political debate between revolution and reformism that he revives in his book isn’t somehow passé. I suspect that Cornel West has realized this. That’s why he’s less obsessed with doctrinal purity and more focused on multi-dimensional approaches and explanations that, while messy, are loyal to the incredibly complex world we live in. A generation ago, this approach might have been dismissed by an orthodox Marxist as “decadently bourgeois.” Today, apparently, the preferred term of condemnation is “progressive.”

Kerry Walters
Gettysburg College


The publication of this valuable contribution to Dewey’s philosophy of education is another instance of interest in John Dewey in the Spanish-speaking world. The author, María del Coro Molinos Tejada, is a professor both in the Institute of Middle School Education (of English) of Bassauri and the Department of Education of the University of Navarra, Pamplona (Spain). As we are informed by Professor Molinos in her introductory chapter (19), the aim of this in-depth study is to present, in an expository rather than critical manner, Dewey’s concept and practice of the curriculum, with its theoretical foundations—as seen in the Laboratory of Elementary School of the University of Chicago, and in his writings of those years as well as in pertinent writings to the end of his life.

The study is divided into three main parts, plus a shorter fourth part, always with extensive use of Dewey’s own words wherever possible (translated expertly by the author), and with occasional reference to leading secondary studies. Part one begins with a rather abstract definition of the curriculum (as synonymous with an educative program) and gradually develops the definition to include the following: the essential connection between learning and the active participation of the student; the necessity that the contents of the curriculum emerge from the students’ current (age group) experiences and be “reconstructed” with the aid of the teacher; and (especially) that reconstructed experiences show the parallels to both the student’
familial and social worlds to illustrate how people interact (later "transact" is used) with their surroundings.

This part relies heavily—as it should have—on the most complete history of the school, publish (in 1936) by two of the teachers of that institution, Katherine Camp Mayhow and Anna Camp Edwards. This history, *The Dewey School: The Laboratory School of the University of Chicago (1896-1903)*, is all the more valuable because Dewey himself, at the request of the authors, contributed information to the introduction and footnotes, clearly labeled "John Dewey, written for the authors." As Dewey wrote for the introduction: “the account of the Laboratory School contained in the pages that follow is so adequate as to render it unnecessary for me to add anything to what is said about its origin, aims, and methods.” (Dewey’s statements appear in volume 11 of *The Later Works, John Dewey*, edited by Jo Ann Boydston, 191-216.)

Part Two, "the Foundational Principles of the Curriculum," devotes a chapter each to Dewey’s main principles that underlie the curriculum. These include the principles of: the organic unity of growth; activity; interest; associated activity to attain social ends; control of experience; continuity of experience; and psychological development. Part three, "Development of the Foundations of the Curriculum (1904-1952)," adds to Dewey’s theory of utilizing materials from his post-1904 writings, especially from *How We Think* and *Democracy and Education*. Among the key chapters in this part are treatments of Dewey’s naturalism, pattern of scientific inquiry, and the socioeconomic context of the curriculum.

The more brief part four, "Implications and Conclusions", draws out the various implications as the author sees them from Dewey’s thought, above all that any curriculum must be continuously open to development, keeping in mind the mutual fecundity of theory and practice (381) and their mutual continuity (383). Among her chief conclusions is that Dewey’s curricular experience is not transferable but that its principles can be applied to other situations as guides (379), that the importance of Dewey is not so much that he offered a concrete model of curriculum improvement at a key juncture of American education, but that he presented the proper manner of reflecting on a curriculum (391,393).
The book under review is the author's unrevised doctoral dissertation, presented in 1983 at the University of Navarra. As she writes in the Prologue: "... Twenty years have passed during which period I have wanted many times to return to the work to restructure and rewrite it, polishing it here and there, [but] it has been impossible to do so" (14). Nevertheless, at the encouragement of various colleagues, especially José Luis Gonzales-Simancas (one of her former professors, and author of the book's "Presentation") and Jaime Nubiola (who needs no introduction to the members of SAAP), she agreed to have it published as the thirty-ninth volume in the "Sciences of Education" collection of the university's press.

In almost all cases, this would be unacceptable. However, her dissertation is of such a high quality, utilizing original sources by Dewey and minimally relying on secondary sources, exhibiting such meticulous research and mature presentation, that it is understandable why she was urged to share it with the vast Spanish-reading public. (It should have been published immediately after its defense. If Professor Molinos does find the time to update and translate into English her research, it would be a valuable addition to an even wider audience.) Her book goes into more detail concerning Dewey and the Laboratory School than do the three excellent recent studies: Harriet K. Cuffaro, Experimenting with the World: John Dewey and the Early Childhood Classroom; Laurel N. Tanner, Dewey's Laboratory School, Lessons for Today; and Stephen M. Fishman and Lucille McCarthy, John Dewey and the Challenge of Classroom Practice (all published by Teachers College Press, respectively in 1995, 1997, and 1998).

When Professor Molinos presented her dissertation, Dewey's work was not as well known in Spain (and the Spanish-speaking world) as it once had been and as it is now. (For an overview of Dewey's influence in the Spanish-speaking world, see: Jaime Nubiola and Beatriz Sierra, "La recepción de Dewey en España y Latinoamérica," Utopía y Praxis Latinoamérica, "Revista Internacional de Filosofía Iberoamericana y Teoría Social," Venezuela, 6, no. 13, junio 2001, pages 107-119; and Antón Donoso, "John Dewey in Spain and Spanish America," International Philosophical Quarterly, U.S.A. and Belgium, 41, no.3, September 2001, pages 347-363.) Spain was largely still under the influence of scholasticism, and not many Spaniards could
read English well. Having studied as a Fulbright Scholar at the University of Kansas for her M.A. in Education during which time she was introduced to Dewey's position, Professor Molinos is in an excellent position to translate the numerous passages by Dewey. She tries to correct the misunderstanding of Dewey in Spain, especially concerning the maxim "Learning through doing." She correctly points out that there was a parallel between the attitude of the educators at Madrid's Krausist-inspired prestigious pre-civil war Institution Libre de Ensenanza and Dewey's Laboratory School. I hope that one day she will undertake such a comparison.

Antón Donoso
University of Detroit/Mercy


One of the inherent difficulties in making evaluative judgments of books lies in the hidden values embedded within the presumptive ground from which one makes those judgments. This difficulty is exacerbated in the case of edited volumes since, typically, they do not represent the work of an author sustained through the treatment of a unitary theme. Thus, in such cases what is being evaluated is not so much the author's skill as it is the skill of the editors in choosing appropriately representative material; where "appropriately representative" assumes the burden ordinarily shouldered by the dominant theme of the author. In the case of Sidney Hook on Pragmatism, Democracy and Freedom: The Essential Essays, we would naturally expect to see some treatment of Hook's personal movement from the pro-Marxist stance of his early years to the starkly anti-Leninist/Stalinist position of his later years (Hook's comments indicating that he "had never undergone a political change of mind" related by Alan Ryan in the "Foreword" notwithstanding), especially as that transition was facilitated by Hook's adoption of pragmatism, the philosophy of his own teacher, John Dewey. In this, the editors have somewhat disappointed us; the five major sections of the book, although they include key essays that help to trace the development of Hook's thought from his "Experimental Naturalism" to the "Education in Defense of a