

When speaking about the development of art education in nineteenth-century Britain he overlooks the fact that he should be talking only about England and Wales. This might be unimportant if it were not that the Scots have a somewhat different educational and intellectual tradition. He speaks about the drawing course introduced in 1857, then attempts to illustrate it with three figures from the 1895 syllabus. Not only was the 1857 course different from the 1895 course, but he combines the three figures into one without identifying their particular significance (pp. 59-60). Even more importantly, Efland assumes that, because there was an official syllabus for drawing, the subject was taught in the schools. In fact, it wasn't. In 1887, for example, only 505 out of 19,154 schools reported teaching the subject. In other words, the official prescription for the teaching of drawing had little relevance to what children were actually taught. Looking at art education beyond school, Efland makes the remarkable unsupported statement that "Britain solved the problem of training artisan designers by devising a two-tiered system of professional art education" (p. 60). The evidence suggests, and most writers agree, that the two-tiered system failed to solve the problem.

If I were complaining about any one of these errors alone, then I might justifiably be accused of being somewhat picky. However, there are so many errors of this type throughout the book that the whole work is suspect. Efland simply has not done the research necessary. He has relied too much on secondary sources—and out-

dated ones at that—and he has accepted what their authors have said without exercising critical judgement and without checking their primary evidence.

Efland's final chapter looks at the period after World War II. Consequently one expects him to break new ground if the book is to be any sort of worthwhile replacement for Logan's 1955 work. Instead, the chapter is more a compilation of writings about art education and education in general and it never comes to grips with what was actually happening in the schools and colleges.

A problem for those concerned about the history of art education is that there is a dearth of historical publications on the subject and that even those have serious flaws. I looked to this book as promising to provide a refreshing new look at the history of U.S. art education. Unfortunately, it fails to do so.

Tony Rogers
University of South Australia

Michael Gauvreau. *The Evangelical Century: College and Creed in English Canada from the Great Revival to the Great Depression.* Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991. Pp. xviii, 398, illus. \$39.95.

Explicitly confronting the treatment Richard Allen, Brian McKillop, Carl Berger, and Ramsay Cook give

the Canadian phase of the late nineteenth/early twentieth-century conflict between religion and secularization, this book argues that that treatment's rendering of what lay behind religion's displacement by the forces of the new needs qualification, at least so far as Methodism and Presbyterianism are concerned.

Far, Gauvreau asserts, from being so bereft of strength and resources that they could be marginalized in a relatively quick, straightforward, and speedy way by the advance of evolutionary theory, the higher criticism, and the thrust to achieve moral regeneration through social reform, the Methodist and Presbyterian varieties of Canadian Protestantism possessed qualities altogether equal to the task of maintaining their central position in the country's cultural and intellectual life, this until well into the twentieth century. Darwinism, says Gauvreau, posed relatively little threat to the two denominations because their members had never taken up the Paleyite view of nature and the world with anything like the enthusiasm shown for it by some Protestants. Preferring to concentrate on the side of God's plan for creation which they saw working itself out in human history, they found it possible to view what flowed from Darwin's work as touching nothing they took to be of central importance and so were able virtually to ignore it. So far as the reform of society was concerned, their attachment to the traditional Protestant idea that the regeneration and uplift of individuals through the conversion experience was the *sine qua non* of any general change in the human estate led

them to suppose that moral improvement of a comprehensive sort had to be achieved, not through the collectivist, secularizing medium of government action, but by a device at the heart of the religious experience itself. The higher criticism's tendency to subvert biblical truth and authority was, finally, dealt with by insisting that the analysis and comparison of sacred texts be carried out in a manner guided by faith in the essential truth of those texts: work done in this "reverent" mode would—and did—permit believing exegetes to impose limits on the new approach at the same moment that they moved to concede its worth and point. Only after 1905, and then mainly because of gathering strength in areas related to the third of these domains, did the two denominations begin to find themselves on the defensive. Powered, affirms Gauvreau, by the quite extreme sort of relativism he finds evident in the fields of history, philosophy, psychology, and the social sciences by the early twentieth century, the new thinking was finally able to strike "at the central pillar of evangelical thought, the belief that historical study, whether it be of the Bible or of human societies, provided some assurance of certainty or predictability in understanding and influencing the behaviour of individuals and communities" (p. 221). Capable, in sum, of resisting the focus of change and innovation through a considerable period of time, the intellectual foundations of Methodism and Presbyterianism at length found it impossible to maintain themselves against the extraordinarily potent combination of elements manifest in the

