

“Hobart” and “Launceston and Northeast” are two of the regions, rarely seen as such in books that (generally, far less adequately) refer to Tasmania’s areal patterns. The concluding chapter briefly relates the island to other areas, both near and far. In format and detail, Tasmania suggests that the authors together have an acute understanding of, and sensitivity toward, a wide variety of approaches to geographical study and teaching.

If it is a reviewer’s purpose to point out faults, in the case of this book only petty matters can be noted. These include the absence of coloured photographs; the infrequent “telling” of the reader concepts or facts that may be discerned directly from the wealth of mapped and pictorial illustration presented; and the imprecise interchangeability of the terms “map” and “diagram” (cf. Figs. 1/14 and 1/15). Such comments as these should be discounted for Tasmania is that rare example of a school geography text which can have many useful applications.

The comprehensive methodological insight of Tasmania has value for any student or practising geography teacher wherever he be serving. The book’s content is worthy of consideration in a course on the regional geography of Australia at any level of the education process. Hopefully, too, the use of Tasmania in Canada will not be confined to teachers’ reference shelves. Class sets of the book should be available in any classroom where Australia is treated in the secondary school curriculum.

John H. Wise
Lakehead University


This book contains fifty individually-authored essays on a variety of education systems (six on the major areas of the world and forty-four on separate countries). The regions included range from the expected (U.S.A., U.S.S.R.), to the unusual (New Guinea, Cuba, Upper Volta), to the exotic (Sheikdoms and Principalities of the Persian Gulf and Arabian Peninsular). The data presented are largely at the level of information, since the essays were written in response to the editor’s question: “What would you say to an intelligent layman from another nation if he asked you to tell him about the main points in the history of education in your country, a description of education now, and what influences seem likely to shape it in the foreseeable future?”

Obviously, there are formidable technical problems in producing a book of this kind and the editor in his preface challenges the critic to call the quality of the essays “uneven.” However, rather than attempt to deal with fifty papers in one brief review, it is preferable to focus on a
few well-known countries. On this basis, the verdict has to be “dated.” Though the book bears a 1970 imprint, the internal evidence suggests that the chapter on Canada was written around 1964. Anyone who thinks Canadian education is static would be amazed to find how many changes have been made in the last few years. Statements that have been true for centuries are no longer valid, e.g. “collèges classiques . . . still offer almost the sole academic entry to the French-speaking universities of Canada” (p. 285; see also pp. 293-4). No mention at all is made of Quebec’s CEGEP’s. Similarly, the chapter on USSR deals with the 1958 reform and the eleven-year school, but does not mention the 1964 reversion to the ten-year program. The editor’s own chapter on the USA is also simplistic and stale.

One wonders whether the end product was worth the editorial effort and frustration.


If you are looking for a Christmas gift for a pedagogue, here it is — a wry collection of insights deftly presented in the guise of definitions. Flip through this “dictionary,” stop at any page and you will come to amusingly cynical comments on the educational scene. There are some good ones under “B” for example. Take “B” itself:

“To an optimist, a grade just below A; to a pessimist, a grade just above C. Considered by the registrar the equivalent of Good, though instructors who give nothing higher consider it Excellent and those who give nothing lower consider it a Bare Pass. Professors who give all B’s are invulnerable. Unlike those who give all A’s, they are not criticized for being too easy and letting down standards. Yet they never have to justify a C, D, or F to a complaining student or parent.”

Across the page, you’ll find a nice comment on scholarly phoniness under “Bibliography”:

“A list of books placed at the end of a term paper to impress the teacher. Not included is the one book the student actually used, probably the Encyclopaedia Britannica.”

Richard Armour, who has an impeccable academic background, including a Harvard Ph.D., is to be thanked for his fortieth book. This is one of his most entertaining satires on teaching.

Margaret Gillett
McGill