

Nevertheless one closes this book with a feeling of sadness, and the words of A.P. Herbert, who wrote "nanny" poems, come to mind:

Other People's babies
That's my life!
Mother to dozens,
And nobody's wife.

Patricia T. Rooke
The University of Alberta.

David Wardle. *The Rise of the Schooled Society. The History of Formal Schooling in England.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974. Pp. viii, 182. \$10.40.

If they have succeeded in nothing else the de-schoolers have certainly succeeded in causing much public and professional discussion about their ideas. David Wardle's book contributes to this discussion, not in the way of the traditional 'enrichment programme' (which usually, simply, means just some more of the same thing) which Illich, Goodman, et al, would justifiably execrate but by approaching the whole de-schooling syndrome from an historical perspective.

The book is an attempt "to examine the historical developments which have made it plausible to argue that formal institutional education has outgrown its usefulness and become an obstacle to social reform" (p. vii). As such it is eminently acceptable though I wish Dr. Wardle had refrained from adding as a sub-title "The History of Formal Schooling in England" because this it certainly is not. It is not even a history of formal schooling in England within the period the author has chosen to confine himself to (the end of the 18th century to the present) and one really needs more than the cursory glance permitted by the author at the twelve centuries or so which ended in the advent of Rousseau and which signal the beginning of this study to justify the claim of a history of schooling. It is true that, "until the late eighteenth century formal, organized instruction of any kind was confined to a minority" (p. 1). But when the minority in question is the source, or means of application, of power, it cannot easily be dismissed because of its numerical inferiority. After all, as we used to be reminded, "Top People Take the Times." This notwithstanding Dr. Wardle is right to claim that an historical perspective has an important part to play in a critique of de-schooling. But then an historical perspective is an important element in a critique of practically anything.

The book proceeds by an examination of the changing relationships of home and school and the concepts of 'childhood' and 'youth' to a survey of the educational expansion consequent upon technological change, and it concludes with a critique of the case for 'de-schooling' in the light of these.

There are, of course, a number of assumptions that one can challenge. There always are. "We live in a child-centered society where the importance of allowing children to follow their interests and develop their individual potential—at great loss to the community at large—is taken for granted" (p. 27). Do we? Is it taken for granted even if it is conceded that we do? Similarly, "... many apprentices never did attain membership of a guild, but this is merely an early example of the failure of educational practice to live up to the theories upon which it is based" (p. 28). It could, on the other hand, be just an equally early example of the uneven distribution of individual ability. But these are relatively minor quibbles about what is an excellent section of this book, that part of it that deals with the concepts of 'childhood' and 'youth.' 'Childhood' is no longer new to us, Messrs. Coveny (included in Dr. Wardle's extensive bibliography) and Aries (strangely missing from the same) have seen to that. But it is nice to have the Rousseau-ian/Romantic ideas re-stated so clearly, and linked to the development of Associationist and Developmental psychology. It is in such cases as these that the author's claims on behalf of an historical perspective being of value in a consideration

of 'de-schooling' appear at their strongest. Dr. Wardle is strangely reticent on the question of the reaction against the Naturalist and Romantic notions with regard to children and their upbringing; this is dismissed more or less en passant. En passant to what? To something that is overdue: an historical perspective on the rise of 'youth'. Considerations of this particular stage of growth have hitherto figured largely and almost exclusively in books written for and by sociologists. Accompanied by interesting anecdotes they make pleasant reading but are seldom of any real consequence because they view youth as a purely contemporary phenomenon, which it is not.

Dr. Wardle points out that whilst 'youth' has a somewhat longer history than the ninety years or so it is usually given, the "problems specific to childhood and youth have emerged with particular force in the twentieth century" (p. 48). This ought not to be too surprising: they are basically just the results of industrialization and its consequent affluence. The problems have become "problems" because of the matter of scale: there are simply a lot more people who, because of the fluctuations in the upper and lower limits encompassed by youth (of which Dr. Wardle is fully conscious) are now included within this distinguished category, or else act as if they were. Also, there are, simply, a lot more people. Whatever sensitivity they demonstrate about their situation is largely, and perhaps ironically, the result of the education (in the utilitarian sense) that they have received. A not insignificant part of that education has been received in formal institutions. When, therefore, Dr. Wardle comes to write of the political and commercial exploitation of youth by society (p. 42-44), it society. Particularly so when the specific arguments of the de-schoolers that Dr. Wardle chooses to present (pp. 45-47), i.e., that youth are educated into the "myth of unending consumption," that schools "institutionalize" thinking and cut off independent thought, that 'education' is construed in terms of "years spent in a recognized institution," and specifically that "the general function of schooling . . . is to prepare children for technological society first by equipping them with the technological skills demanded by industry, and second . . . by so indoctrinating them that they are incapable of questioning the values upon which such a society rests" (p. 158) are precisely the ones that R. M. Hutchins, T. S. Eliot and Ortega have themselves put forward not with the object of de-schooling society but rather the reverse.

