

Historical Studies in Education / Revue d'histoire de l'éducation
BOOK REVIEWS / COMPTES RENDUS

Cristina Yanes-Cabrera, Juri Meda, Antonio Viñao (Editors)

School Memories. New Trends in the History of Education

Cham, Springer, 2017, 278 p. ISBN 978-3-319-44062-0

L'ouvrage résulte d'une sélection opérée parmi les communications présentées au symposium international qui s'est tenu à Séville en septembre 2015. L'idée qui le sous-tend est que la mémoire ou les mémoires de l'école constituent, comme l'école elle-même, un objet digne de recherches historiques, pour deux raisons au moins. S'intéresser aux souvenirs sur l'école permet d'abord d'aller au-delà de ce que nous apprennent les sources classiques, institutionnelles ou livresques, sur les maîtres, les élèves et les programmes : ce sont les expériences et le vécu, individuels et collectifs, que ces souvenirs peuvent en effet rendre plus précisément sensibles. Dans sa dimension collective, cette mémoire est aussi le produit d'une construction sociale, qui la nourrit de représentations et de stéréotypes pouvant eux-mêmes contribuer à orienter les décisions et les choix touchant au présent et à l'avenir de l'école. À ce titre, elle possède une dimension politique qui mérite d'être analysée en tant que telle. Dix-huit communications illustrent, précisent ou enrichissent la problématique ainsi résumée, par des études de cas empruntées à l'histoire de l'école contemporaine dans différents pays d'Europe, essentiellement du Sud et de l'Est : Italie (7), Espagne (3), Grèce, Roumanie, Hongrie, Bosnie, Slovénie, Russie, Angleterre, une dernière étant transnationale. Pour l'essentiel, elles adoptent deux grandes approches.

Les unes s'attachent à cerner les différents voies et moyens par lesquels une mémoire de l'école a pu se construire. Analysée en ouverture du recueil, l'aquarelle du peintre britannique H. J. Richter, intitulée *Picture of Youth* ou *The Village School in an Uproar* (1809) a été maintes fois reproduite dans plusieurs pays, ce qui lui confère, selon Maria del Mar del Pozo Andrés et S. Braster, une valeur d'icône mémorielle dénigrant les méthodes de l'école d'Ancien Régime. En représentant l'intérieur ou l'extérieur de bâtiments scolaires espagnols autour de 1900 et en assurant une large diffusion à ces représentations, les cartes postales « construisent ou reconstruisent une mémoire de l'éducation » (A. Viñao et M. J. Martínez Ruiz-Funes). Présentes aujourd'hui sur les réseaux sociaux, ces mêmes cartes postales permettent le partage d'une mémoire de l'école entre les membres de ces réseaux ; les évolutions historiques pouvant même être rendues sensibles grâce au procédé du *mashup* ou mélange d'images (M. Brunelli).

Contribue également à cette mise en mémoire de l'école une vaste panoplie de supports de communication : annuaires des écoles religieuses espagnols du

XX^e siècle (P. Dávila, L. M. Naya, I. Zabaleta) ; manuels scolaires andalous édités de 1978 à 1993 (G. Trigueros Gordillo, C. Torres Fernández, E. Alastor Garcia Chekh-Lahlou) ; pierres tombales d'enseignants slovènes au XIX^e siècle (B. Šuštar). Le cinéma et la télévision constituent des vecteurs mémoriels analysés dans plusieurs de leurs productions : un feuilleton télévisé italien des années 1970 dont le héros est un instituteur (A. Debè) ; trois adaptations cinématographiques respectivement réalisées en 1948, 1973 et 2001 du roman *Cuore* de De Amicis, publié en 1886 (S. Polenghi) ; deux films grecs, *Zéro de conduite* (1949) et *Pain amer* (1951) ayant pour cadre la vie scolaire dans l'après-guerre (D. Karakatsani et P. Nikolopoulou) ; une évocation au cinéma et à la télévision du pédagogue italien Don Lorenzo Milani (P. Alferi et C. Frigerio) ; de même que des films soviétiques mettant en valeur la figure de l'enseignant (E. Kalinina). Le souci de multiplier les approches originales de la construction d'une mémoire de l'école est donc remarquable. Peut-être aurait-il toutefois convenu de rappeler que celle-ci s'opère quand même, assez largement, par des voies et moyens plus classiquement analysables et analysés : l'enseignement de l'histoire (incluant celle de l'école), la littérature et notamment le roman, la presse pédagogique, voire la grande presse.

Ces études soulèvent en tous cas, explicitement ou non, plusieurs questions intéressantes. D'abord, celle du périmètre exact de ce qu'il est convenu d'appeler « mémoire collective » ou, dans un registre voisin, « identité ». Sont opportunément distinguées ici les mémoires de groupes humains aux configurations diverses : enseignants masculins ou féminins, anciens élèves d'écoles élitistes ou populaires, habitants d'une région (Andalousie), d'un pays (Espagne, Italie, Grèce, URSS) ou internautes sans frontières. Est soulevée aussi la question des motifs et des motivations des entrepreneurs de mémoires. Ils sont relativement clairs dans le cas des établissements d'enseignement (autopromotion), ou du cinéma soviétique (propagande socialiste). Mais qu'en est-il des peintres, des éditeurs de cartes postales, des cinéastes ou des producteurs de télévision ? S'ils visent consciemment un public ou un marché, cela pose le problème, plutôt complexe, des rapports entre mémoire installée et additionnelle : une image de l'école ne peut être proposée qu'à des esprits ayant sur elle des prénotions ou des préjugés, qui définissent un horizon d'attente.

Et dans quelle mesure toutes ces intentions ou ces entreprises mémorielles ont-elles eu des effets observables et analysables ? Un élément de réponse a été cherché par un deuxième ensemble de communications portant sur les mémoires, les souvenirs, les journaux, les autobiographies et les entretiens oraux d'anciens élèves, d'étudiants ou d'enseignants. Parmi eux, un instituteur hongrois qui a publié ses mémoires en 2015 (I. Garai et A. Németh) ; six enseignants bosniaques interrogés oralement sur ce qu'ont été leurs études et leur formation dans les années 1960 et 1970 (S. Šušnjara) ; une trentaine d'instituteurs italiens ayant laissé leurs souvenirs sur les décennies 1860 à 1970 (M. C. Morandini) et quarante-six institutrices italiennes de la seconde moitié du XIX^e siècle, avec un accent sur deux d'entre elles (A. Cagnolati et J. L. Hernández Huerta). Les analyses de ces témoignages, écrits ou oraux, incluent naturellement les précautions d'usage sur leur valeur heuristique et les différents biais qu'ils peuvent offrir à l'interprétation. Chez ces témoins, les auteurs relèvent le souvenir plutôt

heureux des années d'école. Ces souvenirs ont d'ailleurs contribué à orienter des vocations enseignantes ultérieures ; les étapes de la construction d'une identité enseignante, particulièrement remarquable dans le cas des institutrices italiennes qui apparaissent en décalage avec la situation générale des femmes dans l'Italie de leur époque ; la diversité et l'inventivité des pratiques d'enseignement, plus grandes que ne laissent penser les sources réglementaires ; ainsi que l'importance des expériences de sociabilité entre les enseignants et entre les élèves.

L'ouvrage atteint donc largement ses objectifs. Tout au plus pourrait-on regretter que le degré de nouveauté de cette mémoire de l'école n'ait pas été interrogé, par confrontation avec les images et souvenirs de l'école ou des écoles, dans la diversité de leurs formes qui ont existé à l'époque précontemporaine. Mais ceci n'enlève rien à l'intérêt de l'ouvrage, dans les limites du cadre chronologique et institutionnel qu'il s'est donné.

Pierre Caspard

Directeur de recherches honoraire, Paris

Adam Laats and Harvey Siegel

Teaching Evolution in a Creation Nation

Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2016, 144 pp.

After reading *Teaching Evolution in a Creation Nation*, I considered ginning up a seminar in the history of science just to have the pleasure of discussing this lively, accessible book with students. In eight brief chapters, Adam Laats and Harvey Siegel map out the historical and philosophical foundations of the ongoing debate over evolution education in the United States. The first four chapters offer a concise historical narrative of conflicts over the subject and the cultural shifts that prompted them. The last four chapters explore the philosophical questions raised by this debate and suggest how educators might approach it and its various participants. This intelligent little volume is sure to make frequent appearances in undergraduate syllabi. I would assign it in a heartbeat.

Throughout the book, Laats and Siegel characterize opponents of evolution education as cultural minorities operating within a long tradition of dissent, a characterization that both dictates the nature of their inquiry and determines their conclusion. The authors argue that while students of diverging beliefs and backgrounds are to be respected, cultural and religious differences are not a legitimate excuse for ignoring evolution, given its importance in modern science and culture. Science teachers, they maintain, have an educational and moral obligation to foster understanding and knowledge of evolution among their students. But knowledge and belief are different beasts, they note, and it is possible to learn something without believing in it. Science teachers should let belief be, the authors conclude, and resign themselves to educating students about the facts of evolution, rather than demanding faith in the theory.

The argument is optimistic, but not impractical. Like the book itself, the suggestion combines thoughtful logic with a generous respect for the varied participants in this ongoing conflict.