modernist onslaught of the early twentieth century. By 1930 what Rev. S.D. Chown identified as "the wisdomizing tendency" (p. 255) of the age had clearly triumphed: the most influential Methodists and Presbyterians, their organizations now joined together in the recently formed United Church of Canada (1925), had left the old behind, gone over unambiguously to the new, and were making of their faith and central institutions things no less secularized and of the world than those of Protestantism at large.

Accompanying this interesting central argument are several subordinate propositions. Methodists and Presbyterians, Gauvreau joins earlier investigators in insisting, did not simply think God's truth a matter of faith and revelation; that truth, he has them affirming, was also something to be seen as accessible to, and consistent with, empirical observation and the procedures authorized by the inductive method. Scottish "Common Sense" and, especially, scientific reasoning as it was thought to have been developed by Francis Bacon thus loomed large in their understanding of the sorts of intellectual tests which were to be applied in the course of arriving at a sense of how God had intended things to be: persons of belief and an acceptance of God's work, they were also creatures of, and wished to be seen as beings operating in harmony with, the principles of science and rationality which seemed so clearly a part of the world around them.

No less basic to the Methodist and Presbyterian tradition, Gauvreau also argues, was a concern to utilize tendencies of thinking developed by such

thinkers as Locke and Hume. Wesley, he says, certainly drew on elements in the work of those men (p. 46) while the exploitation of important elements in the Anglo-Scottish Enlightenment generally by such Presbyterians as Thomas McCulloch was central to their creed's development (pp. 14-16). The influence on Canadian thinking of ideas drawn from these sources was not, to be sure, as extensive as it turned out to be in the case of the British and Americans, but the "blending of fragments of the Enlightenment and the eighteenth century critique of rationalism with the evangelical creed" was nonetheless strong enough to "shape...the religion and culture of British North America during its early decades" (p. 19).

Nor—here we come upon a third claim—was this tendency to draw on the current and new exclusively a feature of the early decades. Moves to incorporate recently developed ideas continued to be a factor in the evolution of Methodism and Presbyterianism through the early part of the twentieth century. What archaeology was revealing—as the use made of Layard's work at Nineveh shows (p. 110)—was turned to account, at least some of Herbert Spencer's provocative theory got pressed into service (p. 142), and by the 1920s the thought of Bergson and James could be seen informing debate in the evangelical colleges (p. 272).

Gauvreau's sense that these various and several influences had an absolutely fundamental impact on the shaping of Canadian Methodism and Presbyterianism is, then, clear. Equally obvious—and the last of his subor-

dinate claims we need notice—is his argument that their work was done in company with other factors whose role in the determination of the two creeds' character was, despite their much different nature, no less important. Chief among these were the concrete and material circumstances defining the evangelicals' encounter with life in frontier British North America/Canada. Functioning in a new society, and mindful of that society's need to be developed and built in the most basic of ways, Methodists and Presbyterians found themselves having to be much more concerned than their British and American counterparts with institutionally oriented, organizationally focused issues. Abstract questions of theology and metaphysics received little attention, and, says Gauvreau, the overall result was the rise of a British North American/Canadian tradition noticeably different in its concern with the concrete and practical from that discernible elsewhere. "The participation"—he puts the point bluntly—"of Canadian Methodists and Presbyterians in transatlantic Protestantism differed from that of their counterparts in Britain or America" (p. 127).

There is much in this book that is worth having. Its central argument is an interesting and potentially important one. The wide range of material—sermons, articles, books—it exposes to view brings forward much that has not before now been seen by historians. And its overall suggestion that English-Canadian intellectual life was a good deal richer and more complex

than has usually been supposed is at once welcome, intriguing, and sound.