A puzzling omission, in view of the fact that the book has been written as an history of formal schooling in England and with the object of serving as a framework for a critique of the case for de-schooling is the very subdued approach to the question of the English School Boards, an approach so subdued as to be almost overlooked entirely. If ever there was an educational controversy in England which aroused furious anger, passion, religious bigotry and prolonged rhetoric on both sides it was the decision to set them up in 1870 and to an even greater extent the decision to do them in in 1902. The only other issue which has aroused such heights of passion has been the Comprehensive issues in more recent years. If ever there was an issue relevant both to the development of popular schooling and to the question of de-schooling society, and an issue which delights in the telling, this was it. Perhaps, since Dr. Wardle had dealt tandem with the manner in his earlier *English Popular Education 1780-1870*, he felt that enough was enough. It was a pity though.

It was in the 19th century that the potential of education as a tool for social control on a large scale first became apparent. This was occasioned first by a fear on the part of the propertied classes that their possessions might be forcibly taken from them, and secondly by the realization that increasing numbers of paupers constituted a threat to the fabric of society. Hence the provision of mass elementary education came to appear eminently desirable. This was education used first as a tool for social conservatism, to restrain the poor, to make them grateful, to make them realize that their best interests lay, really, in a maintenance of the status quo. The later use of that same education was for precisely the opposite motive: realization of the potential that education has to bring about that sort of social change which it was originally conceived of as opposing. These aspects of nineteenth century history of education are discussed at length in this book. The reason for this is apparent in view of Dr. Wardle's stated object of bringing an historical perspective to bear on the de-schooling argument, since the major underlying assumption is that if education is to be used as an

effective way of ensuring social control first of all, and later social progress, then it must be institutionalized. Particularly valuable is the sustained discussion of the extra school agencies that blossomed in the latter part of the 19th century. Such organizations as the Boys' Brigade and the Church Lads' Brigade with their emphasis on discipline, cleanliness, order, obedience and uniforms are mentioned by Dr. Wardle and serve to illustrate the struggle that continued in favour of social control now that the schools themselves had come to be used as vehicles for hastening a greater degree of social equality.

The author's purpose here also strengthens my belief that the book tends to fall between two stools. As a contribution to the de-schooling argument it fulfills a long overdue need: that of putting an historical perspective into an area of discussion which has centred almost exclusively around the contemporary. To view the idea of such a radical departure from established practice as that advocated by Illich, Reimer, Holt, et al, without relating this to the factors that have produced it is absurd, and Dr. Wardle is right to point this out. But it does mean that in using such a perspective for a particular purpose gaps are likely to occur in what claims also to be "The History of Formal Schooling in England." One such gap, the shameful business of the doing in of the School Boards in 1902, I have already referred to. Another is the virtual ignoring of the contributions of the English Utilitarians and their various associates headed by Bentham, whose influence was as far reaching on educational practice as it was on every other aspect of 19th century social reform.

In criticizing Dr. Wardle's book on a few accounts I have attempted to be positive and not merely contentious. In its major aim, that of examining "the historical developments which have made it plausible to argue that formal institutional education has outgrown its usefulness and become an obstacle to social reform" Dr. Wardle succeeds, and that rather handsomely. In this sense the book is one of the best that this reviewer has read: it provides a long neglected perspective, and it is delightful to read. However, as an history of formal schooling (not its major aim) it is less successful.

B.W. Taylor
The University of New Brunswick

BOOKNOTES

Philip G. Altbach and David H. Kelly. *Higher Education in Developing Nations: A Selected Bibliography, 1969-1974*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974. Pp. ix, 230. \$15.00.

Does the title seem familiar? Well, that's because this is the "son" of an earlier compilation, Philip G. Altbach, *Higher Education in Developing Countries: A Select Bibliography* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Center for International Affairs, 1970). This bibliography contains 2438 items from 85 countries. (You didn't know there were that many developing countries? Altbach's and Kelly's bibliography doesn't even list Mauritius and Upper Volta. Perhaps, they still don't have "higher education.")

Let's get serious. This is quite a collection. As James A. Perkins, chairman of the International Council for Educational Development which sponsored this work, says in the preface "This bibliography should be at the elbow of all scholars of comparative higher education." Massive bibliographies usually suffer from two disadvantages. They cannot be used with ease unless there is a subject index. Pages 210 to 225 do contain such a subject index which enhances the value of the bibliography. The second disadvantage has to do with separating the wheat from the chaff. Only a carefully annotated bibliography can overcome that particular disadvantage. This one is not annotated. It simply classifies all items under "Books" and "Articles." Many of the "Books" are pamphlets. If the number of pages of the "Book" was also given, users would have been able to discriminate between books and pamphlets.