

A COMMON COUNTENANCE?

PART II

Adolphus Egerton Ryerson's conception of public education – knowledge in service to producing Christian citizens and successful businessmen – became secularized during the last decades of the nineteenth century. And not only in Canada: Tomkins tells us that a “recurring theme in international debate was the relation of education to national industrial prosperity.”¹ Not for the last time,² British and American politicians blamed not business practices but education “for the alleged failure of their nations to keep up with their commercial rivals, especially with Germany.”³ Tomkins cites the 1876 Centennial Exposition held in Philadelphia as an occasion when “pedagogical innovation associated directly with industrial development came under close scrutiny.”⁴ He quotes U.S. historian of education Lawrence Cremin⁵ who describes how “a few displays of tools from Russian schools literally stole the show ... [by demonstrating] that Russian educators had finally scored a breakthrough on the thorny problem of how to organize meaningful, instructive shop training as an essential adjunct of technical education.”⁶ American education (still quoting Cremin) “was never the same thereafter,”⁷ as (now Tomkins' prose) “dismay over their technical inferiority shortly led the Americans to introduce manual training into their schools.”⁸

The Ontario Department of Education took 2750 square feet of floor space at the Philadelphia Exposition, exhibiting “more than 2000 articles that won several major awards and attracted highly favorable press comments.”⁹ Despite this success, Ontario educators – Tomkins names J. G. Hodgins – who, like the Americans, was “discomfited,” for it was clear that the Europeans were more advanced in “practical education, and that Canada was lagging behind other nations in industrialization.”¹⁰ Were Canadian schools “behind” because Canadian universities lagged as well? Tomkins tells us that applied science had been established at McGill University as early as 1855, practical science established at Toronto in 1877,¹¹ Engineering faculties followed.¹² Or were Canadians more preoccupied with cultural than with industrial issues? Tomkins notes that Canadian writers emphasized “what was distinctive about Canada as a community,” its “British heritage and northern location – the latter providing a morally purifying climate – were among the prime claimed attributes.”¹³ That heritage, that climate, and immigrants representing the so-called “northern races” had created a country characterized by “self-reliance, strength and hardihood.”¹⁴ These qualities were contrasted with those ascribed to the “degenerate ‘southern,’ i.e. American character,”¹⁵ and among some a sense of smugness that persists today.¹⁶ These racist fantasies were apparently in play when “during this period ... the maple leaf emerged as the most appropriate symbol embodying Canadian identity in a single

striking image.”¹⁷ Given these racist tropes, it is unsurprising, then, that refugee slaves arrived in Canada before the American Civil War caused Ontario to establish “segregated schools.”¹⁸ Self-preservation¹⁹ yes – but was also racism in play in nineteenth-century anti-Americanism?

“Nowhere was concern about American influence more evident than in education,” Tomkins points out, “where Canadian policy-makers were often accused, sometimes correctly, of accepting American fads uncritically and of viewing their educational system and its problems in American terms.”²⁰ The “melting pot” metaphor of the United States versus the “salad bowl” for Canada was apparently in play in the late nineteenth century too, as “it was said that whereas American students learned to think of themselves as primarily Americans, developing a wonderful homogeneity, Canadians were taught to see themselves as different from one another.”²¹ To combat American influence, after 1867 the “informal intellectual nationalist movement known as Canada First” was formed, a movement that emphasized Canada’s status within the British Empire.²² “Over most of the next century,” Tomkins, “the ideology of imperialism would be promoted in school curricula through an emphasis on the Loyalist legacy and on the greatness of British institutions.”²³

Tomkins notes that “the exuberant nationalism and optimism of Canada Firsters was by no means universally shared, for Confederation had not been the intense spiritual experience of the American Revolution,” an “emotional contrast” evident in the emphasis in the British North America Act on “peace, order and good government” while the American Declaration of Independence had proclaimed “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.”²⁴ A “recurrent theme in the curriculum,” Tomkins continues, was the “Canadian identity.”²⁵ As early as 1849, Ottawa’s school superintendent lamented: “It is a matter of regret that while we can learn from our textbooks something of almost every other country, we can learn nothing of our own.”²⁶ A decade later, a “growing nationalism, the onset of Confederation, economic uncertainties, fears of annexation engendered by the American Civil War and prospective westward expansion combined to accelerate the concern for ‘Canadianizing’ the curriculum.”²⁷ Even the Irish National Readers – which had replaced American readers after 1846 – came in for critique: they were deemed “insufficiently Canadian in content.”²⁸ In 1868, the Canadian National Series of Readers – the so-called Ryerson Readers – were “formally authorized,” but teachers continued to teach “many selections” from the Irish Readers as well as selections from the American McGuffey Readers.²⁹ In 1874, the New Canadian Readers became the first homegrown series to be taught across the country.³⁰

Just how Canadian was the curriculum? “In a curriculum that primarily celebrated a British conservative tradition,” Tomkins tells us, “Canadian history per se was a poor relation, subordinated to British and to ancient history in the schools and the universities alike.”³¹ In Quebec, “national sentiment meant French-Canadian

sentiment,” and Canadian history that was unrelated to Quebec was “all but ignored,” even considered a category of “foreign history.”³² So the title of Tomkins’ book (and why I add the question mark in the title of the research brief) refers not to Canada overall – the First Peoples, for example, do not appear to be a consideration at this point – but to “British North America” only, where, he writes: “Few educational developments are more striking than the remarkable concurrence during the latter half of the nineteenth century of legislation and curriculum policies that began to give the British North American colonies a common countenance of schooling.”³³ Even that conclusion could become questioned when he points out that “sectarian controversy and denominational conflict engulfed schooling in all the Atlantic provinces, although both were comparatively muted in Nova Scotia,” where “Roman Catholic separate schools followed the prescribed curriculum, but were permitted to offer religious instruction after schools hours.”³⁴ In Newfoundland, where the inclusion of the Bible in the curriculum was also a “divisive issue, separate Protestant and Roman Catholic school boards were established in each district in 1836.”³⁵

In Quebec, the School Act of 1841 established a dual system by allowing “dissident persons” to “establish schools which satisfy their needs.”³⁶ Between 1841 and 1875, Tomkins continues, this dual system was formalized by establishing “separate denominational publicly-supported school systems under a Council of Public Instruction with autonomous Roman Catholic and Protestant committees,” an “arrangement [that] gave each group effective control over teacher training and certification and over inspection, curricula and textbooks.”³⁷ For almost a century, Protestant and Catholic students could ignore each other “almost completely.”³⁸ In Quebec, then, what Tomkins terms “two quasi-public systems of schooling” meant that “curriculum control” was exercised by “two religious-linguistic communities,” precluding – for a century – any significant government role in the education of Quebec’s children.³⁹

