committed to working with the churches, and these women saw a need for church-sponsored girls' work.

Thus by the autumn of 1915, the YWCA established the National Advisory Committee for Cooperation in Girls' Work paralleling that for boys.³³ During

the following two years under the auspices of this committee, Una Saunders, Winnifred Thomas, and Olive Zeigler prepared a new programme for girls aged thirteen to seventeen which they named the Canadian Girls in Training (CGIT). With little guidance available from the existing literature on the religious education of adolescent girls, Saunders, Thomas, and Zeigler pursued a thorough research campaign in which they discerned the needs of Canadian girls through questionnaires and discussions with YWCA leaders, Sunday-school teachers, Girl Guide leaders and high school teachers.³⁴ The CGIT programme that emerged from these years of study and debate has been described as the climax of the YWCA's years of experimentation in girls' work. Modelled after the YWCA's girls' clubs and led by a YWCA worker or a Sunday-school teacher, CGIT, like the CSET, was organized under the YWCA's four standards for development of youth. In sharp contrast to the competitive activities encouraged in the CSET, however, these leaders assumed that girls would serve the church and society best if they were encouraged to adopt co-operative activities.

In the first place, the CGIT programme rejected the competitive badge system common in teen clubs of that time. Although competition hardly fit the feminine ideal, at least one girls' group, the Girl Guides, elected to work with badges.³⁵ It seems that the initiators of CGIT deliberately chose to emphasize activities that nurtured a co-operative spirit. For instance, Thomas and her committee encouraged their girls to collaborate in planning and implementing homecraft and missionary projects instead of competing with their friends to collect badges. In addition, CGIT girls were invited to help with the younger children's Sunday-school classes and mid-week programmes as well as the summer vacation schools.³⁶

In the second place, the CGIT leaders recognized that girls' parliaments were unrealistic. In an era in which women had only just received the franchise, they saw citizenship as meaning something quite different than it did for boys. Instead of debating and passing bills, the CGIT officials sought to teach girls the meaning of suffrage and the value of their vote. For this purpose, the National Girls' Work Board adopted a study guide prepared by the Local Council of Women in Regina. This material outlined the structure of the Canadian government and the history of the women's suffrage movement, all the while encouraging girls to vote as soon as they were of age. For CGIT girls in the 1920s, citizenship meant learning to exercise the virtues deemed peculiar to women in their mothering and nurturing capacities in the public sphere. For instance, the creators of the CGIT encouraged girls to become aware of reform issues such as temperance, for they believed that much of the legislation for the protection of women and children was the result of women's votes.³⁷ It was these activities that fostered community and spiritual values forming the basis of the CGIT's success as a church group.

In 1921, the same year that the YMCA turned the CSET over to the churches, the CGIT also became a church-sponsored programme, the National Advisory Committee for Cooperation in Girls' Work serving the churches along with the National Advisory Committee for Cooperation in Boys' Work under the auspices

of the RECC.³⁸ The RECC's decision to adopt the YWCA programme meant that women had new opportunities to promote CGIT in the churches. Indeed the clergy were dismayed to find the girls' programme to be more successful than the Trail Rangers and Tuxis Boys.

Much of the women's success appears to have been the result of their knowledge of new educational methods. Indeed there was no parallel in the CSET to the CGIT's exciting Bible studies which fostered discussion and intellectual inquiry. The CGIT officials derived their techniques from their experience with the "new evangelism"³⁹ and the principles of "progressive education" or the "new education," as it was called in Canada.⁴⁰ The male religious educators also advocated new educational methods,⁴¹ but it appears that it was the CGIT leaders who introduced the new approach.

In contrast to the older established clergy who served as religious educators, the CGIT officials were younger and were recent university graduates.⁴² Schooled in the student YWCA and the Student Christian Movement, the women were among the generation of students for whom wartime conditions had fostered a new sense of independence and a greater social vision.⁴³ These young people believed it was their task to reconstruct society, or to build the City of God. While these goals were characteristic of deep personal faith, university students of the twenties had become disillusioned with institutional religion for its involvement with the war effort and its slowness to accept the findings of modern science. Thus they thrived on studies of the historical Jesus led by H. B. Sharman, a key figure in the SCM, whose thinking bore the mark of liberal theology and modern Biblical criticism.⁴⁴

The CGIT officials then effectively combined what they had learned from the SCM Bible studies with elements of progressive education, for the women had a further edge on the male leaders. In the first place, numerous young men had been lost in the war, and in the second place, young women were more inclined than their male peers to attend the normal schools, where teachers espoused the progressive theories of John Dewey and his disciples. Thus there was a pool of women teachers. For many women, paid teaching in the elementary schools only provided an interlude in lifelong commitment as a volunteer in the local Sunday school. Time and again religious educators praised young school teachers for their willing leadership in the Sunday schools and mid-week clubs.⁴⁵

It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of the work of a girl in a lonely country school. Here she is teacher, but in many instances, much more than a teacher, for she is a sort of general servant of the community, giving leadership in every good work. She is found teaching Sunday-school, where no one had thought of it.⁴⁶

When marriage and motherhood terminated these young teachers' formal careers, many devoted their energies to the church and community.

In marked contrast to the abundance of women available to teach Sunday-school classes, religious educators were frustrated by the chronic shortage of male teachers. For instance Oliver Jackson, the Superintendent of Missions and Religious Education in Newfoundland, was convinced that the low interest in Trail Rangers was directly related to "the lack of the right type of leader, apart from the minister."⁴⁷ Another official, David Forsyth, believed that "the discovery of leadership is the greatest need that exists in our United Church Boys' Work."⁴⁸

Many men probably had their hands full earning a living to support their families, but among those that did find time to volunteer in the churches, few had the training and expertise to apply the concepts of Christian nurture to their work with boys, for few men had trained as teachers. In contrast, the CGIT officials and local leaders found the liberal churches to offer more opportunities than even the public schools to practice the "new education" techniques which they had learned in the normal schools, for Canadian schools were slow to adopt the new ways.⁴⁹

Armed with the new educational philosophy and Sharman's methods, women such as Olive Zeigler and Winnifred Thomas had created a programme designed to "take the trouble to think with the present generation of students in terms which they can understand, not in a dogmatic or theological way, but in terms of a strong, Christian *Way of Life* under the leadership of Christ."⁵⁰ So seriously did they take their mandate that CGIT leaders wrote many of their own materials. For example Thomas' Bible study, *The Kingdom of God*, was used over several summers at CGIT camps and by many local groups. This study was based entirely on the synoptic gospels and used the Sharman method "to make real to girls 'the Jesus of history...to lead them to see clearly what he meant when he spoke of the Kingdom of God' and to inspire them 'to commit unreservedly to the extending of His Kingdom in the world'." Thomas advised leaders to use "'research and discussion' and to encourage 'girls to do *their own thinking*. It is irreverent to approach the study of the Bible with a lazy mind'," she wrote.⁵¹

The CGIT programme made a great impact on the girls who were fortunate enough to come under its influence. Take for instance Doris McCarthy, a Canadian artist. In writing her memoirs, she devoted an entire chapter to what she called "the bliss of growth" that she had experienced under the influence of the CGIT in the 1920s. In recounting her experience with CGIT Bible studies, she recalled:

For the first time in my life I understood how the disciples and the early church had struggled to find words to say what they had come to feel about Jesus. After meeting Jesus the man I could return to the language of the church and find it full of meaning. Even the theological words of the creed made sense, especially with some judicious personal reinterpretation.

