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Since the early 1970s Canadian educational history has been deeply influenced by two intellectual positions. The first, which has been called the “radical revisionist” school, stimulated the work of Michael Katz. It set out to replace the sentimentalized and Whiggish profiles of modern school promoters with a rigorous set of intellectual constructs through which our educational experience could be analyzed. Educational history, it was argued, should become a subdivision of the new social history. An important concept pioneered by radical revisionists was that of middle-class social control, as reflected in institutional structures, leaders’ ideologies, and the inevitable violent backlash by the uncooperative working class. This was a pessimistic view, as Donald Wilson has observed.

The second intellectual position is termed “moderate revisionism,” which took up Bernard Bailyn’s challenge to redefine “education” as encompassing both formal and informal learning rather than exclusively considering the people and processes contained within state-recognized schools. This approach has encouraged historians to look at various types of schools, whether private venture, philanthropic, or self-help; whether directed to different ages and gender, including infant schools to adult education; or whether devoted to the needs of sub-classes and ethnic groups. It has also encouraged an examination of more than the concrete components of education. In attempting to assess the experience of education, researchers have been sensitized to the importance of classroom process (what Chad Gaffield has called the “culture of the classroom”).

Both of these approaches to the study of Canadian educational history have enriched our knowledge of the field. Two important books published in 1988 continue these traditions: Bruce Curtis’s Building the Educational State represents a renewed analysis of the social control thesis while Susan Houston and Alison Prentice’s Schooling and Scholars in Nineteenth Century Ontario attempts to investigate the nature of schooling itself in the private and public realm “long predating the legislative enactments of the mid-Victorian decades that have so preoccupied historians of education in the past.” Taking as his central contention that the governing classes, creation of state education was motivated by their desire to reconstruct “popular character and culture,” Curtis’s study investigates Ontario education from the 1830s to 1871. “Members of the governing classes were particularly concerned that the conditions of social independence which characterized political-economic organization in the Canadas might lead to the destruction of political authority, property relations and Christian religion.” The true significance of education, then, was to make the populace governable. In arguing his thesis, Curtis makes a number of assumptions about the society and the leaders busily constructing this educational state. Curtis adopts a familiar E. P. Thompson view of the middle class bullying a proud and recalcitrant working class into a position of compliance. But just as it was impossible to find a single, coherent spokesperson for the English bourgeoisie, it is difficult to accept that Ontario’s educational leaders were as united in their view of the new society as Curtis would have us believe. Twelve years ago, Alison Prentice illustrated for us the school promoters’ policies as decidedly disunified and changing over time. To suggest, therefore, that a blueprint existed for the remaking of the masses would require a good deal of evidence, which has not been presented.

A second assumption of this “class control” analysis concerns the clientele’s class position as manipulated by the school promoters and their surrogates, teachers. There is, in fact, no adequate evidence offered that the children and parents, so woefully disposed to violent retribution, were inferior (so much as rural) in the class hierarchy. Furthermore, the teachers’ class position, an important factor if social control is to be effective, receives virtually no discussion. Curtis discusses at some length the desire of educational authorities to elevate and separate teachers from the rest of the community, but surely this desire is a different matter from the existence of a class difference.

These assumptions, incompletely argued, are the more glaring because of several important omissions. If one wishes to argue seriously the rise of a new institution intended to mould popular character and culture, it is necessary to attempt a definition of that character and culture in its previous state. This has not been done. Obviously, too, popular character and culture involve far more than educational culture.

In suggesting some of the far-reaching changes in ideas that educators were promoting, Curtis has been much more successful. However, most of the changes discussed here concern the relationship of the individual to the state. In order to make such sweeping claims, the evidence also needs to be sweeping. One final omission by the author might be noted - the female role. This story is of male school promoters, male educators, male students, with a few female examples added on for interest.

Despite these conceptual problems Curtis’s book tells us a good deal that is both important and interesting about the rise of Ontario’s school system. Of particular interest in this account is his grasp of a changing curriculum in response to international developments and secularization. His close analysis of sample lessons to unearth the explicit and implicit messages is useful, and one would wish that
more space had been devoted to study of this sort. In addition, the material discussing the training and regulation of teachers is outstanding.

