Daunton argues, persuasively, that previous analyses of both nineteenth- and twentieth-century housing patterns have been distorted by their erroneous basic assumptions. Earlier studies tend to take the development of council housing in the twentieth century for granted, simply presuming that it was the inevitable outgrowth of events which took place at the turn of the century. His comparative approach leads Daunton to pose a question rather than make an assumption. He sees the crucial question as being whether the failure of private investment caused the state to invervene to provide more housing or whether it was the intervention of the state, particularly under the pressures of war, which caused the private market to fail. He concludes that landlords were facing increasing problems, such as a change in the financial markets which made property investment less attractive and a decline in their political power, before the First World War. The state, under pressure of war, subsequently interfered in the housing market and created serious distortions which added to the problems of the landlords. This weakened the ability of the private housing market to cope with twentieth-century demands, paving the way for the expanded provision of government housing.

It is a serious disappointment to hear so little from the inhabitants of the working-class housing. There are some comments on how the working classes behaved, both from the author and from contemporary sources, but there is regrettably little from the people themselves. Good use is made of photographs, diagrams and tables and the work is well footnoted, but the absence of a bibliography is a drawback, especially as the footnote form does not use short titles. With the exception of these flaws, this is a fine and thoughtful work which makes a real contribution to the field.

Janet Roebuck
University of New Mexico

* * *

Thomas R. Osborne — *A Grande École for the Grands Corps. The Recruitment and Training of the French Administrative Elite in the Nineteenth Century.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1983. Pp. ix, 167.

Thomas Osborne's *A Grande École for the Grands Corps* succinctly examines the origins of the *École Libre des Sciences Politiques* (popularly known as "*Sciences Po*"), a school devoted to the training of high government administrators. Despite the centralized nature of both French schooling and the bureaucracy, there was prior to 1872 no school or faculty specifically dedicated to the training of high *fonctionnaires*. Although politicians and *universitaires* had long argued about the need for such a school, when the gap was filled it was filled as a result of private initiative, not state action.

Osborne recounts well how the possibility of such a school had been raised during the Revolution and remained a constant subject of educational debate throughout the nineteenth century. He shows how a variety of proposals foundered as governments fell, ministers changed, and coalitions dissolved. The vested interests of deputies, who clung to patronage, of bureaucrats threatened by a potentially new élite whose claim would derive from educational achievement, and of *universitaires*, some of whom wanted the proposed programme placed within their bailiwick, others of whom feared its implications for traditional curriculum, all inhibited agreement. But so did another concern, mentioned by Osborne only in the context of Jules Ferry after a private school had been founded. In the political atmosphere of nineteenth-century France, a public institution that had as its charge the teaching of modern politics and economics was simply too politically sensitive. Prior to Victor Duruy, "modern", e.g., nineteenth-century history was even deemed too dangerous to be taught in high schools.

Despite all the talk about such a school, I discern little real commitment toward it, save by Hippolyte Carnot.

Minister of Education in the heady year of 1848 and son of the founder of the *École Polytechnique*, Carnot established an *École Nationale d'Administration* that year. It lasted one more year. It became entwined in the general political machinations of the Second Republic, in personal opposition to Carnot whose ministry was no more long-lived, and in a dispute over an attempted purge of the faculty at the renowned *Collège de France* (to which the ENA had been appended in an attempt to evade the Chamber's jurisdiction over budgetary initiatives). Matriculation indicated that there was more social than political enthusiasm for such a school.

The ultimate establishment of "*Sciences Po*" owed less to ideas enunciated in older debates than it did to the shock engendered by the Franco-Prussian War and the Commune. Its founder, Émile Boutmy, attributed France's troubles to a failure of its élites and decided that France's salvation lay in a new educational approach that would regenerate élites. If his solution may have been unique, his concern was not — Catholics believed France had to return to religion and built Sacré Coeur as a penintential offering; Ernst Renan focussed on public instruction; education preoccupied intellectuals generally. Although Osborne interprets Boutmy's ideas as a defence of bourgeois class interest, those ideas sound very much like those of Mgr. Felix Dupanloup twenty years earlier calling for the regeneration of a different élite, and are consistent with establishment of other private schools (Catholic universities were legally recognized in 1875), a rise in private schooling at primary, secondary, and higher levels, and a general dissatisfaction with public instruction. Boutmy was interested primarily in the formation of an élite, not in its constitution. Osborne describes the founders of the "*Sciences Po*" variously as proponents of "positivist liberalism" and of "upper-bourgeois liberalism", "orleanist republicans", and members of the "Center-Left", categories that I found more obfuscatory than illuminatory. It is only at this rather sophisticated level of analysis of social and political thought of the 1870s that the book is disappointing.

"*Sciences Po*" became more important than even its founders anticipated because of a division within the French bureaucracy, with the entry to the highest levels achieved through a *concours* rather than progress through the ranks. The result was that teachers selected future administrative leaders through this "club". Indeed, it seems to me that the school provided certification for a prior social connection more than it acted as an institution that provided both limited social mobility and legitimation of élites as did French schooling as a whole. Accessible records of social origins and social advancements unfortunately do not permit Osborne to do the kind of social analysis that Day, Karady, Shinn, and Weiss have done for other schools.

The author is, however, able to provide excellent insight into the kind of ideas to which students were exposed. The practical, modern, and scientific displayed the classic, abstract French tradition. Teachers were generally Anglophiles who emphasized continuity within French history rather than revolutionary redirections.

The book is best on the origins of the school, the values it inculcated and its place in the general debate about French education in the nineteenth century. Lack of documentation prevents much discussion of the clientele or direction of the school after its foundation (fifteen pages treat the period from 1872 to 1945, the latter the date of the establishment of the public *École Nationale d'Administration*). The book fills an important gap in the history of development of schooling and indicates once again that, although a national system of schooling was early established in France, that system owned much to private initiative.

Patrick J. Harrigan
University of Waterloo

* * *