She continued, "this was the new light that I wanted" for other younger girls. Bored by the more traditional Sunday-school experience, McCarthy volunteered to teach, initiating a new CGIT group for younger teens at Toronto's St. Aiden's United Church.⁵² With results like this, it is small wonder the male officials continually held up the girls' movement as a model and aimed for comparable results in their boys' clubs.

The Feminization of the Trail Rangers and Tuxis Boys

Of course in 1912 when Statten and his colleagues prepared the CSET, they had had no exposure to the Sharman method. Moreover, as was already mentioned, far fewer men than women had the advantage of normal-school training. This may explain the cautious manner in which boys' workers adapted their religious and moral instruction to the new understandings of education. As they gradually gave up mass meetings to attempt group Bible studies, these leaders found themselves inadequately prepared to conduct such studies.⁵³ Nor did they have materials from which to work. The second problem was solved easily enough. It was fairly straightforward to borrow from the materials already published by the girls' workers.⁵⁴ The real difficulty lay in finding leaders capable of leading good Bible discussions.

The boys' club in Midland, Ontario is a case in point. Evidently the leaders were poorly equipped to attempt serious study and group activities. Instead, they organized a hockey team and a yearly hobby show. An annual father and son banquet was their only concession to the spiritual and relational end of church life. Such banquets were encouraged by the International Council of Religious Education during Father and Son Week in the attempt to redeem the fragmented father and son relationships of the industrial era. It is significant, however, that in Midland this event was entirely dependent on the women's auxiliary. The ladies prepared and served the meals, but when their group took on a catering contract for another organization, there were no more father and son banquets in Midland.⁵⁵

In the absence of male leaders, women often taught boys, mentoring them in the decidedly more feminine aspects of church life in the process. For instance, Mrs. George Weir, the pastor's wife at Saint Andrew's United Church in Ripley, Ontario, taught a class of young men. In contrast to the boys in Midland whose father and son banquet was terminated when there were no longer women to serve them, Mrs. Weir's boys did the serving at the annual grandmother, mother, and daughter banquet.⁵⁶

Wrestling with the problem of finding suitable men to lead the boys' clubs, male administrators recommended merging boys' and girls' groups, or at least bringing them together with the young people's meetings on the same evening.⁵⁷ These officials hoped that co-ordinated activities would create a larger momen-

tum than a small group could by itself.⁵⁸ The girls' leaders conceded that it was important for boys and girls to interact socially and were willing even to lend their materials to the flagging boys' movement. They balked, however, at suggestions which hinted at amalgamation of the teen groups. In 1929, Mary Allison cautioned officials against moving too quickly on joint activities:

Our concern regarding the need of developing joint activities and the correlating of Boys' and Girls' and Young People's Work seems so far to be too much based on "generalized" feelings and marked tendencies, together with "hunches" as to the causes underlying.⁵⁹

That same year, Bona Mills appeared relieved that while many "seemed to consider the separateness of the teen-age movements during the past years a distinct weakness, there were none who felt complete merging would be advisable."⁶⁰ In her study of the CGIT movement, Gabrielle Blais hypothesized that this may have been for two reasons. First, the CGIT leaders were aware that girls were more mature than boys of their own age. Second, young women leaders may have been ambivalent about their own relationship with men.⁶¹ It seems more likely, however, that the CGIT leaders refused to give up the independence that they and their girls experienced in their own mid-week meetings.

The teen programmes remained separate, but by 1929 a common approach had evolved which revamped the youth agenda to fit the feminine model, focusing on co-operation and relationships.⁶² In the hopes of integrating the spiritual with other aspects of the teen agenda, the revised programme deliberately directed attention away from the individual to relationships with the home, school, church, and community. It was hoped that this altered focus would result in a greater loyalty to the church.⁶³

Club leaders were urged again and again to emphasize the connection of their groups with the church school. Volumes of correspondence went out from the head office, encouraging local leaders to emphasize Bible Study, decisions for Christ, church membership, temperance education, and missionary promotion.⁶⁴ Officials believed that under the new system, teen groups were "more accessible to the minister and his associates in Christian leadership than before."⁶⁵ Such studies as *Climbing Life's Highway* by Melville C. Wright aimed to capitalize on the religious awakening that occurred during the teen years.⁶⁶ Nurturing boys into the faith was far from natural in a "feminized" church, however. By the mid-1920s, a revised Tuxis and Trail Rangers programme emphasized the relational, forfeiting the more individualistic ideals of the four-fold plan. No longer were badges or Boys' Parliaments emphasized. In marked contrast to the aggressive nature of team sports, the new programme encouraged boys to co-operate with one another in group, relay, and challenge games such as stride ball, weavers' relay, club snatch, and rooster fight. This would permit the less skilful boys to participate on a more equal basis than team games such as hockey

and baseball permitted. The new approach stressed that competition failed to foster the fellowship essential to a good devotional attitude.⁶⁷

Further, the new programme distinguished between argument and discussion, instructing mentors on the purpose of such exchanges:

The lecture method may be easier for the mentor but a lecture represents one way traffic of thought...Every mentor should strive to give part of the study period to discussion. Argument is not discussion. To crush or defeat another's theories and opinion is to miss an opportunity of sharing intellectually. Discussion should become a pooling of ideas and, as such, is highly desirable.⁶⁸

It is difficult to determine the impact of such advice on leaders of boys' groups. It is evident, however, that the national leadership adopted the feminine values of co-operation and relationships which had been fostered in the CGIT movement right from its inception.

While it is difficult to know how many of the Trail Rangers' and Tuxis Boys' leaders attempted to implement these co-operative principles, one might hypothesize that this "feminization" of the church teen boys' clubs was at least partially responsible for the ongoing interest of many boys and leaders in Scouts.⁶⁹ Veronica Strong-Boag has suggested that while girls of that day, much like the girls of today, enjoyed peaceful and co-operative projects, boys were intrigued by more competitive activities.⁷⁰ Norman Coll's observation that many United Church boys and leaders in Ottawa and Montreal had joined the Boy Scout movement, then, is hardly surprising. The situation in that conference was, at least in part, a result of the Board of Religious Education's decision to alter the boys' programmes. Many United Church boys and men shunned what must have seemed to them an "unmanly" emphasis on co-operation, in favour of the more competitive Scout programme. Timothy Eaton Memorial United Church in Toronto is a case in point. That institution's historian notes that while the CSET programmes were started there in the 1920s, by the end of that decade Boy Scouts and Cubs had replaced them.⁷¹ Other churches like Century-Queen Square in Saint John, New Brunswick, ran both programmes simultaneously during those years.⁷²

By 1933 officials recognized that their programme was in danger, for United Church boys and men preferred Scouts to Trail Rangers. A committee designed to analyse the problem affirmed United Church support in theory for any "Christ-centred" boys' programme which aimed "to bring the boy into natural and full Christian fellowship and Church Membership." Since the Boy Scout movement made no claim to be a church-centred programme, however, the Board of Religious Education declared that in practice, it would continue to give official recognition only to the Trail Ranger and Tuxis programmes.⁷³

