

social class. Livingstone concludes, in part, that proletarians want to tighten the link between learning and school and the workplace, while capitalists want to keep it loose.

This volume of articles is a welcome addition to the books available to teacher educators and students who more than ever need to be aware of the pressures upon the schools, teachers, and students. It is an excellent collection of articles that will help teachers understand the context of education in the 1980s.

Keith McLeod
University of Toronto

Gumbert, E. B. (ed.), *Poverty, Power, and Authority in Education: Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. Atlanta: Georgia State University, 1981. 64 pp.

This is not a book, but a loosely connected set of lectures given at Georgia State University. Although the editor makes a valiant attempt to preface the three lectures, no attempt would justify the application of such an imposing title to the content. The editor's introduction does provide a rather useful summary of the issues addressed, and itself serves as a favorable review of the subsequent sections: Harold Silver, "Education Against Poverty: Interpreting British and American Policies in the 1960's and 1970's"; Michael F. D. Young, "Ideology and Educational Research"; Edgar Z. Friedenberg, "Deference to Authority: Education in Canada and the United States." Fortunately I read from the last lecture to the first, and thereby came away in a much better mood than when I began.

Harold Silver's essay is a joy to read. It contains, even in these few pages, a great deal of information on the events and literature of social action through education in the 1960's and 70's. It is not methodologically closed, but is methodologically sound, exemplifying research in the history of education and also probably unintentionally, exemplifying the best of comparative studies. Despite the allusion, almost out of context in the introduction, to comparative education, this is the only one of the three essays which has anything at all to do with that field of inquiry. Silver's conclusions are insightful, and carefully derived from the information he presents. He adheres to his own cautions against immodesty and unsupported assertion in the literature, advice which might have been heeded by the other authors in these particular pieces.

Michael Young's essay seems to be a rather hastily constructed political critique of research reported in the book, *15,000 Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effect on Children*, by Michael Rutter and colleagues. His criticism of the ideology in the research follows automatically from the ideological singularity of his own position, but is not supported by any persuasiveness, logic, or evidence in the argument. Only one similarly convinced could follow the leaps of reasoning which conclude in stale doctrinaire assertions. Young's narrow refusal to consider ideology-free research or idiosyncratic features of the socio-educational situation in the U.K. contradicts the case he presents against one-sidedness in research using "objective analyses" and de-emphasizing social class and power relations.

The problems with Young's piece on ideology are ideological, therefore subject to different interpretation by different readers. The Friedenberg essay is however, as Snuffy Smith used to say, "a pretty piece 'wif naught behind it." One would expect some insights from Friedenberg, but beyond these, there is little new and little substantive. The paper refers to the use of evidence in making points, but avoids practicing use of evidence. Somehow the author got completely away from his title, and returned at the end with some off-hand comparative comments on Canadian education and society. The half-truths of these comments makes the late apology for title even less acceptable.

It is unfortunate that the Center at Georgia State did not ask for reworking of the latter two lectures before committing them to print. As it is, the names of these social scientists, as well as the attractive titles of their essays, promise much more than this publication delivers.

Robert F. Lawson
The University of Calgary

Frye, Northrop, *Divisions on a Ground*, Toronto: Anansi, 1982, 199 pp. \$19.95.

Reading this latest collection of essays by Northrop Frye, the *éminence grise* of Canada's national consciousness, is rather like becoming acquainted with *Hamlet* for the first time: it gives one the impression of saying

things that have been said before. And indeed, Frye's thought has influenced the national awareness of many more Canadians than have actually read his works. Those who have had that pleasure will recognize ten of these essays on Canadian culture as re-publications, a fact which has been emphasized by the casualness with which they have been edited into this collection. But no matter: Frye's thought remains fresh in the midst of our national proclivity for tortured self-examination. His musings lighten and enlighten the shadows in our national awareness.

If the Canadian experience has a contribution to make to the Western culture of which we are a part, it is to be found in our hammering out of the relationship between civilization and nature. Traditional Christian thought places those two concepts in opposition: it sees man's role as bringing nature into harmony with a human concept of order, on the premise that man can improve himself only through human and social institutions. But in most of Canada, conditions are such that the challenge lies not in dominating nature, but rather in coming to terms with it: the capitalist-socialist controversy that is such an obsession in other parts of the Western World must here take second place to working out a "détente with outraged nature."

It has taken Canadians something like four centuries to become clearly aware of this central necessity to their national existence. The artistic age in which Canada was founded, the Baroque, "was an age of intense belief in the supremacy of human consciousness over nature." One of the expressions of this was the imposition of geometric forms in the human environment, "a symbol of aggressiveness, of human domination." It was also expressed in the Christian attitude to other religions, which were seen as demonic parodies of Christianity. Nature spirits had to be devils, as the numinous was not to be found in nature. The concept of false gods which must be destroyed was but a short step from the belief that the only good heathen was a dead heathen. "What is particularly horrifying about the extermination of, say, the Beothuks in Newfoundland is the casualness with which it was done, the ability to murder people of a different ethnical group without losing five minutes' sleep over it." True enough, but the Newfoundland situation cannot in fairness be considered as typical of Canada. The island's administration was not stabilized within the British colonial framework until 1824; the last known Beothuk died in 1827. Those attitudes which had such tragic consequences for the Beothuk were counterbalanced in other parts of the country by the belief that with some effort, even heathens could be incorporated into a fully human society by means of conversion. The struggle to achieve this has led us, slowly and sometimes reluctantly, to the awareness that precolumbian cultures have enough of value for us to consider them a part of our heritage. In destroying them we impoverish ourselves.

But the lesson is a difficult one, and so as Canadians we continue to wrestle with our perpetual crisis in national identity. It is perhaps ironic that as we concentrate on our technological, political and social problems, our enduring legacies to the future will be cultural. Canadians may be justified in priding themselves on being leaders in certain types of high technology, but technologies have a way of being superseded. Political and social institutions serve their purpose and then transform or die. Cultural achievements are the best survivors, and at their artistic best are never superseded. It is ironic that in Canada, our most distinctive (and among the best) achievements in the visual arts have arisen from the nature-based, (i.e., "savage") traditions of the Inuit and Amerindians.

As is perhaps to be expected, this influence is much less evident in our literature; but even here, nature does a fair amount of brooding, and a streak of atavism is not hard to find. Still, as Frye is keenly aware, our cultural traditions are many, even though we revolve permanently in the U.S. orbit. Our national vision of life must be made up of words, just as the myths of bygone ages created worlds out of words. The one sure way of degrading man is to degrade his language, or perhaps to drown him in a sea of meaningless words — George Orwell's "newspeak". It is because Frye is so intelligently optimistic as to our ability to deal with such dangers that he is so salutary to read. Whether we agree with his analysis in whole or in part, he sounds a positive note that I, for one, take heart in.

Olive Patricia Dickason,
University of Alberta

Pickering, Samuel F., Jr., *John Locke and Children's Books in Eighteenth-Century England*. Knoxville, Tennessee: The University of Tennessee Press, 1981, pp. 236. \$21.00 (U.S.).

Interest in the history and development of children's literature has been steadily increasing in recent years. This interest is most readily observable in the number of books and articles that have appeared. The field is still