Despite these intra-national controversies – still focused on French-English and not yet on First Peoples issues – and international concerns (over Canada’s educational standing), Tomkins tells us that “securing the regular and punctual attendance of all children at school has been called the central educational problem of the nineteenth century.”⁴⁰ Many children failed to attend school regularly – Tomkins reports there was “enormous daily and seasonal variation in attendance” – attributable to “parental indifference, sheer poverty, the preference of children to work, and the desperate need for their labor on farms.”⁴¹ Also in play, Tomkins continues, were “inadequate teachers, overcrowding, lack of ventilation and general unhealthy conditions,” not to mention “brutal corporal punishment and school time wasted in ‘listless activity and stupor,’ with the pupil required only to recite his or her ABCs twice a day ... ‘methods’ hardly conducive to learning.”⁴²

Of these Tomkins pauses on the topic of “overcrowding” – what would seem a contradiction of the irregular attendance problem – to report that especially Roman

Catholic and Black parents wanted their children in school, “even in the face of the refusal of Protestant and white teachers to instruct their offspring.”⁴³ In Ontario, the student-teacher ratio rose from 34.8 in 1846 to 75.2 by 1876!⁴⁴ Both irregular attendance and overcrowding, Tomkins concludes, were “crucial factors that reduced the individual child’s exposure to the curriculum.”⁴⁵ In 1871, in Ontario, school attendance became “compulsory,” a move the other provinces made “by the end of the century,” if “in various forms.”⁴⁶

In telling us that the nineteenth century curriculum was “rudimentary, primitive, [and] informal,” comprised of a “permissive list of subjects” – among them “grammar, geography, linear drawing, music, history, natural history, natural philosophy (science), agriculture, human physiology, civil government, political economy and biblical instruction and morality” – Tomkins makes the telling point that schooling lacked a “coherent program.”⁴⁷ The overall school “program” – the coherence of the curriculum overall – is the key concern of curriculum theory, a crucial concern largely overlooked as the single subjects jostled for position and influence. Coherence is not necessarily uniformity, despite Tomkins’ apparent confluence of the two when he writes:

The introduction of the Irish National Readers after 1846 was a major step in the direction of a prescribed uniform curriculum based on graded, integrated textbooks embodying a systematic pedagogy and a de facto curriculum. The term “curriculum” was itself rarely used during the period, although as early as 1852-1853 the Superintendent of Schools for the Town of London observed that “as a necessary consequence of the progressive advancement of pupils regularly attending school, a demand arises for a higher order of studies and a more extended *curriculum*.”⁴⁸

“Higher order” would imply more intellectual sophistication – not necessarily coherence of the overall school program – and a “more extensive curriculum” connotes what came to be known as “scope,” often paired with “sequence”⁴⁹ (which Tomkins invokes with the concept of “graded”).

Then Tomkins returns to Ryerson,⁵⁰ to assert that his “1846 plan is the single most important policy document in Canadian curriculum history.”⁵¹ Not only “as a statement of aims and objectives, of detailed content and method for each subject and as a plan for implementing a curriculum through school organization, textbooks, examinations, teacher training and inspection,” but also as an instance of “what we now call implementation and in-service education” – conducted “through correspondence and articles and by means of speaking tours across Ontario” – Ryerson’s plan remains, he suggests, memorable.⁵²

In his scan of the nineteenth century Tomkins highlights other events and practices, among them the publication, in 1848, of *The Journal of Education*, featuring articles about “American and European schools and articles encouraging new ideas such as those of Pestalozzi.”⁵³ An Educational Depository was established that offered

“approved textbooks” at half price; in 1855 in Toronto an Educational Museum was established, that “in conjunction with the Normal School which had been opened eight years earlier.”⁵⁴ While often associated with the twentieth century, Tomkins tells us that the “decades preceding 1867 saw the development of what came to be called a ‘science of education’.”⁵⁵ More metaphor than actual science, “mental discipline theory” relied on the learner’s mind as a machine or a muscle, viewed, in either case, “as a tool to be sharpened, honed and polished by the application of certain kinds of subjects to it.”⁵⁶ The “related theory of faculty psychology conceived of the mind as subdivided into numerous individual capacities or faculties, such as memory, imagination, reasoning and, of course, the conscience or moral faculty, all to be developed or trained.”⁵⁷ Such “training involved dividing material to be learned into small bits, sequentially organized as the elements of subjects such as reading, spelling and grammar were analyzed relentlessly, often in violation of both sense and utility.”⁵⁸ Maybe consistent with the mind-as-muscle metaphor was the late nineteenth-century concern that “that too much use of the young mind might wear out rather than strengthen it,” so that what in the twentieth century an “enriched curriculum for the gifted would have been considered dangerous.”⁵⁹ Concentrated child study would wait for the twentieth century; in the nineteenth attention was more focused on “textbooks” and “methods of instruction,” specifically “which techniques and devices worked best.”⁶⁰

Perhaps addressing both concerns – the mind a muscle that could wear out and which instructional technique worked best – there was attention to keeping “the brain in good working order.”⁶¹ To do so, “frequent changes of subject matter and type of work were advocated, and recesses and diversions like marching to music were suggested.”⁶² “Competition” was considered a “motivating device,” and “discipline was harsh and severe and corporeal punishment was the norm.”⁶³ But even by mid-century, there were educators who began “to question the conventional view of children as machines and education as a mechanical, punitive process.”⁶⁴ Tomkins cites Henry Esson, “Calvinist preacher, schoolmaster, and professor of mental and moral philosophy at Toronto,” as one who advocated “more enlightened teaching methods.”⁶⁵ Esson argued that the newborn child’s mind consisted of an ‘innate alphabet’,” an inchoate idea of “natural development which implied that the teacher should look to the child rather than the reverse.”⁶⁶ Looking to the child “made the teacher-pupil relationship important.”⁶⁷ Innate perhaps but also evidently needing nurture, as “subjects such as music, if properly taught, would ‘refine and humanize the pupils’,”⁶⁸ an appreciation of the arts’ capacity to cultivate qualities other fields do not.

