The demarcation of the “family as a private entity” would only have occurred around the Second World War in Canada, later than in the United States. From then on, as churches reacted to the sudden prevalence of the welfare state, they came to consider families as a spiritual haven. In an effort to place spirituality on a ground they could control, many denominations seem to have turned their attention to spouses’ sexuality. In their renewed views, families had become the sites of the fulfilment of individual desires. Michel Gauvreau’s article on Catholic marriage preparation courses in mid-twentieth-century Quebec and Christie’s own piece on conceptions of sexuality among the authorities of the United Church in post-war Canada convey the importance of this new focus on physical intimacy. They leave the readers with many questions: Why did churches appropriate sexuality as their domain? On which traditions did they count to do so? To what extent were they followed or led by the faithful? But these authors argue successfully that some origins of the sexual revolution of the sixties may be found inside churches, not in opposition to them. To understand just to what extent, their findings will have to be placed into broader histories of the rising emphasis on intimacy and of what seems to be its corollary, the absence of references to principles of political philosophy in recent debates over family values and relations (Irène Théry, “Vie privée et monde commun. Réflection sur l’enlisement gestionnaire du droit”, *Le Débat*, 1995, pp. 14–42).

Studying family life through the prism of religion shows not only the depth of the influence religious institutions exerted on the nature of public and private institutions but also that this ascendancy outlasted, when it did not prepare, their secularisation.

Dominique Marshall
*Carleton University*


The historical debate over progressive education seems unceasing and unresolved. What did progressive education mean in theory and in practice? When and where was it implemented? Did it exacerbate or ameliorate social inequality? Did it contribute, pedagogically, to the emancipation of young minds or constitute a new system of social control that continued to regiment the lives of school children? The reissuing of Ronald D. Cohen’s *Children of the Mill*, first published in 1990, signifies continuing interest in these questions. Those who missed it the first time will be rewarded by an informative study that sets an intriguing story of educational reform in a carefully drawn historical context.

The unlikely setting for this sustained educational experiment was Gary, Indiana, a boom-bust steel town replete with class and racial divisions throughout the twentieth century. The architect of the new education movement was William Wirt, a principal and school superintendent who assumed the directorship of education in Gary in 1907, a post he held for some 30 years. Educated at De Pauw University where he was exposed to the work of John Dewey, Wirt embraced the tenets of progressive...
education which he understood to be a system that combined work, play, and study, group learning, vocational programmes, night school, and citizenship training, all provided within an efficient organizational structure that was, ideally, effectively embedded within the community.

Perhaps Wirt’s most notable innovation was the “platoon system” in which students would rotate in groups from one educational activity to another throughout the day. Not only would they have the benefit of being taught by teacher-specialists, but the schools would use time and space productively throughout the entire academic year.

In educational reform circles, Wirt and the Gary schools achieved notoriety and acclaim, especially in the 1920s. Their advocates included John Dewey and Abraham Flexner, who effused “that schools representing an intelligent effort to embody modern ideas should spring up and obtain support here is a miracle — just such a miracle as the origin of Christ or Abraham Lincoln” (p. 55).

As Cohen demonstrates, however, Gary was far from an educational utopia. It reflected both the vibrancy and social tensions of the community, as well as the idiosyncrasies of its educational and municipal leaders. While its influential business sector favoured the schools’ emphasis on applied learning, it failed, too frequently, to support taxation levels that the system required to meets its needs. Some critics believed Wirt to be a mere instrument of corporate interests, though he was at the same time generally respected by teachers and their union leaders. During the 1930s, however, Wirt wrote extreme anti-communist tracts and despised Roosevelt’s New Deal. “Just as sure as God made little apples,” he declared, “we are headed for communism if the so called ‘brain-trusters’, ‘brain busters’ is a better name for them, are not literally kicked out of Washington” (p. 129).

