that forced Davis to support Bill 30. The new Liberal government, however, disputed the Bill on constitutional grounds. In response, the Bill Completion Office for separate schools was formed, largely sponsored by the OECTA. In 1986 a court decision was reached that the BNA Act of 1871 did not prohibit Ontario from extending full funding to separate schools. Bill 30 became legislation in June 1986 and resulted, according to Dixon, in "the most important change for separate schools in this century."

Dixon's book provides the only history of the OECTA. His study pays "tribute to the women and men teachers," both lay and religious, who were essential to the work of the Association from 1944 to 1994. Dixon incorporates the dynamics of gender and marital status when looking at the struggles that the OECTA faced during these fifty years. Although his work is limited by his reliance on the professionalism-vs.-unionism model and his failure to place the history of the OECTA within the current historical literature on teacher unions, Be a Teacher is an extremely useful book. It is of value not only to OECTA members, but to all teachers and the general reader interested in educational change.

Susan Gelman
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education


Those who agree with Emerson's dictum "There is probably no history; only biography" will find Selleck's life of Kay-Shuttleworth an exemplar, for it provides not only a detailed account of the career of one of the nineteenth century's most important educators but also the story of the transformation of popular education and society during the period. This is a long and spectacularly well-researched volume—there are forty-six pages of notes and twenty-one of bibliography—and must take its place as the definitive life of Kay-Shuttleworth. And he was undoubtedly a man of parts: medical doctor, Poor Law Commissioner, high civil servant, educator of distinction, popular pamphleteer, amateur post, and a published novelist. Everything one might wish to know about his multifarious activities is here, from details of his meals on youthful excursions in the Lancashire hills to his daily routine as a Poor Law Commissioner, from a character sketch of his wife's mother's second husband to plot summaries of his three novels.
Shuttleworth began life in 1804 as James Phillips Kay (he adopted the name Kay-Shuttleworth on his marriage in 1843 to Janet, heiress to the Shuttleworth fortune), son of a Lancashire cotton-spinner, a zealous Congregationalist and forbiddingly upright paterfamilias. Following a spell as a Sunday School teacher in his youth, Kay-Shuttleworth enrolled at Edinburgh University medical school, and on graduation practised as a physician in the slums of Manchester, the “cottonopolis” of the Industrial Revolution. Appalled by both the exploitation by the cotton manufacturers and the wretched condition of the workers who had flooded into the factories from the rural areas and Ireland, he wrote an impassioned pamphlet, *The Moral and Physical Conditions of the Working Classes Employed in the Cotton Manufacture in Manchester* (1832), a pioneering work praised as “an excellent pamphlet” by another famous student of Manchester, Frederick Engels, in his 1845 work *The Condition of the Working Class in England*. Kay-Shuttleworth, however, was viewed by the conservative Manchester middle class as a Liberal Dissenter who was altogether too advanced and zealous in his advocacy of local government and scientific investigation (he was a member of the Manchester Statistical Society) as a remedy for abuses. Failing to get elected to the Manchester Royal Infirmary, and considering himself a failure and an outsider, he resigned his position and left Manchester in 1835.

He was immediately offered a post as Assistant Poor Law Commissioner in Norfolk and Suffolk, rural counties in East Anglia, followed by a year in London. His duties were to administer the New Poor Law of 1834, which condemned paupers to the comfortless life of the workhouse. As usual, Kay-Shuttleworth took his duties seriously, zealously and untiringly putting into effect what we can now see was a harsh and unjust regime. During this period he began to perceive that if the germs of pauperism were to be eradicated, the younger generation had to be educated. The result was his *Report on the Training of Pauper Children* of 1838. District schools for workhouse children would have the task of “the rearing of hardy and intelligent working men, whose character and habits shall afford the largest amount of security to the property and order of the community;” an observation which pretty well encapsulates Kay-Shuttleworth’s attitude to popular education. He was much influenced by the Scottish educator David Stow, for whose advanced views on the theory and practice of the education of young children—moral training, the sympathy of numbers, gallery teaching, playground activity—he had great admiration.