At mid-century many began to fear that “society was sinking into a state of barbarism from which children, especially, had to be redeemed,” and, Tomkins adds, this fear “led educators to equate ignorance and illiteracy with crime, poverty and immorality.”⁶⁹ Ryerson depicted “ignorance itself as a crime,”⁷⁰ an equivalence that would convict all infants guilty of original sin, that Christian doctrine possibly the source of the idea. Knowledge – “literacy” in particular – became associated not only

with innocence but with “correctness” as “high culture” promised “respectability” in “manners, appearance and speech,”⁷¹ predictable perhaps “in an age when religion, education and status all went together.”⁷² Status seemed somewhat nationalized and structured in class terms: it was felt that the “unfortunate brogue of Irish children must be eliminated, along with the ‘anti-British dialect and idiom’ of American textbooks.”⁷³ This “emphasis on style, on correct pronunciation, modulation and clarity of diction,” Tomkins appreciates, “confused oral performance with cognitive skill, with the result that comprehension was often wrongly assumed to have been achieved.”⁷⁴

While the practice does not seem to follow logically from these attitudes, teachers were directed to spend “an inordinate amount of instructional time – as much as half or more – ... on spelling.”⁷⁵ Anticipating the phonics-whole word debates a century later, Tomkins tells us that over time “the alphabet method was replaced by the Prussian whole word method. Pupils learned whole units, instead of as aggregations of letters.”⁷⁶ More obvious – given the emphasis on appearances – was “Forrester’s famous textbook [that] explicated in detail the principles and concepts of penmanship.”⁷⁷ Presumably these methods “disciplined intelligence,” although Tomkins makes clear that both were “based on the teaching of religion and morality,” what he deems “the central goal of the Victorian curriculum.”⁷⁸ While one hundred years earlier than Tomkins’ time, he discerns continuity: “What was called ‘moral education’” constituted a form of indoctrination similar to that espoused today by some Christian educators through ‘values schools’.”⁷⁹

As ugly as “indoctrination” is, Victorian educators emphasized the “moral and aesthetic importance of the school,” the two in their minds interrelated: “Good thoughts, they believed, could only occur in beautiful surroundings.”⁸⁰ Considerable attention was paid to the “appearance and form of school buildings,” what Tomkins thinks of “as aspects of what some modern educators call the hidden curriculum,”⁸¹ although I can’t see what’s hidden about school buildings. Beautiful buildings would be welcome today when function dictates form. Oddly, Tomkins adds that “textbooks were seen as a prime instrument of moral education,”⁸² oddly because it’s difficult imagining textbooks being printed with aesthetics uppermost in mind. (Artbooks of course, but textbooks?) Tomkins himself points to the “religious” – not aesthetic – “dimension of textbooks,” something, he says, was “explicit well into the later decades of the century,” noting that the “textbooks used in the new British Columbia school system all assumed a literal interpretation of the Bible, and a belief in orthodox Christian doctrines.”⁸³ Tomkins cites “temperance education” as “an example of the attempt to control conduct by means of an organized course of instruction,” also illustrating the instructional attention paid to “character formation” and “habit training,” “terms,” he adds, “that were often used interchangeably.”⁸⁴

Soon enough skepticism surfaced, as “some educators doubted the efficacy of the school’s moral influence,”⁸⁵ citing Goldwin Smith who, in 1873, cautioned Ontario teachers that “it is only to a limited extent that the school can be expected to contend

against the bent and bias of society.”⁸⁶ Despite this dose of realism, even “critics of religion in the curriculum unhesitatingly accepted the school’s responsibility for teaching general more precepts.”⁸⁷ When finally “the formal teaching of religion declined,” Tomkins tells us, “religious and patriotic exercises gradually became a mandatory part of the curriculum everywhere.... Patriotism, taught through history and literature, remained an important dimension of moral education.” Was – is – patriotism in some sense religious? Derivative from religion? In Tomkins’ tale, the implication is there.

Also odd it is to learn that “the initial debate over practical education was couched largely in economic terms rather than in cultural and educational terms,”⁸⁸ implying that morality and religion were not uppermost. Those “opposed to manual training,” including teachers, “claimed that it added to an already overcrowded curriculum” and “trade unionists feared that it would undercut the apprenticeship system.”⁸⁹ Eventually “manual training” won out, although not “until after 1900,” when “agriculture” was also incorporated in the curriculum, “although even then it was a less than successful innovation, as we shall see. As nature study, agriculture later became the basis of general science.”⁹⁰ Apparently these statements reference curricular developments in Anglophone Canada, as Tomkins then tells us that “in Quebec, reformers such as Gédéon Ouimet, who served briefly as premier and Minister of Public Instruction during the short period (1867-1875) when Quebec had a separate education ministry, demanded a more practical curriculum that would permit French Canada to modernize and compete successfully with English Canada.”⁹¹

Coeducation was controversial in the United States,⁹² but perhaps less so in Canada, although even here it took time for the idea to be accepted. Before 1870, Tomkins reports, “girls were separated separately,” preparing them “for a sheltered life of dependency,” adding: “Gradually, a more intellectually demanding and practical education for middle class girls was advocated.”⁹³ Attending “normal school, a form of quasi-higher studies, was the chief type of further education for girls in a period when teaching was becoming a feminized mass occupation,” but “for most girls, schooling was still training for domestic life.”⁹⁴ Not until 1874 did “Mount Allison University in New Brunswick [become] the first university in the British Empire to confer a bachelor’s degree on a woman.”⁹⁵

That year could be considered pivotal, and not only due to its gendered significance. Tomkins casts this “post-Confederation period” as “transitional,” when “the Old Education” became and “the New,” the former “education viewed as knowledge acquired through memorization of content,” the New viewing it “as mental development.”⁹⁶ The concept of “New Education” was imported from the U.S. where, in 1869,⁹⁷ it had appeared in an article by Charles W. Eliot, the new president of Harvard.⁹⁸ Tomkins reports that “John Dewey attributed the popularization of the term to Francis W. Parker, who christened and launched the New Education in 1882,” adding: “Later, Parker visited Nova Scotia and Ontario and became a close friend of

James L. Hughes.”⁹⁹ In 1886, the Ontario collegiate principal J. E. Wetherell, “criticized the Old Education for its emphasis on storing the mind with knowledge through memorization and the study of books,” arguing on behalf “the New Education”¹⁰⁰ because it was “devoted more to things than books” and minimized “Parrotry.”¹⁰¹ The Old Education was dominated by “abstractions, with the unseen and the unfamiliar,” and unduly structured “by teacher talk, ‘the didactic disease’.”¹⁰² A trace of religion in secularism is evident in Wetherell’s assertion that New Education emphasized “the representation of truth in the concrete”¹⁰³ (abstractions apparently banished), “leaving learning initiatives largely to the pupil,”¹⁰⁴ echoing Protestantism’s insistence that each pilgrim must find his or her way to Christ. “Above all,” Tomkins summarizes, the New Education – in contrast to the Old – promised to develop “the whole being, the mental, the moral, the physical.”¹⁰⁵ Sound familiar? The New Education then is the Old Education now.¹⁰⁶

