

archetypes in their respective areas. In consequence, Iannaccone's schema for classification is valid only in so far as it pertains to the descriptions at hand.

In the Nicaraguan case study, the tone is one of breathless immediacy. The author, Richard J. Kraft, was a participant in American educational aid to that country and his first-hand account narrows the range of objective interpretation. There is a good deal of breast-beating over American involvement and reluctant acknowledgement that some American initiative was beneficial. Of course, in his view, Nicaragua is only another instance of the spirit of national liberation over imperial bondage, or the people vs. the Somoza family, as American surrogates. He does admit that there were massive enrolment increases in the 60's and 70's and that the literacy campaign was succeeding. He is too innocent, however in objecting to the cultural baggage accompanying the educational aid. Any and every literacy campaign carries with it social, political, cultural and religious values in the real historical context in which it operates. Literacy is not disembodied pure form but includes real-life content and is value-laden. With the Sandinista reform, the literacy campaign will continue and the several thousand Cuban "teachers" imported will see to it that the "right" values are instilled. Kraft's argument that the country is predominantly Roman Catholic and that several of that faith hold prominent government positions thereby justifying the non-Marxist aspect of the reform is vacuous. The Pope delivered a public reprimand to "Catholic" government ministers during his visit there. The parallel with Poland is too obvious where the overwhelming majority of that country's citizens are Roman Catholic yet they are ruled by a clique of Communists. With the Solidarity reforms, Marxist indoctrination was tossed out of the schools, but with martial law the atheistic dogmas were immediately re-imposed. So much for popular national liberation. (See Viet Nam).

On the other hand majority rule has its prerogatives and its drawbacks: the Malaysian study is a case in point. It highlights compensatory education for the majority who happen to be Malays in the process of ordering their own country for their own benefit. The country is in the process of redressing the balance among the major ethnic groups Malay, Chinese and Indian. During the period of British colonialism, the Chinese and Indian ethnic groups were permitted economic power and influence far out of proportion to their actual numbers. With independence, the Malays have taken over in government, education, the economy and religion. The Chinese educational "system" with its erstwhile Maoist orientation has been disassembled. English as the language of the "powerful" has been downgraded and replaced by Malay. The educational system has been structured to allow Malays to compete successfully for the top positions in every national institution. In consequence, economic power now is being transferred to Malays, and out of the hands of the Chinese minority. Islam has been proclaimed the national religion and is taught to all children in the school system. All this has been accomplished without violence, and with grudging acceptance by the minority. Thomas thinks that the continuous growth of the standard of living over the last decades and the perception by the minorities that they still have a prominent, albeit attenuated, role to play in a national life has restrained overt opposition to the reforms. The parallel with Quebec comes immediately to mind; the rights of a minority are what the majority say they are.

Iannaccone's conclusion is to the effect that the stronger the legitimacy of the state, the clearer the institutional separation between education and politics. One could take this to its logical extension, as has Ilich, and propose that education be taken entirely out of the hands of the state and left entirely to the people. In this minimalist conception of the state, advocated by political philosophers such as Robert Nozick, the state intervenes out of necessity, leaving the widest latitude for individual and group action outside legal structures. Conversely, when government is least secure, education becomes fully politicized, an isomorph of the state. From its ideological underpinnings to its practical manifestations at every level in the educational structure, learning is whatever government says it is. In societies where one man rule is/was the norm (Zaire, Maoist China, Cameroon) education is what the Leader says it is. If one were to guess in which direction the political-education relationship was heading, one could make a solid case for further politicization with attendant ramifications.

Stephen T. Rusak
University of Toronto

Thompson, Norma H. (ed.) *Religious Education and Theology*. Birmingham, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1982, 254 pp. \$12.95 (U.S.) paper.

Under a quiet and unassuming title, Norma Thompson has assembled a provocative collection of widely contrasting views about the relationship between religious education and theology. Each of the

seven contributors presents one possible approach toward relating the two disciplines. Consequently, there is little agreement expressed. To add heat to the discussion there is no common agreement as to what constitutes religious education. Each contributor uses his or her own term. Catechesis, education, and instruction may appear to be synonymous while religion can be taken to mean any one or all of the Christian, Jewish, Muslim or Hindu faiths. To add interest, it is occasionally confessed that the field of religious education is in the process of identifying and establishing itself. All this makes for a good mix of assertion, opinion, argument and, in some cases, pointed criticisms and exchanges among the contributors. This is not a boring work. On the contrary, the reader will find both intellect and emotion aroused as the pages are turned. Neither is the work such that it restricts itself solely to those with religious interests. Theorists and psychologists will be able to appreciate what happens when their ideas are borrowed and applied and historians will encounter a realm of social history they seldom consider.

Norma Thompson, New York University, opens the work with a brief introductory paper. Pointing to the development, in the United States, of the religious education movement she informs us that, as yet, there is no adequate history of this movement. Thompson traces the beginnings of the movement to the foundation of the Religious Education Association in 1903. That Association was greatly influenced by contemporary developments in educational and psychological thought and attempted to appropriate those understandings for its own specific activities. By the late 1930s this movement was greatly influenced by the development of progressive education. Thompson, then, presents a brief overview of the historical development of religious education in so far as it occurred in the Protestant and Roman Catholic churches. In doing so she provides the reader with a modest framework for the discussion that follows.

