

assault on capitalists in Lancashire as elsewhere, notably in Glasgow, as Young found in his *Rousing of the Scottish Working Class* (1979). It is important that those who advocate the use of class exploitation as the principal explanatory tool for nineteenth-century English history begin to take sectarianism into account and give it the importance that seems its due.

Julian GWYN
University of Ottawa

* * *

M. J. DAUNTON — *House and Home in the Victorian City: Working Class Housing, 1850-1914*. London: Edward Arnold, 1983. Pp. ix, 320.

This study presents earlier works as having the serious flaws of considering policy rather than reality and concentrating on types of housing, such as the philanthropic model, which provided only a minority of dwellings. It concentrates on the private investment which provided the bulk of worker housing in the nineteenth century. M.J. Daunton provides summaries of earlier research and closely reasoned critiques of existing theories. His thorough, carefully detailed research lays the foundations for his challenges to existing approaches as well as for the presentation of his own. Case studies of several different towns and regions, including Tyneside, Leeds and Plymouth, allow intelligent distinctions to be made between national and local conditions. Patterns of housing development in other nations are often included, providing an added dimension to the case study approach and leading to the conclusion that “In international terms, it is the *unusual* style of housing in England which demands explanation” (p. 58).

The pattern of nineteenth-century working-class housing was neither uniform nor static, not a foregone conclusion but the product of the subtle interplay of many forces including the availability of land, the system of tenure, the price of land and building materials as they varied across time and place, the size of the building firm, the demand for houses, the wage levels of the workers, and the nature and extent of local housing regulations. Lying behind each of these elements is yet another layer of complex forces and interrelationships. For example, building by-laws varied from town to town and were determined by such things as the time of their passage, the composition of the local council, and the balance of political power in the community: “The explanation of housing form thus merges with the structure of local politics” (p. 185). Meanwhile, the payment of rent, that essential but mundane act of tenancy, had a wide ranging impact on the lives of the workers: “The frequency of rent collection affected budgetary habits; the length of the let controlled labour mobility; the strictness or flexibility of attitudes towards arrears and eviction determined the response to periods of economic pressure” (p. 132).

Standards of working class housing improved overall, especially in the latter part of the nineteenth century. This process was accompanied by a change in the pattern of the private space of the house from “a promiscuous sharing of facilities to an encapsulated or self-contained residential style” (p. 12). At the same time, public space lost the “cellular” quality which had allowed the mixing of public and private use of common space, and acquired a more open texture, becoming “waste space...which was to be traversed rather than used” (p. 12).

The end result of these processes was that the distinction between private and public space became more clearly drawn, a factor which underlay such developments as an increasing emphasis on domesticity on the one hand and a growing official control of behaviour in public places on the other.

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 intervene 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.