The authors begin the book by disavowing familiar binaries, arguing that, despite conventional wisdom, debates over evolution education have never been about science versus religion or educated elites versus rural rubes. Many ardent supporters of evolution education were and are deeply religious, the authors point out, some of them as devout as those who attacked evolution on religious grounds. Instead, Laats and Siegel argue, the conflict is actually between two cultural groups: “evolution supporters,” who gradually come to dominate the scientific mainstream and advocate for evolutionary theory based upon the procedures and findings of modern science, and “evolution opponents,” who have elected to understand the origins of Earth and humanity in religious, often evangelical, terms, and have built an alternate educational infrastructure that supports these beliefs.

The real constant in the contest between these two cultural factions is the fury each group provokes in the other, they write. Over the century, evolution supporters and opponents have denounced one other as “unwise, absurd, ridiculous,” (4) to quote one 1922 Kentucky evolution supporter, and fundamentally irrational, making compromise or genuine debate all but impossible. While the insults are continuous and consistent, who gets insulted and why has actually changed considerably over the century, explain the authors, thanks to major shifts in modern science and culture in the United States.

Though the authors examine the best-known controversies over evolution education in the first four chapters—the Scopes trial, legal and political disputes over the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS), *Kitzmiller v. Dover*—they also place these historical conflicts in broader context. The book does an excellent job connecting seemingly isolated dots, explaining how cultural and intellectual realignments during periods of seeming silence on evolutionary education later helped to ignite serious conflict. New approaches to science and university education in the early twentieth century, post-war consensus among biologists about the legitimacy of the evolutionary synthesis, evangelicals’ increasing disillusionment with mainstream schooling and science in this same period, and the emergence of the concept of “intelligent design” all shaped the evolution battles that punctuated the twentieth century.

After this brisk historical overview, the book turns to philosophy, first explaining the criteria that qualify an idea as scientific, then applying these criteria to evolutionary theory, then to creationism, and finally, to intelligent design. For readers unaccustomed to philosophical reasoning, the authors’ approach in chapters five and six provides an excellent introduction to the discipline’s rigorous logic and systematic method. While supporters and opponents of evolution education have both championed their respective beliefs as superior science to the alternative, Laats and Siegel conclude that, according to traditional understandings of science, only evolutionary theory can be considered scientific.

If opposition to evolution education should be, as the authors suggest, considered an act of dissent by a cultural minority, then how should educators balance their

longstanding commitment to science education with their more recent commitment to multiculturalism? In answering this question, the authors return, in chapters seven and eight, to the distinction between knowledge and belief. “Knowledge and understanding are sufficient goals, for both student *and* teacher. To insist on student belief *in* evolution, that is belief that is true, is to overreach,” they write. “Typically belief will follow such knowledge and understanding; when it does not, that disconnect is usually the result of strongly held convictions that are themselves extra-scientific and so beyond the bounds of science and science education to make” (79). In short, students need only to understand evolution—they do not need to believe it.

It is a rewarding and rapid read, though I had a few minor quibbles with the book’s pacing. The authors pile an awful lot into the fourth chapter, sprinting through six decades of history in a mere ten pages, and chapter six, with its lengthy and frequent quotations, dragged a bit more than the others. But a few wobbles are to be expected in such a compact volume, and the authors do a masterful job identifying and analyzing the core concerns in the battles over evolution education. The book is a case study in how to write smart and short. It also offers some excellent examples of basic historical and philosophical procedure—chapter three is a model of how to approach seeming silence in the historical record. It is the perfect length for an introduction to the topic, and a welcome addition to the field’s literature.

Victoria Cain

Northeastern University

Alan Gordon

Time Travel: Tourism and the Rise of the Living History Museum in Mid-Twentieth-Century Canada

Vancouver: UBC Press, 2016. 364 pp.

I was nine when I first saw Fortress Louisbourg National Historic Site, on the Atlantic coast of Nova Scotia. My father, a history teacher, was driving us around the Maritimes in a Volkswagen camper. I remember the long flakes of dried cod; my little brother being stopped by the sentry at the Dauphin gate (literally—he had run off ahead); eating off heavy pewter plates; and eerie, bone-chilling fog closing in on the fortress walls, as if to seal us off in the past. Four years ago, I went back to Louisbourg, and was caught up again in the sound of the waves, the feel of the cold stone walls ... Then I read about a now annual bike rally, “Storm the Fortress,” where hundreds of motorcyclists drive through the reconstruction. I could not picture it; why invite the present to drive right through the past?

Alan Gordon would not have been as shaken as I was by the motorcyclists. He begins *Time Travel* with a similar scenario: a 2009 proposal for a medieval faire at Upper Canada Pioneer Village. From there he reaches back two centuries to show that living history museums have never been sealed off from the present. Even by the early

nineteenth century, interest in the educational power of artifacts was twinned with an interest in their potential revenue; museums and sites were expected to supply “education, betterment, or simple enjoyment” (24)—a duality underwriting many of our protected places, whether historic sites or national parks. As a comprehensive *history* of public history in Canada, *Time Travel* is a welcome text.

To his great credit, Gordon respects the idealism that sparks many living history projects, and the belief in their educational potential. Living history museums rely on a blend of the material and the intangible; they try to communicate the past by recreating past environments in which physical artifacts can be handled and used, and which evoke “emotion and affect” (23). While public history is frequently criticized for being conservative and/or commercial, “Promoters and innovators did not see their own work quite so cynically. They often believed in the educational benefits that their projects promised as they sound new ways to bring materials they cared about deeply to an ever more jaded and distracted consumer culture” (7). As an advocate of Fort Steele, British Columbia wrote in 1963, “a true restoration and reconstruction is a slow process. This is made necessary because of the tremendous amount of research which must be done. It is our desire to do this on as authentic a basis as possible” (210). (Authenticity is the great, elusive elephant in public history; after endless discussions of the term, Gordon’s negative definition—“better grasped as a concept to be appreciated in its absence” [12]—is oddly satisfying.) In addition, sites like the *Village historique Acadien* served as anchors for minority groups, to which people contributed memories and artifacts.

Such idealism, however, was always subsumed in wider historical currents. Or more precisely, the educational mission often aligned conveniently with the prevailing ideologies of the day. As Gordon notes, living history museums presented “a past grounded in the post-war values of their own world” (308), that soothed anxieties about the signs of twentieth-century “progress” ploughing across Victorian landscapes (15). The gendered division of labour at pioneer villages—women churning butter at home, men in the blacksmith shop—looked an awful lot like postwar sitcoms. They also validated North America’s commitment to consumer capitalism. As Gordon notes, “although their promotional literature repeatedly stressed pioneer self-sufficiency, these villages depicted a remarkably commercial past” (151), and offered commercial opportunities in the present. (Who else remembers buying striped candy sticks at the general store while on a school trip?) *Time Travel* relies heavily at times on Ontario as a barometer of national trends; presumably the signs of modernity were most pronounced in Canada’s most populous, most urbanized province, but this has the effect of echoing Ontario’s own presumptions of a “provincial past as contiguous with Canada’s national past” (229).

In fact, *Time Travel* does a wonderful job of connecting experiments in living history with that national past. Some connections are academic: the centralizing Laurentian thesis endorsed fur trade posts like Old Fort William, while the growth of ethnic studies underwrote new community museums. Others are decidedly not, in a butterfly-effect kind of way. Planners suggested military drills to animate Old Fort Henry in an attempt to compete with the new draw in postwar tourism: transatlantic

flights to Europe. Conservation authority lands, it turned out, supplied convenient park space for historic homes orphaned by megaprojects. When John Diefenbaker, campaigning on promises of northern development, suggested an historic site at Dawson City, “the Parks Branch was committed despite itself” (164). Public history is often *realpolitik*—not an observer of history, but a participant.

But *realpolitik* is a challenge for historic sites. As Gordon observes, in a statement so tantalizing I wish he had said more: “They must find ways to reveal history as a process and must also insert themselves into that process” (312). They become artifacts themselves, their fixed environments sitting apart from changing historical interpretations or societal interests. He suggests there are “ways to live with the past that do not rely on the time travel illusion” (310), as with urban historic districts. Addressing racial diversity may invite new ways of learning, as Gitksan heritage at ‘kSan Historical Village or African-American environmental knowledge at Monticello. The hegemonic impulse betrays a failure of empathy; we want our *own* story preserved before any other. And living history museums are encouraging reminders that, amid the ebbs and flows of funding, history *has* been a prominent part of public life—and we should remain committed to keeping it so. At the risk of sounding like a typical Gen-X-er wistfully dreaming of a Boomer golden age, I think of the group of historians who worked at Fortress Louisbourg in the 1960s and 1970s. They were fresh out of college, immersed in colonial archives, working closely with one another, in a high-water moment of energy, opportunity, and optimism nearly unimaginable today.¹ But that high-water mark still stands on the shores of Cape Breton—with its doors open.

Claire Campbell
Bucknell University

Richard A. Jarrell

Educating the Neglected Majority: The Struggle for Agricultural and Technical Education in Nineteenth-Century Ontario and Quebec

Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2016. 418 pp.

