

'are coming to see, intuitively, that to escape the onus of the history their fathers made they must face and admit the moral truth concerning the works of their fathers.' They have picked up the technique of civil disobedience from the young coloured heroes who started the great rebellion in Montgomery. The same phenomenon is apparent in the British universities today. While in streets and schools, the less educated, to whom Mr Powell has given such encouragement, are inflicting filthy words and deeds upon their coloured fellow-citizens, in the higher world of education an absolute

rejection of racialism is apparent. If the Thames, rather than the Tiber, is to foam with blood, much of it will come from the veins of white people aligned with non-whites, and in both cases it will be from the élite of the nation. It would be foolish to deny the possibility. 'Everywhere', Mr Cleaver says, 'the whites are fighting to prolong their status, to retard the erosion of their position.' In doing so they are ensuring that the ultimate victory of humanity will have to be won at a bitter price.

PAUL FOSTER, O.F.P.

WHO ARE THE PROGRESSIVES NOW?, by Maurice Ash. *Routledge and Kegan Paul*. £2.

This book is a record of a colloquy held at Dartington Hall; a confrontation, rather, between two groups of educators both anxious to claim the title of 'Progressives' and to justify their claim. The book is divided into two parts. In Part I Maurice Ash gathers together the principal themes of the debate under five heads, illustrating them copiously with extracts from the discussions. In Part II he presents extracts from the formal papers by Hu and Lois Child, L. C. Schiller, D. W. Winnicott, Liam Hudson, Douglas Pidgeon, Michael Young, Kenneth Barnes and Royston Lambert. It is an excellent method of presentation. The first part systematizes the arguments of the debate without losing the feel and the excitement of the living clash of idea on idea and experience against experience. The second part, while being, on the whole, less interesting, provides a useful gloss on the first by rehearsing the main themes formally.

In Part I, one has the impression, as Liam Hudson remarks in his paper, that 'a surface of facts or objective data seems to swell on the tides of prejudice and belief'. Yet the contributions well up from such deep springs of experience and devotion as almost to make one believe that anything will work in education provided those who practise it believe passionately enough that it will. The discussion is for the most part straightforwardly as well as enthusiastically expressed, and does not lapse into that curious kind of *Educanto* in which so much of our educational discourse is conducted.

The adversaries in this conflict are on the one hand 'traditional' progressive educators mostly from schools like Dartington Hall and St Christopher's. They stand for traditional child-centred views, freedom, rich personal relationships, emphasis on the expressive and creative arts; they wish to assert the value

of the personality of the individual child against the dominance of the curriculum or of social conventions. Their discourse, says Maurice Ash, is a language-game revolving round the central concept of person. Ranged against them are the 'new progressives' committed to the state system, to comprehensive education, political realities and equality. They characterize the traditional progressives as 'protected, precious and unreal'. They allege that the state system has assimilated all the real values of progressivism, and added social realism, a concern for contemporary needs and socially useful skills which in *their* language-game are necessary for the development of personality. They characterize the ideal of leaving space for inner maturation—leave childhood to ripen in your children—as culturally naive. It is, they argue, a wholly relativistic concept. The traditional progressives retort as best they can to this attack from a party so obviously at present in the ascendant. In their view comprehensive education provides a 'societal paternalism' rather than real equality and their hope is that their personalism will enable children to grow up to animate society rather than be fitted into it.

Although one of the contributors remarks that the conflict between the individual and society is 'an argument of twenty years ago' it is clearly still very much alive in these debates. The traditional progressives want to set their children over against society, with an eye on service and social reform certainly, but otherwise leaving it out of account. The conflict is also one between the empiricist and the existentialist outlooks; between those concerned with learning theory and curriculum development and those whose priorities are emotional and motivational factors. An American reflection of the same controversy

appears in Richard Jones's *Contemporary Educational Psychology* which sets side by side the work on the curriculum and cognitive growth centring round Jerome Bruner, and Laurence Kubie's *Forgotten Man in Education*, a line of thought in the Freudian tradition.

As might be expected, the currently popular notion of creativity figures largely in the debate. It is to this theme that Professor Hudson devotes the most interesting paper in the second half of the book. His title is 'Lieben und Arbeiten—a case of cake and eat it'. He discusses the relationship between divergent thinking and originality and does not find it a strong one. The source of originality, he thinks, is to be found in non-intellective factors, 'the channelling of powerful impulses away from

the sphere of personal relationships and into that of work'. Social scientists tend to value personal relationships highly and build their paradigm of normality round them. But perhaps any tactic or 'life-style' is as valid as any other, provided it works. Perhaps a life where the energy is channelled into 'arbeiten' is as healthy as one where it is devoted to 'lieben' or precariously distributed between the two. Perhaps one can produce brain-workers or contented children but not both. Perhaps. . . .

The dilemma is unresolved and Professor Hudson's thesis can bring little comfort to either party. But the book illuminates one's educational thinking in almost every direction.

KEVIN NICHOLS

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT IN CONTEXT, by Anne Crichton. *Batsford*, London, 1968. 360 pp. 84s.

The contribution of effective personnel management to the development of good industrial relations both within the plant and industry at large has been widely recognized by numerous commentators (*v.* Allan Flanders, 'The Future of Personnel Management', *Personnel Management*, Dec. 1964; and Tom Lupton, 'Industrial Behaviour and Personnel Management', I.P.M., 1964). The Report of the Royal Commission on Trade Union and Employers' Associations (the Donovan Commission) and the Government's White Paper *In Place of Strife* have all assumed that the personnel manager should be able to play his role within the organization even if this has not been the case in the past: 'If companies have their own personnel specialists, why have they not introduced effective personnel policies to control methods of negotiation and pay structures within their firm? . . . Many firms have no such policy, and perhaps no conception of it' (*Report of the Royal Commission on Trade Union and Employers' Associations*, London, H.M.S.O. Cmd. 3623, 1968, para. 94-95).

This book was written and will now be read during a period of public discussion about the quality of British Industrial Relations. Miss Crichton is to be congratulated for providing a book which should help to focus this public debate upon the problems rather than the pseudo-issues of the national press. Personnel management is placed firmly within its organizational context and the work organization is effectively linked to the society 'outside the gate'.

In the first section of her book the author examines the place of personnel management

within management generally. She deftly combines a historical awareness with a grasp of the realities of organizational behaviour. Occasionally her historical account leaves the reader with a few doubts. 'There has been a tendency since the early 1950s to argue that the best form of participation is stronger and more constructive opposition by the Union' (p. 18). This may have been the view of the official trade union leadership but it did not reflect the reality of workplace industrial relations. Within the plant, power and control have shifted nearer the shop floor and it is now likely to remain there. From this base the unions have successfully pursued the policy of 'encroaching control'. The description of management ideologies and the wish of management 'to delegate the ritual of bargaining' is much more successful. The importation of transatlantic management ideologies is recognized and accepted with resignation because of the failure of the British ideology, which still regards the firm as a unitary system. In posing the question 'What is Personnel Management?', Miss Crichton neatly presents the problem in two words: 'Efficiency and Justice.' That these two terms are meaningful to all persons at work is obvious. The notion of justice in social relations has been more fully developed by George Homans in his notion of 'distributive justice' (*Social Behaviour: Its Elementary Forms*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1961. Chapter 12). It is a pity that the influence of this member of the Human Relations school is not more clearly described. The problem presented by evaluation in personnel management is then briefly sketched