Schwab's paper "Freedom and the Scope of Liberal Education" and Nathan Rotenstreich's "The Right to Educate" also touch upon the theme of social and moral education in liberal learning. Schwab is the only contributor to the volume to acknowledge openly that development of companionship is one area of human experience liberal education has ignored, largely he thinks, because academics have felt uncomfortable with the idea of nurturing something like companionship. Nevertheless he is convinced that for the good of everyone alike liberal education must find means and provide occasions for overcoming the pronounced isolation, aggravated by differences in age, in work and in socio-economic backgrounds, of individuals from each other in our society. If there is with Schwab's paper signs of an emerging social conscience for liberalism in education there is with Rotenstreich's paper (which appears at the end of the volume) a return to the themes of classical liberalism with which the collection began. The question about the right to educate is treated as one concerning the right of teachers to intervene in the lives of young people for the sake of assisting the young to transform their potential to be fully human into actuality. There then follows further familiar discussions on the place in this transformation of traditional wisdom and continuity with the past, of great books and of an understanding of religion and society.

Two other papers also appear in the collection. "Ideals and Second Bests" by Avishai Margalit is a closely reasoned work but which in many ways seems to bear only tangentially on the main themes of the collection. It is a potentially useful paper however since it raises matters concerning second best alternatives or approaches where various constraints block the way to achievement of ideals — a situation which any recovery of liberal education might well have to face. "Theory into Practice in Education" by the editor Seymour Fox, is an extremely short piece which in its brevity fails to consider some of the more recent contributions by philosophers of education to the important discussion of the theory — practice distinction.

Philosophy for Education is, one must say, an uneven publication both in terms of topics and quality. With the possible exception of papers by Green and Schwab there does not seem to be demonstrated sufficiently fresh thinking with which to meet the challenges that face the humanities and liberal education in the 1980's. Since *Philosophy for Education* does not speak very directly to the public (parents) concerned about the quality of public education for their children and since what is said, with the exceptions noted, is fairly familiar to philosophers and educators it remains something of a puzzle to know for whom the volume actually is intended. Perhaps it should be left that it is "for everybody."

Douglas Stewart
University of Regina

Rich, John Martin, *Discipline and Authority in School and Family*, Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1982, 199 pp. $28.75 (U.S.)

R.S. Peters, in his *Education and the Education of Teachers*, published in 1977, suggests that there is a new phase of educational theory emerging in which specialists, philosophers, social scientists and historians, integrate their contributing disciplines around concrete problems. He claims that philosophy of education can make a significant contribution to such an approach to educational theory, especially in terms of clarifying concepts, providing an ethical theory and a theory of man, and generally in integrating the contributions made from the various fields. *Discipline and Authority in School and Family* clearly belongs to this more adventurous, pragmatic, integrative approach to educational theory.

Various statistics are cited by Rich to show that the problem of discipline in relation to misbehavior and violence is one of the most significant problems in education today (pp. 1, 81, 158, 160, 163). Too often, however, studies of disciplinary problems in schools pay insufficient attention to the role of the family in creating early disciplinary patterns which shape the attitudes and behaviors of students in

schools. An examination of the family in understanding the problem of discipline is especially important in view of the changes occurring in family life in modern America. Rich is also concerned about providing "a framework for generating more powerful explanations of disciplinary phenomena" (p. 2). The problem of discipline grows out of an institutional framework of authority. Thus it is necessary to examine the nature of authority and changes in authority patterns in the home and the school, with a view to also exploring "the interrelations and conflicts between the public schools and the contemporary American family, the two institutions responsible for handling disciplinary problems" (p. vii).

Chapters 2, 3, 6, and 7, consider the question of authority, which is seen as providing the "framework" of the book (p. 7). These chapters cover a wide range of issues concerning authority: a review of six authority types: expert, counselor, role model, legislator, disciplinarian, and office holder; an exploration of how these authority types interrelate with the process of growing up, which is described as a process of moving from a state of dependence to independence; an attempt to clarify the relationship between authority and moral persuasion, coercion and power; a description of a "model" (better called a "table") of authority relating three authority types to various features associated with authority; a consideration of the justification of authority; etc.

There is little that is new here, and it seems to this reader at least, that the author has not provided us with a coherent *theory* of authority which is to provide the framework for an analysis of disciplinary problems, as was promised in the Preface and Chapter One.

This failure to provide an adequate account of authority and its justification is reflected in the later confusing and inconsistent treatment of patterns of authority in school-family relations. The authority of the family is seen as derived from the state (pp. 135, 100, 110). Thus, the state is seen as having the authority to initiate family-planning, and parenting programs. But, what is the basis of the authority of the state? The author fails to address this central question. Although aware of the dangers of government coercion, Rich criticizes the arguments of libertarians and community control advocates for wanting to increase parental authority and control in education, and for wanting to give parents greater freedom and choice in education. He is, however, sympathetic with increasing parental participation in the schools. He advocates a level of participation intermediate between a representative and a participatory form of democracy, the latter being identified with those advocating either community control of free schools (pp. 148f). But what is the justification for this intermediate position? If parental authority and expertise is seen as sufficient to allow them to act in an advisory or consultative capacity in education, why not allow them a greater degree of authority and control in education?