The subtitle of Richard Jarrell’s *magnum opus* on the evolution of technical and agricultural education in nineteenth-century Ontario and Quebec is an apt one. His pioneering survey delineates thoroughly the challenges of “educating the neglected majority” of farmers, mechanics and artisans. In fact, to call the various attempts to bring technical and agricultural education to working people and farmers as a struggle seems almost an inadequate description, as a variety of educators, politicians, businessmen and rudimentary “men of science” endeavoured to diffuse

¹ “Forum: Reconstructing Fortress Louisbourg, 1961–2013,” *The Nashuaak Review*, volume 30–31 (2013) 390–426.

“useful knowledge” to their clients. Jarrell brilliantly illustrates that these challenges largely resulted from socio-economic upheaval and the various technological and industrial changes emerging from the late arrival of the Industrial Revolution in the newly created Dominion of Canada.

Educating the Neglected Majority is divided into two sections; the first describes a pre-Confederation model of informal technical and agricultural education in nineteenth-century central Canada, and the second tackles a post-Confederation campaign in Ontario and Quebec to include technical/agricultural education in the broader provincial curricula. The pre-Confederation segment explores the rather *ad hoc* nature of early education for the farmer and operative classes. Jarrell illustrates that a rather loose collection of agricultural societies, the farming press, reform societies, and mechanics’ institutes made valiant efforts to provide education with rather scanty resources provided by organizations largely staffed by volunteers and funded by middle-class patrons. By the middle of the nineteenth century, while still embracing the voluntary organization archetype, the emerging Canadian nation state would encourage agricultural/technical education by establishing provincial Departments of Agriculture and Boards of Arts and Manufactures for each of Upper and Lower Canada. By the post-Confederation period, agricultural education evolved to become formalized in Ontario and Quebec, and the Departments of Agriculture systematically attempted to provide this education to farmers by means of model farms, agricultural colleges, *cercles agricoles*, as well as Farmers’ and Women’s Institutes. A discussion of the similar evolution of technical pedagogy appears in the last two chapters of the book, as voluntary associations such as mechanics’ institutes and *institutes des artisans* would be replaced by art schools, technical schools, engineering faculties at the university level, and the *écoles polytechniques* in Quebec.

As a pioneering survey of technical and agricultural education in Ontario and Quebec during the nineteenth century, *Educating the Neglected Majority* succeeds brilliantly. Not only does Jarrell itemize almost every voluntary association, government agency, and individual tasked with providing farmers and working people with technical and agricultural education in nineteenth-century Ontario and Quebec, he also charts the various challenges of providing this education within the context of an emerging liberal nation state. In the book’s introduction in particular, Jarrell illustrates the difficulties that arose in attempting to provide the necessary education in the larger context of the socio-economic upheaval of the late Industrial Revolution, the expansion of the nation state, the drive to improve the emerging middling classes, and the needs of an embryonic industrial economy.

One of the strengths of this book lies in Jarrell’s explanation of the eclectic nature of agricultural and technical education in this period. Education depended on the needs of both client and patron, coupled with the agenda of bureaucrats, politicians and educators. The educational results were completely mutable, often uneven, and only sporadically achieved as promised. And yet Jarrell’s work provides a welcome corollary to the usual academic paradigm that technical and agricultural education in nineteenth century central Canada was an abject failure. Along the

lines of Martyn Walker's description of mechanics' institutes in Great Britain in *The Development of the Mechanics' Institute Movement in Britain and Beyond* (2016), Jarrell provides a nuanced approach to the challenges of providing educational opportunities to the "neglected majority." While the dreams of technical/agricultural improvement in Ontario and Quebec were often hampered by the reality of statist inattention, scarcity of resources, and a fundamental lack of will, Jarrell refuses to take the easy way out and proclaim the educational project a hollow endeavour. Rather, he argues that while formalized technical and agricultural education represented "the right idea at the wrong time," more informal educational efforts "became a notable and variegated success" (267).

The greatest strength of this book, the meticulous cataloguing of the various informal and formal enterprises of technical/agricultural education, is also one of its weaknesses. Given the scope of this study and the originality of its premise, all too often *Educating the Neglected Majority* reads as a simple litany of legislators, organizations, and philanthropists. The effectiveness and potency of the introduction, linking these educational forays to the larger socio-economic, cultural, and political forces in Ontario/Quebec during the nineteenth century, is generally absent in the book's central text. Similarly, while Jarrell acknowledges in the introduction the intricacy of discovering the often-muted voices of farmers and working people within educational endeavours, they too are conspicuously silent in the central text. While recognizing the paucity of source material, a little more "reading against the grain" to illuminate the experiences of the neglected majority of farmers and the working classes would have been welcome, as would have a more substantial discussion of the challenges of gender in agricultural and technical education.

These quibbles aside, Richard Jarrell's *Educating the Neglected Majority* is a book of rigorous scholarship and enlightening argumentation that will stimulate further research and debate on the challenges of technical/agricultural education in nineteenth-century central Canada. Sadly, as one of the foremost scholars on the history of technology and science education in Canada, Richard Jarrell passed away in 2013, just as he was finishing the last revisions of the manuscript. Fortunately for those interested in the history of agricultural and technical education during this period, a dedicated team of scholars working off Jarrell's final corrections ably completed the project. The book stands both as a fitting tribute and a vital new contribution from one of Canada's foremost cultural historians of education, science, and technology.

Darren Ferry
Independent Scholar

Jeff A. Webb

Observing the Outposts: Describing Newfoundland Culture, 1950-1980

Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016. 421 pp.

“This is a study of a small group of scholars working in different academic departments . . . who examined a common object—rural Newfoundland culture” (10), Jeff Webb has written. He is describing Memorial University in the decades after Newfoundland became a province of Canada in 1949. The researchers were “lexicographers, historians, folklorists, anthropologists, sociologists, and historical geographers [who] worked to understand the society and culture around them” (13). Culture, as Webb defines it in this context, is “socially transmitted environmental adaptations and ways of interacting with others within their community” (5).

Within these parameters, Webb has succeeded in producing a scholarly and detailed account of the people and processes involved in some major research projects, but does not provide detail on their findings. Webb is himself a graduate of Memorial (his PhD is from New Brunswick), and he is now an Associate Professor there. It is perhaps with tongue in cheek then that he observes that “anthropologists long ago dismissed notions of themselves as objective outsiders describing a culture” (223). This missing objectivity does not detract from his work, but the book does read as if it is intended for an audience familiar with the history and culture of the Atlantic Provinces, especially Newfoundland and its university.

Six research areas are described. The first, and arguably the most important, is the compilation of the *Dictionary of Newfoundland English*, of which Dr. George Story was the principal compiler. The premier of the new province, Joey Smallwood, wanted to promote Newfoundland culture as well as modernization, and supported the concept of a linguistic identity different from Canada, the United States, or Britain. The second research area, the history of Newfoundland, was deemed to be important because “the collapse of responsible government and the chronic under-performance of the economy had to be understood in a useful way if Newfoundland was to leave the past behind” (144). Under the auspices of the Historical Research Committee, archival and published material was gathered, and numerous books were written on the history of Newfoundland. This was not merely a local phenomenon. Historians from Britain also showed interest in a “self-governing dominion which had slipped back to something like crown colony status” (85), just the reverse of what was happening elsewhere as former colonies clamoured for independence.

Herbert Halpert, a somewhat eccentric social anthropologist and student of folklore, established Memorial’s Department of Folklore, which carried out valuable research into some traditional local practices, especially ‘Christmas Mumming.’ It is worth noting that this practice is never actually described in Webb’s book: he focusses on the people and the process, and assumes the reader is familiar with the old custom. He does acknowledge, however, that research on Christmas mumming was very much part of 1960s revival of interest in folk culture—folk music, collective theatre, American counter-culture, and the protest songs of Pete Seeger. That affinity clearly

helped Memorial attract sympathetic academics from outside the Atlantic Provinces.

The anthropological studies carried out by researchers in the Institute of Social and Economic Research covered similar territory, based on the premise that Newfoundland's "cultural heritage could be a 'holding ground' on which people could securely anchor themselves in a world adrift with change" (200). The book's emphasis here again, however, is on the process not the content of the inquiries: for example, it describes researchers gradually becoming accepted as part of the community by observing and adapting to local patterns of interaction in the village's little grocery store.

Another research area deals with the work of historical geographers as they studied *The Peopling of Newfoundland* and the cultural transfer that came with immigration and settlement. Finally, Webb examines studies described in *Communities in Decline*, the story of resettlement told by social scientists who examined the process of urbanization and the disappearance of rural communities due in part to lack of economic diversification.

The author credits the researchers of Memorial with stimulating the "emergence of a diverse and active interest in Newfoundland studies" (317), although one example he gives might raise a few eyebrows: "entrepreneurs print words from the DNE [Dictionary of Newfoundland English] on T-shirts and sell mummer figurines that are made in China" (331). Times have changed as "national granting agencies set national priorities" (346) and have replaced local funding and interests. "The sense of urgency is gone, and there are fewer of us now engaged in the study of the province. The Newfoundland studies movement was a product of its time" (25). There is a certain irony in the fact that the subject of Webb's thoughtful and well-researched account is now itself only a part of Newfoundland's past.

Alastair Glegg

University of Victoria

Paula S. Fass

The End of American Childhood: A History of Parenting from Life on the Frontier to the Managed Child

Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2016. 334 pp.

