

Hornsby, in particular argues in this context for "a more positive role in leadership" (p. 120), for the (national) Department of Education and Science, especially in matters of curriculum. The implication is that a vacuum has come to exist in terms of professional leadership in educational matters, and that vacuum may come to be filled by others who do not necessarily have the long-term interest of children and society at heart. Brighouse, writing of the unprecedented publication activities of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools in the late 1970's, indirectly points out the dangers of such a vacuum in a context of intense political conflict over educational policy. "Such a flurry of activity (on the part of H.M.I.'s) may have been designed to avoid less welcome, over-prescriptive, even damaging initiatives by politicians" (p. 92). Educators world-wide should pay attention to this British experience.

In light of the discussion provided of the demands on Chief Education Officers in this political context, Canadian and American superintendents, who are becoming the subjects of a body of literature of their own, might consider as relatively matter-of-fact their problems of dealing with boards of trustees.

The overall impression created by this collection is thus not a pleasant one. But all is not doom and gloom. Sometimes the mood is lightened by the terminology, instances of which bring to mind the description of the North Atlantic as an ocean on either side of which live peoples separated by a common language. The use by Murgatroyd and Reynolds of the term "pupil pursuit work" to identify an inspectorial technique in which "one of the senior staff will sit in and watch the teacher teach" (p. 291) brings to mind images of fleeing children. The fault here is the reviewer's, not the author's.

This is a well-assembled collection of insightful articles. It presents a cross-sectional portrait of British education in the late 1970's and early 1980's which will be useful both for comparativists and students of school administration. As with most collections, however, one must select from it with care.

Arthur M. Schwartz
University of Calgary

Holmes, Brian. (Ed). *Equality and Freedom in Education*. London: Allen and Unwin, Inc., 1985, 259 pp., \$11.50 (paper).

In an era when comparative education is flooded with literature, Brian Holmes' *Equality and Freedom in Education* deserves serious attention by scholars in this field.

Undertaking the monumental tasks of comparing six major educational systems in the world — British, French, American, Russian, Chinese and Japanese — the book is highly systematic, thorough and informative. It is systematic in the sense that the educational systems discussed are easily compared with each other through the structure of the text: Aim, Administration, Finance, Structure and Organization, Curriculum, Teacher Education and Higher Education. It is thorough and informative in the sense that each section reveals the historical changes leading to the present state of affairs, with additional data to drive home the descriptive account and further readings to permit in-depth exploration.

The central theme of accommodating the conflicting principles of ensuring equality of opportunities and the individual's freedom of choice is well illuminated in different social structures. Indeed, the choice of the title for each chapter dealing with the respective countries provides strong clues as to why the problem of achieving both the equality of treatment and individual flexibility of choice is hard to resolve. In the case of England, the national educational policy is severely compromised by many local education authorities with different philosophies. In France, the tradition of liberty is at odds with a centralized system professed to ensure equality of resource allocation. In America, the extreme legal protection of individual freedom defies attempts to equalize opportunities for all. In Russia, the cultivation of a talented 'new Soviet man' runs counter to the political ideology of egalitarianism. In China, the forces for preserving tradition and the urgent need for change have led to dramatic shifts of direction. In Japan, the severe competition for the prestigious higher institutions challenges equal opportunity for the masses.

Given the careful structure of the book, one might wonder about the need for a detailed introduction provided by the editor himself. Perhaps a summary section highlighting similarities and contrasts in attempts to achieve the uncompromising principles would be less repetitive and more rewarding to the readers.

If one wishes to be more critical, one might quarrel with the uneven quality of the individual contributions, an effect which is typical of books consisting of collections of papers by different authors. The accounts provided respectively by Jones and Turner about education in Britain and the USA, for instance, are more analytical than Tomiak's far more factual section dealing with the USSR system. This observation might strengthen the present reviewer's point that a final chapter which presents a synthesis of preceding chapters, both factual and analytical, would be helpful.

Overall, however, one should readily concede that *Equality and Freedom in Education* with its systematic presentation of six major education systems in the world has contributed significantly to the field of cross-cultural studies. It lends itself equally to classroom instruction and to research in comparative education.

Y.L. Jack Lam
Brandon University

Lee, James Michael. *The Content of Religious Instruction: A Social Science Approach*. Birmingham, Alabama: Religious Education Press, 1985. xvi, 766 pp., \$14.95.

James Michael Lee has provided the religious studies expert with a substantial introduction to and an in-depth study of a social science approach to the content of religious instruction.

In this third volume of a trilogy on religious instruction, a trilogy which represents "an attempt to put the teaching of religion on a firm scientific basis" (p. 749), Lee focuses on the substantive content of religious instruction. The substantive content, according to Lee, consists of nine types of molar forms: product content, process content, cognitive content, affective content, verbal content, nonverbal content, conscious content, unconscious content, and lifestyle content. Lee devotes a lengthy chapter to each of these content forms and the various learning or social science theories which contributed to his comprehension of the subject matter. By identifying content in its molar forms, Lee forces the religious education teacher, whether a Sunday School teacher, a parent, a minister, or a college instructor, to approach the teaching of religion in a multidimensional manner giving adequate attention to each content. Lee correctly identifies the necessity of placing pedagogy, in the secular classroom and the religion classroom, on a scientific and effective basis. The religious and/or secular educator who heeds Lee's advice to marry multidimensional content forms with innovative and learner-centred pedagogy should be an effective teacher.

The central thesis of Lee's social scientific approach to religious education is that instruction is to focus on the learner, not on theology or dogma. In his view, teaching of theology has too long dominated religious education, which has been deadened by ineffective or inappropriate methods of instruction. Neither the teaching of theology nor the traditional practice of religious instruction treats the learner in a holistic manner. The religious educator must teach from the learner's existential situation for it is the learner and the learner's environment, not theology, that is the centre of the religious education process. While this is not a new approach to teaching religion, it has been too often ignored by religious educators who feel pressured to inculcate a particular theological orientation into the students. Lee, who argues persuasively that theology is simply part of the cognitive content of religion, emphasizes the need to teach religion from a laboratory approach. That is, the instructor and the learner are actively engaged in assessing their lives and living from a religious, in this case a Christian, perspective. The laboratory for Christian living, that is the everyday life of the learner, provides "that kind of purposive and fruitful structure which will tend to optimally promote successful experimentation with various kinds of Christian lifestyle activities and behaviors" (p. 623).

There are two fundamental problems with Lee's volume. First, Lee attempts to be too comprehensive. In addition to the social science jargon which permeates the volume and frequent teleological statements which substitute for argument, his inclusive discussion of the heterogeneous social science theories which influenced his thought on the process and content of religious instruction undermines the effectiveness of his treatment of the content of religious education. For example, Lee's explication of the theories on the unconscious by Freud and Jung are cogent and precise. The impact of this discussion is weakened when, in the same chapter, the religious educator is apprised of the ideas of Ram Dass, a transpersonal-spiritual view of the unconscious and dream theory. There is, unfortunately, little consistent effort to synthesize in a manner useful to the religious educator these conflicting psychological and sociological learning theories. While Lee's intent, that of informing