

1963, indicates. "His intemperate methods, though not of themselves invalidating his statements and judgments, which must stand and fall on accuracy alone, nevertheless are a psychological indication of a mind not wholly calm and judicial." Although he thought the new response to one still supporting Leach useful he felt sure "Leach's ghost will not be finally laid until someone has tackled the whole subject anew."

The subject has since been tackled in a variety of ways, down the years, to exclude the unquiet spirit of a maverick "medievalist," though grateful use may still be made of the product of extensive research when due care is exercised. Interestingly a new criticism has recently arisen, namely Leach's misreading of the post-Restoration years as educationally barren (Geoffrey Holmes, *Augustan England*, 1982), tabled by the leading historian of that period who complains that Lawrence Stone, whose "educational revolution" took off after the grounding of Leach, has in this case perpetuated the latter's error.

Even with the development of social history there remains much to be done before the treatment of education becomes fully integrated. On that central point, made more than once in the present book, there can be agreement. Insofar as this provides an overview of Leach's writings, accompanied by many warnings to the uninitiated of the pitfalls to be met in studying them, perhaps John Miner did all he could well do to commemorate the man he first rose to defend in 1962—another point not mentioned in his book, though the article is listed.

There are signs that the book has been long in the making since judgements seem to be modified towards the close and the careful "conclusions" would not for the most part arouse dissent among the few students of the works of A.F. Leach still around. It is sad to learn from a publisher's note that the author died unexpectedly in 1987, before editing of the book was under way, so that there were many difficulties. One thing would greatly have assisted readers to co-ordinate treatments of the same matter in different places—a fuller index.

John Simon
Leicester

Charles Leslie Glenn, Jr. *The Myth of the Common School*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1988. Pp. xi, 369. \$32.50 cloth, \$13.95 paper, U.S.

To this evangelical Christian senior educational administrator for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the myth of the common school resides in the belief that this institution has operated as a force for national unity and civil harmony through the elaboration of a truly common set of social principles. Glenn takes for granted much of the revisionist critique of common school ideology: the common school did not produce literacy in the midst of ignorance, has not been

the most efficient or cost-effective educator, and was not in any simple sense the result of popular demand for schooling. The common school movement in Massachusetts and elsewhere was fundamentally about political control: in Glenn's view, control of society by a liberal Protestant elite.

Glenn takes particular pains to distance himself from the analysis suggested by Bowles and Gintis in which the common school would appear primarily as an instrument of labour discipline under industrial capitalism. The conception of common schooling on a national basis and the organization of common school movements in several countries preceded large-scale industrial capitalist development, and in other countries only followed long after that development. While Glenn observes that the generalization of common schooling is economically conditioned, he maintains that we must seek the origins of this institution in political circumstances.

Specifically, the political theory of the French revolution elaborated the view that the safety of the republican state depended upon the collective political socialization of the population. These views resonated favourably with many American politicians immediately after the War of Independence, but in both countries popular opposition prevented the effective organization of common schools. Only where it was mediated through a generally established and relatively homogeneous Protestantism was the concern for popular political socialization effectively translated into state-controlled common schooling. Under the Bavarian republic, and

in Prussia, strong popular Protestant movements in favour of general education were guided by middle-class activists towards the organization of common schools. Dutch activists, working in communities where sectarian division was relatively undeveloped, were successful for a time in elaborating a "common Christianity" as the basis of moral discipline in schools. But this consensus was shaky and short-lived. Opposition from Protestant sects and from Catholics called the notion of common schooling into question, and soon led to the appearance of sectarian schools. In Prussia, schools were under sectarian control from the outset.

It is one great merit of Glenn's analysis to place common schooling in Massachusetts in its international context. He shows that American educational activists from the 1820s, if not before, took Prussian and Dutch educational organization and practice as a model for what could be accomplished in the United States. In the face of growing civil disorder, liberal Protestant reformers imagined the common school as the key to social stability and solidarity. This position was often adopted on the basis of a scant acquaintance with actual conflicts in continental school systems, but middle-class educational activists pursued the goal of a common set of Christian principles which could provide social unity, prosperity, and happiness. They accepted that the interests of the state should predominate in educational matters, and they themselves attempted to define these interests.