While many boys were unimpressed by their new co-operative church programme, the CGIT continued to appeal to girls. It is important to emphasize,

however, that teen-age girls hardly found egalitarian opportunities in the "feminized" church of the interwar decades. The prolonged struggle for ordination continually reminded CGIT leaders of the limited opportunities for girls in the institutional church.⁷⁴ The 1932 *Leader's Book* acknowledged the situation: "In the case of the worship of the Sunday session," it read, girls were offered "comparatively little opportunity of contributing."⁷⁵ Nevertheless, young women were fortunate to have more opportunities in their CGIT groups than they had in coeducational settings. In CGIT, girls learned to participate in discussions, conduct business meetings, keep minutes and accounts, and prepare and lead worship services.⁷⁶ By circumventing the male ministers and Sunday-school superintendents, the CGIT leaders themselves could maintain control of their groups and teach their girls important life-skills. Thus while CGIT officials were willing to share their materials and expertise with boys' leaders, in the tradition of other women's organizations, they held tenaciously to their autonomy and independence. As Strong-Boag has pointed out, "in some ways,...CGIT represented only a more formal opportunity to participate in a long-existing female culture and cultivate female friendships."⁷⁷

Conclusion

This study of the CSET and the CGIT programmes in the 1920s and 1930s suggests that the relational ideology and co-operative methods which suited girls reflected also the goals of the Methodist and Presbyterian religious educators. This conclusion substantiates the hypothesis that liberal Protestant churches had become "feminized" institutions. For instance in 1938, the executive of the Young People's Union noted with alarm:

Grave concern is experienced in many Churches because, in most of the Churches' activities, the men of the congregation are conspicuous by their absence....The men are found usually in Public Worship and on Church Boards. A few teach in the Sunday School, or sing in the Choir. Occasionally they join in a mixed or Men's Bible Class. In most Churches, however, practically all the Service work is done by the Women's Association, the Missionary Education by the Women's Missionary Society, the Mission Circle or Auxiliary, and the Adult Religious Education by Women's Bible Classes.⁷⁸

During these decades Canadian Methodist and Presbyterian clergymen, worried about the exodus of boys from their churches, experimented with educational methods which they hoped would interest boys in church life. By 1912, church officials had joined forces with the YMCA, supporting the new CSET programme. Excited about Taylor Statten's "muscular" version of Chris-

tianity, clergymen pictured male mentors encouraging boys to live active Christian lives through the competitive programme of badges and Boys' Parliaments. The boys' programme worked under a handicap, however, for there was a dearth of qualified men interested in teaching boys.

The girls' programme, on the other hand, had the advantage of large numbers of women in the churches, many of whom had been previously trained as elementary school teachers and who were eager to lead local groups of girls. Thus when the YWCA followed the YMCA's precedent, creating the CGIT as a programme to parallel the CSET, they found many positive responses in the churches. The CGIT was based on the premise that teaching girls the art of Christian womanhood was equally significant to training young men. The YWCA women, however, deliberately rejected such competitive aspects of the boys' programme as badges. Instead they concentrated on teaching girls relational and co-operative skills. As recent college graduates, the women who created the CGIT programme used the knowledge they had gained from SCM Bible studies and progressive educational methods to train girls to enjoy critical discussion and dialogue.

Although the Trail Rangers and Tuxis boys' clubs initially outnumbered CGIT groups, this trend soon reversed itself. While grappling with the shortcomings of their programme, clergymen observed the success of the CGIT and began to look to the girls' programme as a model. By 1927, religious educators altered the old approach of the CSET, softening its more competitive aspects to take on the relational and co-operative characteristics of the CGIT. While the new boys' programme fit better into church life, its appeal to boys and their leaders was limited. Boys and men preferred competitive activities such as those promoted by the Scouts. Further, few laymen were qualified to teach with modern educational methods. Thus in the end, CGIT, offering girls opportunities long held by women's groups to nurture relationships in the church, provided a starting point for a variety of other avenues of service, while boys continued to drift away from the churches for lack of a programme that spoke to their needs.

NOTES

- * An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Canadian History of Education Association meeting in October 1990.
- 1. United Church of Canada Archives, Victoria University [hereafter UCA], United Church of Canada [UCC], Board of Religious Education [BRE], Minutes, Apr. 1929, 69.
- 2. The Presbyterians took the lead in encouraging their congregations to become aware of the importance of religious training for teenage girls, selecting May Gemmill, a Queen's University graduate, as its first girls' work secretary in 1918, immediately on the heels of the appointment of that denomination's first field secretary. By 1919, the Methodists followed suit, also hiring a girls' secretary. UCA, Presbyterian Church of Canada, *General Assembly* (1918), 221.

3. Ann Douglas, *The Feminization of American Culture*, 2nd ed. (New York: Doubleday, 1988), 13, 17-19.
4. This study emerges from the larger context of my doctoral thesis in which I analysed youth groups of all ages. I found that the ratio of girls to boys remained constant at about two-thirds girls and one-third boys. For instance, in 1920, among Methodist pre-teens there were 9,000 boys compared to some 17,000 girls. The ratio of boys to girls was similar for the post-high school group with some 19,000 boys compared to some 36,000 girls. "Church Hierarchy and Christian Nurture: The Significance of Gender in Religious Education in the Methodist, Presbyterian and United Churches of Canada, 1919-1939" (University of Waterloo, 1990), 195, n.2.
5. Several scholars have analysed these club movements as part of the early twentieth-century reformers' efforts to mould the nation's youth into good Christian citizens. Margaret Prang and Gabrielle Blais have provided interesting and thought-provoking studies of the Canadian Girls in Training Movement. See Prang, "'The Girl God Would Have Me Be': The Canadian Girls in Training 1915-1939," *Canadian Historical Review* 66, 2 (June 1985): 154-84; Gabrielle Blais, "The Complete Feminine Personality: Female Adolescence in the Canadian Girls in Training (CGIT) 1915-55" (M.A., University of Ottawa, 1986). Diana Pedersen has provided further insights into the development of the CGIT in "Young Women's Christian Association of Canada, 1870-1920: A Movement to Meet a Spiritual, Civic and National Need" (Ph.D. diss., Carleton University, 1987). The parallel programme for boys, the Canadian Standard Efficiency Training (CSET), has aroused less scholarly interest thus far, but David McLeod contributed some valuable insights into that movement in "A Live Vaccine: The YMCA and Male Adolescence in the United States and Canada, 1870-1920," *Histoire sociale/Social History* 11, 2 (May 1978): 5-25. Patricia Dirks has set the programme in the context of Methodist history: see "'Getting a Grip on Harry': Canada's Methodists Respond to the 'Big Boy' Problem, 1900-1925," *Canadian Methodist Historical Society Papers* (1989): 67-82. Leila Mitchell McKee has attempted the only study thus far in which both the boys' and girls' programmes have been analysed as parallel movements, but she made few efforts to understand the differences which gender made on the two programmes. See "Voluntary Youth Organizations in Toronto, 1880-1930" (Ph.D. diss., York University, 1982). Even though these programmes had become primarily church-run organizations by 1919, only Dirks analysed youth work from the perspective of church history.
6. In 1921, the National Boys' Work Board estimated that there were approximately 1,800 boys groups across Canada although they only had 1,361 groups on record in the national office; in contrast, the National Girls' Work Board had about 1,700 groups on record. By 1929, the UCC *Yearbook* recorded that there were close to 2,200 girls' clubs, four hundred more than boys. By 1939, the gap had become even wider. There were seven hundred more girls' clubs than there had been a decade earlier, while the boys' organizations had actually dwindled so that there were only about two-thirds as many boys' clubs as there were girls' clubs. UCA, Religious Education Council of Canada (RECC), Minutes (9 Sept. 1921): 13, 15; UCC, *Yearbook* (1929): 182; (1939): 39.
7. J. H. Riddell noted that this concern first came up in the Methodist church at the General Assembly of 1904. *Methodism in the Middle West* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1946). See W. B. Forbush, "Training the Boy," in *The Encyclopedia of Sunday Schools and Religious Education*, ed. J. T. McFarland et al. (New York & London:

- Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1915), 161, for a list of books which attempted to deal with boys' needs in the early twentieth century. Patricia Dirks has dealt exclusively with the boy problem as well in "Getting a Grip on Harry," and "Finding the 'Canadian' Way: Origins of the Religious Education Council of Canada," *Studies in Religion* 16, 3 (Summer 1987): 303-16.
8. David Mcleod based this hypothesis on the "feminization" theory developed by Douglas, in *Feminization of American Culture*: "A Live Vaccine," 6, n.3, 9-11, 13.
 9. Murray G. Ross, *The Y.M.C.A. in Canada: The Chronicle of A Century* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1951): 194-95.
 10. Douglas' *Feminization of American Culture* was preceded by Barbara Welter's "The Feminization of American Religion: 1800-1860," in *Clio's Consciousness Raised: New Perspectives on the History of Women*, ed. Mary Hartman and Lois W. Banner (New York: Harper & Row, 1974): 135-57.
 11. Samuel D. Clark, *Church and Sect in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1948): 261.
 12. Horace Bushnell was the father of the theology of Christian nurture. See *Christian Nurture*, reprinted from the 1861 edition (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979). For further discussion on the theology of Christian nurture see Neil Semple, "'The Nurture and Admonition of the Lord': Nineteenth-Century Canadian Methodism's Response to 'Childhood,'" *Social History/Histoire sociale* 14, 27 (May 1981): 157-76. While there are no similar studies of the development of Presbyterian thought on this issue, John McNeill pointed out that John Thompson, the first Presbyterian Sabbath school convener, held to Bushnell's view of Christian nurture. See *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925* (Toronto: General Board, Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1925): 158-59. See also Douglas, *Feminization of American Culture*, 121-64; Anne M. Boylan, *Sunday School: The Formation of an American Institution: 1790-1880* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1988): 133-65.
 13. Douglas, *Feminization of American Culture*, 112.
 14. I deal more extensively with this concept in chap. 6 of my Ph.D. dissertation.
 15. E. Anthony Rotundo, "Body and Soul: Changing Ideals of American Middle-Class Manhood, 1770-1920," *Journal of Social History* 16, 4 (1983): 30. See also David Mcleod, "A Live Vaccine," and "Act Your Age: Boyhood, Adolescence, and the Rise of the Boy Scouts of America," *Journal of Social History* 16, 2 (Winter, 1982): 3-20.
 16. Rotundo, "Body and Soul," 29-32.
 17. Mcleod, "A Live Vaccine," 10-11; J.H. Kett, *Rites of Passage: Adolescence in America, 1790 to the Present* (New York: Basic Books, 1977): 173.
 18. Ross, *The Y.M.C.A. in Canada*, 33, 323; "The Canadian Boys' Work Plan," *Religious Education* 14, 2 (Apr. 1919): 107.
 19. Mcleod, "A Live Vaccine," 15-16; Dirks, "Finding the 'Canadian' Way," 309-10.
 20. By 1920, this committee became known as the National Boys' Work Board [NBWB]. C.A.M. Edwards, *Taylor Statten* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1960): 47-48; UCA, *The Boys' Own Book* (Toronto: National Boys' Work Board of the Religious Education Council of Canada, 1929): 9-10.
 21. Mcleod, "A Live Vaccine," 20; John T. McNeill, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1875-1925* (Toronto: Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1925): 181-82.
 22. Mcleod, "A Live Vaccine," 22; Ross, *The Y.M. C.A. in Canada*, 354.
 23. Dirks describes the development of the RECC in "Finding the 'Canadian' Way."

24. Mcleod, "A Live Vaccine," 22; Ross, *The Y.M.C.A. in Canada*, 203-5.
25. UCA, *The Canadian Standard Efficiency Training for Trail Rangers and Tuxis Boys* (Toronto: Committee on Canadian Standard Efficiency Training, 1918): 3.
26. The article by J. M. Artman was originally published in *Religious Education* and reprinted in *The Canadian Mentor* (Jan. 1925): 1, 7.
27. *The New Outlook* (23 Feb. 1927): 15.
28. *The Canadian Mentor* (Jan. 1925): 1; see also *The Canadian Standard Efficiency Training*, 9 and *The Boys' Own Book* (Toronto: National Boys' Work Board of the RECC, 1929): 30-31.
29. *The Canadian Standard Efficiency Training*, 405-421.
30. Linda Kealey defined "maternal feminism" as "the conviction that women's special role as mother gives her the duty and the right to participate in the public sphere." *A Not Unreasonable Claim: Women and Reform in Canada, 1880s-1920s* (Toronto: Women's Educational Press, 1979): 7.
31. Pedersen, "Young Women's Christian Association," 2, 468.
32. Pedersen, "Young Women's Christian Association," 388; Prang, "The Girl God Would Have Me Be," 159.
33. Early in 1920 this committee became known as the National Girls' Work Board. Prang, "The Girl God Would Have Me Be," 158, n.13.
34. Prang, "The Girl God Would Have Me Be," 158-60; Pedersen, "Young Women's Christian Association," 391, 400-1. See also Gertrude E. Griffith, "The Girl," *Encyclopedia of Sunday Schools*, I: 450. In Griffith's words, "the problem of the boy has demanded...attention....As a consequence of...wide-spread interest, a wealth of material on...this subject has been produced....That such material concerning the girl in her teens is not equally available, has been the cause of real concern among persons actively interested in...the adolescent girl."
35. McKee mistakenly suggested that CGIT also used badges. "Voluntary Youth Associations," 404. See also Helen Lenskyj, "Femininity First: Sport and Physical Education for Ontario Girls, 1890-1930," *Canadian Journal of History of Sport* 13, 2 (1982): 4-17.
36. UCA, UCC, BCE Collection, *The Leaders' Book*.
37. Prang, "The Girl God Would Have Me Be," 172-73.
38. Pedersen, "Young Women's Christian Association," 401.
39. Richard Allen, *The Social Passion: Religious and Social Reform in Canada 1914-28* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971): 224-25.
40. Prang, "The Girl God Would Have Me Be," 163.
41. UCA, PCC, GA (1923): 269.
42. Prang, "The Girl God Would Have Me Be," 165, 170.
43. Elizabeth Anderson showed that women participated almost equally with men at all levels of activity in the SCM in the twenties. UCA, "Women and the Student Christian Movement of Canada, 1921-1949" (Unpublished paper, 1980): 12.
44. Prang, "The Girl God Would Have Me Be," 165; Donald L. Kirkey, "'Building the City of God': The Founding of the Student Christian Movement of Canada" (M.A., McMaster University, 1983): 3, 5, 51-53, 88-89, 102-3, 153-54.
45. For instance, Oliver Jackson praised public school teachers in Newfoundland for their contribution to religious education. UCA, UCC, BCE, Minutes (Apr. 1937): 77-78. See also *Teacher's Monthly* (Nov. 1924): 644.
46. *The New Outlook* (2 Dec. 1925): 25.
47. UCA, UCC, BCE, Minutes (Apr. 1937): 77-78.

