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

to teaching and curriculum reform the sociology of knowledge framed by Alfred Schutz, Peter Berger, and Thomas Luckmann, as "augmented by ideas borrowed from cultural anthropology and social linguistics" (p. ix). The purpose would be to assist students to prepare themselves for action to gain social renewal (in our "modernizing" times) by learning a negotiatory style of "communicative competence" functional for talking about everyday experience.

Setting the stage for the feasibility and desirability of this is the anthropological concept of "liminality," which comes from a classic 1907 theory of life-crisis rituals advanced by Arnold van Gennep. He argued that the first phase of any *rite of passage* highlights the individuality of a person leaving an old position in his group; the last phase foregrounds the person's new status within the group; and the middle phase is culturally transitional — a threshold, or "liminal." Bowers classes modern times as a liminal "brief period of openness that follows the relativizing of taken-for-granted authority" (p. 7) and, therefore, an opportunity to be seized for educational reform. As for Bowers' idea of enlightened reform, that reform results from personal synthesis from the above-mentioned body of sociology of knowledge, and consists essentially in conceiving of (cultural) learning as socialized, intercommunicating, social construction of reality, including values and beliefs. While it is an individual who learns, he does it while actively embedded in society, and it is the job of the teacher to facilitate the learning process by fostering aquisition and practice of its essential instrument, "communicative competence." Hence the lip-service paid to "social linguistics." The ultimate use for this kind of social skillfulness is seen as lifelong, and as bound to enable problem-solving coping behavior, in the "modernizing" context, throughout life.

Bowers' presentation of the argument is without empirical foundation, completely ideological, and, to a degree, polemical. It is specifically hard on those other game plans for meeting the educational challenge of "modernization" advanced by liberal-technocratic educators, neo-Marxists, and neo-Romantic advocates of "free" alternative schools. They are criticized for making a fetish of "self-realizing" learning, for failing to expose "the true form of authoritarianism in a consumer-oriented culture" (p. 27) which might give students a proper perspective with which to deal with society as it is, and for not fostering "communicative competence."

The difficulty is, of course, that in a case like this, unsupported by evidence, a reviewer's evaluation is likely to be no better or worse than the argument itself. It would be easy enough to dispute. For example, Bowers denigrates neo-Marxists and neo-Romantics for not "taking seriously the liberalizing influence that the teacher has on the process of learning" (p. 55), but a factor-analysis of cross-cultural survey results reported in Joshua A. Fishman's *Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective* (1976) has shown that community support for education first, and student variables second, are more basic to academic excellence than the teacher. Again, Bowers' enthusiastic endorsement of general validity for Berger/Luckmann's concept of "reification" — "perhaps one of the

most useful analytical tools available for understanding the socialization process that goes on in the classroom'' (p.60) contrasts radically with Hanna F. Pitkin's view of it in a *Theory and Society* (1987) article which criticized it as confused, confusing, and a ''bad tool'' to be used only in contexts where its meaning can be specified. One notes that Bowers, having expressed enthusiasm over this concept, then omits it from the ''simplified overview of concepts derived from the phenomenological tradition'' (p. 79) given in Chapter IV, entitled ''A Sociology of Knowledge approach to Curriculum Development.'' This curious fact may be in response to educationists' criticisms of Bowers' earlier (1974) presentation of this ideology on grounds that it involved unfamiliar vocabulary and difficult concepts (to which he replies in Chapter V).

The bottom line, however, is that books of this type seem to please the more-or-less converted while they irritate and/or bore others. On a central notion like ''modernity,'' Bowers apologizes for ignoring thinkers like Marx, Weber, and Durkheim, while I could argue (and in the case of Weber have argued in print) that they are more misleading than illuminating on the subject anyway. On another central notion, that of ''communicative competence,'' the less said by this linguistic anthropologist on Bower's speculative ideas, the better.

William C. McCormack
The University of Calgary

Bolin, Frances S. & Falk, Judith McConnell. (Eds.). (1987) *Teacher renewal — professional issues, personal choices.* New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 244 pp., $16.96 (paper).

This book is about ''sustaining the note,'' recovering and repeating moments of excellence, striving to do one's best without flopping ''back into flatness,'' stopping to become, to care, to reach out, and to make meaning, for others and ourselves. As such, the editors have selected an aspect of the human condition that is not unique to teaching. We all need to renew ourselves, to overcome inertia and lack of meaning, and to sustain the spark of life, continuously, until all efforts fail.

Renewal is connected to the ecology and the ethical character of teaching. Though the book does not offer clear guidelines, Bolin, borrowing from Casteel, suggests four notions for teacher renewal: imaginative reflection, affirming the goodness and rightness of being a teacher, focusing on the objective reality of the