That theology and religious education should be related in dialogue with theology taking a back seat is the position taken by Randolph Crump Miller of Yale Divinity School. Writing from the point of view of his own involvement in the development of the religious education movement, Miller reviews the major developments that have taken place since the 1930s. Identifying the influence of H. Shelton Smith, John C. Childs, John Dewey and others Miller contends that theology was understood to be essential in the formulation of religious education curricula. The result was the slogan, "Theology in the background: grace and faith in the foreground". He also draws attention to the work of Sarah Little in the early 1960s and her view of his position in contrast to those taken by James Smith and Lewis J. Sherrill. So Miller observes that whether theology is clearly articulated or assumed it is always in the background of the religious education process.

Viewing religious education as an emergent discipline, Gabriel Moran, New York University, portrays the traditional hegemony of theology as a major obstacle in the religious education process. Moran points to the nebulous nature of the term "religious education" and seeks to explain how it might better be understood. He prefers to view religious education as that process which provokes rather than precludes inquiry into religion and religious life while at the same time promoting religious toleration and conversation. His position is, then, in part, that theology can supply the content of religious education but it has nothing to offer in terms of method, structure or institutional form. In addition, he recognizes the validity of much of the work of the social sciences which, where relevant, have considerable contributions to make.

In an abrupt change of style and viewpoint Olivia Stokes of the Greater Harlem Comprehensive Guidance Center, presents a lightly written, powerful and evocative case for the place of Black Theology within the context of religious education. Here a multicultural dimension is added to an already complex issue. Drawing on the Judaeo-Christian understanding of God's abiding concern for the poor and oppressed, Stokes draws attention to the narrow ethnocentrism which has been so predominant in American religious education. The result, according to Stokes, has been the failure of religious education in the U.S. "to produce an American Judaeo-Christian notion of equality and justice". This failure has not just effected the black community but all the ethnic communities, including the whites, in the nation. What Stokes calls for is a theology which will inform religious education in order that it might equip people to struggle for justice, freedom, equality and liberation.

If religious instruction can have a valid macrotheory, then for James Michael Lee, University of Alabama in Birmingham, it can be supplied only by the social sciences. In this, the longest paper in the book (40%), Lee presents a lively assertive examination of the topic, "The Authentic Source of Religious Instruction". Lee finds much of which he is critical and wastes little time or sympathy in

despatching what he considers to be inferior scholarship. Given such a rigid approach to academic rigor Lee might well be advised to consider some of his own shortcomings. He calls on contemporary research to support his position without citing that research on page 104 and again on page 111. He literally sprinkles his writing with the word "gratuitous" of which page 113 is an example. But, much more importantly, is his heavy reliance on the validity of empiricism in coming to grips with things religious. Can empiricism completely explain what happens in religious instruction or is it just another descriptor of a phenomenon which, by its very nature, is beyond the grasp of human comprehension? Can we confine the ways of Father, Son and Holy Spirit to test and tabulation? These are the sort of questions which Lee's approach provokes.

That Lee's paper is immediately followed by "Experiencing Reality Together: Toward an Impossible Dream" by Lawrence O. Richards, Dynamic Church Ministries, is an indication of the skillful editing of the book. For Richards immediately turns the tables and examines educational ministry as part of a revelatory process in and through which God discloses Himself. Richards understands this process to be rooted in the Bible and one which "orients" and "commits" people to God's world. Such a process, he maintains, requires a move away from a purely cognitive approach to Christian instruction toward the application of experiential techniques, methods, and processes. What Richard calls for is an educational process which will provide the opportunity for the learner to experience biblical truth within a community context.

So we come to the closing paper in which John H. Westerhoff III, Duke University Divinity School, examines the possibility of using catechetics in the doing of theology. Westerhoff sees catechetics as a way of socializing people within the religious community. This approach brings to light what Westerhoff calls the catechetical circle. In this circle faith, understood as perception, lead the individual into revelatory experience which, in turn, brings the individual to the vocation of true human life in community. The process, as Westerhoff explains it, is circular since each step influences and makes possible the others.

This book, then, is a rare treat. Scholars will enjoy it for the opportunities it gives them to enter into the debate. Students will benefit from it for the wide variety and divergence of views it presents. Thompson deserves credit for assembling such a provocative collection.

J. Stewart Hardy
Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg

Shaw, Beverly. *Educational Policy and Sociology*. Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 1981. 268 pp. \$14.25.

I am sure that somewhere there exists a book reviewer's code of ethics which indicates a high level of objectivity when initiating a critical review of another person's literary effort. In any event, I must confess that I began reading Beverly Shaw's book, *Educational Practice and Sociology*, determined not to like it. I had been put off by what I considered to be more than just a touch of patronizing arrogance implicit in the foreword reference: namely, the author's assumption that his readers, being both intelligent and literate, "will not stumble over the occasional polysyllabic word and may be prepared to bear with an infrequent neologism."

The author's promise to avoid unnecessary jargon might be construed condescending as well as confusing to the reader when it is followed by a glossary of terms (jargon, if you will) — some of it sociological, much of it not — virtually all unnecessary and not infrequently followed by a perjorative description. The author also claimed in his foreword furthermore, to eschew a general survey of the literature (such as to be found in Olive Bank's highly regarded *Sociology of Education* (1976) — and then proceeded to do precisely that in the pages that followed.

The author contends that his book is aimed not only at preservice and practicing teachers, but also at other vested interest groups such as parents, administrators, and politicians. I doubt that members of these groups, teachers apart, will be seriously interested in the contents of this book and if the volume of sales is dependent on its appeal to these groups, then his book will have been a labor of love indeed.

However, once past the notice of intent and purposes, claims and counterclaims slowly but surely, albeit with some reluctance I began to come around. I finished Mr. Shaw's book in a much better frame of mind than when I had started. This is, I concluded, a book that can be recommended as supplement-