48. UCA, UCC, BCE, Minutes (Apr. 1937): 72.
49. Prang, "The Girl God Would Have Me Be," 163-64; see also Robert Stamp, *The Schools of Ontario, 1876-1976* (Toronto: University of Toronto, 1982): 51-53; 164-67.
50. UCA, Methodist Church of Canada [MCC], Board of Sunday Schools and Young People's Societies [BSSYP], Minutes (1920): 71.
51. UCA, Winnifred Thomas, *The Kingdom of God* (Toronto: National Girls' Work Board, c. 1926); Prang, "The Girl God Would Have Me Be," 166-67.
52. Doris McCarthy, *A Fool in Paradise: An Artist's Early Life* (Toronto: MacFarlane Walter & Ross, 1990).
53. Mcleod, "A Live Vaccine," 16.
54. The Board of Religious Education recommended a number of sources from the NGWB to boys' workers: *The Use of the Bible in Worship, The Use of Poetry and Prayer in Worship, The Use of Stories in Worship, From Dawn to Dawn, Heralds of the Dawn, A Treasure Book of Books, A Treasure Book of Discussions*. The NBWB adapted several other NGWB publications for boys' use: *A Girls' Practice of the Presence of God, The Kingdom of Love, The Message of Jesus for the Life of Today*. UCA, UCC, BCE Collection, Boys' Work, Box 3, Files 9-10, "List of Supplies for Trail Rangers and Tuxis Groups," 1932-33, and "The Programmeme of Boys' Work in the United Church of Canada."
55. UCA, UCC, BCE Collection, Boys' Work, Box 3, File 8, "Boys' Work in Midland"; Box 10, File 47, "Father and Son Week" (Nov. 1931).
56. *St. Andrew's United Church, Ripley, Ontario, 1886-1986* (Mildmay, Ontario: The Town & Country Crier, 1986): 35.
57. UCA, UCC, BRE, Minutes (31 Aug. 1926): 10.
58. UCA, *The Torch* (Nov.-Dec. 1929): 35-36; BCE Collection, Boys' Work, Box 3, File 9-10, *Mentoring: Programme Suggestions for Trail Ranger and Tuxis Leaders*, 30-32.
59. UCA, UCC, BRE, Minutes (Apr. 1929): 54.
60. UCA, UCC, BRE, Minutes (Apr. 1929): 55.
61. Blais, "The Complete Feminine Personality," 65-66.
62. Carol Gilligan's hypothesis helps explain the different emphases in the boys' and girls' clubs of the twenties and thirties. Gilligan argues that for girls, relationships are primary whereas boys develop a separate and independent identity at an early age. See *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982): 160-61.
63. UCA, UCC, BRE, Minutes (31 Aug. 1926): 11. By 1929, a new book for leaders replaced the old *Canadian Standard Efficiency Training* manual. *Creative Leadership for Mentors and Workers with Boys, for Leaders in Boys' Work, Parents, Teachers, Ministers and All Interested in the Development of Canadian Boyhood* (Toronto: National Boys' Work Board of the RECC, 1929). By 1932, the National Girls' Work Board published a new manual for girls which also outlined these ideas, *The Leader's Book* (Toronto: National Girls' Work Board of the RECC, 1932).
64. UCA, UCC, BRE, Minutes (5 May 1927): 105-6; UCC, *Yearbook* (1927): 132.
65. *The Canadian Mentor* (Apr. 1931): 5.
66. C. Melville Wright, *Climbing Life's Highway: A Study of What Church Membership Means* (Toronto: United Church Publishing House, 1926); UCC, *Yearbook* (1928): 340-41; *The Torch* (Jan.-May 1930): 50-51; *The Canadian Mentor* (Apr. 1931): 5.

67. UCA, UCC, BRE, Minutes (18 Mar. 1926): 22; BCE Collection, Boys' Work, Box 3, File 9-10, *Mentoring*, 8, 15, 22 and "The Trail Rangers and Tuxis Boys' Programmes." See also McKee, "Voluntary Youth Associations," 409-10.
68. UCA, UCC, BCE Collection, *Mentoring*, 28.
69. Undoubtedly many local church groups, like the club in Midland, continued to emphasize the physical. For instance, the situation of a boys' church club of the 1950s that was more physically rough and competitive than the local Scouts group has been brought to my attention.
70. Veronica Strong-Boag, *The New Day Recalled: Lives of Girls and Women in English Canada, 1919-1939* (Mississauga: Copp Clark Pitman Ltd., 1988): 30.
71. Shirley Ayer, *A Great Church in Action: A History of Timothy Eaton Memorial Church, Toronto, Canada, 1909-1977* (Whitby: Plum Hollow Books, 1978).
72. *Milestones in Methodism: A History of Centenary-Queen Square United Church of Canada, Saint John, New Brunswick, 1790-1966* (Saint John, New Brunswick: Lingley Printing Co. Ltd., 1967): 160.
73. UCA, UCC, BCE Collection, Boys' Work, Box 11, File 48, "Report of a Committee to Consider the Attitude of this Board to the Boy Scout Movement," 6 Apr. 1933.
74. After years of struggle, women in the United Church of Canada finally achieved the privilege of ordination in 1936. For a description of those years and the issues involved see Nancy Hall, "The Professionalisation of Women Workers in the Methodist, Presbyterian, and United Churches of Canada," in *First Days, Fighting Days: Women in Manitoba History*, ed. Mary Kinnear (Regina: University of Regina Press, 1987): 120-33; Mary Hallett, "Nellie McClung and the Fight for the Ordination of Women in the United Church of Canada," *Atlantis* 4 (Spring 1979): 2-16; see also chap. 3 of my Ph.D. dissertation on this subject.
75. *Leader's Book*, 11.
76. Prang, "The Girl God Would Have Me Be," 170-71.
77. Strong-Boag, *The New Day Recalled*, 29.
78. UCA, UCC, BCE Collection, National Young People's Union, Second National Congress, 1938.

UNE REVUE À LIRE? WOULD YOU READ THIS JOURNAL?

This review is the first in a series which will examine periodicals in the field of the history of education.

The *Histoire de l'éducation* and Canadian Historians

Patrick J. Harrigan

Most Canadian historians of education are primarily interested in topics of Canadian educational history, but a number have focused on European education. Moreover, as the field has matured increasing numbers of them have become interested in a comparative history of education, primarily with that of Australia, England, or the United States but also with that of Europe. Certainly for historians of Quebec the French experience is illuminating. In 1979 a French journal appeared, the *Histoire de l'éducation*, devoted to research in French educational history but paying attention as well in its bibliography and book reviews to the educational history of other western countries as seen from a French perspective. Interest in education has burgeoned so much that most large western countries now publish a journal devoted to the history of education—*History of Education* (England), *Studi de storia dell'educazione* (Italy), *Historical Studies in Education* (Canada), *History of Education Quarterly* (U.S.), *Paedagogica Historica* (Holland), *Journal of International and Comparative Education* (Spain), and *History of Education Review* (Australia). *Histoire de l'éducation*, like the first two above, confines its articles to national history, while the others contain articles concerning a variety of countries. Although the *Histoire de l'éducation* has become a major journal within France, it is not widely known in North America (only nine institution subscriptions in the United States and seven in Canada—the National Library and the Universities of British Columbia, Montreal, Ottawa, Sherbrooke, and Waterloo, and the Collège de St. Boniface). Thus, a review of its history, format, and quality is appropriate.