For anyone seeking a comprehensive study of American parenting and childhood over the past two centuries, Fass's new book delivers. It manages to cover two hundred years of history in just six, well-articulated chapters. Organized chronologically and thematically, the book demonstrates how events and contexts have shaped and altered the way American parents and children interact. Readers should be prepared to be met with a broad range of historical sources including sociological observations, personal memoirs, individual case studies of families and children, and advice literature.

Fass chooses to begin her narrative in the post-Revolutionary period (1800–1860), arguing that “the American Revolution first endowed children with an important role in the unfolding of the nation’s future” (6). As the new republic required strong citizens, early American childhood was characterized by independence, increased personal autonomy, and rejected entrenched hierarchy. Children were expected to work but, in return, received the freedom of independence. Chapter two looks at the post-civil war era (1850–1890), focusing particularly on the plight of freed slaves and their children after abolition and in the wake of slavery’s destruction of family life. A consequence of the civil war was the high number of children left orphaned and destitute which, Fass argues, along with immigrant and urban development, spurred Americans into a child saving movement. With fresh concerns over child protection, public institutions and rescue organizations were formed as new spheres of authority, and redefined how parents were expected to care for their children.

The early twentieth century (1890–1940), as Fass outlines in chapter three, heralded a new professionalism to the study of children. Child rearing and care “experts,” such as pediatricians and psychologists, presented new scientific values, replaced amateur child savers, and encouraged mothers to seek advice outside the home. The establishment of the Children’s Bureau, the first and only federal children’s welfare agency, also helped to reframe normalcy in children and how parents, particularly mothers, were supposed to care for them.

Turning in chapter four to American adolescence between 1920 and 1960, Fass asserts that high school became a “uniquely American institution” (128) and operated not only to assimilate immigrant children into American society and culture, but introduced alternative adult authority into family lives, thereby changing parent-child relationship dynamics. Adolescents stayed in school longer and school, like organizations such as juvenile court, “broadened the reach of childhood dependency into the teen years” (157).

Chapter five argues that the civil rights movement, 1960s liberation, and an increase in college attendance created new forms of independence and expression in American adolescents and encouraged them to hold views of their lives that differed from those of their parents. Within a new world context and changing economy, Fass concludes, “Americans began to worry about the future and how to prepare their children” (214).

In her final chapter, entitled “What’s the Matter with Kids Today?” Fass sets her sights on the period from 1980 to the present, a time which has been defined by continued parental anxieties. Fass scrutinises parenting literature and argues that there is a historical blindness which makes it appear as though contemporary parents are the only ones who feel inadequate in their parenting roles (an assertion that her book squarely challenges). That Americans today have greater autonomy over child-rearing due to birth control, abortions, genetic testing, lower child mortality rates, and women in the workforce means, according to Fass, that privileged American parents have been “absorbed in illusions of control and ideals of perfection” (225). Fass claims that childhood is now strictly supervised and children are over-controlled and over-indulged while mothers struggle to balance parenthood, careers, and societal

childrearing norms. From a place of fear that their children may make wrong decisions, “the guiding principle of successful parenting,” she opines, “has become control” (226). Consequently, adolescence as a preparatory stage of life has crumbled and left America with helicopter parents and boomerang kids (who return to the family nest after graduating from college). Herein lies Fass’s overarching thesis that “American childhood as it had evolved over two hundred years of changes had come to an end, in no small part because the end of childhood was not clearly defined” (267).

Fass’s wide-ranging piece is successful in large part due to its myriad sources. However, a clear outline of the limitations of retrospective sources like memoirs would have been helpful. Further, although in line with her objective, the book looks at how American childhood was crafted by adults and only in a limited scope does it uncover the reality of the lived experiences of children and youth. This, of course, is a larger methodological problem of finding child-created sources because historically, children and youth, until the advent of social media, have been less likely to record and keep records of their lived experiences. So, one might ask, what do today’s children think of this parental control?

The snappy yet rather alarmist title of this book makes us wonder if American childhood has ended because “childhood” (meaning here, a state of dependency) can now extend until one’s early twenties, or because American parents, too anxious and fearful of their children’s failure, have snuffed out the period in their children’s lives previously characterised by play, self-discovery, and developing independence. In this vein, Fass ends with the new crisis and harshly characterises millennials as a “generation with unclear goals, embedded in a new world of Internet rules, and Facebook friendships” (226). Beyond the argument that controlling parents have stunted their children’s independence or overindulged them, Fass could remind readers that millennials, just like American offspring from the past two centuries, are products of their time. Has the new world context, where economic uncertainty is prevalent, jobs are no longer for life, bachelor and master’s degrees and world travel are the norms, and the internet has changed communication, created a new form of early adulthood rather than an extended or truncated childhood? Moreover, do “Millennials” only shed their status as “children” when they have children themselves? These are questions that await others to answer them.

Claire L. Halstead
Saint Mary’s University

Jonathan Zimmerman

Too Hot to Handle: A Global History of Sex Education

Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2015. 216 pp.

Too Hot to Handle is an ambitious work that covers the development, implementation, and controversies of sexual education around the globe from the turn of the twentieth century to the present. Completing a national history of sexual instruction is an impressive feat, as education is often within a single province or state's jurisdiction, as in the cases of Canada and the United States. Curricular initiatives/directives on sexual education have the added complication of lacking standardization, especially during the twentieth century, and were inconsistently implemented across school districts.

This work illustrates how diverse regions found common cause in promoting or rejecting sexual instruction in schools. Regardless of the uniqueness of their national context, governments, organizations, and educators reached across geographical boundaries to collaborate on tactics for improving or eliminating sexual instruction in classrooms. This work argues that despite worldwide attempts to institute sexual education, it was not fully implemented in schools during the twentieth century, even though most Western countries had a type of sexual instruction by the 1970s. Sex itself is a controversial topic. Ironically proponents and opponents of sex education had the same objective of maintaining youths' innocence and preventing sexual activity that could lead to infections, pregnancy, and promiscuity.

This work focuses on international events that promoted collaboration amongst education experts, in order to demonstrate how campaigners for and against the inclusion of sexual topics in schools shared resources and collaborated on strategies. However, the central narrative revolves primarily around the experiences of the United States and other Western countries. *Too Hot to Handle* is divided into four sections and begins with a discussion of schools starting to assume the role of sex educator in the early 1900s as a means of limiting youth's sexual experimentation. Instruction at this time focused on animal and plant reproduction. In response to World War I, education was seen as the solution to curbing the spread of venereal diseases. The same concerns were echoed in World War II, and volunteer organizations, such as the American Social Hygiene Association, concentrated their efforts at home and abroad to limit incidences of venereal disease. In reaction to the seemingly substantial sexual education in Western nations, countries in the Communist bloc perceived this education as immoral and a corrupting influence. Furthermore, nations often defined their own values in comparison to others, particularly the United States and Sweden. From the 1960s to 1980s, the introduction of oral contraceptives led to increased fears over sexual promiscuity, and sexual instruction was viewed by advocates as necessary to preserve traditional values of monogamy and confining sex to marriage. Zimmerman argues that as the sexual revolution was seen as an international crisis, opponents of sexual instruction advocated for an international solution. The AIDS crisis in the 1980s prompted many governments to implement sexual

education as a means of averting the spread of the disease. The author also illustrates how tensions over sexual instruction arose in Western countries as a consequence of immigration and diverse views of sexuality.

Zimmerman's work makes a significant contribution to the history of sexual education, however, greater clarity when presenting evidence would enhance the work's central arguments. As there is no outline or overall framework presented in the introduction, it is unclear if this work includes private or denominational schools, as well as the experiences of new immigrants and Indigenous peoples. Other challenges that arise include inconsistent referencing. Anecdotes and supporting evidence are not regularly cited; consequently the sources and their context are unknown. Furthermore, while extensive primary resources are included in discussions of the United States and Sweden, it appears that the source base for most of the countries is the secondary literature. In addition, there is little discussion of intersectionality in the content of sexual education. For instance, in North America, until the 1970s, the majority of sexual instruction materials depicted white middle-class families, leaving very little room for those who did not conform to this ideal to locate themselves in these resources. Overall, *Too Hot to Handle* is a fascinating read that highlights how the challenges of promoting sexual education, as a solution to perceived social ills, was international in scope. The strategies adopted by specific nations were also informed by the international context. It is highly recommended for any course on sexual instruction and education.

Michelle Hutchinson Grondin
Independent scholar

Matthew D. Pauly

Breaking the Tongue: Language, Education, and Power in Soviet Ukraine, 1923–1934

Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014. xx, 456 pp.

In 1923, Soviet authorities directed teachers in Ukraine to undertake a two-pronged effort to revolutionize primary schools: They were to implement a new, radically child-centered curriculum (based on North American models) and to do so in Ukrainian, a language that had been banned in tsarist-era schools. Thus school reform, as Matthew D. Pauly emphasizes, constituted a vital component of Soviet nationalities policy—the effort to at once accommodate and contain nationalism in a multinational state. Educational policymakers expected teachers, who had previously taught only in Russian, not only to break with traditional pedagogy but also to “break the tongue”—that is, master and use a new language of instruction. Drawing on minutes of teachers' conferences, inspectors' reports, and the pedagogical press, Pauly provides a fine-grained, almost month-by-month account of the failure and

abandonment of these expectations.

