

mean. For all Dean Kimball's effort, however, the informed reader may well conclude that he has perpetuated an artificial distinction between two versions of the liberal arts ideal by relying on the false dichotomy between speech and reason. But the oddest thing of all in a work that celebrates the virtues of eloquence is to find it so dull that it could have been written by an administrator.

Charles J. Brauner  
University of British Columbia

Stabler, E. (1986). *Founders: Innovators in education, 1830-1980*. Edmonton: The University of Alberta Press, 306 pp., \$24.95 (cloth).

Normal schools are institutions of the past. By now in North America, school teachers, administrators, and other specialists, are trained on university campuses as are physicians, lawyers, engineers. This situation indicates a positive evolution in the professionalization of educators. But contrary to the three other occupational groups mentioned, a commonly established and universally recognized *cursus studiorum* for future educators among colleges and universities still has to be identified: there is yet no "Flexnor Model" providing for the integrated education of educators, linking learning and doing adequately, theory and practice satisfactorily, basics and specializations efficiently, and well-defined intellectual contents and real life classroom applications effectively. Nothing approaching university hospitals, student courts, and cooperative training in engineering covers the field of education, other than the deficient (according to many observers) probation period in application/affiliated grade schools. From place to place, program contents and teaching requirements are only partially congruent.

All this to point out that a master plan for training professional educators is still in the making. Fundamental parameters have yet to be clarified. And in order to attain this necessity, success stories from the past (immediate, recent, or centuries old) have to be scrutinized. Dr. Stabler has contributed to this scrutiny magnificently by narrating six of them: the chronicle of educators who had great culture, who conceived and implemented well-adapted institutions as answers to educational needs, and who, consequently, innovated with success in the real world of educational practice. Innovations became institutions and prospered to this day, still meeting contemporary needs. These were men and women of vision in the fields of rural education (Grundtvig in Denmark); of common public schools (Mann in New England); of higher education for women (Lyon at Mount Holyoke College); of cooperative study circles (Tomkins and Cody in Nova Scotia); of international education (Kurt Hahn in Germany and Scotland); and, of adult higher education (the team at the origin of the British Open University).

What lasts after reading this text is the conviction that the innovators were trained to think, to imagine, to organize. Out of their own personality they

“created” first class education, so to speak. And the treatment given their initiatives by Dr. Stabler of the University of Western Ontario is a monument of logic, nuances, clarity, and enthusiasm. It is a real classic that should be compulsory reading for educators to be!

André Girard  
Université de Montréal

Williams, R.J. (1986). *Rethinking education: The coming age of enlightenment*. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., Publishers, 160 pp., \$15.00 (hardcover).

When somebody claims that he “tells simple truths not explored before” (p. 13), one feels almost compelled to go immediately to the library, and provide the author with a concise basic bibliography in which these simple truths have been thoroughly examined during the last 4,000 years. Would Dr. Williams book have to be added at the end of the list?

The essence of this text consists in mixing together scienticism, positivism, determinism, idealism, essentialism, existentialism, individualism, and deism, all contradictions being resolved by the simple assumption that biology, since it is fully coherent, encompasses and transcends everything. Hence, thanks to biology, knowledge and science are equivalent; principles, theories, and scientific or natural laws are the same; and truth, reality, materiality, have but one definition. From centuries old astronomy, science heads toward physics, chemistry, and finally biology. “Psychology” covers the whole area of human sciences. Indeed, “psychology is a most important part of biology” (p. 76). But it has still a long way to go:

we do not know how to train our children so as to prevent . . . drug abuse . . . terrorism . . . early heart attacks . . . We need unified knowledge because of our present relative ineptness in dealing with . . . arthritis and schizophrenia. (p. 36)

As remnants (almost as footnotes) are the humanities, aesthetics and philosophy. “Diverse tastes, opinions, surmises, and speculations with respect to literature, poetry, music, art, sculpture, etc., need not conflict in any way with the single core of basic knowledge” (p. 88).

Can the experimental method, in the competition to gather knowledge, accept along its side any other valuable (deductive or intuitive) method? What if these methods lead to conclusions of their own? How did humanity manage history before the experimental sciences?

The unified knowledge concept, in the new unified education, is ideally embodied in “a book on *comprehensive world knowledge* for children this age. Such a book would also be invaluable to every adult” (p. 36). But such a book has not