Although the journal is editorially independent, it is funded by the French Ministry of Education through its *Service d'histoire de l'éducation*, founded in 1879 and now housed in the Institut national de recherche pédagogique (INRP) in Paris. This governmental aura is in contrast to the other educational journals cited which grew out of academic or professional organizations and has given

the publication a bureaucratic flavour, with many early articles treating administrative history or heralding the legislative initiatives of past governments—the 1982 issue celebrating the centennial of the Ferry Laws which abolished tuition in primary schools, made primary schooling compulsory, and removed all religion from the schools (*gratuité, égalité, laïcité*), is an unfortunate example of that bias. None of the authors mentioned, if they indeed recognized, that compulsory and free schooling was almost universal before the laws were passed. Pierre Caspard is the editor and administrative chief of *Histoire de l'éducation*, and a regular contributor of both articles and book reviews. Editorial board members are regular reviewers—nine of twenty of the book reviews in one issue in 1987 were written by three editorial consultants; such consultants wrote two dozen of the book reviews over two years—about one-third of the total reviews in those years. The selection of both the articles to publish and of the books to review seems to reflect the predilections of a few. Still, the quality of the research is good and the scope of the journal is widening along with its audience.

At its inception the journal had 237 individual subscriptions, 219 of those in France. Many subscribers were employed at lycées or in government rather than in academic or research posts. Of the eighteen foreign subscribers, five were from Britain, four from Germany, four from the United States, and three from Canada. Six years later, in 1984, its subscribers numbered 712. The number of individual subscriptions in France had remained about the same (233), and foreign ones had increased to 56; the large gain had been the 423 institutional subscriptions. Of the last, 290 were in France, 133 from ten different countries, Italy having the highest at 27 but even Japan and Switzerland with more than either Canada or the United States. These subscriptions compare favourably with most historical journals in France, excepting the giants like *Annales—économies, sociétés, civilisations*, *Revue d'histoire*, or *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine*.

Histoire de l'éducation's four annual numbers are divided into bibliography (44% of the space), articles (27%), notes ("informations" or "actualités scientifiques": 9%), and book reviews (20%).¹ The most valuable feature of the journal is its meticulous annual bibliography which appears in a September double-number. In 1979 it listed 1,134 citations for the year 1976; in 1989 it offered 1,383 citations for 1986. This comprehensive and invaluable bibliography includes not just works concerning French education but related topics such as the family and religion. Under the sections "Aspects théoriques et généraux," and "L'Éducation Générale," which comprise about 25% of the total citations, it lists general works on education that could be relevant to research in French educational history. Indicative of the strength of research by North American scholars into French education, 10-15% of the cited works were published on this side of the Atlantic. In the two aforementioned general sections, foreign citations constitute about 25% of the total. Other sections and their recent percentage of citations are the following: sources (7%), related [literacy, childhood] (12%), particular schools (9%), teachers (13%), curriculum (9%), students [*vie scolaire*] (20%), and social

aspects (5%). The bibliography also includes indices of authors, proper names, and places. Naturally, it is not annotated but it is exhaustive, even uncovering material available only on microfiche.

Research into French educational history exploded during the 1960s. Then, the historiography concentrated on official attitudes to education, the development of schools, political conflicts related to them, and teaching within them. Its research defined the intellectual dimensions and political ramifications of educational development. During the 1970s attention shifted to education from below and the application of social scientific methods to the study of the past. Insights drawn from sociology, statistics, and the *Annales* school defined new issues concerning who attended schools and what careers they pursued afterward, the extent of mobility, the role of the church, literacy, and serial history generally. Partly as a reaction to social scientific methodology in history, partly as a result of the general social and political conservatism in the 1980s, there has been some criticism of this preoccupation, particularly that of North American historians, with elites, mobility, and classes.² This reaction is apparent in the articles in *Histoire de l'éducation*, which are rarely interdisciplinary, but the bibliography indicates the continuance of themes of the 1960s and 1970s as well as new ones of the 1980s.

The great contribution of the 1980s has been the extension of research into women's education. In a historiographical article in 1980 I wrote that "the entire subject of women's education has received little attention until lately."³ Both in quantity and quality this subject dominates recent research. Curriculum has received new life. Theoretical discussion of the process of learning has continued to preoccupy scholars in France, with a greater historic awareness than before. In sheer numbers, histories of particular schools or schooling in a town or region dominate. No one could possibly read all of the last. Nor should one, for their quality is uneven and most fill gaps in information rather than opening new horizons. Although calls for comparative history still abound, attempts are few and found mainly in collections, with different authors treating different countries within a common theme. The volume of work on French educational history remains enormous, but some of the excitement of the 1970s has dissipated. Except in the area of women's history, the 1980s has not broken as much new ground as did the 1970s. The new structures are being built on existing foundations.

Although the review originally indicated a desire to publish works on both French and comparative history of education, articles thus far—four or five in each of the first two issues each year, only 1% of the selections in its own bibliographic section—have concentrated on French subjects. The range has constantly expanded, however, and has shifted from political/administrative topics to social and cultural ones. Many issues emphasize a particular theme. As with most other French journals, 1989 was a year for remembering the Revolutionary years and the quality of articles, which covered social history, curriculum, and science and medicine, was especially high. In 1988 three articles appeared

on "disciplines scolaires," or approaches to teaching, two concerned professional schooling, and another adult instruction. The 1987 edition concerned objects of teaching—one on history, two on literary topics, one on curriculum, and one on religion. In 1985 painting and popular culture was the subject of three articles, while childhood and Italian education also received attention. In both 1984 and 1985 the majority of articles dealt with curriculum—three concerned educational theory while others treated administration and teaching. Unlike *Historical Studies in Education*, *Histoire de l'éducation* deals exclusively with the past.

Historiographical articles have been a welcome recent addition. In the January 1990 issue, Dominique Julia, the leading scholar in the field of schooling during the ancien régime, wrote a lengthy survey of the past twenty years' historiography of French education during the Revolution. His article fairly treated works that appeared in North America as well as in France. Two years earlier, Michel Ostenc, who regularly appears as a reviewer of books concerning Italian educational history, surveyed that field. In January 1987 a similar analysis of German educational history appeared. These articles, all thorough and imaginative, are important sources for anyone interested in comparative history. They both review the field and call attention to publications in European journals, especially regional ones, that are simply not available in North American libraries. Occasionally important articles do appear in minor journals and can be ordered. The other advantage of these articles is that they open the world of German and Italian scholarship to those of us who are not proficient in those languages. An unfortunate inclusion in 1987 among these was Jean-Noël-Luc's ill-conceived attack on quantitative history. The substance of his remarks appeared elsewhere and reveals mainly his ignorance of the simplest of statistical techniques. The only apparent reason for inclusion of this tirade was his membership on the editorial board.