If Wirt’s brand of educational progressivism could embrace right-wing politics, it also reconciled itself to decades of racial segregation in Gary. Blacks, by and large, were excluded from white schools and efforts at integration were hotly resisted. In 1927 and again in 1945, hundreds of white students, supported by their parents, walked out of school to protest the presence of additional blacks in their classrooms. The latter incident aroused national attention, and celebrities, including Frank Sinatra, came to Gary to promote civil rights. By this time, Gary hardly appeared to be an emblem of educational innovation.

Indeed, by the end of the 1950s, even the platoon system had disappeared, and Gary schools were largely indistinguishable from those of other American cities. New schools were built in response to the demographic bulge, and the subjects of juvenile delinquency, comic books, mental hygiene, and the cold war played themselves out in Gary, as elsewhere.

How “good” were the Gary schools, particularly under Wirt’s leadership? The evidence on student performance and retention is uneven, and Cohen, perhaps unavoidably in light of available sources, fails to deliver a verdict on this question. If Wirt’s own linguistic lapses were any indication — he was an atrocious speller — “play and work” may well have trumped “study” in the Gary classrooms. In any event, Cohen is less interested in educational outcomes than in social history. He explores, successfully, the relationship between educational and social change, a

complex dynamic, in which idealism yields continuously to political conflict and human imperfections. *Children of the Mill* significantly contributes to, without resolving, the continuing historiographical debate over the virtues — and meaning — of progressive schooling.

Paul Axelrod  
*York University*


Dans son tout comme dans ses parties, sain ou malade, réel ou apparent, le corps est devenu objet d’histoire sociale. Éclairée par le regard anthropologique, l’histoire du corps captive les historiens qui doivent faire flèche de tout bois et extirper de sources diverses les traces servant à leur histoire. Pour ces historiens, le livre que propose Lucie Desjardins est fort utile puisqu’il fournit en quelque sorte un guide de lecture des sources, un mode d’emploi, pourrait-on dire, que les historiens ne devraient pas ignorer.

L’objectif de l’auteure n’est évidemment pas de fournir un outil aux historiens. Tiré d’une thèse de doctorat, l’ouvrage met en évidence la représentation des passions telle qu’on la retrouve dans divers traités du XVIIe siècle et s’interroge sur les principes qui président à cette représentation. À partir d’une trentaine de textes publiés entre 1640 et 1680 (traités des passions, ouvrages de rhétorique, manuels de civilité, écrits sur la peinture et sur la musique, par exemple) qui « posent les principes d’un examen des passions à partir d’une lecture du corps » (p. 4), Desjardins scrute la représentation de l’intériorité et la codification des traits attribués aux passions. Le livre est construit en trois parties. La première porte sur les différentes formes de savoirs sur le corps et met en évidence les tentatives de chacun de ces savoirs pour rendre compte des différents « mouvements intimes de l’âme ». Tour à tour, la physiognomonie, la médecine, la physique des corps en mouvement, qui constituent en somme le modèle médical et anatomique, sont appelées à traduire ce qui semble bien être une représentation codifiée des passions. La deuxième partie s’intéresse à la simulation et à la dissimulation des passions dans une « réflexion sur l’être et l’apparence, […] la nature et l’artifice » (p. 108) qui repose cette fois sur les traités de rhétorique. La codification des voix et des gestes et l’art de persuader grâce aux « ressources langagières du corps » (p. 142) ouvrent tout naturellement sur la cour et les salons où la « seconde nature [que se construisent les courtisans], plus naturelle que la vraie » (p. 156), est interprétée comme une « pratique sociale à même de préserver un moi caché sous les replis du corps éloquent » (p. 159). La dernière partie aborde le corps mis en scène et intègre à la démonstration les guides de représentation à l’usage des artistes : y défient les peintres, les musiciens, les comédiens, mais aussi les mystiques dont l’exemple aide l’auteure à soutenir que la « valeur des différents signes du code n’est pas la même pour tous » (p. 275) et que