

## Reviews

developing a strong moral sense and hopefully some amount of aesthetic awareness. How are these to be taught in Illich's new framework? Do we allow the student to choose *not* to learn these things? Or to learn them from anyone he pleases? Has society no stake in all of this?

I have the feeling that Illich does not discuss such primary components of learning because his system presupposes them. That is, he presupposes that people are capable of making intelligent choices and that the only real problem is that of increased accessibility and communication. I submit that the equipping of persons for intelligent choice is the first problem and that it can still be best accomplished through the schools. Rather than disestablish schools, therefore, we should be *re-establishing* them, taking a fresh (and critical) look at what they are for and how we can best accomplish their objectives.

This attempt to re-define objectives is a solid opportunity for bringing together the interested parties (students, teachers, parents, politicians) and letting them see that the institution is meant to serve not to manipulate. With some agreement on objectives, the next task would be to decide how one can measure attainment of them and then to open up for students the time, means, personnel, and occasions for learning. Perhaps a set of exams could be set and the students allowed to prepare in any way they see fit, so long as they can pass. This would encourage autonomous learning while preserving the primary components of learning. Passing such exams could well be followed by use of one of Illich's new channels for further learning.

Illich likes to compare the impending demise of schools with that of the Church, and suggests that for both institutions the time has come. I prefer to look for a possible reformation that would retain the essential purpose of the institution (i.e. the schools should

convey the primary components of learning), while doing away with the outmoded framework. What is needed in the schools (and likely in the Church as well) is a manipulation of the institution by the clients. To be effective this requires communication and informed use of things, skills, and persons. All of which could well precede, but certainly cannot be replaced by the new channels of learning Illich proposes.

Brian Hendley  
University of Waterloo

Anthony Burton.

THE HORN AND  
THE BEANSTALK:  
PROBLEMS AND  
POSSIBILITIES  
IN CANADIAN EDUCATION

Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and  
Winston, 1972.

Anthony Burton's is a happy book. To read it is to feel the genuineness of the author's excitement and optimism about humanity and his insistence that an increasingly technocratized Canada can be rehumanized. In some ways it calls to mind Theodore Brameld's notions of cultural renaissance and the part education might play in the dynamics of social change. *The Horn* is happy too because of its immensely personal literary style which occasionally, at least, approaches the poetic and in so doing excels much of the rad-chic lit of the past few years.

Burton has tasted of the Cuenavaca mushroom and had a high from it; and yet *The Horn* and *The Beanstalk* is fundamentally where most of us are: in Canada and the 1970's. He writes of Reimer, Reich, and Roszak in a sensitive but unfawning way. One

may observe in Professor Burton's work the influences of the late Paul Goodman's anarchism and the socialist humanism of Erich Fromm. The reformers of the Kohl, Dennison, Kozol ilk are there too.

It may well be that because Burton's is an eclectic philosophy of life and education, *The Horn* will be dismissed by ideologues of all shades. Still, one of the most challenging aspects of the book is the author's ability to provide more than an explanation of Paulo Freire's Marxist conception of *praxis* in education. Burton's involvement with the X-Kalay Foundation and with the Lyceum (a Winnipeg "free school") give ample testimony of his ability to make the leap from thought to action. Few of us in the world of academia ever try!

The range of "Problems and Possibilities" is too great to be even hinted at in this review. Perhaps an explanation of the metaphors in the title will suggest the general thrust of the work. The "Horn" is the cornucopia, the technocracy we've too uncritically accepted as both inevitable and a positive good. Burton reminds us that if we couldn't get to heaven in a model T, a '73 Imperial serves the purpose no better, that the nirvana which consumerism promises is as remote as ever. And so it is with the rapid growth of "ed bizz", the "Beanstalk," which likewise promises, but can't deliver. Tony Burton announces that if ordinary people are to free themselves from the seductiveness of the horn and the smothering embrace of the beanstalk, the struggle must begin now. And the schools may be the ideal place to begin the fight.

Even for those of us unwilling to take up the cudgels for personal liberation and social change, *The Horn and The Beanstalk* will provide an encounter with a creative response to problems which should be of concern to all.

Morton Bain  
McGill University

Everett Reimer.

SCHOOL IS DEAD

New York:

Doubleday & Co., 1971.

Though inappropriately and rather sensationally titled, Mr. Reimer's book is a thoughtful and sincere, if uneven, work. As another of the publications which had its genesis in the CIDOC seminars of Cuernavaca, Mexico, in essence it is similar to Illich's *De-Schooling Society and Celebration of Awareness*. The message is clear — technology has encompassed human individuality, destroyed initiative and perverted man's values. The school is the perpetuator of this state of affairs by its elitist tendencies, authoritarian and bureaucratic nature and coercive tendencies. Ringing very close to the educational criticisms of Paul Goodman's *Compulsory Mis-Education* and Jules Henry's *Culture Against Man*, Reimer states: "Schools treat people and knowledge the way a technological world treats everything, as if they could be processed." Continuing with arguments similar to Holt, A. S. Neill, or Jonathan Kozol, on the conforming, repressive and soul-destroying effects of schooling, Reimer concludes: "Contradictions in the world are best illustrated by the school and best corrected by freeing education from the school so that people may learn the truth about the society in which they live." To correct the unequal distribution of educational opportunity Reimer suggests that nations think in terms of educational networks which free men from compulsory schooling, that funds be diverted from public schooling to the student himself in the form of educational credit and that teachers compete for