table. But will it appeal to serious scholars of art history or art in education in Canada? Probably not. Regardless of its publisher’s claims that the book will “appeal to art lovers, and artists, educators, and students of social and political history,” this book is an unabashed official history intended for an uninformed audience. Although purporting to champion art, it sheds no light on the subtle yet significant aesthetic and social enculturation of Ontario public school children and young adults in turn-of-the-century Toronto. A love and commitment to art should not preclude a close and critical analysis of it. Art was not a mere topic of cultural appreciation but a crucial component of character formation in educational and historical contexts. This social dimension of enlightenment is missing. Without it, Art for Enlightenment is a disappointing (and expensive) effort.

Lisa Panayotidis
Toronto


The Festschrift will never be popular outside Europe and a few countries of the former British Empire. For these celebratory essay collections usually come from university departments where a single “Professor” rules the roost. The Professor, usually a

man, sets the department or institute budget, hands out grants, supervises the best (or all) doctoral students, decides the academic fate of subordinates, and teaches a few hours per week. At its best, the professorial system leads to writing and research on the grand scale, and produces academic careers for juniors and for students upon whom the Professor looks with favour. At its worst, the system leads to decades of mediocre teaching and research in an entire discipline. (Festschriften most often come, one presumes, from the “good” departments.) Although “Essays in Honour of Professor X” are scarce in Canada, the few we have, ironically, are useful and even excellent. The same cannot always be said for the European ones, too many of which smell of the vanity press.

In Gaston Mialaret, we have both excellence and vanity.

First, the vanity. The book appears in a series whose editorial supervisor is...Gaston Mialaret. Louis Marmoz, who compiled the volume, did his doctoral thesis with Mialaret, and over the past decade was his fellow professor in Caen. The book includes complete lists of all Mialaret’s successful graduate students, his major granting projects, his State commissions (these require ten single-spaced pages to list at four lines apiece), all Mialaret’s publications since 1948. This latter is a daunting list at pp. 180-206 of several dozen books, several hundred articles and book chapters, and innumerable technical reports and talks. At least some of this is plain vanity, whether it be Mialaret’s own, or the aspirational vanity of the contribu-
tors. When one recalls that this is the second such volume (an earlier one appeared in 1988), it is hard not to conclude that scholarship and the celebration of it weren’t the only things on these writers’ minds.

Despite the posturing and pretension, and partly because of them, the book constitutes a significant primary source for the history of education in France and in Europe in the post-war period. Although it might better have appeared as a set of microfiche for publication “on demand,” Gaston Mialaret will interest researchers wishing to understand the development of educational research in France, or to catalogue the surprisingly numerous connections between the French educational research establishment and the rest of the world.

Mialaret was born in 1918 into a modest rural family, entering Normal School even before he had completed his baccalauréat. A reservist from 1940 on, Mialaret taught high school mathematics until 1946 in the ancient town of Albi. His ambition took him through the Mathematics licence (our Honours degree) by 1943, then to Paris (St.-Cloud) 1946-48 to train to become a normal school professor himself. In 1948 Mialaret became one of the first three persons to take a licence in educational psychology in France. He then began the programme of research and university teaching in Paris (1948-53) and Caen (1953-84) that led first to a Doctorat d’État in mathematics learning (1957), then to his titularisation in 1967. He was and is a power in UNESCO, the OECD, the UN, and the Council of Europe. From the late 1960s, he has been an occasional visitor at the Université de Sherbrooke, Québec. Altogether, his career and his working and travelling habits are reminiscent of Torsten Husén, an equally hard-driven Renaissance man.

Mialaret’s career was shaped by the institutional structures of the Third Republic (the École Normale of his département, the baccalauréat, the higher Normal School at St.-Cloud). More important, he was given a huge fillip by two post-war factors: massive growth of public interest in educational research, and the rapid expansion of the university system after 1960. Before 1930, almost no one in France did empirical research on children’s learning. The engines of American educational research had been running for decades before the French even thought of organizing large-scale applied studies in psychology, curriculum, administrative science, and the rest. Mialaret was in on the ground floor. His research in mathematics education in the 1950s combined a common-sense behaviourism with a taste for on-the-ground pedagogical experiment. His Experimental School at Caen and his own new Department of Education in the University of Caen were the first fruits of that work. He was led to study what we would now call active, or participatory, learning, through research on audio-visual techniques of instruction, on various techniques for teaching reading, and on early childhood education. From 1960 on, Mialaret’s enthusiasms were fuelled by a massive expansion of funding for, and enrolments in, secondary and higher education. Mialaret had the breadth of experience and the careful—nay, prudent—habits of a high
civil servant. The State increasingly took his advice after 1960.

I make it sound straightforward, but of course it was not. The anti-empiricist views of Mialaret’s Arts faculty colleagues had to be overcome all along the way. The movement to build a proper system of provincial/regional universities, Caen among them, had to be organized. To do the first, Mialaret had first to make his reputation: by publishing a great deal, supervising seventy-eight doctoral theses, and building a large university department of his own. These tasks alone would yield a seventy-hour work week. Then there were the politics of national and international education to do—another full-time occupation. The volume includes a fine autobiographical essay by Mialaret himself that unfortunately just hints at his motivation (it suggests Edmund Hillary’s explanation why he climbed Everest).

Of the eight essays not by Mialaret in the volume, three are especially revealing of the state of French educational research, theory, and practice in the 1990s: Altet’s paper on Mialaret’s views of teacher education, Francine Best’s note on Mialaret and the New Education, and Guglielmi’s discussion of Mialaret as educational psychology researcher. But none of these papers, nor the book as a whole, would help an administrator, a teacher, a researcher, or a parent do her/his job better. Rather, the book is grist for the historian’s mill, a kind of primary source.

These papers are original sources for an historical explanation of the slow French entry into the field of “scientific” educational studies (one notes, for example, the near-total absence of references to research done outside France). The papers are documents on the transformation of the French universities in the 1960s, especially the beginnings of a movement to give “applied” research the respect and the resources it desperately required. The book is also a map of one corner of the complicated networks of influence and patronage that make French higher education the slow-moving, yet powerful beast it is.

If you want a nicely edited volume of original material on these questions, Gaston Mialaret is the book for you.

William Brunoeau
University of British Columbia


In the fall of 1889, two young Irish women, Honoria (Nora) Prendiville and Alice Nolan, sailed from their Dublin convent boarding school to New Orleans. Their journey was full of purpose. They emigrated to the United States to begin new lives as Dominican sisters teaching in schools in Louisiana. During their four-week voyage, each woman kept a diary. These diaries form the centre chapters of From Dublin to New Orleans. The two historical documents, complemented by photographs, maps, and