

Had the state been developed to its proper point, Edison should have been working in a university and not for his own and other's personal gain; Luther Burbank would have been stimulating colleagues and students by his observations; . . . Marconi should have been developed in his practical applications as he had been in his theoretical knowledge by a university. (p. 39).

Obviously, Wesbrook had not been infected while in Germany by the spirit of disinterested learning, of *Lern- und Lehrfreiheit*, which the German universities hoped to embody. His university would provide facilities for thoroughly interested teaching and research. Another question: Did the commitment to provincial development explain why Wesbrook was so close a friend of H. R. MacMillan and Leon Ladner, both industrial barons of early British Columbia?

One wonders how different Wesbrook was from his counterparts at the Universities of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. One wonders, too, if his commitment to a provincially supported secular university meant that the benefits of institutions like St. Michael's College (now in the University of Toronto) and St. Thomas More College (University of Saskatchewan) could never be realized in British Columbia. Did he pay any attention to the model of the Scottish universities or to the experience of the Eastern Canadian universities?

At several points Gibson speaks of Wesbrook's inclination to "overdo" everything, whether it be study, teaching, administration or athletics. His energies were spoken of as "compelling," even during Wesbrook's lifetime. Gibson neglects to ask still another important question: why was Wesbrook a driven man? Was it religious conviction? Was it moral fervor? Or was Wesbrook so deeply a part of the international advance of science that his commitment to academic life and scientific work allowed him no rest? Unfortunately, there is no way to answer these questions on the basis of Gibson's biography. Since he has given so little indication of the extent and the nature of the evidence with which he dealt during his research, Gibson prevents his readers even from deciding whether there will *ever* be grounds for answering these questions.

Still, this beautifully printed and bound book may have done the very best service it could, for it has piqued the historical curiosity of one reader at least, and it has begun the job of giving a university an historical personality.

William A. Bruneau

University of British Columbia

Famum Gray &
George Mager.
LIBERATING EDUCATION:
PSYCHOLOGICAL LEARNING
THROUGH
IMPROVISATIONAL DRAMA.

Berkeley:
McCutchan, 1973.
202 pp. \$8.95.

This book presents a convincing case for improvisational drama as a method of teaching. The authors employ improvisation for therapy; but this is *not* psychodrama.

The book's excellence lies in the honest and imaginative approach of its authors. The actual experi-

ence of the drama classes is vividly communicated, and any careful reader who has remained keenly aware of his students or used improvisational methods in the classroom, must gain insights from the facts presented.

Gray and Mager start by agreeing that the difficulty of education by direct experience is that you cannot measure it; then go on to do just that,

This intelligent and sensitive boy learned a great deal about people in the course, and outgrew his initial fear of movement to become one of the most abandoned dancers. (p. 142)

Reviews

This kind of statement might bring howls from the unconverted such as "Do we really want to encourage boys to become 'abandoned dancers'?" My answer is, "Yes, we do" — if this "frees" the dancer and opens the way to fuller living.

Gray and Mager claim that,

Our purpose in teaching is to afford people opportunities to develop their human capacities fully. Our approach and premises are based on theories of developmental psychology. (p. 4).

I have myself used improvisational drama as a tool in exploring the possibilities of education through art. This in no way detracted from the developmental aspects of drama — but augmented them. In *Liberating Education* the emphasis is on therapy by means of 3-way psychological learning: teacher/student; student/student; and student with himself. All possible combinations of relationship are explored and the excerpts from both tapes and journals show that the students were enriched by this exploration of themselves and their environment.

The authors succeed in their presentation of principles, techniques and experiences, to demonstrate the vast possibilities developmental drama opens up. The capabilities of students are so often in question that it is exhilarating to read a book by human beings who realize how pitifully seldom during their school years most students' inner resources and abilities are called upon. "Never underestimate your pupils" is the unspoken maxim of this book, which contains detailed examples, techniques, aims and concrete facts enough to keep several dramatic workshops going for years. The book is clear and easy to read. For me, it is marred only by its ambiguous and pretentious-sounding title which seems to be a contradiction of the Boleslavsky adage, "The object of education is not to know but to live." (p. 1)

Education is a process, not some

static thing somehow imprisoned. However, once one understands that the title comes from the remark of a clinical psychologist, "A liberating education" (p. 2)—that is, a freeing method — the title then does justice to the book.

Paddy Hearsey
McGill University

Margaret Gillett &
John Laska, eds.
FOUNDATIONS STUDIES
IN EDUCATION:
JUSTIFICATION AND
NEW DIRECTIONS.
Metuchen, N.J.:
The Scarecrow Press, 1973.
423 pp. \$10.00.

Ordinary mortals, writes Prof. Gillett, can count on two inevitables, death and taxes; teacher trainees may depend on three — death, taxes, and History of Education. You could add Educational Sociology, Philosophy, and other constants whose enduring presence in education faculty calendars seems to indicate that a teacher ignorant of Ryerson, Durkheim, or Plato is no teacher at all.

Foundations Studies in Education seeks first to justify these inevitables through offering some good essays by writers like Maxine Greene, Wayne J. Urban, and Margaret Gillett herself in order to identify what teachers-to-be might expect to learn from the so-called foundations. The book serves a second, different purpose, however. In the 60's, foundations scholars saw fit to ally themselves closely with corresponding disciplines in Faculty of Arts departments. Conversely, the editors of *Foundations Studies* . . . ask "whether or not foundations of education are worthy of being considered an independent study," and, by implication, propose the American Educational Studies Association as the appropriate body for helping to bring about this self-sufficiency. To borrow Prof. Gillett's image, this is both bad and good news.

First the bad news. Books stemming from self-conscious debate