Glenn is insightful in stressing that the content of common school training resulted from an attempt to translate biblical principles into social ideology. This was an attempt to create a new, unifying civil religion. But at the same time, this civil religion in Glenn's view was extremely sectarian: in its attempt to exclude controversy, it ignored or neglected precisely those principles which were seen as essential Christian tenets by many sects. In effect, common Christianity was a Unitarian rendering. Sectarian Protestant opposition to common schooling was present in the 1830s and 1840s, but was submerged by the perceived threat of Catholic scheming against public education. The essence of the myth of the common school, however, is the erroneous belief that educational activists were able to elaborate a religiously tinged social ethic capable of providing social unity. This has never been the case.

Glenn concludes his work with an analysis of more recent developments in the relation between public and private schooling in France, Holland, and the United States. Ironically, he shows, in Holland state schools enroll only 30% of elementary school students, and in France attempts in the 1980s to eliminate the private school sector have defeated governments. Challenges to state school ideology in the United States attempt to have this declared a sectarian religion by the courts, namely, secular humanism. Repeated attempts to remove "offensive" material tend to produce a bland, tedious, and unchallenging curriculum.

Glenn favours a system of mixed schooling in which concerns for the elaboration of common political values would be compatible with family choice in the manner of education. He does not see the state school as the foundation educator. A few elliptical remarks about "magnet schools" are complemented by notes referring the reader to Glenn's publications as a state educational equality commissioner. Given the force of his critical analysis of the origins of the common school, his conclusions strike this reader as vaguely pious.

Still, this is a thought-provoking and rewarding book. It is particularly important for its stress upon the international dimensions of the common school movement, with its revelation of the links which connected activists in several countries. (For some reason Glenn is entirely silent on Irish experience.) It is insightful in its probing of the sectarian character of the common Christianity which was to serve as the vehicle for social unity, and it provides a useful review of religious struggles surrounding the common school.

Can (bourgeois) society elaborate a common and unifying social ideology? Glenn's position seems to be that it cannot because the interests of the state will necessarily conflict with private religious views. While he mentions that such educational critics as Emile Durkheim attempted to elaborate a civil religion in which a benevolent state would be the object of adoration, he clearly would not defend such an attempt. Any single state educational ideology would conflict with private interests, and the essence

of pluralist democratic freedom in Glenn's view is respect for minority views. In effect, we are left with the proposition that collective and individual interests will always conflict at some point, and Glenn takes us no further.

There is an important silence in this book on political-economic dimensions of educational organization and practice. Glenn does mention that common school reform in Massachusetts was directed by liberal members of the rising middle classes, and that reform ideology was in part directed against working-class and farmer religious "enthusiasm." But the main protagonists in his account are male members of religious sects. Common school ideology is mythical because it was sectarian in religious terms. But Glenn does not attend to the fact that this ideology had an explicit and implicit class and gender basis as well. He pays somewhat more attention to questions of ethnicity.

Surely the literature of educational reform has stressed these matters in the last two decades. There is an enormous volume of work on the relationship between Protestant ideology, capitalist accumulation, and, more recently, the subordination of women! While it is important to avoid a naively functionalist view of the common school as a reflex of industrial capitalist development, the common school activists who guided policy viewed society and elaborated conceptions of unity from the position of one social class, one gendered group, and often one ethnicity. They were not the only people who struggled over these questions, but educational activists, in

Glenn's entire book, were exclusively native-born middle-class men. No women of any class, and no working-class men, seem to have participated in religious controversy, and the fact that middle-class common school Christianity was patriarchal, that it elaborated a distinct set of principles for different classes of men, women, and children in social comportment, passes entirely without comment here.

Despite these important shortcomings, Glenn's contribution to the historical literature of the common school is refreshing and controversial.

Bruce Curtis
Wilfrid Laurier University

M'hammed Mellouki. *Savoir enseignant et idéologie réformiste: la formation des maîtres (1930-1964)*. Québec: Institut québécois de recherche sur la culture, Coll. «Documents de recherche» no. 20, 1989. Pp. 392. \$28.00 paper.

What are teachers taught? How are the content and the role of teachers' training influenced by the changing ideological context of the larger society? M'hammed Mellouki seeks to explore such questions by examining the preparation of teachers for Quebec's Catholic public primary and secondary schools between 1930 and 1964. This study is the result of work undertaken while the author was a researcher at the Institut québécois de