A new book by Professor Butts rates more than passing interest, for no other reason than his popular *A Cultural History of Western Education* has long been a mainstay among history of education textbooks. Declaring his latest effort a successor rather than a revision of his earlier work, he does not waver in the belief that educational history must be viewed in the context of general history. Calling his approach that of civilization building, Professor Butts offers a voluminous study that, while anchored in European and American education, gives greater attention to educational developments in heretofore neglected areas: pre-Greco cultures; Latin America; and Africa. The net result is a praiseworthy attempt to expand the historical treatment of learning in the West and to bring into play the new research findings of social scientists and others.

So ably written and impressive in range is Butts’ magnum opus that at first glance the book appears to be without serious flaws. A closer look reveals the contrary. The reader soon discovers that the author is guilty of “encyclopedism,” of laying before the reader every conceivable educational and cultural happening that has transpired since the dawn of civilization. Were not Professor Butts’ pen so facile, he might be suspected of impersonating Isidore of Seville. This is to point out that despite moments of superior scholarship, the overall effect of the book is disappointing. Quite simply the author fails, as he did in his earlier work, to establish a meaningful link between social and educational history. Too often, social events are paraded before the reader where they stand in not so splendid isolation to educational developments. The upshot is that Butts has written not one but two books: a survey of general history and one of organized education.

To his credit, the author undertook an almost impossible task: simultaneously considering the history of civilization and learning in the West in comprehensive fashion. That he failed to effect the coup is less a stain on his not inconsiderable abilities than on the assignment confronting him. Professor Butts’ book is certainly deserving of respect; whether it is deserving of high praise awaits a larger forum.

Roger Magnuson
McGill University

In many ways this is a praiseworthy and valuable book. It combines in a single volume the scholarly endeavors of several American and Indian social scientists; and, with only minor exceptions, the contributions are of high quality and direct relevance to the theme of education and politics. In other ways, which I shall attempt to demonstrate as well, it is a disappointment.

The dual purpose of the work is, first, “to identify critical problems in the relationship between politics and education generally and to explore concepts and methods for their investigation” and, sec-
ond, "to make a specific contribution to our understanding of the relationships between politics and education in India." (p. viii) In terms of the latter, substantive goal the editors and contributors deserve full marks. For the former theoretical aim, however, their reach has unfortunately and inevitably exceeded their grasp. As the Rudolphs candidly admit with reference to their particular study, the anticipated findings "either had not occurred, had occurred only marginally or had more complex meanings and ambiguous effects than we had anticipated." (pp. 268-9) Those who peruse this work for contributions to theory or hypotheses for further related studies must content themselves with a fuller understanding of politicization as it relates to Indian education.

In spite of the contributors' success in clarifying the concept of politicization and the efforts of the editors in Part I ("The Political System and the Educational System: An Analysis of their Interaction") to provide an appropriate background for understanding the ensuing studies, the book can only be recommended for Indian specialists. While it is neither as complex nor tendentious as the Rudolphs' earlier book, The Modernity of Tradition: Political Development in India, it contains too much esoterica to commend it to the general student.

In Part II, "Educational Institutions in Their Social and Political Environment," Harold Gould examines the ways in which the schools are used by politicians to abet their efforts to gain and hold public office. Typically, this is accomplished by founding private secondary schools, thus gaining the support of families whose prospects for further education are thereby enhanced. This is a particularly significant article in that it uncovers in clear and accurate detail an aspect of Indian education which is usually taken for granted by Indian authors and overlooked by foreign observers, namely, the preponderance of private control of secondary education.

In an article which complements Gould's, T. N. Madan and B. G. Halbar report on their research in the State of Mysore which reveals the discriminatory effects resulting from the private character of secondary education. The authors believe that the failure of the schools to bring the classes, castes, and religious communities of neighborhoods or localities together in a common educational setting impedes modernization, since it fails to promote social and national integration. They advocate strict control of private enterprise in the field of education at the state level as a means of fostering equality and integration.

Iqbal Narain provides an all too rare view of rural primary education. Although his findings regarding the effects of placing such schools under decentralized, local management (panchayati raj), as opposed to being under the Rajasthani State Department of Education, are inconclusive, the author should be credited for raising an even more fundamental problem, that of the adaptation of the school to its particular local environment.

Part III, "The Political Dimensions of University Government," consists of three essays centering on the issue of autonomy. Irene A. Gilbert's study of three colleges under the raj, a period "when autonomy was easier to achieve" and "British professors were left relatively free in their colleges" (p. 171), provides an effective counterpoint to the contemporary studies which suggest that a new definition of the university is aborning as a result of profound political changes and public pressures.

Perhaps no other university in India better exemplifies the new directions and definitions in Indian higher education than Maharaja
Sayajirao University of Baroda. In a thorough and searching essay, the Rudolphs, assisted by Joan Landy Erdman and Janet Guthrie, examine the effects of the various and often conflicting internal and external environments on the university. Carolyn M. Elliott in her study of Osmania University explores the problem of autonomy as manifested in the case of the Rajasthan State Legislature’s efforts to attain greater control over the university. Elliott goes beyond the issue of autonomy and raises the question as to whether in fact the Indian university is contributing to the goals of national development in ways which are consistent with its resources.

In light of recent analyses and criticisms of formal education, one might question whether it is sufficient to merely raise the issue of the societal benefits derived from education. Although the Rudolphs protest that they are “uneasy about too romantic [sic] or purist a view of The University [in capitals] as the seat of a universal intellectual ideal and the guardian of ultimate concerns” (p. 231), they and their fellow contributors, particularly in Part III, subscribe too readily to the notion that what benefits the university or the educational system will be good for the society, and little or no attempt is made to assess the impact of education on the social or political order.

Part IV, entitled “Professional Constraints on Politicization of Education,” contains two largely unrelated essays. The first by Irene A. Gilbert, which might have more appropriately appeared in the introductory section, provides an interesting account of the Indian Educational Services during the period from 1864 to 1924. The final essay by Paul R. Brass presents an intriguing and significant analysis of the politics of Ayurvedic education. His treatment of the conflict between Ayurvedic and modern medicine raises perhaps the most pervasive and profound question of all. Can there be an effective integration of the traditional and modern elements of Indian society in the realm of education?

While Education and Politics in India contributes to our knowledge and understanding of the subject and does it well, there is much more of greater significance that we need to know. Especially in view of the Rudolphs’ previous contribution to the problem of development, it is regrettable that more light was not shed on the theoretical questions surrounding tradition and modernity and the practical problem of what education is most appropriate and how it can be provided.

John Lipkin
McGill University

Thomas J. Ryan.
POVERTY AND THE CHILD: A CANADIAN STUDY.

This study contains the contributions of several writers who examine the impact of the early environment on the disadvantaged child. It suggests that economic poverty, being a major cause of deprivation, is common to those groups whose attitudes and achievements diverge from those of the middle-class. It also examines the differences between the disadvantaged child and his middle-class counterpart and attempts to suggest ways in which some of the problems of poverty may be reduced. The key recommendation is for a policy of “early intervention,” by which is meant the establishment of preschool programs for children and parents from poverty backgrounds.

This is an interesting study in that poverty is viewed in the Canadian context. Many of the problems are unique to Canada and the lack of relevant research is emphasized. The authors do not