limited a theory of knowledge, socialization, and school pedaogy. A critical theory of education must start with the limited impact of these reformers on society; it must question the normative interests behind pedagogical practice and it must analyze the link between knowledge and power. Only then can students be given the conceptual tools necessary to understand their reality and only then can power in the classroom be democratized and humanized.

The remaining four chapters deal with more specific topics. In "Beyond the Correspondence Theory: Notes on the Dynamics of Educational Reproduction and Transformation," Giroux criticizes the work of Gintis and others who have written on the hidden curriculum and the failure of school, arguing that they have no dialectical notion of ideology, that they have ignored content, have a passive view of people and a monolithic view of domination. In "Dialectics and the Development of Curriculum Theory," he looks at dialectical thinking as more than an intellectual method and argues for a praxis of critical thought and reflective intervention. "Paulo Freire's Approach to Radical Educational Theory and Practice" is a generally favorable appraisal of Friere's thought as a kind of case study in "critical theory" with the caution that it has limited implications for the North American context. The final essay on "Teacher Education and the Ideology of Social Control" is in some the ways the weakest of the set, restating the theme of "culture as hegemonic ideology," criticizing teacher education programs as "agencies of social control," and calling for the emancipation of students, a contribution that contains little that is original or profound.

Although I am not persuaded that what Giroux calls "Western Marxism" has a great deal to contribute to the development of new educational theories or to the rejuvenation of learning in our society, I do appreciate the ethical perspective, insight and conscious raising that neo-Marxist critiques have brought to the prevailing "wisdom" of educational theory and practice. And within this school of criticism, Giroux is an articulate, sensitive, and balanced spokesperson. Throughout these essays he presents a thoughtful analysis of the relationship between knowledge and power, and between the social context and the school curriculum. He is also more concerned than many theorists — neo-Marxist or not — to suggest implications of his educational reflections for the life of schools and the practice of those who work in schools.

In their timing, these essays fall between two eras: the period of naive or pessimistic school criticism of the sixties and seventies on the one hand and the emerging period of turbulence, accountability, and "reproductive and technocratic rationality" represented by the back-to-basics and high-technology movements of the eighties. The "correspondence" potential of current trends to more government control of curriculum and evaluation, and the dialectic potential of the widespread use of microcomputers in schools, will provide Henry Giroux with new and important subjects for study.

The essays in the present volume show a serious thinker dealing with important issues in a responsible way. I hope he continues to make this kind of contribution to the curriculum and educational discussions which need to take place if education is going to fulfill its obligation to provide both enlightenment and liberation.

Norman Henchey
McGill University

Crittenden, Brian. *Cultural Pluralism and Common Curriculum.* Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 1982, 103 pp. $3.95.

This is a book that is as useful to Canadian educators as it would be to Australian ones. The theme and discussion are pertinent to any country which has had a large in-migration and which consequently has a diverse school population. As I will examine in further discussion, both its strengths and weaknesses are pertinent to a consideration of cultural pluralism and curriculum in both countries.

Unlike much of the recent literature on multiculturalism and cultural pluralism, this book is written in a far more philosophical vein. Indeed, many of the glib generalizations and glossed-over meanings in the recent multicultural jargon are examined in depth. This is a decided strength to the volume.

The theme of the book is the consideration of whether a culturally diverse population is better served by a common curriculum in the state educational system than by a diversified curriculum decided in individual schools or local areas. "More specifically, I wish to examine in detail one of the key grounds on which a common curriculum is challenged: that it offends the values of pluralism." (p. 4). The author then presents a careful analysis of the arguments for a common curriculum. The first set of arguments rests on claims that there are several distinct systematic modes of meaning or forms of knowledge in human culture, and that full human development depends on entering effectively into these modes of meaning. The second set of arguments rests on the assumption that there are certain basic values universally held in a society, and that a common curriculum is needed to uphold the beliefs and values of the common culture, particularly in mobile industrial societies. The third line of argument rests on the utility of certain skills and knowledge in the economic and political life of the society. All of these arguments have an underlying assumption that the school has a role to play in the fostering of equal opportunity or equality. None of these arguments, on the face of them, seem to be particularly responsive to the needs of a diverse or pluralistic society.

The arguments against a common curriculum are summarized as follows. The first is the principle of pluralism, in which a common curriculum would impose the beliefs and values of some members of society on everyone. This principle would restrict a core curriculum only to the values and educational aims about which there was consensus among groups. The second argument derives from a sociology of knowledge position that what counts as legitimate knowledge in a common curriculum may be simply the reflection of the interests of the dominant group. The third position is based on individualist progressive argument that the school should respond to the needs and values of each child. The fourth view is that there are significant differences of ability and interests among students, and that a stratified school system would be better suited to deal with this fact.

