

REVIEWS

M. Belok, O. R. Bontrager, H. C. Oswalt, Mary S. Morris, E. A. Erickson. *Approaches to Values in Education*. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1966. xi, 322 pp.

Four contributors to this volume are members of Arizona State University, and E. A. Erickson is of U.S. Naval Personnel Research Activity. The book is a sequel to *Scientific Foundations of Education* and *Psychological Foundations of Education*, all intended for undergraduates preparing to teach. The present work maintains that in the process of learning to express himself in language, man has gained the ability to evaluate. This is taken to be an essential characteristic of man in consequence of which the inculcation of values must be seriously considered an important function of education. Not that the authors intend to dogmatize. Their method is historical and admirably objective, as Dr. Thomas Weiss points out in his Foreword (p. ix). Yet the main thrust throughout is that it is the democratic values which are to be fostered: "the school's role is to transmit the democratic heritage . . . and foster democratic personality" (M. Belok, p. 186). Possibly it is only an educational text-book written in the United States which would state this so baldly. The democratic

values are well defined in the Foreword (p. x). However, the frank discussion of control of the schools by M. Belok in Chapter 7 shows that the American teacher may frequently start with a handicap in teaching democratic ideals to his pupils.

The most interesting chapters are those on "Traditional Values," Anglo-Saxon and French-Latin (H. C. Oswalt), and Greek and Judaic-Christian (apparently anonymous). But they include some very questionable statements. Here the reader must seize the opportunity of using his critical powers, for example on such sentences as "To view Plato (or Aristotle . . .) or the Greek experience in general critically means that we cull from them those suggestions and theories that appear good to us and reject the rest" (p. 57); and "It was also Suleiman who perfected a civil service long before such a thing was dreamed of in the West" (p. 60). What of the civil service of the Roman Empire? A critical eye should be cast also on the suggestions that the Hebraic concept of God is closer to Aristotle's Unmoved Mover than to "the Renaissance

concept of an old man with a long, white beard" (p. 70) and that Paul of Tarsus tended to see sex as the chief agency of the Devil (p. 75). What is said of the New England Puritans on p. 75 must also be taken cautiously.

An excellent chapter by H. C. Oswalt on "Humanistic Values" discusses Rousseau, Herbart and John Dewey, and weighs the pros and cons of emphasising psychological values (child-centered school) and social values (community-centered school). His succeeding chapter, "Values Stressed in Post-Dewey Philosophies of Education" discusses educational theories derived from various types of Realism, Idealism and Existentialism. The final chapters on "Moral and Spiritual Values in the Schools," "Creativity," "Character Development" and "Concepts of Character Formation" are likely to be very helpful, but the stud-

ies of Comenius, Durkheim, Makarenko (the Soviet Dr. Spock), Dewey, Riesman, and Jacques Maritain (appearing as 'Maritian' in the text and 'Martian' in the Index!) are too condensed to be entirely lucid.

The writers are to be commended for a vigorous and refreshingly sincere effort to help the teacher in training grip the question of the aim of education. The volume is, however, uneven in several respects: lucidity, sustaining of interest, grammar, and occasionally spelling (e.g. *skepticism* and *sceptecism* are both offered on p. 38). There are many misprints, some of them serious (e.g. *follows* for *allows*, p. 265).

A useful feature is the provision at the end of each chapter of a summary, discussion questions, exercises and bibliography.

Eric G. Jay
Faculty of Divinity

F. R. Wake. *Family Life Education: Dating and Sex Behaviour-Adolescence*. 3 records and manual; ages 11 to 13, 14 and 15, 16+; 33 1/3 rpm, 22 min. per side; McGraw Hill, 1967.

"My views are old fashioned," says Dr. Wake in discussing dating. They are indeed. He believes that one-to-one dating should not begin until after age 16. He believes that parents have the ultimate responsibility for the education of their children, and that "they must select, over-

see, interpret, and modify the information reaching their children." Moreover, he believes that "neither a boy nor a girl is supposed to have pre-marital sex relations."

However, he is not old fashioned in his willingness to discuss with children in a frank