One idea that informed the New Education wasn’t exactly new, however, the emphasis on “things” (in Wetherell’s statement quoted above). This was derived from Pestalozzi’s concept of “object teaching,” an “oral question and answer method that was intended to stress sense perception and to challenge the dominance of the textbook.”¹⁰⁷ The method followed Pestalozzi’s conviction that education should stress “things, not words,” and urged teachers to proceed “from the known to the unknown, from the simple to the complex.”¹⁰⁸ Almost sixty years after Pestalozzi’s death “Ryerson was urging a greater emphasis on sense perception and object teaching in Ontario schools,” as the “oral-object method undoubtedly increased teacher-pupil interaction and encouraged classroom discussion through what came to be called the ‘conversational method’.”¹⁰⁹ Tomkins points out that we don’t know “how widespread object teaching became but, given the lack of teacher training, large classes and often primitive ill-equipped school rooms, it seems unlikely that the method was very widely adopted.”¹¹⁰ Then he adds: “Like most curriculum innovations then and since, it made heavy demands on the teacher, particularly because it required an extensive knowledge of many varied topics.”¹¹¹

Another not exactly new idea informing nineteenth-century New Education was that of Froebel, “of whom James L. Hughes became the leading Canadian disciple.”¹¹² In 1874 Hughes traveled to Boston where he observed a Froebel-inspired kindergarten – Froebel is often considered the Father of Kindergarten – a trip that confirmed Hughes’s conviction that “school could never give a real education so long as the work done in them was confined to learning from books.”¹¹³ Like Piaget and others to follow him, Froebel thought children’s growth underwent “stages,” and he invoked the metaphor of a plant – thus kindergarten or children’s garden – to depict what he saw as the “harmonious development of the mental, moral and physical attributes of the child.”¹¹⁴ Tomkins tells us that “the freedom and creativity of the kindergarten often ended in uniformity and control,” as “Canadian Froebelians, influenced by John Watson’s idealist concept of an organic Christian community, sought to subordinate

the individual to the group,” adding: “Opposed to teaching reading in the kindergarten because it required a premature introduction to abstract ideas, they also opposed free play, which could undermine self-control and discipline.”¹¹⁵

The kindergarten movement gained momentum in Ontario after Hughes’ future wife, Ada Marean,¹¹⁶ opened the first public kindergarten in Toronto in 1883. Seventeen years later, more than 11,000 Ontario children under six years of age were enrolled in 120 kindergartens. Kindergartens promptly appeared in other provinces. Tomkins advises us that “large classes of fifty to seventy-five pupils often attenuated Froebelian aims.”¹¹⁷ Later Canadians would take interest in the science of child study, a concept often associated with the American psychologist, G. Stanley Hall.¹¹⁸ Despite this child-centeredness – at least at the kindergarten level, and despite all the anti-book talk – Tomkins considers the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries “an era when the textbook was the de facto curriculum,” so much so that “there was hardly a dimension of policy that textbooks did not touch.”¹¹⁹ He reports: “What came, in Ontario especially, to be called ‘the textbook question,’ had many aspects – religious, political, economic – including issues of American influence, denominational conflict, patronage and the demand for a Canadian publishing industry.”¹²⁰

As early as 1843 the Reverend Robert Murray, Ryerson’s¹²¹ predecessor, emphasized “curriculum uniformity by means of uniform textbooks, in part because, Tomkins tells us, “uniform texts permitted group instruction in classes,”¹²² important apparently because “most teachers lacked training and could best learn pedagogy from textbooks.”¹²³ Uniform textbooks also “facilitated school inspection and common examinations.”¹²⁴ And presumably uniform textbooks, specifically the Irish Readers,¹²⁵ - used in Scotland and England as well as in Ireland, Australia and New Zealand – were thought to support patriotism, not the vulgar American kind of course, but the “pan-imperial” type, one not “stridently nationalistic.”¹²⁶ In Canada, the Irish Readers functioned to counter “American influence at a time of rapidly increasing enrollments when, despite prohibitions, there was a need to use textbooks and to hire teachers from the U.S.”¹²⁷ Tomkins tells us that Ryerson was accused of being both anti- and pro-American, the former to “gain support for uniformity,”¹²⁸ the latter because he had authorized the use of American textbooks. Regarding that decision Tomkins thinks Ryerson had “little choice.”¹²⁹ In his defence, Ryerson did pressure U.S. publishers to add Canadian content. In 1847 he was pleased that Morse’s *New Geography*, published in New York, contained “substantial Canadian content,” and, moreover, “the publisher had agreed to prepare a special edition containing statistics and other material on Canada.”¹³⁰ Finally, in 1857, a Canadian textbook – J. G. Hodgins’ *Geography and History of British North America*, a book “commissioned” by Ryerson – became available.¹³¹ “Significantly,” Tomkins observes, “it devoted an equal number of pages to sketches of French and British rule in Canada, and emphasized the common elements in the heritages of both groups.”¹³²

In the post-Confederation period, “extensive discussion of textbooks and their proper use foreshadowed later interest in formal curriculum planning.”¹³³ Already in use in Ontario, the Irish readers were, in 1871, authorized in New Brunswick, a decision soon followed by the other provinces.¹³⁴ The almost universal use of Ontario textbooks represented a “de facto national curriculum for decades.”¹³⁵ Tomkins concludes that the “curriculum centralization and uniformity promoted by Ryerson became a hallmark of Canadian education,” something accomplished not only by the use of Ontario textbooks but also by school examinations, “well established in Ontario by the mid-nineteenth century.”¹³⁶ At first, these were conducted by “visitors” – including “clergy and other local notables, in the presence of trustees and parents” – and were comprised by “memorized recitations, chanted multiplication tables or read aloud.”¹³⁷ Department was also evaluated – including the department of teachers and trustees – and each school was legally required to hold “a public and quarterly examination.”¹³⁸ The position of school inspector shifted from that of “visitor” to (by the 1980s) “professionally qualified agents of the central authority.”¹³⁹ The professionalization of school inspection, Tomkins suggests, illustrates “the trend towards the bureaucratization of all public administration in an age when centralization and a cult of uniformity developed that stressed selection by merit and evaluation by impartial purportedly objective means.”¹⁴⁰

Together with textbooks, examinations became the primary means of grading and classifying students.¹⁴¹ After 1870, Ontario instituted a high school entrance examination which, over time, “became the major hurdle and chief sorting device for the entire system.”¹⁴² As it was designed to do over one hundred later – including in the United States¹⁴³ – Ontario’s “entrance examination allayed much of the criticism of declining standards.”¹⁴⁴ It also “promoted curriculum uniformity by ensuring that the curriculum laid down by the department of education was taught as prescribed in all common schools,” as well as serving “indirectly as a selection method for university as well as for secondary education, and helped to ensure university dominance of the curriculum.”¹⁴⁵ North America’s most famous curriculum experiment could occur precisely because major universities were willing, albeit for less than a decade, to suspend those curricular requirements.¹⁴⁶