The central argument of the remainder of the book becomes how to justify a common curriculum as the best solution in a pluralist society. The author analyzes in detail the justification for pluralism, in much more historical depth than is usually found in writing on this topic, and concludes that it can be justified. However, he presents three basic conditions for a pluralist society to flourish or survive, and these conditions form the fulcrum on which his later argument rests. He requires that everyone in society should accept certain basic standards of behaviour, without which life in any society would be intolerable. These values are linked with moral values such as personal freedom, the toleration of diverse ways of thinking and acting, recognition of the dignity and worth of each human being as a moral agent, and commitment to non-violent means of persuasion. It is here that one begins to see how the author is resolving his dilemma. It is not clear that all groups in a society would subscribe to even this basic condition. Moreover, these values are seen as linked with a particular form of legal system and form of democracy.

The second major condition for a justifiable pluralism is that people, as individuals and groups, be concerned for the interest and good of society as a whole. Professor Crittenden sees this concern as leading ultimately to the development of a new common culture via the sharing of a common language, in the Australian case, English. He states explicitly that this theory of pluralism "requires the acculturation of all groups to the extent that they participate in an evolving core of common culture." (p. 35). One sees that this view of pluralism is becoming so muted that it is beginning to be not at all contradictory to the aims of a common curriculum.

The third major condition is the valuing of "critical rationality." The author spends the central chapter of the book developing the analysis of critical rationality as a universal ideal. He rejects cultural relativism as a basis for supporting pluralism because "it provides no guide for distinguishing among the conflicting beliefs and values the ones that are supposed to be true for society as a whole." (p. 41). However, he sees critical rationality as encouraging and justifying "a form of social order in which competing theories and diverse ways of life have the opportunity to exist." (p. 48).

The setting up of the problem and the analysis to this point comprise three fifths of the book's contents, and are actually more interesting than the resolution of the problem. Once one has brought

forward these three "common" conditions for justifying pluralism, it is but a short step to describing an ideal common curriculum for such a society. The general blueprint suggested comprises: 1) the development of an adequate understanding of the principles of the basic social morality and the values on which pluralism depends; 2) an introduction to the main features of the political, legal and economic system; 3) the acquisition of skills in speaking, reading and writing English as the common language; 4) the effort to gain a critical appreciation of the major aspects of the distinctive common culture in the Australian context; and 5) the development of the general outlook of rationality which permeates every part of the curriculum. These elements would be treated in a thematically organized program of Australian Studies.

The remainder of the book is spent on discussion and comparison with various other models of common curriculum. Several key issues in this last section are matters of interest for Canadian educators also. For example, Professor Crittenden comments on the case for common and separate schools, and concludes that he favours the mixing of ethnic groups in a common school, for reasons of social cohesion. Another topic of interest is his discussion of the case for a subject called multicultural education in the common school curriculum. Since he is opposed to a pluralism composed of culturally retentive ethnic groups, he is doubtful of the merits of such an approach. However, as his earlier argument shows, he is also by no means in favour of a diffuse multicultural relativism as an ethic underlying the entire curriculum. Rather he supports the diffusion of certain universal moral values, an outlook of social tolerance, and an ethic of critical rationality, set within a curriculum culturally relevant to Australia.

This last aspect has a similar counterpart in the anxieties in Canada over the place of Canadian Studies in the curriculum, and its relationship to the principles of a multicultural education. Canadians have still to think through these issues in a far more fundamental way, in relationship to the realities of ethnic and linguistic diversity, the present emphasis on job-related training, the need for Canadian Studies, and the need for a sense of purpose in education at all.

The strength of Professor Crittenden's book is that it tackles these issues for Australian education in a systematic and serious manner. It avoids completely a facile or naive use of multicultural jargon to resolve arguments by sleight-of-tongue rather than by serious dissection of the issues. It is not a book that Canadian undergraduates would find easy to read, but it would repay the effort. Its major flaw in the eyes of a committed cultural pluralist (in the retentionist sense) is that its major argument rests on the view that consensus is possible about certain societal universals. Even the author admits that the Aborigines should have options for social and cultural retention not possible for other ethnocultural groups in his schema. In Canada, Native Peoples may well feel they have a similar case.

Vandra Lea Masemann
Inter Cultural Associates, Toronto

Leithwood, K.A. (Ed.), *Studies in Curriculum Decision Making*, Toronto: OISE Press, 1982. 310 pp. $18.95.

This book is a collection of studies about the nature of classroom teachers' curriculum decision making (Part I), who influences those decisions (Part II), and how to improve them (Part III). "Curriculum" is defined broadly as "the educative experiences of students" (p. 249), so the papers encompass decisions about instruction and management as well as program. The studies in Parts I and II address such questions as:

1. What are the most salient influences on teachers' curriculum decision making?
2. Which teacher beliefs influence pupil evaluation practices in the classroom?
3. What needs motivate teachers to behave as they do in their classroom?
4. Is the principal typically a curriculum leader in the school and if so, how?