Equally, however, it has to be said that there are many things in these pages that are disappointing. A reality that would be unfortunate in any case, this fact is the more regrettable as one of the most obvious things it turns out to involve is the book's handling of its main thesis. This, moreover, is true in two important respects. There is, first, a difficulty reconciling the claim that these denominations' capitulation to the new was centred on the relativist-inspired collapse of the absolute with the testimony (carefully recorded here) of such figures as S.D. Chown and John Baillie, the burden of which is that the faith's final defeat was produced by a) their co-religionists' growing doubt that a direct relationship with God could be worked out in the terms defined by revivalism and the conversion experience, and b) those co-religionists' loss of belief in the idea that the Bible was in some literal way a "true" account of God's dealings with the most important part of his Creation. It may indeed be that Gauvreau's discussion is right to put the emphasis on the sort of essentially metaphysical transformation it ends by singling out, but until that discussion explains—or explains away—the conviction Chown, Baillie, and others had that the pivot on which movement towards the new was turning was the set of developments just noted, what that discussion provides by way of explanation will continue to seem—at least to this reader—incomplete and unconvincing.

The second matter to force itself upon one's attention is the claim that

the absolute-despatching relativism Gauvreau finds so central a) emerged only after 1905, and b) is to be understood as nothing more or less than “a cataclysmic revolution in ideas far more profound and unsettling than that faced by [previous generations]” (p. 221). Again, this may be true. But—again—until it is shown much more clearly than has been managed here why the forces found to be so dramatically in play after the *annus mirabilis* specified are to be seen as having emerged clearly, sharply, and from a kind of void, most readers are likely to carry on viewing what took place as continuous with the long and gradual erosion of the old certainties set in train by the historicist and Darwinian revolutions of the nineteenth century.

If the book’s central proposition is not sustained with the kind of force, coherence, and strength the conventions of sound argument demand, some of its subordinate themes are similarly left wanting and undeveloped. It is not so much, to take the most obvious of these, that one is inclined to doubt claims made for the important role something called Baconianism played in evangelical thinking. Commentators have said enough about evangelical concern to give the faith a kind of scientific cachet to put such claims far past disputing. What raises questions is the treatment the Baconian phenomenon itself receives; the sense that there has been no careful making of the distinction between Baconianism properly so-called, and what evangelicals took it to be, is simply too strong not to provoke concern. Particularly disturbing is the failure to see the very heavy irony con-

tained in the fact that attachment to Baconianism eventually helped make it impossible for evangelicals to maintain the very beliefs that attachment was supposed to aid in validating. So long, it is evident in retrospect, as data concerning such things as the earth’s origins, human history, or the operations of nature were few, handling them in ways consistent with the Baconian method could be made to yield “truths” consistent with those contained in the Bible. Once, however, those data multiplied, they and the conclusions to which application of the Baconian method made them point slipped beyond the limits of the biblical paradigm, began to generate an organizing design of their own, and so contributed to the displacement of the world view they had formerly done so much to uphold. Evangelicals, in short, turned out not simply to have been supping with the devil, but to have been doing it with a very short spoon; this, indeed, was a central part of their problem, and it deserves to have more made of it than it receives in the argument which has been put together here.

In need, too, of a much more carefully worked out treatment is what is done with the claim that evangelicals were alive to new ideas which, once taken up, were integrated into their own system and philosophy. It is, quite simply, one thing to say that commentators were open to innovation, and an altogether different one to argue that they put what awareness of it brought them to work in ways that redefined their thinking in some general and comprehensive manner. Here, however, the first is too often

taken for the second, most notably in the utterly exaggerated claim that "questions raised by the philosophies of vitalism and pragmatism ...shaped...theology in the evangelical colleges between World War I and the Great Depression" (p. 272)—an assertion, it's worth adding, which points out not just a certain reluctance to make careful distinctions but also an even more generally present—and at least as troubling—disinclination to move beyond judgements framed in language of the most categorical and unqualified sort.