During the mid-nineteenth-century decades, “content was considered more important than method.”¹⁴⁷ It would take one hundred years before once again content was considered primary, at least by curriculum theorists who remind that the canonical curriculum question – what knowledge is of most worth? – positions content first and method second. Tomkins seems to sidestep the issue, focusing instead on the fact that “many, and probably most, Canadian teachers were untrained,” not indicating whether their ignorance was of method or content, the two together (in my view) constituting knowledge of most worth. “Although the Toronto Normal School was established in 1847,” Tomkins tells us, “most training in Ontario was conducted in county model schools, fifty of which flourished after 1877,” adding: “Admission requirements to

both model and normal schools were extremely low for many decades.”¹⁴⁸ Common still in China, the concept of “normal” has disappeared from North America. Tomkins traces the term to the *école normale* in France in 1834, its root meaning one of method: “the norm” or “the right way.”¹⁴⁹ Ryerson construed “normal” as meaning “according to rule or principle,” a normal school being one “in which the principles and practice of teaching according to rule are taught and exemplified.”¹⁵⁰ In 1871, Ryerson promoted the “elevation of school-teaching into a profession,” an aspiration attainable by proper training only. One hundred fifty years later what “proper” teacher training continues to prove quite contestable,¹⁵¹ the issues then being overcrowded classrooms and a “lockstep process similar to that endured by common school children.”¹⁵² (Overcrowded classrooms were also “endured” by common school children.)

Prospective teachers were forced to learn every detail of the elementary school curriculum by studying whatever textbooks were in use, their certification shifting by 1867 from local to provincial authority.¹⁵³

The Victorian common school was focused on elementary education, its graded curriculum and group instruction structured by uniform textbooks, city schools organized into separate classrooms, increasingly incorporating the factory model associated with industrialization.¹⁵⁴ “Knowledge was broken into pieces,” Tomkins tells us, “reduced to its elements and [then] compartmentalized; pupils themselves were viewed as raw material to be processed.”¹⁵⁵ The mind was a muscle to be exercised; comprehension considered secondary, as students were forced to recite in unison what they had memorized.¹⁵⁶ Not only were the school days divided into periods, so was the curriculum: the first formal province-wide curriculum in Ontario (installed by Ryerson in 1871) was divided into fifteen subjects.¹⁵⁷ In so doing the curriculum was thought to reproduce the “order, obedience and uniformity characteristic of the factory system.”¹⁵⁸ There were, even in this era when the differentiation of the curriculum into school subjects was first underway, critics. In the 1880s, Superintendent David Allison of Nova Scotia deplored the absence of a unifying “basis” or “aim” of an overcrowded, differentiated curriculum.¹⁵⁹ Even though the U.S. incorporated a factory model to split the curriculum into separate school subjects, even though obedience and conformity ruled the day, one post-Confederation British visitor (who had previously toured U.S. schools) reported differences:

Entering a Canadian school, with American impressions fresh upon the mind, the first feeling is one of disappointment. One misses the life, the motion, the vivacity, the precision – in a word, the brilliancy. But as you stay, and pass both teacher and pupils in review, the feeling of disappointment gives way to a feeling of surprise. You find that this plain, unpretending teacher as the power, and has successfully used the power, of communicating real solid knowledge and good sense to those youthful minds.... To set off against their quickness, I heard many random answers in American schools; while, per contra to the slowness

of the Canadian scholar, I seldom got a reply very wide of the mark. The whole teaching was homely; but it was sound.¹⁶⁰

Tomkins comments: “Not all Canadians would have agreed that the teaching was sound.”¹⁶¹

U.S. soldiers returning from World War II were granted access to U.S. universities even when they had not studied a curriculum that would have prepared them for university-level coursework.¹⁶² Many professors were unhappy at the extra pedagogical work the returning soldiers’ presence required, leading later to a federal-government-imposed curriculum reform designed to address the academic as well as perceived military (the Cold War was on) and economic (more engineers and other science-informed professionals were wanted) deficits. In Canada’ university professors’ complaints occurred much earlier: “By the late 1850 the complaints of university people were legion,” Tomkins reports, and university faculty themselves were “forced either to lengthen their introductory courses or to organize special preparatory classes, the forerunners of remedial instruction.”¹⁶³ Non-university employees were also alerted to the problem; school inspector (and later academic philosopher) George Paxton Young, whom Ryerson had appointed in 1864, recommended that the common school be replaced by two new institutions.¹⁶⁴ High schools should be established to “provide training in English, commercial subjects and natural science, especially agriculture” while “better funded collegiate institutes” should prepare students for university-level coursework.¹⁶⁵ Over time, Tomkins tells us, “the distinction between the two types of institutes was narrowed.”¹⁶⁶

While still “multi-purpose in function,” the “well-equipped and well-staffed urban schools that developed in Ontario after 1871” kept a “strong classical orientation,”¹⁶⁷ primarily a consequence of their curricular control by the universities. Science and commercial subjects were only “grudgingly incorporated” into secondary-school curricula, and then only “as concessions to industrial demands and scientific advances.”¹⁶⁸ By 1880, British Columbia had opened its first high school in Victoria; its curriculum was “as broad as any established or proposed in the eastern provinces.”¹⁶⁹ On the Prairies, high schools copied the Ontario model; Winnipeg’s first collegiate institute opened in 1882, providing both preparation for university coursework as well as teacher training.¹⁷⁰ Tomkins tells us that “all these schools initially functioned primarily as *de facto* normal schools to meet the burgeoning demand for elementary teachers.”¹⁷¹ Canadians were “unable to agree, as the Americans soon did, on a standard twelve year eight-four pattern for elementary and secondary schooling.”¹⁷² Ten years later – in 1892 – the Ontario model of the high school as an “elite institution modeled on the English public school” – Upper Canada College being its primary example – “remained powerful.”¹⁷³ University influence on secondary school curriculum also resulted from teachers’ own disciplinary commitments; Tomkins reports that “university graduates in Latin, unable to obtain other employment, turned to teaching and became staunch advocates of the subject.”¹⁷⁴

Despite the efforts of Latin schoolteachers and university professors, modern languages made their way into the school curriculum by the 1880s.¹⁷⁵ The arguments of those who defended Latin – often based on “mental discipline,” e.g. the mind-as-muscle metaphor – were met by those of critics who pointed at that if Latin was justified due to its provision of “mental discipline,” Chinese and Russian should work just as well.¹⁷⁶ French had appeared in the Ontario school curriculum as early as 1854.¹⁷⁷ Twenty years later enrollment in French courses passed enrollment in Latin courses, although Latin kept its “retained high prestige as a result of the force of tradition and a greater mark weighting in examinations.”¹⁷⁸ German had been taught as early as 1840 but only secured a place in the Ontario school curriculum in 1871, a result of the Ontario Public School Act of that year specifying it as a secondary school subject.¹⁷⁹

