

who had been fighting a decade earlier to train at the South African Military College (85). The collection mentions other forms of socialization at military colleges such as—housing for officers and families, student groups and initiatives,—however, these examples remain generally outside the book's focus on institutional histories, leadership, and curricula.

This more limited view of military education leaves the education of nurses, women's auxiliary forces, and militia regrettably out of scope, as were connections with military education and organizations such as the Scouts, Girl Guides, cadets, and public schools. The voices of students themselves are generally overshadowed by a focus on correspondence between senior leadership, published official histories, or course texts. Perhaps future work that builds on this foundational text will explore intersections of military education with other educational systems, particularly public schools where military education was often part of curricula, and with ideals of imperial masculinity and citizenship.

In general, and with a few exceptions, gender, race and empire sit at the margin for much of the collection's analysis. As agents of empire, institutions for military education were also agents of colonial violence. Discussions about how racial and gendered ideologies of patriarchal white supremacy shaped who was let into military educational systems—and who was kept out and policed—feels left hanging in the balance. So too does the reality that staff, officers, and recruits who trained at these military institutions participated in colonial violence. A growing scholarship has demonstrated the pervasive and damaging ways imperialism takes hold through educational systems. Future studies could build on this work's strong foundation by more directly exploring military education as part of the British imperial project.

Mary Chaktsiris
York University

Paul Bocking

Public Education, Neoliberalism, and Teachers: New York, Mexico City, Toronto

Toronto, Buffalo, and London: University of Toronto Press, 2020. 299 pp.

Paul Bocking was introduced to educational politics at an early age, as he explains in the preface to *Public Education, Neoliberalism, and Teachers: New York, Mexico City, Toronto*. From his mother, a teacher, he learned how fragile professional autonomy—an educator's ability to shape the dynamics of the classroom free of outside interference—had become over the course of her decades-long career. As Bocking himself became a teacher in the early-2000s, he saw the problem getting exponentially worse, and came to see that neoliberalism, a governing philosophy which seeks to “realign [the] form and content” of public institutions with “for-profit rationalities,” was at the heart of the problem (3). In this book, based upon his doctoral work in labour geography, Bocking examines how neoliberalism has taken root in three

geographically bounded, yet culturally distinct, locations: New York City, Mexico City, and Toronto. Drawing on extensive oral interviews with teachers and close readings of policy documents, he uses the state of teacher professional autonomy in these cities as a means of elucidating the corrosive effects of neoliberal policies upon North American public schooling. In doing this, he demonstrates in a particularly novel way how neoliberalism, while it retains a relatively stable conceptual core (its “for-profit rationality”), is also deeply dynamic and adaptable, taking distinct forms in different places.

Bocking begins with New York City, which had become by the early 2000s a “site of experimentation” for neoliberal school reform. He highlights one particularly potent tool invented by NYC reformers: “Mayoral Control,” in which the mayor’s office was able to override the demands of unions and school boards in the name of improving what they considered to be failing schools. Decisions over curricula and pedagogy were increasingly centralized. Standardized testing was mandated and the grades produced became the measure of whether or not a teacher would gain tenure (i.e., job security) and whether or not whole schools would be levelled and replaced by centrally mandated alternatives: from massive super-schools to a myriad of charter schools. Despite the much-vaunted objectivity of the new testing regime, decisions over teacher autonomy and school closure were, in practice, “subjective, arbitrary, and political,” as one teacher explained to Bocking (98). This top-down style of educational governance provided a template for other attempts to curb teacher professionalism in Mexico City and Toronto.

In the former, Bocking found similar neoliberal patterns, though the stakes were infinitely more harrowing. In Mexico City, by the early 2000s, teachers were subject to *El Programa Escuelas de Calidad* (PEC)—a program designed by business, policy, and union elites in concert with the World Bank—to dissolve popular control over schools in favour of a “subordination of classroom instruction to the imperative of test preparation and more space for managers” (135). As Bocking notes, PEC saw grassroots unionism maligned and rural teacher preparation undercut. The “humanism” once central to Mexican teacher practice had been supplanted by a new, neoliberal value: “productivity” (145). In one disturbing detail, Bocking contends that the abduction of forty-three student teachers from the *Ayotzinapa Rural Teachers’ College* in 2014 was not perpetrated by a criminal gang, as was widely claimed, but by Mexico’s power elite in order to silence dissent over neoliberal policies. In this part of North America, resisting education reform can cost you your life.

Bocking’s third case study deals with Toronto, where he identifies an entirely different model of neoliberal reform. Ontario Conservative Premier Mike Harris’s 1990s government set the table by enacting a severe austerity regime alongside a full-frontal attack on teacher professionalism, one which generated widespread opposition amongst teachers, parents, and the public. His Liberal successors, Dalton McGuinty and Kathleen Wynne, in power for thirteen years between them, proposed a new approach to teachers and the public, while maintaining—and even enhancing—the neoliberal mechanics of the Harris years. Their “softer,” more progressive, neoliberal strategy allowed them to give with one hand, while taking away with the other. They

increased school funding and class sizes, while imposing standardized testing, school consolidation, and increasingly rigid controls on collective bargaining—a process that has rendered public schools, in the words of one of Bocking's interviewees, mere “service providers” for a system geared to commercial rather than educational ends (227; 236). When the political winds shifted to the right in 2011, the Ontario government altered its approach accordingly. It cut \$500 million from the 2012 budget, instituted salary freezes, and worked the media to ensure that teachers were widely perceived as “well off and spoiled” (227). That same year, the province went further still, introducing the Putting Teacher's First Act, which imposed contracts upon two of the three teachers' unions, in a move that contravened Canada's Charter of Rights and Freedoms. The Liberals eventually rescinded the Act, admitting that they might have gone too far, but only after the move “served its purpose,” which was, as the teachers interviewed made clear, to undermine teacher professional autonomy (228). Overall, it was, as Bocking argues, McGuinty and Wynne, and not Harris, who normalized neoliberalism in Ontario education by giving it a progressive sheen—one that provides cover for its more utilitarian aims, and that makes it readily exportable to other national and international contexts.

Though *Public Education, Neoliberalism, and Teachers: New York, Mexico City, Toronto* will prove most useful to those studying education in North America, it will give those interested in neoliberalism more generally much to reflect upon. Though it is not a work of history, Bocking is careful to historicize his social scientific work, and the wealth of detail he provides in all three of his case studies—much of it previously untapped by scholars—will undoubtedly enrich the work of educational, economic, and labour historians grappling with the development of the most potent and controversial ideological formation of our time.

Josh Cole

Independent Scholar

Stéphane Lévesque and Jean-Philippe Croteau

Beyond History for Historical Consciousness: Students, Narrative, and Memory

Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2020. 216 pp.

When academic research and writing focuses specifically on student voice and experience, it comes the closest to understanding the multiple worlds sitting within our students during our teaching. Understanding these worlds helps us, as educators, better develop a community of teaching and learning with content and ideas that may be difficult or new for students as well as for us. However, in the field of history education, full-length manuscripts related to student experience are rare. This is why publications like Stéphane Lévesque and Jean-Philippe Croteau's new manuscript *Beyond History for Historical Consciousness: Students, Narrative, and Memory*, published by the University of Toronto Press, are important for developing academic dialogue