The book review section, which contains on average both ten *comptes rendus* (three to four-page book review essays) and ten *notes critiques* (book reviews of a few hundred words), is of particular interest to historians outside France who cannot read all European publications. The selection process is unclear, seeming to reflect what books are made available to the journal or what ones interest potential reviewers rather than systematic reliance on certain publishers or topics, but it offers a flavour of what is being published in France. German and Italian publications appear regularly (the latter apparently due to the energy of Michel Ostenc) but rarely anything from other European countries, North America, or other areas of the world. The only English-language book on a French topic studied Hungarian students at the University of Paris—an interesting topic but not on my list of major works; none of the works mentioned in Dominique Julia's indispensable article was reviewed.

The short book reviews have been devoted exclusively to French topics, but in recent years the journal has attempted to devote some of its longer essays to educational topics outside France, almost all dealing with compilations of some kind. Thus, volumes of the *Oxford History of Universities*, B.E. McClelland and

W.J. Reese's edited *The Social History of American Education*, and Daniel Resnick's *Literacy in Historical Perspective* have been reviewed. One might expect some attention to Quebec's educational history if only because of the commonality of language. Nadia Fahmy-Eid and Micheline Dumont's *Maîtresses de maison, maîtresses d'école: Femmes, famille et éducation dans l'histoire du Québec* has received unique attention. Authors might consider contacting the editor, M. Caspard, about his interest in arranging for reviews of their books, but I would not recommend sending books on speculation.

From small beginnings *Histoire de l'éducation* has become an essential journal for the history of French education. If it remains conceived as an organ for French historians and has not reached its objective of encompassing comparative history except in its bibliography, which is the best of its kind, its quality has steadily improved and its horizons widened. The bibliography reflects an interest in related topics like the family, childhood, religion, and popular culture. However, North American historians generally relate these topics to education better than the French have, save for interdisciplinary scholars like Dominique Julia. *Histoire de l'éducation* has yet to publish an article that employs quantitative techniques. Some of the Positivist aura of traditional French historiography still surrounds the journal. Subscriptions and past issues are available for 118 francs annually from the Institut national de recherche pédagogique (INRP), 29, rue d'Ulm, 75230 Paris, France, Cedex 05.

NOTES

1. This information is compiled from figures given in the first issue of January (1979), a report in the May 1984 issue, a note by the editor of *Histoire de l'éducation* in *French Historical Studies* (Spring 1989), and a computer search of serial titles in North American libraries. *Histoire de l'éducation* claimed sixteen subscriptions to Canada in 1984 but a CUSS search reveals only seven holdings in 1990.
2. See Francoise Mayeur, "Recent Views on the History of Education in France," *European History Quarterly* 14 (Jan. 1984): 93-101. Mayeur is an expert on women's education and author of the volume concerning the nineteenth century in the multi-volume *L'éducation en France* (Paris, 1984).
3. Patrick J. Harrigan, "Historians and Compilers Joined: The Historiography of the 1970s and French Enquêtes of the Nineteenth Century," in *The Making of Frenchmen: Current Directions in the History of Education in France, 1679-1979*, ed. Donald N. Baker and Patrick J. Harrigan (Waterloo, Ontario, 1980), 3-22.

INTERPRETING SCHOOLING IN
NINETEENTH-CENTURY ONTARIO*

Donald Soucy

Curtis, Bruce. *Building the Educational State: Canada West, 1836-1871*. Lewes, U.K., and London, Ontario: Falmer Press & The Althouse Press, 1988. Pp. 450. \$25.00

Houston, Susan E. and Alison Prentice. *Schooling and Scholars in Nineteenth-Century Ontario*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988. Pp. xiv, 418. \$40.00 cloth, \$19.95 paper.

Gidney, R.D. and W.P.J. Millar. *Inventing Secondary Education: The Rise of the High School in Nineteenth-Century Ontario*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990. Pp. xii, 411. \$42.95 cloth, \$19.95 paper.

Judging from recent reviews and conference sessions, three key books are shaping our current understanding of schooling in nineteenth-century Ontario: Bruce Curtis's *Building the Educational State*, Susan E. Houston and Alison Prentice's *Schooling and Scholars in Nineteenth-Century Ontario*, and Robert D. Gidney and Winnifred P.J. Millar's *Inventing Secondary Education*. While each of these books has been reviewed separately in this journal, here they will be looked at together. This comparison makes it clear that, just as two artists depicting the same subject produce different interpretations, so too do these historians describe differently the "same" past. Some of the books' interpretations complement each other, others contradict, and others are simply talking about different things. As in any history, the perspective in each of the books can explain some things but not others.

Different perspectives fit certain times, places, and purposes. Houston, Prentice, Gidney, and Millar have roots in the revisionist debates of the 1970s. Houston and Prentice were grouped with the so-called "radical revisionists" led by Michael B. Katz. Gidney and Millar, along with their earlier collaborator the late Douglas Lawr, were more moderate. They revised Whiggish interpretations, but, unlike the radicals, they did not pose a social control thesis. Curtis's work,

on the other hand, is a product of the 1980s. He arrived after the radicals and moderates had staked out their territories, so he went out and found his own. His degree and university position are in sociology, not history or educational history. He thus carries different professional baggage than the other authors, which prepares him to arrive at different positions.

Perhaps it is Curtis's non-historical academic background that in part accounts for some of the methodological differences between his book and the other two. Whereas Houston and Prentice and Gidney and Millar present succinct syntheses of their data, Curtis lists quote after quote, note after note, in a sometimes antiquarian fashion. In addition, Houston and Prentice, and even more so Gidney and Millar, are more careful than Curtis to describe subtleties that historical research is yet unable to answer. They organize their data throughout to let you know which facts go with which arguments, which data are crucial, and which raise questions yet unanswered. Curtis, in contrast, tends to present many of his arguments in groups, primarily at the end of the book, and to list both crucial and peripheral data all mixed together in other groups. He leaves it to the reader to figure out how best to connect everything. In short, compared to the others, Curtis is excessive in factual detail but deficient in outlining and historically backing up interpretive details.

In addition to the authors' dissimilar disciplinary backgrounds, there are at least two other reasons for their different handling of language and data. The first, quite simply, is that in these books Gidney, Millar, Houston, and Prentice are better writers than Curtis (or at least one of the authors in each pair is). Their writing is carefully crafted, with well-worded sentences, attention to precision in meaning, well-organized flow, and use of enough literary technique to keep the reading pleasant. Curtis's writing, on the other hand, is too often unpolished and ambiguous. A good deal of the blame lies with his publisher, The Falmer Press. They provided Curtis with neither substantive editing nor copy-editing—certainly not the way to treat such an important book.

The second reason that Curtis is less careful about interpretive details is that his theoretical concern is more with the larger picture. Thus, in Curtis, but not in the other two, we have heavy borrowing from Marx, Foucault, and Gramsci. Although Curtis appears to have a dim view of certain power relations, it could be argued that he has adopted Foucault's strategy of limiting analysis to how those relations came about, not whether they are good or bad. It is primarily by describing events in Foucaultian and Gramscian terminology that Curtis links the institutionalization of schooling with the formation of the Canadian state. He argues that the centralization of educational authority, along with schooling's "subjectification" of individuals, its "remaking" of popular culture and family relations, its moulding of moral character, and its "solidification of genial habits," all worked in unison to create ruling class "hegemony" by imposing a "popular intelligence" that would accept "bourgeois ideology" as normal and natural. The education system was a pioneer in establishing a centralized state apparatus that

could “gaze” upon citizens. Thus schooling played a vital role in building the capitalist state.