By the 1880s, several new subjects achieved “high status” in the Canadian curriculum. Like Latin, mathematics had long enjoyed such status; during the late nineteenth century it evolved into the “examination subjects of algebra, geometry and trigonometry.”¹⁸⁰ During this period – certainly prior to 1890 – theories of mental discipline and faculty psychology structured the arithmetic curriculum; textbooks were organized according to rules, terms were defined, and students commanded to memorize everything.¹⁸¹ On blackboards teachers scrawled examples.¹⁸² Arithmetic not only exercised the mind – or so it was asserted – it was also useful in securing work, specifically “bookkeeping” or “the knowledge of accounts,” these jobs available “in the days before calculating machines.”¹⁸³ Also prevalent in the provinces in the post-Confederation era were algebra and geometry, their inclusion in the secondary-school curriculum rationalized by their capacity to “cultivate and develop the powers of memory, abstraction and generalization,” to teach “strict logical inference” and to give “power and continuity of thought.”¹⁸⁴ This same (now largely but not entirely discredited) rationale – “mental discipline,” the mind-as-a-muscle – “increased the status of mathematics in the curriculum, particularly as the classics declined.”¹⁸⁵

Other subjects may have also offered “mental discipline” but did not always produce observable results. The study of English literature and composition had “evolved” from “reading, spelling and grammar,”¹⁸⁶ but critics asserted that the study of grammar – however much it may have exercised the mind – still failed to improve students’ English, pointing out that even after years of study many Canadians were still “unable to speak or write correctly.”¹⁸⁷ Other subjects appeared to reflect changing political attitudes. For example, the study of British and Canadian history gained equal status with the study of ancient history.¹⁸⁸ The inclusion of music, art and the practical subjects encountered resistance, “as they still do.”¹⁸⁹ Music was at first vocal music only, it took the “form of rote-singing and instruction in the rudiments.”¹⁹⁰ Art was at first equivalent to drawing, which, after 1871, became a regular subject in Ontario; by 1900, “drawing,” by then an examination subject, had morphed into “art.”¹⁹¹ Early on the science curriculum encompassed “natural history,” meaning “botany and zoology,

including human physiology.”¹⁹² Physics and chemistry were construed as “natural philosophy.”¹⁹³

Social issues did surface in the curriculum, explicitly so when, in 1887, “temperance” was added to the curriculum.¹⁹⁴ The textbook titled *Public School Temperance* became required reading as the subject was embedded in the High School Entrance Examination.¹⁹⁵ Weekly one-hour “familiar conversations” on the “degrading tendencies” of the habitual use of alcohol and narcotics were compulsory.¹⁹⁶ Another expression of concern for students’ well-being – one that, unlike temperance, has persisted – was the inclusion in the curriculum of physical education, a subject Ryerson thought essential. Then conceived of as “physical culture,”¹⁹⁷ the topic was considered conducive to “school discipline and morale,” as “it cultivated habits of obedience while serving,”¹⁹⁸ as he put it, as “a powerful antidote to inattention or absence of mind.”¹⁹⁹ Although, Tomkins tells us, the subject took “little formal place in Canadian curricula before 1900,” standard “forms of physical culture such as team games, military drill, gymnastics and calisthenics were early valued for the contribution to moral and general character development and their fostering of Christianity and patriotism.”²⁰⁰ These associations stemmed from the thinking of Thomas Arnold, himself “the influential headmaster of England’s Rugby School (and father of Matthew Arnold) whose ideal of ‘godliness and good earning’ emphasized ‘manliness’ that connoted moral courage and maturity.”²⁰¹ This educational ideal became “transmuted” into “muscular Christianity,”²⁰² but not only Christians became enthralled with the fantasies of muscularity, so did certain Jews.²⁰³ Given threats – imagined and real – from their neighbour to the south, so did certain Canadians.²⁰⁴

“Despite many gaps and serious limitations,”²⁰⁵ the Canadian curriculum – Tomkins attributes its “order and efficiency” to Ryerson – “aroused the envy of American educators.”²⁰⁶ At the 1893 World Columbian Exposition held in Chicago, the Ontario Department of Education received a special award for “a system of public instruction almost ideal in the perfection of its details and [for] the unity which binds together in one great whole all the schools from the kindergarten to the university.”²⁰⁷

REFERENCES

Armour, Leslie and Trott, Elizabeth. 1981. *The Faces of Reason: An Essay on Philosophy and Culture in English Canada 1850-1950*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Press.

Atwood, Margaret. 2012 (1972). *Survival. A Thematic Guide to Canadian Literature*. Toronto: House of Anansi.

- Boyarin, Daniel. 1997. *Unheroic Conduct: The Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clark, Penney. 2009, September. "Great Chorus of Protest": A Case Study of Conflict over the 1909 Easton's Readers. *History of Education* 38 (5), 681-703.
- Cremin, Lawrence. 1961. *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education 1876-1957*. New York: Vintage.
- Cremin, Lawrence. 1971. Curriculum-making in the United States. *Teachers College Record*, 73 (2), 207-220. Reprinted with Cremin's autobiographical statement in *Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists*, edited by William F. Pinar (19-35). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Grimmett, Peter P. 2022. *Restoring Soul, Passion, and Purpose in Teacher Education: Contesting the Instrumentalization of Curriculum and Pedagogy*. London: Routledge.
- Kimmel, Michael S. 1996. *Manhood in America: A Cultural History*. New York: Free Press
- Phelan, Anne, Pinar, William F., Ng-A-Fook, Nicholas, and Kane, Ruth. 2020. *Reconceptualizing Teacher Education Worldwide: A Canadian Contribution to a Global Challenge*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Pinar, William F. 2001. *The Gender of Racial Politics and Violence in America: Lynching, Prison Rape, and the Crisis of Masculinity*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Pinar, William F. 2006. *Race, Religion, and a Curriculum of Reparation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pinar, William F. 2010. The Eight-Year Study. *Curriculum Inquiry* 40 (2), 295-316.
- Pinar, William F. 2015. *Educational Experience as Lived*. New York: Routledge.
- Pinar, William F. 2019. *What Is Curriculum Theory?* [3rd edition.] New York: Routledge.
- Pinar, William F. 2022. Indexical Traces of the Real: Teaching in the Techno-Nation-State. In the *World Yearbook of Education 2022: Education, Schooling and the Global Universalization of Nationalism*, edited by Daniel Tröhler, Nelli Piattoeva, and William F. Pinar (136-149). London: Routledge.

