

**I. A. Snook.**

**INDOCTRINATION AND  
EDUCATION.**

**London:**

**Routledge and Kegan Paul,  
1972.**

**118 pp. \$3.35.**

Teachers, especially those in controversial subject areas, are often liable to charges of indoctrination. More often than not, such charges are based on no more than thinly disguised disapproval of what these teachers are teaching. Disapproving of what is going on is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for identifying something as a case of indoctrination. Does the teaching of religion or morality necessarily involve indoctrination? Can we avoid indoctrination when we are teaching very young children? What differences, if any, are there between indoctrination and propaganda, conditioning, and brainwashing? We cannot begin to answer these questions until we have a firm concept of indoctrination.

Snook reduces some of the ambiguity surrounding our understanding of indoctrination. He critically examines several plausible criteria for identifying indoctrination, presents what he takes to be an adequate analysis of the concept, and relates this analysis to the teaching of morals, politics, and religion.

The central argument of the book is that the logically necessary and sufficient conditions for indoctrination are found in the intentions of the teacher: not in his methods, not in the content of his teaching, not in the effects of his teaching on his pupils. For Snook, a teacher is indoctrinating his pupils only if he teaches a proposition and intends to have the pupils come to believe that proposition regardless of the evidence. Therefore, indoctrination is not necessarily restricted to areas such as religion, morality and politics; it may go on even when one is teaching physics. The important question for teaching religious, moral, and political beliefs is whether such beliefs can be supported by evidence

How adequate is Snook's account? Suppose a teacher of literature is try-

ing to persuade students to believe his interpretation of a particular work, although his views are disputed by others equally competent. The teacher makes no serious effort to consider opposing views. When asked, he denies that he intends to get students to believe his interpretation regardless of the evidence, claiming that his views are the only ones which the evidence supports. Although his intention does not fulfill what Snook says is a necessary condition, I think most people would agree that the teacher is indoctrinating his students.

To overcome such a counter-example, Snook distinguishes between weak and strong intentions. A person intends (in the strong sense) to bring about a state of affairs when he wants to bring it about. A person intends (in the weak sense) to bring about a state of affairs when he ought to be able to foresee that state of affairs as a consequence of his actions. If a man plays a trumpet in a crowded apartment building at two o'clock in the morning and, when asked what he is doing, replies, "Practicing on my trumpet," according to Snook, this early morning musician intends (in the strong sense) to practice on his trumpet but also intends (in the weak sense) to disturb his neighbors. In our counter-example, then, the teacher of literature intends to have students believe his interpretation but only in the weak sense of "intends."

While I think Snook's analytical deftness is admirable, I doubt whether there is a weak sense of "intends." It would, perhaps, be more accurate to say the musician does not intend to disturb his neighbors, but he is culpably ignorant of the consequences of his action. Therefore, Snook's analysis of the concept in terms of intentions provides us only with a sufficient condition but not a necessary one. Perhaps the condition which allows us to claim that the literature teacher is indoctrinating can be called the "culpable ignorance" condition and, indeed, this condition would cover a vast number of important cases. Despite these reservations, however, this book would be very useful in intro-

ducing education students to philosophical analysis.

P. T. O'Leary  
University of Western Ontario

**Terry Orlick and Cali Botterill.**  
**EVERY KID CAN WIN.**  
Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1975.  
186 pp. \$6.95.

As a senior high school student, I was very interested in the philosophies expressed by Terry Orlick and Cali Botterill in their book *Every Kid Can Win*. Throughout the book, a whole new concept of education was examined: one that stressed the learning and enjoyment of sport rather than winning. Having taken part in a physical education program throughout elementary and secondary schooling, I was able to relate to the reasoning behind the principles of their teaching methods.

Orlick and Botterill impressed upon the reader the necessity of mass participation and equal opportunity in organized scholastic and community sports. They endorsed early exposure of children to physical activity in order to encourage the enjoyment and positive aspects of sports. The teaching of skills should be executed in a manner such that a child learns self-improvement and self-discipline. Sportsmanship and positive attitudes toward competitors were also major concepts that the authors presented.

In present society, I feel that too much value has been placed on winning. Often adults are made to feel inadequate when they take part in sports. Children also feel this way. Too often I have seen and experienced the emphasis placed on the talented child who always makes the team, who is the pride of the teacher, and who is, needless to say, the envy of the less skilled children. Is this necessary or even desirable? Why can't every child, regardless of athletic ability, be able to enjoy and participate in sports, and in a sense be a winner, too?

These ideas are examined in Orlick and Botterill's *Every Kid Can Win*.

I think that they have some very constructive suggestions for the improvement of the present teaching methods in institutions across the country and offer techniques aimed at increasing the level of enjoyment and satisfaction achieved by children everywhere.

Linnea Chomay  
Rosemere High School

**Elizabeth Hallamore.**  
**THE METRIC BOOK OF**  
**AMUSING THINGS TO DO.**  
Toronto:  
Greedy de Pencier, 1974.  
96 pp. \$2.50.

This book offers a wide range of things to do. The activities vary from construction, games, and recipes to thought-provoking puzzles that are most easily solved through the use of algebra. Instructions are brief and clear but in some cases would seem to be inadequate. Rather clever illustrations tend to make up for this deficiency.

The use of the term "metric" in the title informs the reader that all construction measurements are made in centimetres, masses are given in grams and kilograms, and the word puzzles centre around metric prefixes. The metric 24-hour clock, however, is ignored in the activity involving time; and there are a few of the crossword puzzle clues that, correctly answered, would not agree with the solution shown on the answer page. Number 2, Down, asks for "A basic unit of capacity." Such a unit does not exist. "Farad," a derived unit of electrical capacity, has the required number of letters; but "litre," a unit of fluid volume, is the expected answer. The solution is also a little careless in its use of upper and lower case letters in its symbols, and it refers to the puzzle itself on the wrong page.

In spite of the few technical errors, however, this book should provide hours of activity for a mentally active teenager.

L. D. Hutton  
McGill University