Pauly emphasizes that while the Communist party set the overall trajectory of school reform and promoted it as an essential means of building socialism, implementation was both chronically underfunded and decentralized, depending on the local, daily decisions of non-party educators. Teachers thus emerge as central actors in his story. At the most fundamental level, shortages of everything from training in progressive methods to Ukrainian-language textbooks and even basic supplies such as paper hampered teachers' ability to radically remake primary education. Additionally, many teachers, particularly in Ukraine's Russophone cities, could not or would not teach in Ukrainian. Rural teachers who were more likely to speak Ukrainian often knew only the local dialect and were unfamiliar with newly standardized syntax and orthography. Those interested in improving their language skills had to pay for courses from their own meagre salaries—which local districts often withheld for months at a time. Everywhere teachers resented and often found ways to delay or avoid the periodic state exams designed to test their competency in Ukrainian. When the state managed to administer tests, large numbers of teachers failed; although few lost their jobs as a result.

Such foot dragging and resistance notwithstanding, the Ukrainian commissariat of education "Ukrainized" large numbers of schools. "On paper," Pauly notes, "the percentage of Ukrainian-language schools rose from 50.7 per cent at the beginning of 1923 to 88.1 per cent in the 1932–3 academic year, in excess of the ethnic-Ukrainian proportion of the republic's population" (4). Pauly draws on the pedagogical press to illustrate the innovative ways in which at least some educators enthusiastically took up the call to reorient the primary school curriculum around Ukrainian language and studies. Such programs, as teachers in Kyiv affirmed, drew on local material in order to raise children's "class proletarian consciousness" (60).

Soviet authorities hoped that granting privileged status to Ukrainian would defuse the nationalist aspirations that had animated Ukrainian opposition to Soviet power over the course of the brutal war that ended in 1921 with the defeat of independent Ukraine. In the village, Ukrainization aimed to integrate Ukrainian-speaking peasants (the majority of the republic's population) into Soviet institutions. In the cities, teachers worked to train "Russified" (Russian-speaking, ethnically Ukrainian) youths in the language that would allow them to bridge the gap between the city and the countryside, where they might convince suspicious peasants that Soviet power was "native."

But even as Soviet authorities promoted Ukrainization, they never entirely trusted the Ukrainizers. Pauly identifies 1930 as the key turning point, the beginning of the end of Ukrainization. In the spring of 1930, as the collectivization of agriculture ignited civil war in the countryside, the Ukrainian Communist party staged a show trial of forty-five people, twenty-five of whom were professors, teachers, or students, as members of a counterrevolutionary Union for the Liberation of Ukraine. Although the organization "was an invention of the party leadership" (258), the consequences were quite real; in the wake of the trial the security services arrested and executed thousands for alleged involvement in the conspiracy.

The attack on the "Ukrainian national intelligentsia" (258) did not end

Ukrainization; indeed the party remained committed to correct, “proletarian” Ukrainization as the best antidote to dangerous, separatist nationalism. Nonetheless, Pauly emphasizes, the crackdown “sent an unequivocal message to rank-and-file Ukrainizers: they might be next” (264). At teachers’ conferences, discussions no longer focused on efforts to Ukrainize the Russified children of urban Ukrainians, but rather on fears that some ethnically Russian children were being forcibly enrolled in Ukrainian-language schools, despite their rights as members of a protected national minority in Ukraine to schooling in their native language.

The increasing suspicion of Ukrainization as a tool of counterrevolutionary nationalists coincided with a turn away from progressive pedagogy. During the industrialization and collectivization drives, hands-on projects remained central features of primary education; however, they now reflected not children’s interests but the dictates of the First Five-Year Plan. Both Ukrainization and progressive pedagogy, Pauly concludes, fell victim to “the contradiction in Soviet education generally at this time”: “Soviet authorities wanted to create citizens capable of independent, self-motivated action” (347) but feared the unpredictable results of such action.

For those in the field of Soviet history, this book offers a unique and important study of the intersection of school reform and nationalities policy. The emphasis is on how local institutions and teachers participated in the “process of nation building” (11). Drawing primarily on teachers’ and inspectors’ accounts, Pauly provides only fleeting glimpses of children’s experiences as refracted, for example, in reports of allegedly teacher-sanctioned antisemitic violence. Focused on the categories of generation and ethnicity, Pauly ignores gender as a category of analysis, although he includes without comment photographs of mostly male groups of teachers and of “Young Pioneer girls” (291). Historians of education outside the Soviet Union will appreciate Pauly’s meticulous reconstruction of teachers’ (and to a lesser extent parents’) efforts to negotiate reform with often unreceptive, distrustful state authorities. His examination of teachers’ responses to high stakes testing (in this case of teachers themselves) and to inadequate funding will no doubt resonate with those who study school reform in other contexts.

Lisa A. Kirschenbaum
West Chester University

Lisa Pasolli

Working Mothers and the Child Care Dilemma: A History of British Columbia's Social Policy

Vancouver: UBC Press, 2015. xii, 240 pp.

It is a puzzle of remarkable difficulty to piece together the history of the care of young children by people other than their parents. The victim of deep and recurring disregard, the question has left scattered and infrequent traces. To assemble this

impeccable book, Lisa Pasolli has formulated impressive questions: Why has the work of child care (inside or outside of homes, by parents or minders) been so little valued as a means of inserting citizens into society? Who has shouldered the main responsibility of caring for babies and toddlers, and how much say have these adults had in the matter? Who has set, and changed, the perceptions and conditions of the perennially large number of parents needing or wishing to work outside their homes? To answer these questions, the author probed one century of archives, at all scales of public and private decision-making, as well as fifty years of studies in women's and gender history, using the analytical tools of feminist scholarship on 'care' and of cultural history of social policy. Readers of *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation* will be interested to discover how contemporary debates over the importance of early education, and over the educational disadvantages of parents and workers who bore the consequences of the deficiencies of child care, became part and parcel of *The Child Care Dilemma*.

The most disturbing of the "threads of 'meaning'" (6) of Pasolli's investigation are the history of evasions surrounding child care, the ways that the topic has consistently provided a means of choice to hide away harsh clashes of public expectations, and the sheer disparities of resources. For each of the six periods covered by the book's chapters, Pasolli links the dilemmas of working mothers to larger inequalities of access: to safe and independent family life, to meaningful work, and to respectable institutions of welfare and education.

The reader is introduced to the arguments, circumstances, and methods of those who have attempted to build institutions of child care. With surprising regularity, mainstream politicians, employers, reformers, and civil servants have painted their proposals as means to save poor children from relegation to an orphanage away from their parents, destitution, ignorance, or immorality, or, as an inexpensive way to sustain low-income families. In the first case of such confusion of preconceived and self-serving opinions examined in the book, Pasolli introduces well-off women of late-nineteenth-century Vancouver, seeking in-house nannies. Their preference for a form of child care they knew from Britain got the better of the maternalist and racist values of most of them, because they otherwise ended up hiring Asian men as live-in domestic servants. By the turn of the century, this unsteady resolution of the child care dilemma clashed with rising notions about the all-powerful relation between mother and child. Philanthropic campaigns to find and train ideal domestic servants ensued. In a British Columbia colonial economy still based on resource exploitation, transportation, gender imbalance and racial inequality, tensions between rich husbands and wives, and rich and poor women became briefly visible. Should white women minders bring their own children to the middle-class homes that employed these women? By doing charitable work, were rich women not in danger of neglecting their offspring by entrusting them to strangers? Philanthropic campaigns foundered, and were replaced by slightly more successful attempts to provide child care to poor mothers: a public crèche in the 1910s; mothers' pensions in the interwar years.

The story of struggle for child care reads like a catalogue of ways to ignore working mothers' dilemmas. The labour and the women's movements have not always been immune to this blindness, but they have been the ones to ask at times for child care allowances in emancipatory terms: care allowances as a form of wages for housework; public child care as a form of socialization; community child care as a kind of extended family rearing. By the critical time of the 1960s and 1970s, the women's and labour movements came to see the extension of care to a "comprehensive, accessible and competent" (166) system as the key to equal rights for men and women in the workplace. Behind the scenes, functionaries in charge of the other welfare programs included in those programs indirect measures to support child care, such as the day care subsidies of the Canada Assistance Plan of 1966.

Canada remains one of the worst countries of the OECD for the quality and extent of its child care system; within the country, British Columbia has lately risen to the status of one of the better-performing provinces on child care. It is not surprising to discover that most inquiries and institutions researched by Pasolli were short-lived and incomplete. These occasions allow a brief look into the directions of parents' despairs and wishes, and into the unsurmountable nature of the obstacles many of them faced. A Vancouver social worker found that only one of the eighty-eight mothers who sent their children to a Wartime Day Nursery of Vancouver in the summer of 1943, worked in an actual war industry. Amongst the others, many were not even employed in the formal economy: they wanted a place away from "cramped housing conditions," more nutritious food for their children, or "to keep them away from bad neighbourhood influences" (92).

Pasolli's findings will need to be related to other problems, into which the book offers promising glimpses: the "approaches to caregiving work in indigenous communities" (185); the experiences of children in day care; the conditions of child care workers, including young babysitters, siblings, or elderly people; transnational explanations of the poor standing of Canadian policies amongst rich nations. The convincing method Pasolli has used to form this picture of unsystematic, under-regulated, underfunded, invisible, and stigmatised institutions has already earned many distinctions. It should inspire those who wish to piece together connected and current jigsaws: the large movement of parents in the direction of child care outside their homes, the unequal challenges of the care of the elderly, the implications of publicly sponsored programs to invite nannies from the Philippines, the steady growth of involuntary part time work which concerns a disproportionate number of women, as well as Canada's humanitarian campaigns to support women's work in the Global South.

