

Brundtland Report, and Peter Jull on Native peoples and the environment.

I was going to conclude this review with a statement parallel to that of Kenneth Coates in this journal's spring 1991 number regarding J.R. Miller's *Skyscrapers Hide the Heavens*. Coates said that with a few exceptions Miller had gone as far as the literature would permit and had indicated gaps for future historical research. But I cannot. Partly this is because Robin Fisher and Kenneth Coates' *Out of the Background: Readings on Canadian Native History* (1988) lay on my desk beside *Sweet Promises*. I had to compare the two books and determine what use they would be to my undergraduate history students. Both books were disappointing in their relative lack of discussion of Indian education history. This topic is not only interesting to students, but also historically significant, considering that Indian-White relations in most regions and time periods involved Indians meeting Whites via missions and schools. However, Miller's "Owen Glendower, Hotspur and Canadian Indian Policy" does highlight some recent work on missions and schools. The Fisher-Coates volume does have a list of further readings indicating that Jean Barman and her colleagues did publish a collection, *Indian Education in Canada, Volume 1: The Legacy*, in 1986.

I do not think it is unreasonable to expect that for \$24.95 paperback/\$60.00 cloth, *Sweet Promises* should also have had a list of further readings. In it, J.R. Miller, without doing his future publication on Indian education any harm, might have indi-

cated works available but not referenced in endnotes to articles he did select. Students and scholars, especially those new to Indian history, would appreciate having his directions to bibliographies and films, or to studies of Metis or regional history. They could benefit from Miller's knowledge of Native oral history and memoirs. They would enjoy his preliminary observations on Indian education history: on, for example, the essays of E. Brian Titley on government and church administration, and JoAnne Fiske on Native students and mission schools. The readers of this journal are familiar with Titley's work. JoAnne Fiske completed "'And Then We Prayed Again': Carrier Women, Colonialism and Mission Schools" as a master's thesis in Anthropology at the University of British Columbia in 1981.

Jacqueline Gresko  
Douglas College

**Andy Green.** *Education and State Formation: The Rise of Education Systems in England, France and the U.S.A.* London: MacMillan, 1990. Pp. 353.

Andy Green's *Education and State Formation: The Rise of Education Systems in England, France and the U.S.A.* is a comparative study of the establishment and growth of educational systems in the three above-mentioned countries as well as Prussia,

which is inexplicably omitted from the title. The author focuses mainly on the nineteenth century, when state systems were constructed, but gives attention to the eighteenth century and follows the tale for England, his home country, to contemporary times. The introduction raises the question of how and why modern systems of education arose in different forms and at different times. Comparative sociology has been lacking in this area, with most scholarly work having been national studies by historians. Later, the author stipulates that "the main contention of this book has been that the development of education can only be understood as part of the wider process of state formation that led to the emergence of the modern capitalist state" (p. 213). The theoretical approach owes much to Gramsci, whose ideas are outlined in chapter 3. Green modifies the Marxian/Gramscian approach, however, conceding that to speak of "social determinants" need not imply a (fully) deterministic approach. Schooling can vary from society to society, even in those with similar economic and social structures, and schools themselves can be agents of social change. Although this reviewer finds even the amended Gramscian approach inadequate, the work is valuable, offering both an intelligent framework for analysis and an accurate comparison of developments in the four countries. The detail is best for England, the area of Green's other publications, weakest on Prussia, for which no publications in German are listed (work by Margot Kidder, Peter Lundgreen, or Detleff Müller concerning school clientele would

have been helpful as would James Albisetti's study of German secondary schools in English).

The problem facing any historian or sociologist interested in comparative educational history is why did Prussia, an authoritarian, mercantilist, pre-industrial state, achieve widespread, though socially restrictive, schooling while urban, industrially advanced, capitalistic England lagged behind all other western countries? If an authoritarian state is the answer, why did the decentralized network of schools in the United States achieve such early widespread schooling—the northeastern states surpassing all other regions in the world? How does one explain this "uneven development" of national educational systems? Green acknowledges that education little occupied Engels, Marx, or Weber and that even Durkheim gave it less attention than he did religion or suicide. None of the theories that have devolved hold up under empirical investigation. Chapter 2 discusses in detail three main theories and points out the failings of each. The Whiggish, Protestant explanation need not be discussed here. It should remain in eternal rest. Functionalist or integrationistic theory, built upon Durkheim, has misunderstood the nature of nineteenth-century public instruction which only marginally prepared children for future work and did not form classes, although it might have justified them as it did gender roles. Myths die hard, however. Green interprets *enseignement primaire supérieure* in France as professional or vocational schooling, which it was

not; it provided a modern arts undergraduate programme. The *Écoles des Arts et Métiers* were the vocational schools, as C.R. Day's articles and *Education for the Modern World* (1987) have shown. Attempts to link causally urbanization, changing family life, and bourgeois culture (though not capitalism) deserve to fare better than Green would allow in accounting for initial impetus for schooling, but the English exception proves that these are insufficient to explain the full development of schooling. All such reductionist theories fail. Enter the State.