Pinar, William F. in press. *A Praxis of Presence in Curriculum Theory: Advancing Curere against Cultural Crises in Education*. Routledge.

Pinar, William F., Reynolds, William, Slattery, Patrick, and Taubman, Peter. 1995. *Understanding Curriculum*. New York: Peter Lang.

Taubman, Peter M. 2009. *Teaching by Numbers: Deconstructing the Discourse of Standards and Accountability in Education*. New York: Routledge.

Tomkins, George S. 1986. *A Common Countenance: Stability and Change in the Canadian Curriculum*. Scarborough, Ontario, Canada: Prentice-Hall. [Reissued In 2008 by Pacific Educational Press.]

Williamson, Ben. 2017. *Big Data in Education. The Digital Future of Learning, Policy and Practice*. London: Sage.

ENDNOTES

¹ 1986, 38.

² In the U.S., the politically reactionary Reagan Administration (1981-89) blamed schools (not the Administration) for the economic state of the nation: see Pinar 2019, 57.

³ 1986, 38. U.S. politicians blamed schools – and not themselves or the U.S. military – for the Soviet success in space, e.g. the launching of the Sputnik satellite: (see Pinar 2019, 55).

⁴ 1986, 38.

⁵ For Cremin's canonical studies of progressivism in U.S. schools and of curriculum-making in the U.S. see Cremin 1961, 1971.

⁶ Quoted in 1986, 38.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ 1986, 38.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid. Tomkins (1986, 39) tells us: "Industrial education for Indian boys, vagrant children and delinquents emphasized moral redemption." Blame the victim.

¹¹ 1986, 40.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ 1986, 40-41.

¹⁵ 1986, 41.

¹⁶ As I complain: Pinar 2015, 47.

¹⁷ 1986, 41.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ “Canadians had long seen history as an instrument of cultural survival,” Tomkins (1986, 42) points out, echoing Atwood (2012 [1972]).

²⁰ 1986, 41.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

²³ 1986, 42.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Quoted in 1986, 42.

²⁷ 1986, 43.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid.

³² 1986, 44.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ 1986, 45.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Quoted in 1986, 45.

³⁷ 1986, 45.

³⁸ Quoted in 1986, 45.

³⁹ 1986, 49. Quite the contrary in Manitoba where, in 1890, the legislature abolished the dual system of Catholic and Protestant school; it even eliminated the official status of French, a move modified under the leadership of Sir Wilfred Laurier, but in truth only a “limited restoration of minority rights” that lasted until a reactionary move toward “unilingual Anglo-conformity during World War I” (1986, 48). “Now,” Tomkins (1986, 49) reminds, despite education being under the jurisdiction of the provinces, the “federal government” is involved “in a wide range of educational activities, including the promotion of curriculum development.”

⁴⁰ 1986, 49.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid. In the United States, too, the mind was considered a muscle, its development dependent on exercise not necessarily meaningful in nature. (This is a view that has not entirely disappeared today.) Comprehension came into play in the twentieth century: see Pinar et al. 1995.

⁴³ 1986, 50.

44 Ibid.

45 Ibid.

46 Ibid.

47 Ibid.

48 1986, 55-56. Emphasis in the passage Tomkins quotes.

49 Pinar et al. 1995.

50 See research brief #80; also <http://www.ryerson.ca/archives/egerton.html>

51 1986, 56

52 Ibid.

53 Ibid.

54 Ibid. Regarding the concept of “Normal School” see:

https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Normal_school

As noted, the term is still used in China, e.g. East China Normal University:

<http://english.ecnu.edu.cn/1712/list.htm>

55 1986, 56. For an overview of recent developments, see Taubman 2009, Williamson 2017.

56 Ibid.

57 Ibid.

58 Ibid.

59 1986, 57.

60 Ibid.

61 Ibid. Apparently there was little attention to aesthetics, as Tomkins (1986, 57) tells us that “textbooks ... with their small type, dull covers and lack of illustrations, remained unattractive.”

62 Ibid.

63 Ibid.

64 Ibid.

65 Ibid.

66 Ibid.

67 Ibid.

68 Ibid.

69 Ibid.

70 Ibid.

71 Ibid.

72 1986, 57-58.

73 1986, 58.

74 Ibid.

75 Ibid.

76 1986, 59.

77 Ibid.

-
- ⁷⁸ 1986, 60. “In Ryerson’s 1846 report,” Tomkins (1986, 60) writes, “more than thirty pages were devoted to the teaching of religion and morality, including biblical instruction,” as “Ryerson emphasized the ‘absolute necessity of making Christianity the basis and cement of the structure of public education.’”
- ⁷⁹ Ibid.
- ⁸⁰ Ibid.
- ⁸¹ Ibid.
- ⁸² Ibid.
- ⁸³ Ibid.
- ⁸⁴ Ibid.
- ⁸⁵ 1986, 61.
- ⁸⁶ Quoted in 1986, 61.
- ⁸⁷ 1986, 61.
- ⁸⁸ Ibid.
- ⁸⁹ Ibid.
- ⁹⁰ 1986, 62.
- ⁹¹ 1986, 63.
- ⁹² Pinar 2019, 68.
- ⁹³ 1986, 62.
- ⁹⁴ Ibid.
- ⁹⁵ Ibid.
- ⁹⁶ 1986, 63.
- ⁹⁷ Ibid.
- ⁹⁸ 1986, 64.
- ⁹⁹ Ibid. James Laughlin Hughes was born near Bowmanville, Ontario on February 20, 1846; he died in Toronto on January 3, 1935. Hughes had been educated at the Toronto Normal School; he became principal of its associated Model School at age 24: <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/james-laughlin-hughes>
- ¹⁰⁰ Ibid.
- ¹⁰¹ Quoted in 1986, 64.
- ¹⁰² Ibid. Before entering an experimental urban education program my senior at Ohio State, I was subjected to similar nonsense, as in one course we were to track how long a teacher talked, how long each student talked. What was being talked about – recall the curriculum question is: what knowledge is of most worth? – was apparently irrelevant (Pinar 2015, 3).
- ¹⁰³ Quoted in 1986, 64.
- ¹⁰⁴ 1986, 64.
- ¹⁰⁵ Ibid.
- ¹⁰⁶ What’s “new” now? See Pinar 2022.
- ¹⁰⁷ Ibid
- ¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