Dominique Marshall
Carleton University

Tim Allender

Learning Femininity in Colonial India, 1820–1932

Manchester: University Press, 2016. 352 pp.

In a 2009 review, Tim Allender described Sanjay Seth's *Subject Lessons: The Western Education of Colonial India* (Duke University Press, 2007)—a sweeping assessment of western education written from a postcolonial perspective—as a work preoccupied with “subcontinental receptivity” rather than “the thinking and intentions of the colonizer.”² Allender thus hinted that the divergent motivations of imperial actors, their intellectual and personal trajectories, and the variety in their pedagogical methods, could benefit from further scrutiny. His *Learning Femininity* moves the focus away from the reception and transformation of colonial education policy and its impact on native epistemologies and communities, and the story of Indian men educating their wives and daughters—themes that have arguably dominated the field. Instead, Allender moves to and through several new sites—military ‘asylums’ for abandoned mixed-race girls, missionary schools, normal schools for training teachers, the ‘accomplishments curriculum’ aimed at girls and women—to offer insights into women educators, and their Indian and Eurasian students. But what does *Learning Femininity* add—analytically and not just cumulatively—to an understanding of colonial education, and its production of race and gender?

Based on vast archival research in several continents, *Learning Femininity* provides a dynamic view of women's education which, as it shows, did not always align straightforwardly with colonial policy, yet remained enfolded in the rubrics of race, class, and gender. The engagement with the historiography in the introduction is useful, if dated, as evidenced by the claim that “Anne McClintock is one of a very small number of scholars who have elaborated on the relational aspects of... race, class and gender” (7). The analytical and thematic elements also highlighted in the introduction—the co-constitution of race and gender; the changing contours of colonial rule; the pedagogy of ‘femininity’ as opposed to the rise of feminism—could have been better integrated into the nine chapters of varying length that make up this book.

Chapter one provides an account of western constructions of “Indian femininity” between 1820 and 1865, and the question of a curriculum for Indian girls in both official colonial and missionary circles. The chapter highlight is a brief but rich anecdote on how attempts to prevent female infanticide ended up funding a corrupt system in which households masqueraded as schools and husbands as teachers, practically bankrupting the Punjab education department. Chapter two discusses changes in colonial education policy with increasing anxieties about race, and deals with the incorporation of Eurasian girls ‘abandoned’ by white fathers into the ‘European fold,’ through a white, middle-class accomplishment education, in institutions such as the

² Tim Allender review of *Subject Lessons: The Western Education of Colonial India* by Sanjay Seth, *American Historical Review* 114, no. 4 (October 2009): 1057–8.

Lawrence Military Asylums. Chapter three shows how official racialization policies affected pedagogical priorities, such that normal schools were prioritized over schooling for Indian girls. Chapter four traces how transnational missionary networks—including their work in the *zenana* (the female quarters of the Indian household)—supplemented and even overwrote state-directed efforts after the 1870s, thus highlighting the tensions between state and missionary efforts. Chapters five and six take up the question of medical care for Indian women by missionaries and by various types of trained medical personnel, and offer a glimpse at the history of medical education for women in India and Britain. The extension of medical care to Indian women both challenged the borders of race and class, while also marginalizing pre-colonial understandings of health and hygiene. Chapter seven turns to the education of Indian girls in the 1880s and 90s in the Martinière schools in Lucknow and the Doveton colleges in Madras and Calcutta, and surveys the introduction of new pedagogical methods. This focus on the education of Indian girls during the years of rising nationalism continues in chapter eight which, despite its title, “Better mothers,” is not focused on instruction in domesticity or mothercraft as sites for learning femininity. Chapter nine examines how western education thrived beyond the reach of official colonial policy, as it did in the Loreto School in Calcutta, which was part of a network of Irish Roman Catholic schools.

With the range of themes and institutions covered, it is understandable that some of the relevant scholarship is neglected: the vast literature on colonial medicine, for instance, would have helped clarify the chronology for the introduction of ‘Western’ medical education in India, and the common use of terms such as ‘native doctor’ or ‘lady doctor.’ Other bibliographic absences are harder to explain: Despite the book’s focus on missionary education, Parna Sengupta’s excellent *Pedagogy for Religion: Missionary Education and the Fashioning of Hindus and Muslims in Bengal* (University of California Press, 2011), is not engaged with. And although *Learning Femininity* is focused on gender and femininity, the author overlooks Shefali Chandra’s *The Sexual Life of English: Language of Caste and Desire in Colonial India* (Duke University Press, 2012), which offers a rich analysis of how new models of femininity, domesticity, and sexuality, were forged by and for different groups through ‘English’ education, and to what end. Were these works overlooked as examples of “scholarship that offers deeper case-study analysis for specific locations and educations stratum,” but that fails to bring “different periods of colonial interaction within a broader view ...” (3), as *Learning Femininity* proposes to do?

While *Learning Femininity* is set up as a vast survey of women’s education over a century, it remains, at its heart, a case study of European women engaged with colonial and missionary pedagogical projects. The book is intended, in part, as a corrective to (what the author perceives to be) the scholarly neglect of Europeans in India. Of course, several works with just such a focus do exist—for India and elsewhere—including Ann Stoler’s *Race and the Education of Desire* (Duke University Press, 1995) which is mentioned by the author, and which offers a sweeping account of the place of coloniality and race in the history of modern sexuality. While the author’s interest in the careers of European women in India hardly needs justification,

what is less clear is how this *particular* case-study, juxtaposing the three key objects identified in the introduction (accomplishments education, colonial governance, and Eurasians), might modify or challenge current understandings of colonial education, the changing imperatives of colonial government, and gender or racial anxieties in colonial India. Despite its title, *Learning Femininity* does not explore, in any sustained way, how ideas of femininity—and relatedly, of race—were transformed by the specificities of the colonial encounter as experienced between women. A more rigorous and sustained use of femininity as an analytical category (rather than a mere descriptor for anything concerning females) would have provided a sounder organizing principle for the rich and diverse material explored here, and would also have added to this book's general appeal for scholars of gender and empire, and for historians of India. *Learning Femininity* remains a well-executed case study that shifts the focus from so-called 'subcontinental receptivity' to European complexity; that this dichotomy is both untenable, and dated, is amply demonstrated by the book itself in its strongest parts.

Ishita Pande
Queen's University

Larry Cuban

Teaching History Then and Now: A Story of Stability and Change in Schools

Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press. 256 pp.

A commonplace in current educational thought is students' need to understand the personal relevance and their connection to the topics at hand. The expression of this idea in history education is perhaps most fully developed through the concept of historical consciousness—the idea that students can learn to see themselves as historical agents, somewhat bound by the conditions they inherit from forebears, yet with the potential for change in a (more or less) new and (more or less) different future. History as a school subject optimally promotes the understanding of the processes of historical continuity and change, the prerequisite for effective historical agency.

Teaching History Then and Now is a map of Larry Cuban's own historical consciousness. He recalls his own decade of teaching experience from 1956–1967, when he was just out of school himself, and then goes back to the same schools—Glenville High School in Cleveland and Cardozo High School in Washington, DC—to observe what was happening in those classrooms a half century later. That is the personal starting point. But, being an eminent educational historian, he sets his personal experience, recollection, and observation into a broader historical context, examining the two schools, the school districts and urban environments where they are located, and the state and national educational policies that had impacts on them at the local level.

As a study of history teaching, specifically, Cuban also introduces the two major national history/social studies reform movements of the past half-century. The New

Social Studies gathered speed during the period roughly coinciding with his early teaching. And what he calls “the New, New History” has been similarly accelerating over the years prior to his recent classroom visits. Cuban is also astonishingly well situated to report personally on both of these national movements. As a young teacher in 1962, after speaking on a panel at the National Council for Social Studies, he was approached by Ted Fenton, subsequently author of the movement-defining *The New Social Studies* (1967). Fenton asked Cuban if he wanted to contribute to a new series, *Problems in American History*. “I accepted his offer eagerly,” Cuban recalls. “So in 1963, I began my first book and unknowingly enlisted in the New Social Studies” (38).

The epicentre of the recent New, New History is Sam Wineburg’s Stanford History Education Group (SHEG) at Cuban’s own academic home. Cuban observes, “As I knew Ted Fenton in the early 1960s...I also have known Wineburg for over a quarter-century...” (fn 53, 226). These relationships with people central to two major reform projects—along with the documentation of his own experience teaching and observing—comprise the personal dimensions of a study that weaves the personal into the larger educational and social context. Cuban, who has written as much as any other American scholar on the subject of educational stasis and reform, uses this elegant structure to consider his central question: “what has changed and what has remained the same in the content and pedagogy of high school history over the past half-century” (1).

Chapter one recounts his early years at Glenville in Cleveland as a new teacher struggling to articulate and design something more educationally satisfying than the practices that he saw around him. He provides remarkable detail, while issuing the required caveats about the vagaries and selectivity of memory. Perhaps intentionally, the narrative is quotidian and bleak. Eager to expand his horizons, he enrolled in a graduate program and after seven years was offered a position as a master teacher at Cardozo in Washington, DC. There he taught returning Peace Corps volunteers, as well as his own classes of Cardozo students. Chapter two tells that story.

