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Mona Gleason. Normalizing the Ideal:
Psychology, Schooling, and the Family in
Postwar Canada. Toronto: University of

What is the “ideal” family, and through
what dimensions of social life have the
effects of that normalizing construct
become invested and lodged in
Canadian consciousness? If, indeed, the
notion of “the ideal family” has
contributed to particular relations of
social knowledge and power (through,
for example, local practices of schooling,
examination, justice, healthcare, child­
care, custody, homecare, and so on),
what can be said about how the
discursive construct actually managed to effect (“normalize”) and
objectify human behaviour? In turn, how did such idealized notions of
behaviour provide a necessary condition for the emergence and
disciplinary effects of the human science of psychology in post-war
Canadian society?

Normalizing the Ideal is the tenth volume to appear in the University
of Toronto Press Studies in Gender and History series, and in it author
Mona Gleason makes useful points about the modes of objectification
through which human beings become discursive subjects in a disciplinary
field. Perhaps the most substantial is her argument that the discipline of
psychology systematically affected ordinary Canadians during the early
postwar decades primarily as a normalizing or regulating mechanism
through which families and schools could be shaped and brought under
the suasion of “ideals” that were white, middle-class, patriarchal, and
heterosexual in sensibility. Gleason calls on theorist Michel Foucault’s
notion of “technologies of the self” to inspire what she calls her examina­
tion of “technologies of normalcy.” The concept is meant to underscore
how particular discursive networks and mechanisms, represented by the
school system, childcare agencies, public health systems, and popular
media,

conflated the normal with the socially acceptable... strengthened
Canadians’ receptiveness to psychological discourse and, in turn,
ensured the primacy and endurance of psychology's notions of the normal family." (9)

The hypothesis is theoretically exciting insofar as it sets out to make visible how particular "rules" or formal modes of thought in a discipline take root in a social body at a specific historical conjuncture, and how "effects of truth" can then invest the production of practices, subjectification, forces, materials, desires, thoughts and so on at play in wide scale ideological production. Gleason incites educators and health care professionals to question received assumptions about "normalcy" in citizenry, and to think about how much of social, healthcare, and educational theory is due to the play of gendered and racialized assumptions that are inscribed within every facet of the socialization process. The bywords of "normalcy" in the postwar family populate psychological discourse, through constructs such as stability, order, prevention, and then, "pervasively and insidiously," intervention.

The book is ambitious in scope but has problems. Most particularly, the author at times betrays what feels like a fixity of position or predictability, revealed in teleological assertions about psychology's coercive effects in the minds and hearts of Canadian teachers, childcare workers, and parents. For example, fixated on the deficit model of the problematized family, "psychologists spent a great deal of time detailing normal and abnormal characteristics of parenting." (105) This is one of Gleason's telling insights into the social construction of psychology as a household fixture and public panacea. But the unanswered question in her analysis is how, exactly, such details took explicit effects in forms and practices of everyday life. Thus, the author exhibits a tendency to repeat her argument in an attempt to persuade, rather than to demonstrate precisely the mechanisms through which the production of consent in postwar Canadians occurred through psychology's normalizing strategies of "comparing, differentiating, hierarchizing, homogenizing, and excluding." (9) The reader would welcome more finely nuanced illustrations showing how the ideas of leading psychologists (such as Drs. William Blatz and Samuel Laycock, known as Canada's Dr. Spock) came to leave colonizing traces on the minds and bodies of actual men and women struggling to re-make life in Canada's towns and countryside after the painful disruptions of a Depression and two World Wars. We are left to puzzle out what were the local tactics and regional forms of resistance or transformation that must also have played out in this landscape of codification of a concept of a monolithic family unit. And although the assimilation of immigrant families is alluded to in the consideration of psychology's forms of knowledge and power in Canada, French Canada and parti-

particularly Québec are omitted from references to Dr. Laycock's phenomenon.

Another problem is that the mechanisms through which psychological political and historical value for humanize, liberate, and repair, as is not always at home or conversely child development and child contributions of European psychoanalysis (Klein) that has contributed to the world through understanding the infantile attachment, the significance of separation and loss, the transference experience in human the possibility for renewal those the potential for the psychoanalytic endeavour that in her explication of the original psychology in postwar family more room for the theoretical and honest musing on the counter around and pleasures of daily teachers (like yours or mine family) in late 20th century Canada.

