
Pourquoi l’inertie? Les experts sont davantage entendus lors des procès. Mais les divisions sont nombreuses. Bien des représentations demeurent en place. Certes, les champs des maladies mentales retenues par le tribunal se sont élargis. Le décalage est pourtant important entre le discours psychanalytique et les interventions des psychiatres québécois convoqués comme experts. Les facteurs sociaux et la maladie mentale expliquent des verdicts d’irresponsabilité ou des peines atténuées qui continuent à profiter davantage aux femmes qu’aux hommes. Parce que l’amour maternel serait inné, la femme meurtrière est une malade. Comme dans le passé, les hommes sont plus souvent reconnus responsables, mais ils sont moins nombreux à être dénoncés et poursuivis, car leur travail protège la famille de la misère.

Avec la modernité, la mort d’un enfant est devenue un drame. La nationalisation et la démocratisation des sociétés ont changé le discours sur la famille et l’enfant. Le traitement judiciaire et médiatique des filicides montre la complexité du changement social. Le processus intègre mouvement et résistance. Les identités de genre se transforment lentement.


Pascale Quincy-Lefebvre
Université d’Angers


Bruce Curtis demonstrates in his latest book, Ruling by Schooling Quebec: Conquest to Liberal Governmentality – A Historical Sociology, the intimate connections among schooling, state formation, and human subjectivity. He shows how colonial officials in Quebec claimed to be liberal by demanding that freedom meant “‘the people’ was free to educate itself, provided it did so freely” (p. 439). From the Conquest of Quebec to Union of the Canadas, Curtis argues that the Assembly, churches Reform majority, and others justified the preservation of ignorance for the masses in the name of civil and religious liberties (p. 428). While repeated proposals were made, particularly in the 1830s, to support the international “common school” movement, opposition to administrative institutions and practices made the development of a secular public school system impossible (p. 432).
Schooling was necessary in so far as it supported systemic colonization – reason for the elite and social engineering of the habitants. Curtis points to the logic of liberal governmentality for ruling through schooling: “Free self-government was possible only by those schooled to the use of a reason which recognized the value of free self-government” (p. 439).

Bruce Curtis sets out four ambitious objectives for this book and he meets all of these objectives with meticulous archival research based on reflexive historical sociology – attentiveness to the way knowledge is deployed in social and political relations in a given moment (pp. 4-5). His first objective is to provide rich documentation of Quebec common schooling. With due reference to the earlier work of Louis-Philippe Audet, Curtis fills many gaps in Quebec’s educational history. Chapters one and two detail an early opportunity lost for a non-sectarian university and later the defeat of denominational boards by imperial intervention. Chapter three explores the under-examined influence of monitorial schooling. These large-scale institutions to transform “masses of ignorant young people into orderly and cheerful readers and writers” were accepted to the extent that they addressed the early nineteenth-century “rise of urban pauper and proletarian populations” (p. 121). Curtis makes clear that monitorialism was an early experiment in liberal governmentality- encouraging social mobility with greater access to schooling, while seeking to discipline social subjects (p. 184). Failure was the result of poor conditions in the countryside, which included, as sketched in chapters four through six, low student attendance, poor infrastructure, and a lack of trained teachers (e.g. Montreal Normal School disappointment).

