historical record, a point from which to engage in an analysis of the present. It is useful to be reminded of the extent to which these extremes have had indigenous expression in the United States, for it is not too difficult, in 1988, to discern the same tensions underlying the ruffled service of contemporary politics, and to find them redefined in the positions that have been tested before the Supreme Court. So this is not a complacent book, and if indeed the Supreme court has become the "school board of the nation," it is easy to understand why the question of its membership must necessarily be so highly politicized.

Any non-American review of such a work should comment on its comparative value. In spite of the sub-title this work is more than a history of American educational ideas; it is a study of how the major influences in western educational thought generally have interacted within American society. To a great extent the United States has indeed been the "great experiment," the great laboratory, and though the evocative power of the myth of the frontier, of the existence of space for creativity and experimentation, has waned, the United States has remained a society where the chemical interaction of ideas can be tested. For this reason Karier's work unquestionably has universal value as a record of primary educational experimentation. One senses, unfortunately, towards the end of the book where he develops and explores the Supreme Court theme, that this is all coming to an end in the mechanistic legalism of a society desperately in search of stability in the face of its own contradictions, which are post-adolescent as well as post-industrial. But as a paradigm for all schooling in modern history to date, this book is a very informative, readable, and lasting contribution.

D. Radcliffe
University of Western Ontario

Hendley, B.P. (1986). *Dewey, Russell, Whitehead: Philosophers as educators*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 200 pp., $19.95 (cloth), $9.95 (paper).

Over the past three decades, philosophy of education has tended to neglect the ideas and arguments of important philosophers of education whose work appeared before what came to be fashionably termed the "revolution" in philosophy. Although somewhat condescendingly allowed to be classics of their kind, the writings of the historical philosophers who dealt with educational problems have been judged to fall short of the stricter standards of what is now to count as philosophy. The great merit of Brian Hendley's excellent study of three philosophers whose work just predates the modern period is to encourage us, as Russell might have said, to keep a wide horizon. Dewey has maintained a loyal following in the

United States though generally outside what has been the mainstream. Russell, on the other hand, has been almost entirely ignored, and Whitehead relegated to the occasional scholarly footnote.

Many of Hendley's criticisms of analytical philosophy of education hit home. Enthusiasm for conceptual analysis as an end in itself led to work which was, at best, only of marginal relevance to educational theory and practice. When Hendley borrows from Richard Rorty the caricature of the analytic philosopher as "quasi-lawyer," breathlessly awaiting the latest counter-example in a soon-to-be-published paper by R.S. Peters, is he so far from the mark? It needs to be said, however, that these excesses have to a large extent been rectified. The caricature is truer of the late 1960s than the late 1980s. A wider view of the subject has been emerging over the past fifteen years, although the particular lesson which Hendley teaches about the need to recover what was of value in earlier contributions has not yet been fully appreciated. His book will certainly help to foster interest in the precursors of contemporary work.

Not surprisingly, perhaps, when we do turn to the writers in question, we find that they have more in common with us than exaggerated statements about *modern* philosophy of education would allow. Russell *is* concerned, and not just in passing, to show what the concept of education involves and how it differs from indoctrination. Dewey is no idle propounder of "high-level directives," but a philosopher who takes great care to explain what is meant by general notions. In the course of defending an aim such as thoughtfulness, Dewey will spell out what it *means* to be thoughtful. Hendley echoes Dewey in warning against simplistic either/or thinking, but occasionally comes perilously close to an exaggerated contrast between what he calls the futility and stagnation of analytic philosophy and the productive nature of traditional philosophy of education. To be fair to Hendley, he does explicitly mention the need for analysis in any adequate conception of philosophy of education, but I wonder if the *impression* left is not that analysis is rather pointless.

The three central chapters of the book are devoted to individual studies of the authors in question. There are full and helpful notes, and an extensive bibliography of primary and secondary sources. It would be hard to identify a more sympathetic and intelligent introduction to these writers, one which combines a coherent general overview of their theories with a careful examination of the link between theory and practice. In the case of Dewey and Russell, this takes the form of an inquiry into the theory behind the Laboratory School and Beacon Hill, and an assessment of the conduct of these schools in the light of the background theory. Hendley argues persuasively that the translation of philosophical aims into practical terms is a legitimate and important task for philosophers, and one complex enough that even sophisticated philosophers propose simplistic and problematic ideas. Witness Russell's suggestion for an international university to screen and select textbooks. Errors, however, are instructive and we can continue to ask what a concern to avoid bias might involve in practice.

Whitehead ran no school so the rhythm of the book is somewhat disturbed, but Hendley makes out his case that Whitehead shares the same concern to bridge the theory/practice gulf. If, as Russell said, it was left to America to discover Whitehead as a philosopher, one might say, with only slight exaggeration, that it has been left to Hendley to rediscover him as a philosopher of education. There are fecund notions in Whitehead (inert ideas, the rhythm of education, knowledge as process) which invite careful examination and deserve better than polite quotation. These are tools which, if thought out clearly, can be used to enhance our critical awareness of educational practice.

Although the individual studies of Dewey, Russell and Whitehead are significant in themselves, Hendley has a more general thesis to advance which the studies are designed to bolster: that philosophers have a productive role to play in relating educational thought and action, and that older philosophers set an instructive example. Not that they were especially good at *resolving* practical problems, but they did take seriously the question of how philosophy might help us to address practical issues. There is, of course, a debate in the literature concerning the role of the philosopher with respect to questions concerning practice. (I refrain from mentioning names in view of Hendley's strictures against shorthand references to in-house disputes!) It may be, however, that the either/or prospect of philosophical rigor versus practical import can be modified by thinking of standards and relevance as separate but independently valuable criteria. And I suspect that Brian Hendley would favor that kind of view.

To underscore his point about the need to relate theory and practice, Hendley concludes by setting out an agenda for a contemporary philosophy of education. The list includes computers and education, gender and education, adult education and peace education, all important examples of topics deserving careful philosophical reflection. Philosophers *have* started work on this agenda, but Hendley's support is timely and his sense of the places within these areas where further work is needed is sound. In the end, Hendley's achievement is to return us to our roots in philosophy of education while pointing a way forward.

William Hare
Dalhousie University

Bowers, C.A. *The promise of theory: Education and the politics of cultural change*. New York: Longman, 1984, 116 pp., $13.95 (hardcover).

This book, an elaboration of the author's 1982 John Dewey Lecture sponsored by the John Dewey Society of the United States, is a manifesto for teachers to apply