Luke, C. (1989). *Pedagogy, printing and protestantism: The discourse on childhood.* Albany: State University of New York Press, 172 pp., $12.95 (softcover).

If a book should be judged on the merit of what it attempts (rather than on its execution), then this book warrants acclamation. In presenting a kind of Foucauldian analysis of how many of our contemporary ideas about childhood came to be constructed historically, the book provides an important counter to much of the de-contextualized cant inhabiting public debate about educational issues today.

As the book makes clear, many of our most salient contemporary preoccupations found their genesis in 16th century Protestant convergences regarding the nature of the individual, the role of the school in education for democratic citizenship, and, perhaps most important as far as Carmen Luke is concerned, how printing technologies shaped pedagogy and childrearing.

Luke begins with a critique of the standard "history of childhood" literature. For example, the (in)famous Aries thesis that the West had no formal concept of childhood before the 16th century is shown to be based on exceedingly elitist and culturally specific (French) documentary sources. The psychohistory school of Erikson and DeMause, the heuristic aim of which is to show the correlation of personality characteristics with generalized cultural characteristics, is faulted for being unable to account for how economic and social factors mediate people's lives.

Luke's approach is to apply Foucault's "threefold field of delimitation" in examining the emergence of childhood as a "discourse." As such, she is not interested in children per se, but in the constellation of conditions out of which children come to be thought about and planned for in particular ways. According to Foucault, (à la Luke), the field within which objects of study can emerge is ordered through three basic levels of information: (1) the surface of emergence (the social historical, political, and cultural "site" where an object first appears); (2) authorities of delimitation (institutions and professional persons empowered to code and interpret knowledge); and (3) grids of specification (the system according to which the objects under study are divided, contrasted, related, regrouped, and classified).

Transposing this "field of delimitation" onto the emergence of childhood as a discourse takes Luke in a number of different directions. In the 16th century the development of printing as a communicative technology was a formative feature in the development of a textual and institutional discourse on pedagogical practices and the ideas held about childhood. This was particularly true in Germany (Catholic France originally sought to suppress the printing press) where Luther's Augustinianism valorized notions of the individual and personal

responsibility while at the same time upholding an essentially negative view of human nature. Luther's pessimism (especially after the chaos of the Peasant's Revolt of 1525) inspired the writing of innumerable tracts, pamphlets and books on education, family life, pedagogy, and child rearing as a way of introducing a new form of public discipline in the face of the breakdown of an old order. Public schooling came to be universally regarded by Protestant reformers as a necessary precondition for socio-religious change, providing the means for inculcating children with Christian morals and values while teaching them to read and write, in preparation for citizenship within a new Christian social dispensation.

As Luke would have it, then, the modern discourse about childhood in the West received its primary character from the convergence of two events: the rise of a new "text-centered religion of individualism" (p. 135) coupled with a new kind of public education, itself disciplined by a public culture-of-the-text rather than by the old established ecclesiastical authority. Printing also made possible a new kind of public debate about childhood itself as a social category so that in the Reformation period there can be seen the early signs of the later, more familiar to us, child study movement.

As a reviewer, it's probably good to feel a bit uneasy about summarizing someone else's work. The possibilities for misrepresentation are legion. In this case, however, a little self-satisfaction may be warranted. For the reader, the book suffers from irritating flaws of organization and coherence, with repetitiveness and frequent restatement not helping much with those difficulties. In fact, the regular use of "my purpose here is to . . ." gives a sense of the writer's own struggle to hold together a large and often difficult-to-manage range of material. But for me, this doesn't detract from the overall importance and value of the work. It reminds me of a good graduate thesis (which I understand it is): a little wild and stumbling in execution, but bold and courageous in conception. It opens up a number of important topics that deserve fuller attention.

For one thing, the book helps us understand why the whole enterprise of public education in the West seems intractably stuck as a text-ridden venture: why the public so often feels that nothing is really happening in schools unless books are at the center of everything and why curriculum reform usually ends with the re-writing of textbooks. This is in spite of the fact that most children's experience of the world today is iconic and random rather than print-based and linear-sequential; and in spite of the fact that moral and ethical development in young people is not necessarily a conceptual, intellectual achievement or a matter of simple cognition, but rather involves a profoundly embodied response to life in all its variegation and depth. To stretch the Luke thesis, public education today remains a text-ridden enterprise because text-guidedness and vulgar understandings of literacy remain our primary form of social discipline.

In the manner of Marshall McLuhan or Walter Ong, one might speculate on the ways in which a strong orientation to the printed word has shaped our collective psyche, some of which are not very flattering. The production of hyper-individualism (reading is inevitably a solitary activity) and the tendency to abstract an understanding of anything from its situated ground by transforming it into a form of literal information, might be two examples. Creative reform in education, then, must inevitably involve an exploration of the question of discipline itself (its phenomenological character and positive value in the formation of persons) rather than a preoccupation with literacy per se. We need to formulate pedagogy proposals that attend to other ways by which human beings learn to achieve a sense of the social good.

David G. Smith
University of Lethbridge

Johnson, L. & O'Neill, C. (Eds.); (1984, reprint 1991). *Dorothy Heathcote: Collected writings on education and drama.* Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 218 pp., $12.95 (softcover) / $34.95 (hardcover).

Creative drama, whether it is referred to as developmental drama, educational drama, or drama in education, is a powerful learning medium which is often confused with the art form "theater." Both have their roots in role plays of different personae, but they differ in purpose. A public performance need not exist in creative drama. Through this type of playful exploration participants have the potential to see the human situation anew and this alone is of educational worth. Creative drama may remain at the private level with the intent of understanding self and others through role play. This difference from theater has sparked many educational debates about whether the purpose of drama in the schools is to teach the art form or to enhance the teaching of all subjects from language arts and social studies to biology and law.

In fact, these are two legitimate and often complementary approaches. As an art form, theater can shed light on ways of using and refining creative drama in the classroom while the use of creative drama can lead to the development of scripts which can provide powerful rehearsal tools for actors. Creative Drama helps students to understand the process of discovering and creating their own personal voice, the way journals do in language arts. Students do much writing which is not intended for a public forum and the same is true of creative drama. To take the analogy even further, creative drama is to creative writing as the study of literature is to the study of theater. There is the practicing for self and there is the study of those in the public eye. With enough practice and interest