Chapter three sketches the reform movements that shaped the thinking about (if not the practice of) history and social studies over the course of Cuban’s career. Chapters four and five return us to Glenville and Cardozo, with observations of the classes of four teachers in the former and three in the latter, again set within the context of continuities and changes in the schools and cities that surround them. Tedious routines dominate. In the final teaching vignette, however, “Burt Taylor” has “stumbled onto the [SHEG] website” (153) and adapted some of the lessons for his students. The account of his inspiring class on the Japanese invasion of Nanking provides a wisp of a happy ending.

A final chapter, “Stability and Change in Schools and History Classrooms” attempts to bring the pieces together. *Why* have good, new ideas not changed more history classes more significantly?

The huge ambition of this work is partially concealed by its easy readability: its accessible style, the intersection with Cuban’s own personal history, and its short length (188 pages before the notes and appendices). But explaining the continuity

of poor conditions in America's urban public school districts through a case study of history education reform efforts may be a bridge too far. The systemic factors that Cuban weighs for the larger explanation—demographics and the influence of poverty, versus the persistent and nearly universal “grammar” (167) of age-graded schooling—exist on a different plane from the efforts of the New Social Studies and the New, New History reformers.

Some nuance in the analysis of history education is lost as a result. A short cut of “heritage vs. history” is Cuban's major analytical dichotomy for examining the field. It conflates many different variables: teaching for conservative enhancement of patriotism versus for progressive challenge of the status quo; learning facts and stories versus learning disciplinary practices; teacher-centred instruction versus group work; and rote learning versus teaching for understanding. Further, contributions of a substantial, international research base in history education are acknowledged in footnotes, but not weighed as a factor in the strength of the New, New History.

On the other hand, improving the history classrooms in America's toughest schools cannot ignore their systemic *or* historical contexts, and nor has Cuban. His work, an attempt to link the micro with the macro, points us in the right direction.

Peter Seixas

University of British Columbia

A. J. Angulo, editor

Miseducation: A History of Ignorance-Making in America and Abroad

Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016. 384 pp.

In most circles the history of education has turned the corner on the triumphalist and internally-oriented progress narratives that characterized much early scholarship. With social and cultural history approaches directing increased attention to access, equity, and marginalization, our field generally displays a keen interest in circuits of inclusion and exclusion that are evidenced in and through educational institutions. While historians of education now pay more attention to what schools fail to be, A.J. Angulo's excellent edited volume *Miseducation: A History of Ignorance-Making in America and Abroad* reminds us that there are still blind spots in our field, one of which is a tendency to overlook what is not learned.

In his introduction Angulo introduces the concept of “ignorance” as a lack of knowledge that is systematically maintained and perpetuated. He draws on the work of historian Robert Proctor to describe “native ignorance,” a simple lack of knowledge due to naiveté or lack of exposure; “passive ignorance,” the selective limitation of what knowledge we choose to accumulate (or not); and, “active ignorance,” the purposeful maintaining of a lack of knowledge. The last of these has the most relevance to the history of education. To address it, Angulo has drawn together a luminary group of historians who are all at the height of their craft. Topics covered

range from literacy and sex education to American empire, Asian-American identities, and history teaching in Stalinist Russia. In all cases, the chapters are drawn from well-developed lines of research and are quality pieces of scholarship. They engage with the concept of “ignorance” in a wide range of ways, though with mixed results.

In the initial section of the book titled “Legalizing Ignorance” we are treated to a set of excellent essays, including Kim Tolley writing on slave anti-literacy legislation, Karen Graves writing on sexuality, and Jennifer Burek Pierce and Matt Pierce examining sex education through a fascinating discussion of the censorship of radio broadcasts in the 1930s. Adam Shapiro provides an engaging account of teaching about evolution in the United States that includes an introduction to the Creation Museum in Petersburg, Kentucky. In a chapter titled “Environment,” Kevin C. Elliott furnishes a veritable taxonomy of different ways that various industries have fostered misinformation about the risks their products present. Elliott’s piece also explicitly proffers a solution to the problem of ignorance that seems more or less implicit across all these early chapters: improve schooling, so that Americans improve their critical thinking abilities and have a broadened exposure to scientific knowledge.

A number of chapters in the subsequent sections of the book deal with historical knowledge. Lisa Jarvinen discusses ways that turn-of-the-twentieth-century American imperialism became obscured; Daniel Perlstein examines the avoidance of the topic of socio-economic class inequality in the curriculum of progressive schools in 1930s West Virginia; Lisa Pine analyzes censorship and mythmaking in the textbooks of Nazi Germany; Thomas Ewing discusses history teaching in the Stalinist era; Soli Vered and Daniel Bar-Tal discuss Zionist narratives in Israeli history textbooks; and, Dongping Han and Stephen Samuel Smith explore one-sided narratives about the Cultural Revolution.

While each of these chapters is an excellent work of historical scholarship, the chapters’ engagement with the notion of “ignorance” remains somewhat tenuous. The idea that historical memory is as much forgetting as it is remembering is not a novel concept (think of Ernest Renan’s 1882 observations on France’s St. Bartholomew’s day massacre), and few historians of textbooks ignore the curating and exclusions that accompany the molding of what is sometimes referred to as “official knowledge.” It is not evident what added value comes from posing the construction of historical narratives through the lens of ignorance. The exception in these sections, however, is Donald Warren’s elegant and important discussion of the historiography of education itself. By introducing Native American chronologies, ceremonial practices, and archeological evidence, Warren persuasively argues that the problem of how to tell the story of American Indian education “accurately and without ignorance” (207) persists.

Perhaps precisely because there is uneven engagement and unresolved ambiguities around the problem of “ignorance” in education across these chapters, this volume is capable of stimulating thought, questions, and innovation. In a short reflective essay to conclude the volume, Angulo both reaffirms a belief that education is a best “solution” to ignorance and points to the need for new categories and frameworks to better understand ignorance. While historians of education can take some comfort

in Angulo's suggestion that our profession is well primed to begin teaching courses in fraud studies, it would be rash to ignore the existing rich literature that looks at the historical sociology of knowledge. Nonetheless, overall, this volume makes an important contribution by prompting and inviting readers to take matters forward in their own engagement with the problem of ignorance. Even in titling the book "Miseducation" Angulo plants the seeds for exciting debate and discussion about what it might mean for historians to identify that which has been mis-educative across time and space—and on what grounds we are able to identify and understand this.

Noah W. Sobe

Loyola University Chicago

John Allison

A Most Canadian Odyssey: Education Diplomacy and Federalism, 1844–1984

London, ON: The Althouse Press, 2016. 214 pp.

A Most Canadian Odyssey is an important book. It is also a remarkably ambitious book in scope and intent. John Allison, a professor in the faculty of education at Nipissing University, has written a pioneering study on the role of education as a form of Canadian international statecraft, examining a period of 140 years. Education diplomacy is a branch of public or cultural diplomacy, in which nation states utilize their educational soft power to gain influence, project domestic values abroad, and cultivate international goodwill. One only has to think of the impact and exposure that the Fulbright scholar programme has had for the United States in creating a global pool of students who learned at American institutions, interacted with American society, and then later rose to prominence in their country of origin as policy makers, politicians, entrepreneurs, or academics. More recently international education has become a lucrative financial market for countries, provinces and states, and higher education institutions hoping to attract—and retain—the best and brightest from other countries. Universities and colleges also charge international students more for tuition. In the case of Canada, declining enrolments and an aging population make international education a key consideration for provinces, and the post-secondary sector, in offsetting demographic trends.

Allison's central question—and it is a critical question—is why has Canada historically lagged amongst Western nations who regard education as a valuable diplomatic tool? Looking just at Anglophone countries who actively recruit international students and pursue robust education diplomacy policies, Canada has been well outpaced by Australia, Great Britain, the United States, and even little New Zealand. For Allison, "coherent, collaborative, and focused education diplomacy is vital to a nation-state's...foreign policy in the twenty-first century" (3). He is absolutely right. Indeed, China, France, and Spain all have international institutions dedicated to promoting cultural and education related activities. Other nations actively fund education related

diplomacy supported with diplomatic staff focused on education specific duties. Or they ensure that there is close coordination between federal and domestic agencies to ensure coherent “policy leadership and direction” (3). Allison rightly laments that despite some improvement Canada does none of the above well at all.