Curtis’ second objective is to situate schooling where it belongs in colonial politics – at the centre of administrative, legal, and ideological debates for ruling a people. This is inextricable from the third objective to demonstrate how a population was ruled by schooling through emerging techniques in knowledge production. Chapters seven and eight address how royal commissions, in the context of the Rebellions, experimented with the new social sciences to approach “schooling through the lens of population government” (p. 23). The first was the Gosford Commission of 1835-36, which was pioneering in seeking the opinion of ‘civil society,’ rather than that of elites, through personal observation, circulars, and the colonial press (as well as investigations by Jean Holmes of the Irish system) (pp. 338-39). The Commission recommended a “state school system, with central boards of education, inspectors, elected trustees, property taxation, normal schools, and curriculum and pedagogy on the Irish model” (p. 346). Because of insurrection, these recommendations waited for consideration by a second royal inquiry, the Buller Education Commission from 1838-39, established by Lord Durham. For a more exact understanding of the population and territory that an educational “machine” (p. 354) would serve, the commission, through the work of Christopher Dunkin, attempted to compile “complete statistics” (p. 23) with a questionnaire. Despite the lack of desired results, the commission endorsed a centrally regulated, property-tax supported, public school system, most of which Curtis argues “came to be the reality of public education – but not in Lower Canada/Canada East/Quebec” (p. 412). This was the result of opposition to Buller’s obvious agenda to anglicise the majority. There still remained strong articulation by such figures as Charles Mondelet that schools were a necessity for the security of the colony: “no Government is secure if it neglects or proscribes them” (p. 418). The result was the 1841 School Act that “gutted” earlier proposals. The government provided grants for locally administered schools, but issues of teacher training, compulsory attendance, and seigneurial property would only be addressed well after the period under study.

Throughout Ruling by Schooling Quebec, Curtis satisfies his fourth and most ambitious objective, to employ Michel Foucault’s theories of state formation to flesh out the project of liberal governmentality. From monitorial schooling to the Buller Commission, Curtis
demonstrates that “liberal reformers of the 1830s analysed Lower Canada as a combination of population, territory, and institutions, and they schemed to articulate these elements in ways that would produce a self-replicating system of government, a system of security” (p. 434). This book should be widely read as it makes a strong political statement regarding the role of government in the liberal democratic schooling of a population. As Curtis acknowledges in the conclusion, one of the weaknesses of a study that focuses on governmentality and knowledge production can be the invisibility of informal politics and the domestic domain (i.e. legislative acts and political press come more to the forefront) (p. 441). While Curtis argues that reflexive historical sociology takes seriously “tactics of sociability” (p. 442) in the view of politics, the main text does not fully demonstrate this practice. For example, the importance of oral transmission of political information, given the illiterate majority, is often downplayed as mere gossip and rumour mongering (p. 350). The political significance of orality perhaps deserves more attention. In addition, given its depth of documentation and theoretical sophistication, it is not necessarily an accessible read for neophytes. Although Curtis writes with some wry humour, the prose is thick and the argumentation complex. This will, unfortunately, limit the readership. These are of course relatively minor notes for a masterful text that will serve as a foundation for scholars seeking to understand the relationship between education and state formation. *Ruling by Schooling Quebec* will surely be a staple book for those studying in the areas of the sociology of education, Canadian and Quebec history, history of education, and political science.

Kristina R. Llewellyn  
*Renison University College, University of Waterloo*


This book unites new and established scholars in an interrogation of the nature and meanings of French and indigenous encounters in the heart of the North American continent. *French and Indians in the Heart of North America, 1630-1815*, seeks to understand and examine exchanges, or “bridge-building processes” (p. xxi) that took place between a vast array of people, places, and circumstances. The edited collection, published conjointly by the University of Manitoba Press and the Michigan State University Press, is grounded in vast geography: a heart of North America that assembles the Great Lakes, the Illinois Country, the Missouri River Valley, and Louisiana into a conceptual territory. Fruit of the ideas exchanged at an annual meeting of the French Colonial Historical Society, this collection expresses a desire to produce and engage in a conversation often divided by national, ideological, and methodological frontiers. The co-editors of this collection, Robert Englebert and Guillaume Teasdale, new scholars themselves, bring together voices from France, the United States, and Canada in an attempt to homogenize isolated discourses into a clear reflection of plurality. The editors weave together an intellectual discussion loosely framed around rethinking tenets of Richard White’s middle ground concept “and at the same time, demonstrate the rich variety of French-Indian encounters that defined French and Indians in the heart of North America” (p. xxiii). The contributors featured in this edited work are engaged in diverse