

individual protestors, narrow curricula, hopeless teaching methods, ignorant professors, etc. etc. In turn, these protests led to arbitrary administrative action — closing of universities or classes for a year or so, drafting of students into the army, breaking-up of peaceful meetings, the use of *agent-provocateurs* and “show trials”, civil executions.

The women’s movement for social and educational emancipation was another important contribution — schools of dissent included women as theoreticians, helpmeets, active propagandists and terrorists, agitators.

Thus, side-by-side with the official career-oriented institutions the school of dissent functioned as a parallel organization, recruiting its personnel from the same sources, with its own “counter culture” norms and activities, its own curriculum and its own rewards and sanctions. Continuing efforts to suppress the radical student movement invariably failed. “The young helmsmen of the impending storm”, as Herzen designated the radical student intelligenzia, survived, providing a theoretical basis, an inspiration as well as devoted workers for the broader revolutionary movements which took over from the circles in 1881. The successful and long-prepared assassination of Alexander II by Zhebyabov and his circle was at once the finest hour of the student circles and also the moment of anti-climax. Nothing followed from this *auto-da-fé*, except more police persecution, the setting-back of constitutional reforms, a new Tsar and a return to the barracks-régime of the unmourned Nicholas I.

Professor Brower covers this whole development in a masterly way, giving us a considerable number of new insights. He does not add much to our store of information on the period — the fact of the matter is that being a student movement, anxious to persuade and convince others of the corrections of their views, and the rectitude of their conduct, the Russian radical movement has certainly the most extensive and detailed documentation of any social movement with the possible relevance to an understanding of our own situation as well as its intrinsic interest, this scholarly work should be studied especially by those in day-to-day contact with students in higher education.

John McLeish
The University of Alberta

* * * * *

R. F. Dearden, P. H. Hirst and R. S. Peters (editors). *Education and the Development of Reason*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972. Pp. xiv, 536. \$18.25.

It is perhaps extremely unusual, if not preposterous, to begin a review by puzzling over the seemingly trivial question whether the work under scrutiny is best described as a book or as a volume. Yet, perverse as this approach may seem to what is unquestionably an important work, it is precisely this sort of question which, like a nagging aftertaste, one feels compelled to react to once one reaches the end of the work.

The problem arises, it would appear, partly from incongruities in the introduction itself and partly from the discrepancy between what seems to be offered as the *raison d’être* of the work on the one hand, and its organization and content on the other.

In a two-and-a-half-page introduction to the work, Hirst begins by noting that “anyone familiar with contemporary writing on education cannot but be

aware of the almost total absence of literature discussing in an informed way the major aims of the educational enterprise." After conceding that the kind of informed discussion of which he speaks would demand a breadth of knowledge and understanding few would dare to claim, he calls attention to the unsatisfactory nature of most contemporary writing and in justification of the work of which he is coeditor observes further:

What is more, when discussion of general aims does become explicit, it is usually carried on in terms so ambiguous that few conclusions specific enough to have any practical significance can be drawn. Not surprisingly those concerned with educational planning find it hard to keep the aims of the business clearly in focus and the paucity of rational discussion in this area leaves them largely without defence for what they do, at the mercy of pressure groups with very particular axes to grind.

Presumably in keeping with these concerns the editors have divided the work into three parts entitled respectively, "A critique of current educational aims," "Reason," "Education and reason." The separate parts are not further introduced.

One would expect that somewhere in these sections the editors would at least inform us as to what exactly are "the major aims of the educational enterprise" since, according to Hirst, the "almost total absence" of literature discussing them is to be lamented. But nowhere do we find such mention. Either the editors assume that we already know them, a rather curious assumption, or that we need not know them as such only informed talk about them.

Or, is it not that the phrase "the major aims of the educational enterprise" is just as hapless, just as misleading, just as intractable as most statements about "general aims" of education which the work is at pains to set straight. Indeed, Peters elsewhere (in his *Ethics and Education* published in England by George Allen and Unwin Ltd. in 1966) makes a valuable distinction between education as achievement, as the attainment of that which is intrinsically worthwhile and about which questions about aims are mistaken, and education constituted of activities about which questions about aims do apply but must be viewed as "a way of getting people to be clear about and focus their attention on what is worthwhile achieving."

If as is clearly implied in the introduction, the work is addressed "to those concerned with educational planning," if, that is to say, it is at the level of educational planning and policy-making that the work is to be justified, then one is at a loss to see how this is to be accomplished. Not only are the "major aims," if at all they do exist, not identified, let alone distinguished from any other kind of misleading aim, general or current, the form of the contributing papers and the organization of the work make it, for all practical purposes, an unlikely resource for any but analytic philosophers of education. If educational planners are as a rule neither themselves philosophers of education nor are known to be in the habit of trotting off to philosophers to seek their erudition, then it is difficult to see how his work is, in any serious sense, addressed to them. It is simply not the kind of thing that planners readily consult; nor is what Hirst calls its "open-ended character," likely to resolve many real problems or give much guidance at that level of "the educational enterprise."

In short, the work can hardly be said to do justice to the problems which it attempts to identify at the outset and thus seems rather to speak less to planners than to philosophers.

But in speaking to philosophers, and particularly to philosophers of education, the volume must be counted among the most illuminating and useful works in the philosophy of education. Wit, elegance of style and analytic rigour characterize an impressive number of the papers. Especially noteworthy in this regard are Ryle's delightfully provocative paper entitled "A rational animal," Black's "Reasonableness" and Hirst's "Liberal education and the nature of knowledge." The section on reason which occupies slightly less than half of the volume brings together a goodly assortment of lucid papers which treat of the concept "reason" and closely related notions like belief, will, truth, and the like. While no attempt was made by any of the contributors to tie in their discourse with educational concerns as such, the nature and scope of each discourse contributes significantly to intelligent talk about what Hirst has called, "the educational enterprise." It is precisely this concern for placing educational philosophy squarely within the setting of discourse on reason that sets the work apart as extremely important if not unique.

The first part of the volume also contains an impressive collection of essays. It would seem, though, that Hirst's "Liberal education and the nature of knowledge," and Peters' "Education and human development," both excellent papers, have much more in common with the material in the first part of the volume than with that of the last part where they seem almost out of place. Peters' analysis of the concept "development" which appears in the last part runs roughly parallel in strategy to Dearden's analysis of the concept "growth" in the first part and their conclusions are largely similar.

Given the diversity of authorship and of focus — there are twenty-one contributors to the collection — an essentially substantive review would seem impractical. But the absence of a unifying theme or the failure to follow through on promises is not altogether tragic. While the editors appear remiss in not saving the planners from "pressure groups with very particular axes to grind," they amply catered to the philosophers. The volume seems to survive the book.

Hollibert E. Phillips
Walla Walla College

* * * * *

Frank Smith. *Comprehension and Learning: A Conceptual Framework for Teachers*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1975. Pp. 277. Paper.

Contemporary educational psychology is characterized by a schism between those who emphasize the rational and purposive quality of learning and those who conceive of the process in terms of the modification of observable behaviour by the arrangement of appropriate contingencies of reinforcement. Smith occupies a secure position within the former camp. *Comprehension and Learning*, however, is not an attempt to further elucidate (or confuse) the basic differences of theory that characterize the study of learning. It is not a review of the literature, nor a research report, but an attempt to link both theory and research in human learning, psycholinguistics and cognition. As the author states in his Introduction the book is written "from the perspective of a teacher trying to understand the mental processes of a schoolchild." Indeed, because of its emphasis the title might well have read as *A Conceptual Framework for Teachers: learning and comprehension*.