Schooling and Scholars considers the same region and generally the same period. (One might protest that the book is mistitled in its suggestion that the subject is investigated for the “nineteenth century.”) It terminates in 1871, as does Curtis’s.) Both books are concerned far more with the internal workings of education than with legislative fiat, with the roles ascribed to the administrator, teacher, parent, and student. In most other respects, however, this is quite a different book from Building the Educational State. One is struck throughout by the balance. Rejecting a single cause for the growth of a public school system in 19th-century Canada (including disciplining future wage labourers), the authors argue that the impetus was undoubtedly multi-faceted, from the fear of urban and rural poverty and disorder, intemperance, and criminality to the improved transportation and communication systems of early industrialism. They ascribe a strong sense of agency to parents and children who demanded and created their own school system before the state intervened, and then used it as their working lives would permit. Instead of confident school promoters reshaping society in their image, Houston and Prentice find a “beleaguered” corps struggling to offset the dangerous influences of disintegrating family units. In terms of source materials, a great deal of primary research by other historians has been recognized and effectively incorporated into this account, making the authors’ own wide-ranging use of official and private sources the more impressive. Even the style of argument is balanced. Biographical accounts have been woven into the fabric of the analysis, giving the reader a sense of the strong personal stake that individuals had in the educational system. Finally, the book achieves a more integrated gender balance than anything yet available in this period.

Given such an impressive addition to educational history, one can have but few complaints, and indeed none that call into question the quite remarkable achievement of such a book. The authors have taken seriously the need to expose public and unofficial schooling, and in so doing have made some useful comments about private venture schooling, Sunday Schools, academies, and colleges as well as Model and Normal schools. However, by ending the account before the last quarter of the 19th century, the proliferation of philanthropic schools, such as those maintained by the W.C.T.U. serving large numbers of working-class boys and girls, are ignored. Secondly, too little attention is given to the “culture of the classroom,” the process by which curriculum is delivered to children. There is a tendency, even in this fine volume, to assume that printed curricular materials accurately reflected how classrooms operated. In modern classrooms it is well known that curriculum materials, laboratory equipment, or standardized examinations do not in themselves determine classroom standards: the personal goals of teacher and students do this. These goals are highly resistant to outside pressures, including pedagogical techniques presented in teachers’ colleges. So, one suspects, must have been the case in the 19th century. Prescription must not be confused with practice. To an unsettling degree, both of these books do just this. To unearth practice from prescription will require that sources such as teachers’ daily records and reports of classroom procedures be carefully analyzed.

These recent books have expanded our knowledge of Ontario’s educational heritage. If, however, one had time to consult only one of these books, Schooling and Scholars in Nineteenth-Century Ontario would be the wiser choice. The thorough examination of the period before 1871 makes the task for educational historians all the clearer by exposing the vacuum of similar studies for the last quarter of the 19th century and beyond, into our more recent past.
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Books by politicians are invariably a disappointment since the authors are seldom explicit in discussing their political activities. Frequently the works are defensive explanations or panegyrics extolling the virtues of the politicians or their political parties. Occasionally there are some, such as Judy Lamarsh’s Bird in a Gilded Cage or Lise Payette’s Le Pouvoir? connais pas, that go beyond these sterile parameters. Lapalme’s book is different in that he had already produced his memoirs; this piece is an attempt to place him in the political perspective he deserves as a progenitor of what became known as “la révolution tranquille,” the misnamed and mythologized period in Quebec’s history.

Lapalme is an interesting figure, even if little known outside Quebec and not that well known even in his own province. A lawyer of Liberal antecedents, he successfully entered politics, first federally (after World War II) and then provincially, where he became the provincial Liberal leader (1950-57) of the Opposition. He was briefly a member of Premier Jean Lesage’s “cabinet du Tonnerre” but resigned. None the less, he was important for the ideas and platforms he advocated for the Liberal Party, thus his appellation as the father of the “quiet revolution.” There are, basically, two books here: one that is a reflection on what was wrong with the party and why it remained out of power and the second that proposes what had to be done to attain power and what had to be done once there. As well there are