The hegemonic, modern capitalist State acted to establish social cohesion, national cultural uniformity, and its own hegemony as well as that of the dominant social class. The particular relation between a state and civil society was the formative influence in the development of educational systems, which could have different (uneven) developments from country to country as the nature of that relationship varied. The last point is an important emendation from Gramsci, for Green allows for a dynamic relationship rather than a static, deterministic one as in Gramsci or, in a cruder form, in classical Marxism. I am troubled over the word "capitalist," crucial to Gramsci but perhaps not to this theory. A host of sophisticated economic studies have shown that the French Revolutionary/Napoleonic period retarded French capitalism at the same time that the foundation of a national system of schools was founded. The theory works better without its ancestral Marxist verbiage. The lack of this integra-

tive State in England, which achieved industrialism and cultural uniformity outside of the State, explains, then, England's lag in education even as it would fail to keep pace industrially with Germany and the United States in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Education remained in the private sphere. In this context, Habermas' distinction between the public and private sphere might be more illuminating than Gramsci's notion of a hegemonic state—or at least Green might have considered joining the theories.

The decentralized system of the United States fits into this theory less clearly, but Green offers a convincing intellectual framework for its inclusion. He concedes that in the U.S. "demands and activity clearly issued from 'below' but they were inevitably organized from above." "Education in America, as elsewhere, was an important factor in the construction of a hegemonic ideology and a social order which...involved relations of power and domination between different ethnic and class groups" (p. 175). Green is judicious in his judgements, rightly accusing Katz of "reverse historicism" and undocumented claims that "elementary education for the working classes was essentially a middle-class imposition, designed to control an unruly urban population" (p. 35), in his *Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools* (1971). Green is also courageous in pointing out some of the failings of Fritz Ringer's conceptually flawed and often factually erroneous *Education and Society in Modern Europe* (1979).

There is no question that Green has made an important contribution to scholarship in emphasizing the dynamic relationship of state/civil society/education. States played an integrative, formative role in the direction of educational systems. But that role is much clearer in the ultimate organization of schooling than it is for its foundation. That is my fundamental disagreement with the thesis of this book. The State's role has been integrative rather than formative, as I argue (with Raymond Grew) for France in *School, State and Society: The Growth of Elementary Schooling in the Nineteenth-Century France—A Quantitative Study* (1991). Green refers to enrolment figures and to legislation without ever deciding which is crucial. He concedes that demand came from below in the United States. But it did in France as well. Compulsory schooling legislation in both France and Canada, as well as in most states in the U.S.A., crowned long-standing trends toward full enrolment and merely brought truants into the system. To use an example that Green cites—3,000 (actually a bit less) of France's 37,000 communes lacked a school in the 1840s. That is true enough. But the obverse is that 92% of French communes had a school. Only the tiniest ones lacked a school with the result that less than one-half of one per cent of French children lacked a nearby school then. More than 80% of these hamlets had a school before any national legislation required one. Moreover, the private sector of secondary schooling actually increased, not decreased, between 1850 and 1870.

National legislation promoted schooling, regulated it, supervised it, created uniformity, even defined it, but it did not provide the initial impetus which derived from social forces and private initiative.

A book of this scope is bound to provoke disagreement over one or another interpretation and specialists will be able to point to scholarship that Green has missed, but that should not detract from his book's importance. It is learned, thought-provoking, and well-written.

Patrick J. Harrigan  
University of Waterloo

**M. Apple and L. Christian-Smith, eds.** *The Politics of the Textbook*. New York: Routledge, 1991. Pp. 290. \$45.00 U.S. cloth, \$14.95 paper.

Textbooks have been a fact of school life for ages. Yet despite their widespread use in schools the study of textbooks and other curriculum materials is a fairly recent phenomenon. One of the key researchers in this area is Michael Apple, whose insightful analyses have made the study of the textbook a scholarly enterprise. In this collection, he and Linda Christian-Smith offer the reader a variety of essays relevant to the study of curriculum materials. Each is premised on the obvious fact that "[texts] signify—through their content and form—particular constructions of