

obviously intending. A third omission is his neglect of the key role of socialization in all this – and thus the need for a disciplined, knowledge-based educational process. These points aside, however, I can agree with Wilson's major conclusions, especially his focus on the overriding urgency of solving the problem of population expansion, and the importance of the search for principles of consilience in knowledge.

Pat Duffy Hutcheon
Vancouver, British Columbia

Pat Duffy Hutcheon is the author of a number of books including *A Sociology of Canadian Education* (1975), *Leaving the Cave* (1996), and *Building Character and Culture* (1999).

Vogt, W. P. (1997). *Tolerance and education: Learning to live with diversity and difference*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc., 289 pp., (Softcover).

This detailed scholarly investigation of current and past research clearly delineates a pedagogically viable correlation between education and tolerance levels. According to the author cultivating and nurturing tolerant attitudes and beliefs is a necessary precondition for sustaining a pluralist and egalitarian society. This well-written text systematically explores and critically evaluates current and past research and provides statistics that together serve to redirect academic interest about the practical implications for developing the skills and understanding required to promote tolerance within educational contexts. The book therefore seeks to develop the skills and understanding required to guard against discrimination and injustice. In addition, it raises important issues about future lines of inquiry and methods of assessment to determine the environmental and personal factors that can ensure growth in

tolerance. To the author's credit, the study is more than a collection of facts and figures to substantiate the links between schooling and social, political, and moral tolerance, but also delineates significant limitations which affect attempts to measure tolerance levels and their multiple correlates.

One may divide the text into three sections which progressively expand on the author's central arguments regarding the correlations between education and the refinement of tolerant traits. In the first section, Professor Vogt explores the denotative and connotative functions of the concept of tolerance, and provides a historical survey of the semantic evolutions of the term within specific social, political, religious, and cultural contexts. Tolerance itself is defined as an "intentional self-restraint" when confronted with something, or someone, that one dislikes, objects to, feels threatened by, or has a negative attitude toward, so as to maintain a social or political group or to promote harmony in a group (p. 3). The author then defines three forms of tolerance (political, moral, and social) that can be nurtured on an educational basis. He classifies individuals tolerant as either exhibiting a personality trait, reflecting a disposition to act favourably or unfavourably toward someone or something, possessing a belief or commitment to support equal rights under constitutional law, or refraining from discrimination. In the second section of the book, Vogt examines *indirect* processes of socialization and learning (such as personality development and cognitive development), and *direct* forms of instruction and social interactions (such as intergroup contact and civic, moral, and multicultural education) to clarify ways in which schooling might influence the development of different categories of tolerance. The author ends his text with recommendations for educational programs and pedagogical strategies to encourage the acquisition of tolerance skills and understanding. He provides suggestions for further research to uncover sociological and intelligence factors which could contribute to the advancement of tolerant traits and attitudes.

Although the author presents strong arguments to substantiate the social and political merits of educating for tolerance, he neglects to describe the processes by which tolerant attitudes or dispositions eventually evolve into an acceptable and desirable moral ethos which determines actions to be taken so as to resolve conflicts between individuals and groups within a given population. Here, I think, is a

point, where further elaboration is needed. It is one thing to define tolerance as a minimal "procedural value" (p. 24) for dealing with divisive issues and conflicting opinions – it is quite another to suggest that a tolerant orientation is a fundamental moral good to be inculcated because it inevitably secures and ensures just, equitable, and responsible resolutions to interpersonal and inter-communal conflicts. Since the author himself does not make this conclusion, the issue remains of whether or not a tolerant individual necessarily possesses the kind of moral sensibility and knowledge to deal with conflicting parties and social groups in a responsible and morally responsive manner.

Interestingly, the author initially suggests that tolerance in and of itself can not be regarded as a substantive value, such as compassion or care, and then avers that it is *the* only fundamental value that functions to limit acceptable options when dealing with conflicting value priorities within pluralistic societies. If that is the case, the author would have helped his argument significantly if he had attempted to elaborate on those common moral grounds by which values could be ranked and reinforced within tolerant cultures, and thus to identify desirable ethical frameworks that need to be nurtured for the preservation of a civilized and just polity. The correlational links between a tolerant populace and a more ethically responsible/responsive social order need to be clearly established both empirically and theoretically, which is an issue the author neglects to address in his conceptual analysis of tolerance.

Furthermore, the text itself would have benefitted from some concrete examples or anecdotal testimonies that illustrate how curricula and pedagogical strategies have been used to foster and promote tolerant attitudes, beliefs, or behaviours within specific classroom circumstances. Although the author refers briefly to a tolerance curriculum that was implemented in several Minnesota high schools in the early 1990s, he makes little use of actual case studies from this program to describe how individual students' perceptions and attitudes were influenced because of their exposure to the subject matter. I think that several references throughout the text to specific learning situations that depict the manner in which teaching and intergroup socialization seem to nurture more tolerant dispositions over a period of time would have complemented the

substantial statistical data the author cites to support his observations.

John Basourakos
McGill University