Gleason's historical exam aspects of the postwar family's present is influenced by the intersection of the normative family ideal, Gleason's time travel, for example, from 1940s and 50s. In one instance psychology's "technologies of power" in schools in 1951 (31), the 1930s (31), and then to assessment. Although she is speaking in 18th Century Canada," we believe a coherent view of the normalization more chronologically coherent and effects. A similar analysis throughout Chapter Two.
Insofar as it sets out to make clear modes of thought in a discipline historical conjuncture, and how the production of practices, subject-thoughts and so on at play in wide incites educators and health care assumptions about “normalcy” in social, healthcare, and educational and racialized assumptions of the socialization process. The family populate psychological notions of the social, healthcare, and educational and racialized assumptions of stability, order, prevention, and intervention. But has problems. Most particularly, like a fixity of position or predictions about psychology’s coercive assumptions about psychology’s coercive Canadian teachers, childcare workers, in the deficit model of the problem-a great deal of time detailing normalizing.* (105) This is one of Gleason’s actions of psychology as a household answered question in her analysis is effects in forms and practices of a tendency to repeat her argument than to demonstrate precisely the production of consent in postwar psychology’s normalizing strategies of homogenizing, and excluding.” In one instance, a discussion of the construction of psychology’s “technologies of normalcy,” we are introduced to Vancouver schools in 1951 (31), then to “social welfare agencies” in the late 1930s (31), and then to assessments of soldiers in 1939-1945 (32). Although she is speaking in a chapter on “Psychology in Early Twentieth Century Canada,” we believe it would provide a clearer and more coherent view of the normalizing techniques of discourse to try for a more chronologically coherent presentation of its practices, relations, and effects. A similar analytical strategy of tile-like jumping occurs throughout Chapter Two, weakening the genealogical elaboration of the particularly Québec are omitted from the equation, apart from occasional references to Dr. Laycock’s preoccupation with the Dionne family phenomenon.

Another problem is that the book pays too little attention to the mechanisms through which psychology possessed moral, aesthetic, political and historical value for citizens, through discourses that might humanize, liberate, and repair, as well as dominate and regulate. Gleason is not always at home or conversant with the psychological literature on child development and child care (for example, the significant contributions of European psychologists such as Freud, Winnicott, Bion, and Klein) that has contributed to the contemporary desire to make a better world through understanding the vicissitudes of early relationality, infantile attachment, the significance of the maternal body, the experience of separation and loss, the human passion for aggressivity, and the transference experience in human relations. The author de-emphasizes the possibility for renewal through discourse, and tends not to acknowledge the potential for the humane function of psychological and psychoanalytic endeavour that is perhaps under attended by the author in her explication of the construction of normal citizens through psychology in postwar family and schools. We would have liked to see more room for theoretical and methodological play, open reflection, and honest musing on the contradictions, overlaps, border areas, turnings around, and pleasures of dalliance, as “good enough” parents and teachers (like yours or mine) internalized the ideal of “safeguarding the family” in late 20th century Canada.

Gleason’s historical examination of psychologically-influenced aspects of the postwar family proceeds under the convention that the historical present is influenced by what came before. In portraying the history of the intersection of psychology and the construction of the normative family ideal, Gleason has a tendency arbitrarily to engage in time travel, for example, from the 1950s to the 1930s, and back to the 1940s and 50s. In one instance, a discussion of the construction of psychology’s “technologies of normalcy,” we are introduced to Vancouver schools in 1951 (31), then to “social welfare agencies” in the late 1930s (31), and then to assessments of soldiers in 1939-1945 (32). Although she is speaking in a chapter on “Psychology in Early Twentieth Century Canada,” we believe it would provide a clearer and more coherent view of the normalizing techniques of discourse to try for a more chronologically coherent presentation of its practices, relations, and effects. A similar analytical strategy of tile-like jumping occurs throughout Chapter Two, weakening the genealogical elaboration of the
thesis. On a minor note, the author's frequent excursions into Masters' student theses to substantiate her claim of psychology's "analytics of power" a propos a national trend toward normalization, were irritating. These warrants were generally unhelpful and ultimately not convincing in the overall conceptualization of an archaeology of human sciences whose mechanisms of power invest bodies, acts, and forms of behaviour in the ideological will to knowledge as these are lived and crystallized in social hegemonies enacted at local levels.

Despite these shortcomings, Normalizing the Ideal is a thought-provoking introduction to a period of Canadian history when psychology "came of age" in its bearing on Canadian bodies. Reading between the lines, it was intriguing to speculate on what currents, at a professional and personal level, underlay psychology's aspirations for power and prestige in postwar Canada.

Perhaps in a future volume in the series, it would be possible to be treated to more finely nuanced case studies and genealogical instances that show not only how and why the idea of the ideal family was cherished (thus enabling Canadian psychologists to be embraced as knowledge exemplars within the Canadian scene), but also the disparity, deviations, and dispersion behind the constructed fantasy of the normal ideal family, and the discontinuities and struggles that also constituted what came to exist and have value in the family's name.

Judith P. Robertson and Kathleen Connor
University of Ottawa

Marinell Ash et al., Edited by Thinking with Both Hands: Sir David Brewster in the Old World and the New. University of Toronto Press.

Few among the University of Toronto students today recognize the St. George Soquet after whom a St. George Street was named. They could be forgiven, for was some Titan of capitalism few of his dollars for immortality, rather than a wise benefactor and a spurious immortality, rather than a past remembered than his contemporary Dawson of McGill, Wilson.

Victorian scholars, though at Dawson of McGill, Wilson:

Daniel Wilson (1816-1892), Edinburgh man and a contemporary photography pioneer Octave photographers, Auld Reekie would generation of giants of the classics at the Edinburgh High apparently did not matriculate.

Wilson rounded out his educational opportunities for self-education and earned a university degree, that explained—granted him an LL.D.

The two-handed thinking among other things, to Wilson calling Wilson spent some invariable task of engraving J.M.W. two years' work. Although never ceased drawing. Stacey that this commitment "be between in objective truth and abstract hand gossip" (239) is a rather practice was common among Wilson, taking his London years that Wilson's education.

Born a Baptist (if such