Curtis’s use of Foucaultian and Gramscian terms leads to more than stylistic differences between him and Houston, Prentice, Gidney, and Millar. Underlying the terms are concepts and analyses that allow arguments unavailable in the other two histories. The result is that Curtis’s book goes the furthest of the three in setting new theoretical directions for the 1990s. For example, all three histories stress the role of discipline in nineteenth-century schooling.¹ But neither Gidney and Millar nor Houston and Prentice comes up with as far-reaching and speculative analysis of discipline as Curtis achieves by adapting Foucault. In *Discipline and Punish* Foucault asserts:

Discipline “makes” individuals; it is the specific technique of power that regards individuals both as objects and as instruments of its exercise....The success of disciplinary power derives no doubt from the use of simple instruments; hierarchical observation, normalizing judgement and their combination in a procedure that is specific to it, the examination.²

It is by echoing these concepts throughout his book that Curtis is able to present a much different perspective on discipline than is found in the other two books.

Curtis posits that discipline, “self-formation,” and self-policing were all intentions of school reform. Education authorities sought to observe the “pedagogical space” through a complex network of intelligence gathering. “Tours of inspection, annual reports, report cards, public examinations, and so forth made visible the activities of those involved in schooling” (p. 376). Curtis finds a striking parallel between Foucault’s “analysis of ‘panopticism’ as a model of disciplinary power and the education office’s conception of pedagogical authority” (p. 165). Curtis paints a picture in which the educational reformers—especially Ryerson—consciously try to build an educational “space” that fits what Foucault describes as the “perfect disciplinary apparatus,” a space that

would make it possible for a single gaze to see everything constantly. A central point would be both the source of light illuminating everything, and a locus of convergence for everything that must be known: a perfect eye that nothing would escape and a centre towards which all gazes would be turned.³

Curtis describes Canada West’s Education Office as this type of central point (e.g. pp. 366-67). Using different conceptual tools, neither Houston and Prentice nor Gidney and Millar could validly sum up their own positions on discipline as Curtis does in one of his more quotable lines: “Education, for Ryerson was not a *means* to government; education *was* government: government of the self” (p. 110).

This last sentence also typifies another way that Curtis differs from the other historians: its conclusion is inferred from much less evidence than would be allowed in either of the two other histories. Curtis achieves this inference through a technique he uses throughout his book. He selects historical events, or he takes quotes and actions by nineteenth-century figures (as often as not Ryerson), and describes or paraphrases them in terms (often metaphorical and Foucaultian) related to his overarching theory. He then infers that his subjects understood their own lives within the framework of these terms. From there it is easy to leap to the inference that his overarching theory explains causal factors for the events and for the motives behind his subjects' actions. The lawyer's precision with which Gidney and Millar argue such details is not Curtis's mode. Thus we can gain from him insights into Foucaultian interpretations, but we should turn elsewhere if we need solid evidence on details such as Ryerson's actual motives and beliefs, such as whether the Superintendent really believed that education "was government" as opposed to a "means to government," or whether he even viewed the situation in such terms.

Another characteristic that sets Curtis apart from the others is his use of language. Though rich in potential meaning, it is often ambiguous. He never, for example, clearly defines so key a term as "educational state." In contrast, the exactness Gidney and Millar use in setting out an argument goes hand-in-hand with their accuracy in use of terms. They spend a good part of their introduction surveying the changing meaning of key words, letting us know what the terms meant in the nineteenth century and how they will be used in the book. Throughout their history, they take time to introduce us more thoroughly to both unfamiliar terms, such as "collegiate institute" (p. 199), and overly familiar ones, such as "school" (p. 121) and "science education" (p. 287). They, like Houston and Prentice, "pay careful attention to words, to their shifting meanings over time and to the ways in which nineteenth-century usage differs deceptively from today's."⁴ In comparison, Curtis is more anachronistic in his use of terms.

None of the authors, however, gives precise meanings of terms related to class. Gidney and Millar use a loose notion of class as one of their major units of analysis, the others being sex (pp. 15-19) and families (pp. 26-32), and to a more limited extent geography (pp. 282-83). They outline factors of social class in chapter two, and they attempt a definition of "middle class" in their introduction. The definition is broad: the middle class "includes the people who could afford the opportunity costs and other expenses of keeping their children in school for a few years longer than the majority of Upper Canadians, and whose children formed the clientele of the senior classes in the common schools, the grammar schools, and the colony's various private and collegiate schools" (p. 8). This definition is clearly circular when it is coupled with their contention that these schools were middle class (the middle class is defined as those who go to high school; the high schools are therefore middle-class institutions). But it is generally a workable definition for most of their purposes. They admit that the definition is "theoretically unsatisfying" (p. 8), but they also tend to avoid the need for a

correct class theory (is there one?) by identifying more easily measured variables such as parental occupations.

Curtis also says that class is one of his major areas of concentration (p. 12). But though he assigns actions, intents, interests, and ideologies to specific classes, he never outlines the factors that determine the structure of each of these classes. At different times he categorizes the "educational state builders" and theorists as the "governing classes," the "ruling classes," the "respectable classes," the "bourgeoisie," or even, curiously, as the "middle class." He never gives us even a Gidney and Millar-like crude definition that would help us to know what, if anything, distinguishes these classes from each other or from the social classes of what he calls the "school supporters." Like Gidney and Millar, Curtis can present his case even though he lacks a clear framework of class. But his history suffers more from this lack than does the history by the other two, since he does not compensate for it with careful accuracy in other areas.

One way Curtis and Gidney and Millar are alike is that they present one clear argument as the crux of their history. Not so with Houston and Prentice. They divide their book into three sections; and whereas Gidney and Millar's chapters generally lead from one to the next, Houston and Prentice's sections do not. In fact, their sections at times present differing points of view.

In their book's first section, "Interpreting Pioneer Schooling," Houston and Prentice stress family strategies. They argue that, for Upper Canadians in the early nineteenth century, most education took place within the household. Families transmitted skills from one generation to the next, and they determined where and with whom children would attend formal schools (pp. 58-60, 81). Many of these schools, especially the private-venture ones, were very much family affairs (pp. 56, 69). Given the scarcity of historical sources on education during this period, Houston and Prentice do an admirable job describing it. Their bottom-up focus on families is achieved through using certain types of evidence. They piece together their story from diaries, popular writings of the period, letters, sermons, newspapers, and from official documents and secondary sources. For their description of the programmes and teachers of private-venture schooling, they depend primarily on newspaper ads, as do Gidney and Millar.

In their second section, "Mid-Nineteenth-Century School Reform," Houston and Prentice suddenly shift their focus from families to legislation. They also call upon different sources. Whereas the first section allows for some voices of school consumers to be heard, the second gives voice primarily to the promoters, especially Ryerson. The emphasis is now top-down, with official documents and reports providing most of the historical evidence. In their book's last section, Houston and Prentice take up Chad Gaffield's (1986) call to "go back to school."⁵ Unlike the first two sections, in which voices from below are heard separately from the voice of above, this last part is better at letting both types of voices speak to us in the same conversation.

As can be seen, Houston and Prentice deliver mixed messages. In section one, families shape events. In section two it is Ryerson and the school promoters