So why is this? As Allison demonstrates, Canada has not had “coherent education diplomacy” throughout its history because “of a series of challenges and obstacles associated with the development of and collaboration in the areas of international representation” (2). Throughout the study he explores the evolution, role, and activities of Canadian federal and provincial agencies, and non-governmental organizations, who have sought to play key roles in articulating international education policy. In doing so he illustrates (see chapter six) that no shortage of actors have sought to influence Canada’s international education direction and they often work at cross-purposes. For this fracas we can thank the division of powers in which Ottawa controls the conduct of foreign relations but the provinces possess jurisdiction over education. But what to do when questions of education meet the international stage and become entangled in foreign relations? And this is one of the many peculiarities of the Canadian constitution that has bedevilled politicians and policymakers alike, not to mention educators. Chapter two provides a concise case study of the headache and potential threat to national unity when Ottawa and Quebec City were at loggerheads as to whether a province could represent itself on the international stage when questions of education diplomacy were at stake and became entangled with Quebec’s desire for greater autonomy within the federation. Ottawa was determined to offer limited concessions allowing provinces to participate in international forums and sign modest international education agreements while making it clear that the country spoke with one international voice, and that the voice was Ottawa’s. Rather than lead to closer education diplomacy coordination, some events of the 1960s prompted “ongoing conflicts over jurisdiction with the provinces” that “spilled over into Canada’s foreign policy and education diplomacy” as Ottawa and the provinces also squabbled over international training and labour issues pertaining to international education (75). The situation failed to improve and “over the years a constitutional and policy patchwork became the defining feature of the Canadian educational landscape as provincial governments conceded little to the federal government in terms of jurisdiction over education” (99). That shrewd observation neatly sums up the federal-provincial relationship to the present day regarding the lack of a coherent and coordinated approach to education diplomacy. Allison concludes that until governments of all levels learn the “lessons of this period of history” the “constitutional conundrum” (147) will continue.

As noted above, *A Most Canadian Odyssey* is an ambitious book and herein lie a few areas where Allison’s work has cut a pathway for others to follow and expand on this novel study. Trying to assess and write about 140 odd years in 147 pages of text means that certain areas are skimmed over and the necessary archival, and at times, secondary research, is lacking. Some notable gaps or interpretative errors appear in the story of Ottawa’s role in education diplomacy. For instance, Allison suggests that “developments at the Department of External Affairs (DEA) increased the profile of

education in foreign relations in the 1920s" (30). But he does not provide a single example to support his statement. Although it had begun to attract a talented pool of officials, the DEA was chronically underfunded, had a meagre staff, and its policies were closely controlled by Prime Minister W. L. Mackenzie King (who was also his own foreign affairs minister). Under these circumstances, education diplomacy did not register at the DEA. But here is also an opportunity for others to see if there is indeed more to say about that era. The claim that "after the election of the Diefenbaker government, education diplomacy disappeared for three years" is absolutely false (41). It was the Diefenbaker government, after all, that committed Ottawa to the Commonwealth Scholarship Plan. One is hard pressed to think of a better example of a federal government taking a role in education diplomacy, and cooperating with the higher education sector. Much remains to be written about that case and it is one of the few occasions where Ottawa acted with some purpose and some intent on education diplomacy within the broader contours of Canadian foreign relations. Allison's suggestion that the Vietnam War negatively affected Ottawa's interest in, and ability to conduct, education diplomacy is not convincing either and there is no archival evidence in the footnotes to support that notion. Perhaps future scholars will examine the claim further to see if there is indeed any linkage. Allison has as well an annoying social sciences habit of referring throughout the study to individuals without identifying who they are. Despite these problems, students of Canadian foreign relations and policy makers should read this book to understand how and why successive Canadian governments have repeatedly struggled to utilize educational diplomacy to advance national interests and for this John Allison deserves a good deal of thanks.

Ryan Touhey

St. Jerome's University/University of Waterloo

George Buri

Between Education and Catastrophe: The Battle over Public Schooling in Postwar Manitoba

Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2016. 277 pp.

From 1945 through the 1950s, Canadian schools were held up as instruments of national defense and national reconstruction. Subject to utopian expectations, educational leaders, schools, and teachers were also vilified, blamed for falling academic and moral standards, and for failing in their responsibilities to the nation. Anyone who read a newspaper or news magazine in these years knew about the crisis in public education, and understood that the consequences of failing to address it were potentially catastrophic.

At first glance, the commentators writing about education seemed remarkably concerned about curriculum and pedagogy, details of schooling that had rarely been of wide public interest in earlier decades. George Buri's *Between Education and*

Catastrophe examines the heated conflicts between educational progressives and traditionalists after the Second World War, and sees them as less about pedagogy than “about the hopes, aspirations, and fears of Canadians in the 1950s” (8). As such, Buri presents the debates that pitted progressives against traditionalists as political debates about the nature of postwar Canadian society. He argues that progressives supported schooling in the service of a postwar new liberal order: “a vision of Canadian society in which Keynesian economics, a limited social welfare state, compromise between labour and capital, and mass consumerism would provide economic prosperity for a nation of ‘normal’ middle-class, patriarchal, nuclear families” (5). Traditionalists, on the other hand, advanced a “back to the basics” agenda and defended “laissez-fair economics and limited government” (5). Buri concludes that the debate was never really resolved, but by the early 1960s a pragmatic compromise or synthesis characterized educational discourse.

Between Education and Catastrophe is divided into two sections. The first attempts to present the progressive-traditionalist debate at the national level. In the first chapter, Buri demonstrates how public schooling was seen as central to the task of postwar social and economic reconstruction. While progressives and traditionalists disagreed about the solution, they were united in that “education was widely judged to be in a state of decline and in need of serious attention” (22). Buri draws on newspaper and news magazine stories to demonstrate the nature and breadth of Canadians’ concerns in this regard. He refers to the writing of a range of Manitoba’s educational leaders to describe their advocacy for progressive education reform to support new liberalism. Buri makes good use of historian Mona Gleason’s work to demonstrate how psychology came to provide scientific support for hegemonic notions of students’ mental and moral vulnerabilities and their need for “social adjustment.”

In the second chapter Buri traces the American intellectual roots and branches of progressivism, but it is not always clear who Manitoba progressives were or how they engaged with like-minded educators across the country. Buri distinguishes between child-centred pedagogical progressives and “life adjustment” progressives who “supported an education system that was practical and directly related to the conditions of life in order to prepare students to take their place in the social order” (65). Since the purpose of this section of the book is to provide a national context for the progressive-traditionalist debate, it would have been enhanced by more engagement with the research on Canadian progressive educators most of which has focused on Alberta and Ontario. This might have helped readers understand the extent to which progressivism really was a national movement as well as better appreciate its regional nuances.

Chapter three addresses the impact of “life adjustment” progressivism on curriculum, specifically how health and citizenship education explicitly prepared children to participate in consumer society and healthy leisure activities. Buri’s detailed examination of Manitoba curriculum documents and textbooks describes how they communicated the message that “as adult members of society they would indeed find happiness in a highly gendered, family-oriented, and consumer society” (75). This is a thorough analysis of “education for democracy” as presented in Manitoba school

materials, but again the author does not situate this within a national context.

In chapter four Buri ably describes the traditionalist movement in education, which was less a coherent group than a coalition of factions all of which opposed progressivism in schools and the new liberalism it sought to foster. He identifies four sources of opposition to progressivism: supporters of laissez-faire capitalism; opponents to the psychologism of schooling; cultural conservatives such as Hilda Neatby; and “Cold Warriors who argued that ‘softness’ in Canada’s school systems would lead to Canada’s inability to muster the moral strength and technical know-how to defeat the threat of the Soviet Union” (105).

In the second half of the book, Buri turns more specifically to Manitoba, presenting it as a case study of how the progressive/traditionalist debate “played out in the everyday working of schools” (136). He provides a brief overview of the educational priorities of the various provincial governments in the period. He then turns to the battle over reading and writing instruction, and the attempt to revise high school curriculum in the face of considerable public opposition to vocationalism. An interesting chapter on progressive educators’ attempts to consolidate rural school districts in order to modernize school facilities makes good use of a range of sources, including collections of oral history interviews, to counter the assumption that rural schools provided an inferior education. In the debates about teacher education, Buri grants a partial victory to progressives who may not have fully realized their goal of professionalizing teaching, but by the 1960s succeeded in ensuring that teaching “was viewed as an occupation that required not only inborn skills and attributes but techniques and abilities in handling the physical and mental well-being of pupils that could be learned only from those with expert knowledge” (208).

Like other provinces in the late 1950s, Manitoba appointed a Royal Commission on Education and Buri argues that in 1959 its MacFarlane Report provided “a general endorsement of traditionalist principles without entirely overhauling the existing ‘progressive’ curriculum” (216). As such, what Buri calls a synthesis, was really a rejection of “experimental education techniques associated with pedagogical progressivism in favour of the confirmation of life-adjustment education and the entrenchment of outsider, traditionalist critiques of progressive education in the official discourse of public education” (223).

Despite the claim that the first section of the book provides a national context for the Manitoba case study in the second, the two sections are rather alike. Throughout, Buri describes the debates as they were articulated in national magazines and the Manitoba press, then draws examples from Manitoba schools. For the most part, the book is more descriptive than analytical in approach. For example, a discussion of hegemony is confined to the introduction but it is unclear how this might apply to the national debate between progressives and traditionalists, or in the specific debates about schooling in Manitoba. This may be because in these debates, it is not always clear who the dominant group was. Regarding reading instruction, Buri asserts, “In this debate, as with others in the battle for the schools, the insiders tended to think one way and the outsiders another” (149). But who were the insiders and outsiders? At one point, Buri describes the progressives as “psychologists, curriculum advisors,

professors of education, school administrators, and leaders of teachers' organizations" (103). But research about progressivism in other parts of Canada demonstrates that even these education "experts" differed in their views, and that they were generally unsuccessful in implementing their progressive vision of education in classrooms. That said, this book makes a significant contribution to the history of education in Manitoba and successfully articulates the vibrant public debate about the goals and nature of public schooling in the 1950s.

Amy von Heyking
University of Lethbridge