There is obviously a problem with giving parents complete authority in education because the American family is going through turbulent times (p. 142), and the public does also have an interest in the education of its citizens (pp. 143f). But are there not equally serious problems with government control of education? Is the state and are state-appointed professionals necessarily experts? Will they always have the interests of the child in mind? These and other questions need to be addressed more carefully. But they will only be adequately addressed if we first of all deal with the more basic problem of the basis for the authority of the state and the family. Although Rich seems to have promised the reader this, he fails to provide an adequate analysis of these more fundamental questions.

Discipline is the focus of chapters 4, 5, and 8. After reviewing four representative perspectives on discipline, the always popular, stern discipline model, the natural development model of Kohl, the deficiency model of Glasser and the social-literacy model of Altschuler and Paulo Freire, Rich outlines his own normative-proactive view of discipline (pp. 67ff). Rich is strongly opposed to the traditional harsh methods of discipline which he sees as involving coercion and control and thus violating student rights and falling far below his ideal of self discipline (pp. 73f, 58). Stern discipline is also described as dehumanizing (pp. 68, 75f). He is thus also opposed to corporal punishment which he associates with force, violence and child abuse (pp. 120f). In fact, Rich would like to see the state remove the legal sanctions for the use of corporal punishment (p. 124).

Instead, Rich advocates an approach where the child "would learn discipline naturally and effortlessly" (p. 67). Discipline in this approach is not something done to someone, but is "proactive" rather than passive or reactive (pp. 71, 171). It avoids problems of force and coercion because it grows out of "what is healthy, and what individuals genuinely want to do" (pp. 68, 78). What Rich seems to be talking about is self-discipline, an approach which bears some resemblance to that advocated by Rousseau or A.S. Neill.

The entire discussion of discipline is confusing because of a constant shift between two very different uses of the term discipline: disciplined or orderly behavior, self control; and treatment that is meant to correct or punish misbehavior. Rich himself makes this distinction earlier (pp. 52f). The main focus of the book, we are told at the beginning, is to explore the issue of "handling disciplinary problems," problems such as school crimes, assaults, sex offenses, drug-related crimes, etc. (pp. vii, 1). To talk about "discipline" as orderly conduct is to introduce another topic. The real question of the book is what parents and schools should do about disorderly conduct.

If it is maintained that the cure for disorderly conduct is an approach which fosters self discipline, then the recommendations of this book must be dismissed as hopelessly idealistic. Rich himself confesses that he is being idealistic: "Ideally, the failures in discipline found frequently today would be nonexistent or negligible" (p. 67). But, the ideal is nonexistent! We need a realistic approach which will correct the misbehavior and violence so prevalent in our society today. Although Rich acknowledges that "another type of analysis may be needed for school violence" (p. 78), he offers us little help in answering the question as to how to cope with these problems, except for a vague suggestion that the application of a revised "Differential Association approach" might provide a start in the way of correcting violent behavior (p. 96). In Chapter 8, entitled "Improving School Discipline," Rich does make a few specific suggestions. (It should be noted that here "discipline" is used in the more traditional sense). He suggests, for example, that rules and policies should be established, but these should be few in number and should not violate student rights (pp. 162f). The problem, however, is that Rich can say little about enforcing these rules because such enforcement would involve force, violence and punishment according to his own earlier analysis. He does analyse various objectives which sanctions might serve (pp. 163 ff), and is forced to concede that some punishment and violence might be necessary (pp. 158, 168), but this obviously contradicts his main position.

I would suggest that the idealism of the normative-proactive view of discipline with its rejection of corporal punishment rests on the familiar belief in the goodness of human nature, an assumption which is at least clearly spelled out in Rousseau and A.S. Neill. The position also seems to be grounded on a rather arbitrary association of punishment with force and violence. It further assumes that punishment causes harm and often leads to child abuse.

More generally, *Discipline and Authority in School and Family* suffers from a lack of coherence. In the opinion of this reader, the author is trying to do too much and thus touches on too many topics and surveys too many theories. What is needed is a broader philosophical framework in which basic presuppositions are clearly spelled out. This would provide a basis for integrating various theories and providing a coherent approach to disipline and authority in the family and in schools.

Elmer John Thiessen
Medicine Hat College

Friesen, John W. *Schools With a Purpose.* Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Limited, 1983, 142 pp. $10.95.

Those who know John Friesen's book *Schools as a Medium of Culture* (Ginn Custom Publishing, 1981) will be familiar with much of the material in *Schools With a Purpose.* The case studies Friesen uses to make his points are identical in both books. Indeed, the central thesis is the same for both