Kay-Shuttleworth’s main claim to fame as an educator, however, undoubtedly rests on his ten-year secretaryship of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education, which he took up in 1839. The Committee of Council (as it was usually called) was a peculiar English institution; certainly not a Department
or Ministry of Education, it was established by the Whig-Liberal government in 1839 as a branch of the Privy Council, virtually without Parliamentary sanction, and administered by four Whig grandees. Kay-Shuttleworth applied himself to the difficult task of beginning the construction of a system of national, popular education with the same zeal that he had brought to his Poor Law duties.

His main opponent was the Church of England, which sought to maintain and extend what it regarded as its traditional right to provide and control education for the poor. One of the Committee’s first successes was the institution of an inspectorship in which the inspectors reported to the government rather than the Church—the thin end of the wedge for a series of measures which gradually wrested control of what became known as National Schools from the Church. Building grants for these schools (provided they accepted inspection), the inauguration of an inspected pupil-teacher system (with government scholarships), the establishment of local lay management of schools, and the granting of teacher’s diplomas directly from the government were crucial measures in the ultimately successful war of the state versus the Church. In addition, Kay-Shuttleworth issued a constant stream of directions, suggestions, architectural plans, syllabuses, questions for inspectors, and so on, largely based on the most advanced educational thinking of the time.

In one endeavour he failed. Government refused to sanction one of his key proposals, the building of a Normal School. With typical energy, he opened one himself, funded by private donations. Battersea Training School, opened in 1840, was a remarkable pioneering effort, combining academic instruction with professional training—the model for subsequent institutions of its type. The regime was strict, conditions Spartan, and the working day (including gardening and gymnastics) lasted from 5:30 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., aspects not a little influenced by Kay-Shuttleworth’s Poor Law experience and his visits to continental agricultural schools.

In his decade of office at the Committee of Council, Kay-Shuttleworth revealed himself as a new type of civil servant, well fitted to construct a modern civil bureaucracy, efficient, rational, and utilitarian, with a broad vision that was forward-looking yet minutely detailed in its application, eminently suitable to an advancing industrial nation. As Lord John Russell, the Home Secretary, observed in 1836, “We are busy in introducing system, method, science, economy, regularity and discipline,” and Kay-Shuttleworth was a civil servant uniquely qualified to carry out this task in the educational field. He was one of a group of middle-class men who came to prominence in the 1830s and 1840s, the first generation to accept the fact of the Industrial Revolution and to perceive the necessity of employing rational management and statistical discipline in the running of the state machine. Inspectors, civil
servants, secretaries, commissioners, these men were engaged in constructive work for their aristocratic masters which also necessarily involved increasing control of the lower orders, whether by legislation, education, or further ramification of administration.

Selleck makes these points, but perhaps a little too discreetly and unobtrusively. In fact, one criticism I would make of the book is that it does not place the role of this administrative class, of which Kay-Shuttleworth was the most eminent exemplar, sufficiently firmly in a more dramatic picture of an industrializing nation, within which the bourgeoisie was rising to power and influence, and the working class increasing in size and organization.

Selleck stresses that Kay-Shuttleworth’s educational work “was driven by his perception of an unstable society threatened by an ignorant population and by his desire to provide a richer intellectual and moral experience than England had previously given the children of the poor.” His fifteen or so books and pamphlets on educational topics, sometimes heavily statistical, were admittedly largely concerned with the politics of education, but a more detailed account of how teachers attempted to fulfill his ideals at the grass roots level—given that the “richer experience” was usually only the three Rs, religion, and a little history and geography—would have put Kay-Shuttleworth’s objectives into sharper focus.

On the whole, however, Selleck succeeds admirably in the difficult task of weaving together his subject’s working days and his inner life, in a manner which makes a long book fascinatingly readable. Shuttleworth suffered from feelings of class inferiority (his aristocratic in-laws considered him a low-bred fortune hunter, and his grandee employers were too often condescending), self-doubt, and partly psychosomatic ill-health, which forced his resignation from the Committee of Council. In addition, he was separated from his wife during his last years of life. Selleck is very much in the modern autobiographical mode in his attempt to penetrate Kay-Shuttleworth’s psyche, but one wonders occasionally if he were always quite the melancholic outsider his biographer depicts. These criticisms notwithstanding, Selleck has written a masterly work which sets a new standard in educational biography.

Phillip McCann
Memorial University of Newfoundland