-
- ¹⁰⁹ Ibid.
- ¹¹⁰ 1986, 65.
- ¹¹¹ Ibid.
- ¹¹² Ibid.
- ¹¹³ Quoted in 1986, 65.
- ¹¹⁴ 1986, 65.
- ¹¹⁵ Ibid. Armour and Trott (1981, 216) tell us that “Watson was to exercise an important influence on the country. Young men went out from Queen’s to man the growing civil service, Presbyterian churches across the country, and the newer universities in the west. For more than fifty years, Watson was the dominant – sometimes *the* dominant influence – at Queen’s. He played a significant role in the intellectual background and even in some of the practical negotiations which led to the United Church of Canada. His pupils seem to have carried with them an echo of that dry voice and its persistent demand for reasonableness and it often stayed with them for life.”
- ¹¹⁶ Ibid. For more on Marean see:
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/254295206_Ada_Marean_Hughes_A_Loyal_Soldier
- ¹¹⁷ Ibid.
- ¹¹⁸ 1986, 66.
- ¹¹⁹ Ibid.
- ¹²⁰ Ibid.
- ¹²¹ In 1859, Tomkins informs us, Ryerson “authorized the establishment of school libraries” (1986, 67).
- ¹²² 1986, 66.
- ¹²³ 1986, 67. There is a burgeoning scholarly literature on textbooks in Canada: see, for example, Clark 2009.
- ¹²⁴ Ibid.
- ¹²⁵ Tomkins (1986, 68) reports that “while Catholics had few objections to the [Irish] Readers, to Ryerson’s disappointment they still insisted on separate schools.”
- ¹²⁶ 1986, 67.
- ¹²⁷ Ibid.
- ¹²⁸ Ibid.
- ¹²⁹ 1986, 68.
- ¹³⁰ Ibid.
- ¹³¹ 1986, 88.
- ¹³² Ibid.
- ¹³³ 1986, 69.
- ¹³⁴ Ibid.
- ¹³⁵ Ibid.
- ¹³⁶ Ibid.

-
- 137 Ibid.
- 138 1986, 70.
- 139 Ibid.
- 140 Quoted in 1986, 70.
- 141 1986, 70.
- 142 Ibid.
- 143 Pinar 2019, 105.
- 144 1986, 70.
- 145 Ibid.
- 146 For a synopsis see Pinar 2010.
- 147 1986, 71.
- 148 Ibid.
- 149 Ibid.
- 150 Ibid.
- 151 For recent contributions see Grimmett 2022, Phelan et al. 2020.
- 152 1986, 71.
- 153 1986, 72-73.
- 154 1986, 76.
- 155 Ibid.
- 156 Ibid. For a summary of the factory model and its structuration of the U.S. school curriculum see Pinar et al. 1995.
- 157 1986, 77.
- 158 1986, 76.
- 159 1986, 77.
- 160 Quoted in 1986, 78.
- 161 1986, 78.
- 162 Pinar 2019, 54.
- 163 1986, 79.
- 164 Ibid. George Paxton Young, Armour and Trott (1981, 85) tell us, “holds a remarkable place in the history of Canadian philosophy. He was the first of the long and influential line of Canadian idealists and the first to mark a firm line between religion and philosophy – a line which caused him, briefly, to give up his livelihood.”
- 165 Ibid.
- 166 Ibid.
- 167 Ibid.
- 168 1986, 80.
- 169 Ibid.
- 170 Ibid.
- 171 Ibid.
- 172 Ibid.

¹⁷³ Ibid.

¹⁷⁴ 1986, 82. In the U.S. Latin disappears as a curriculum staple during the 1920s (see Pinar et. al 1995); I argue for its re-emphasis in *A Praxis of Presence in Curriculum Theory* (in press), third behind History and Poetry, all antidotes to a STEM state of Mind. I do not, however, advocate one curriculum to be studied by everyone.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid.

¹⁷⁶ 1986, 84.

¹⁷⁷ 1986, 85.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid.

¹⁸⁰ 1986, 82.

¹⁸¹ 1986, 86.

¹⁸² Ibid.

¹⁸³ 1986, 87.

¹⁸⁴ Quoted in 1986, 87.

¹⁸⁵ 1986, 87.

¹⁸⁶ 1986, 82.

¹⁸⁷ 1986, 84.

¹⁸⁸ 1986, 82.

¹⁸⁹ 1986, 83.

¹⁹⁰ 1986, 89.

¹⁹¹ Ibid.

¹⁹² 1986, 87.

¹⁹³ Ibid.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁹⁵ 1986, 88.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁹⁷ In the U.S., Kimmel (1996, 127) chronicles, it was one Bernarr Macfadden who was considered the founder of Physical Culture; he promoted a “new muscular manhood to be built from purified blood, deep breathing exercises, vigorous workouts with barbells, and large doses of his breakfast cereal, Strengthro.” Macfadden, Kimmel adds, was also the “proud inventor of a ‘peniscope,’ a cylindrical glass tube with a rubber hose at one end attached to a vacuum pump, designed to enlarge the male organ” (ibid.)

¹⁹⁸ 1986, 90.

¹⁹⁹ Quoted in 1986, 90.

²⁰⁰ 1986, 90.

²⁰¹ 1986, 90-91. The 1890s were an era in which occurred a crisis of masculinity – the phrase is historians’ – and not only in North America (Pinar 2001) but in Europe too (Pinar 2006). Its racial consequences could be horrifying.

²⁰² 1986, 91.

²⁰³ This point Boyarin (1997, 37) makes clear: “The Westernization process for Jews, clearly then not to be simply identification with modernization *tout court*, was one in which *mentsh* as Jewish male ideal became largely abandoned for a dawning ideal of the ‘New Jewish Man,’ the ‘Muscle-Jew,’ a figure almost identical to his ‘Aryan’ confreres and especially the ‘Muscular Christian,’ also born at about this time. Reversing the cultural process by which the late antique Jewish male and the Christian religious male got their self-definition in opposition to prevailing imperial modes of masculinity, in the Victorian era both of these groups sought to conflate their masculinity with that of ‘real men.’”

²⁰⁴ Tomkins (1986, 91) alludes to “threats of American invasion manifested in the hit and run Fenian raids that occurred from the New Brunswick to Manitoba borders following the Civil War.” These were attacks – between 1866 and 1871 – by members of the U.S.-based Fenian Brotherhood on British army forts, customs posts and other targets in Canada in order to bring pressure on Britain to withdraw from Ireland. While the U.S. authorities arrested those involved, there was speculation that many had ignored their preparations for the raids, angered at actions that could be construed as British assistance to the Confederacy during the American Civil War. Retrieved on June 8, 2007, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fenian_Raids

²⁰⁵ 1986, 92. These were more pronounced in rural Canada where, Tomkins (1986, 92) tells us, “meager resources, limited inspection, the meager backgrounds and sheer lack of teachers, their transience and that of their students meant that the curriculum as experienced by the individual child was probably idiosyncratic.”

²⁰⁶ 1986, 92.

²⁰⁷ Ibid.