Even the argument that Canadian evangelicalism was made by its quotidian, institutional, and historical orientation something *sui generis* seems unpersuasive. This is of course partly because the evidence the book itself presents makes it clear that Canadian Methodists and Presbyterians drew on, and participated in, the great debates being fought out in the Christian world in ways indistinguishable from those of other disputants involved in them. Equally, it comes from the reasonableness of the suggestion that Britishers and Americans preoccupied with the day-to-day business of building and maintaining congregations in their respective countries would have sounded in their concern with the day-to-day much like the organization-building, practical-minded Canadians Gauvreau finds so special. Either, in short, much common ground between Canadians and their co-religionists elsewhere existed or it is likely to have existed, and while this may not have eliminated all differences between the two, it seems probable that it removed

many of them. The possibility, at any rate, is a real one, and it ought to have been considered. That it has not marks yet another way in which analysis does not get pushed to the point it should, argument is left incomplete, and the reader is let down and disappointed.

Despite, in sum, its interest, this volume has problems. Well-researched but imperfectly assembled, it leaves the reader with a strong sense that there are basic things awry. This, let it immediately be added, does not mean one comes unambiguously to the conclusion that it gets matters "wrong"; there is a clear feeling, however, that insubstantial grounds have been given for believing that it has them "right." Confidence—the sort, for example, generated by George M. Marsden's *Fundamentalism and American Culture* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980)—that one is being competently guided through a complex of difficult issues is never created. Faced with underdetermined propositions, contradictory claims, and a sometimes impenetrable fog of information and detail, the reader comes to feel nothing so much as an irresistible attraction to the idea that though rhetorical and expository skills may not be all that are necessary for the making of a cogent and supportable case, construction of such a thing is impossible without them. In the end, then, the principal lesson to be derived from this impressive but flawed work does not concern the subject putatively under investigation; it has rather to do with that work's inadvertent underscoring of the point that craft, care, and rigour have a place in the writing of history and the fashion-

ing of argument no less important than the place they occupy in the design and building of any made object. Their absence—as we see here—may not be wholly destructive; it can, however, much diminish the worth and value of an otherwise estimable undertaking.

Allan Smith
University of British Columbia

Konrad H. Jarausch. *The Unfree Professions: German Lawyers, Teachers, and Engineers, 1900-1950.* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. Pp. xv, 352. \$77.00.

Jarausch, a leading scholar in modern German history, has written a book that is as much a study of the appeal and impact of Naziism as an examination of the history of three German professions during the first half of the twentieth century. Stressing the centrality of the Nazi seizure of power in 1933, Jarausch insists, "Like it or not, the *Machtergreifung* [seizure of power] is the most important question of German history in the twentieth century" (p. 79). Setting out from the observation that "perhaps the most dramatic corruption of professionalism in the twentieth century was the evolution of German professionals from internationally respected experts to accessories to Nazi crimes" (p. vii), he poses as his major question, "How could competent, individually decent

university graduates fall collectively for the Austrian corporal?" (p. 4).

In endeavouring to address this question, however, Jarausch ranges even more broadly than the title of the book suggests, providing a history of the struggles for professionalization by German lawyers, secondary teachers, and engineers from the 1870s until the 1950s. With a thorough knowledge of recent literature on the sociology of professions and of empirical studies of individual professions in Germany and elsewhere, Jarausch places his study in both a theoretical and a comparative framework. The number and variety of sources used is very impressive, ranging from government archives to journals and conference proceedings of professional organizations to a substantial amount of statistical data, some borrowed from existing publications but much of it created through sampling of archival material. This data is reported in sixteen tables integrated into the text and eighteen more included in an appendix, which report information about the growth in the numbers of professionals as well as their social origins, levels of income and unemployment, and "Nazi proclivity."

By extending his investigation over several political regimes, Jarausch is able to discover both continuities and discontinuities in the fate of German professionals. Especially important are his discussions of the various setbacks these groups suffered, which he labels "deprofessionalization." This phenomenon took many forms: loss of autonomy during World War I and the Third