
To appreciate fully the contribution made by Raymond Grew and Patrick Harrigan’s quantitative analysis of nineteenth-century French education, readers may wish to turn first to a standard “qualitative” history. Joseph Moody’s French Education since Napoleon (1978) or Antoine Prost’s Histoire de l’enseignement en France 1800-1967 (1968) provide reminders about the political and ideological characteristics of France’s five post-1815 regimes of the nineteenth century—Bourbon Restoration, July Monarchy, Second Republic, Second Empire, Third Republic—and also about the policies of leading ministers of education. Equally important for understanding Grew and Harrigan’s concerns is the pathbreaking “revisionist” work, Lire et écrire (1977), edited by François Furet and Jacques Ozouf, and also available in an English version. Chronicling French literacy patterns from the Protestant Reformation to the late nineteenth century, Furet and Ozouf launched the important historiographical trend of questioning the traditionally celebrated importance of national education reform laws—especially the Guizot Law of 1833 and the Ferry Laws of 1881-82—for increasing literacy or providing schools in nineteenth-century France. Using published and archival statistical records and sophisticated computer analyses, Grew and Harrigan seek to refine Furet and Ozouf’s central insight: namely, that local demand for literacy and knowledge—standard products of schooling—typically preceded rather than followed from national educational reform.

The book resulting from Grew and Harrigan’s extended labours has enormous value for specialists in the history of French education and also for social historians. The authors bring numerical detail to the major topics of school enrolments, Catholic Church involvement in public as well as private education, girls’ education, the professionalization of teaching, and governmental spending on education. Their first chapter, “Historical Problems and Statistics,” also provides an excellent introduction to the burgeoning historiography for many topics concerning French education and, sometimes, that of other countries.

Grew and Harrigan then tackle the related topics of the number of schools available and levels of enrolment at different dates. The issue of the reliability of official enrolment statistics has already embroiled the authors in some controversy with French researchers who collaborated to review and refine previously published nineteenth-century education statistics. Jean-Noël Luc pointed out, for example, that primary school records often counted the presence in class of children older or younger than the six-to-thirteen age range, officially designated by 1843 as the cohort for primary schooling but often not adhered to
rigidly. Failure to note the extended age range of primary school pupils might lead, Luc observed, to assuming that universal primary enrolment of six-to-thirteen-year-olds had been achieved at earlier dates than was actually the case. Luc also cautioned users of national enrolment totals to remember the impact of territorial changes on statistical trends: namely, Napoleon III’s addition of three new departments in the regions of Nice and Savoy during the early 1860s and the loss of Alsace and part of Lorraine in 1871 after the Franco-Prussian War. Territorial additions helped raise the level of Second Empire enrolments during the 1860s, just as the losses in 1871 somewhat masked actual increases during the early Third Republic. Grew and Harrigan explicitly take note of the French researchers’ cautions (pp. 60-65, 81-82), but they also argue for continuing to utilize published statistics. Viewing these statistics as “a close and very useful approximation rather than a precise description” of enrolment (p. 61), they employ them to measure the strength of public demand for education and to note how departments (France’s administrative subdivisions) varied in that demand. Thus they are not troubled if the recorded primary school enrolment exceeds 100 percent of a department’s six-to-thirteen-year-olds at a given date because they interpret such a number as evidence of strong local demand for education. They also contend that revising specific departmental statistics, as suggested by the French research team, does not alter the important relationship of one department to another in a national ranking of each department’s provision of schooling. In other words, if most or all departments’ primary enrolment statistics mislead by including pupils above or below normal primary school age, relationships between departments stay constant.

Grew and Harrigan’s summarizing of statistical trends in departments’ provision of schooling and citizens’ support for schools by enrolling children requires particular attentiveness from the reader. On the one hand, they generalize that too much use has been made, since the nineteenth century, of a line drawn on the map from Saint Malo to Geneva to divide France into two zones of literacy and, by extension, educational opportunity. They believe that this division obscures more differences than it shows (p. 39); and their analysis highlights some weaknesses in schooling north of the line and also some notable strengths south of it. For example, local communities south of the line spent noticeably more per pupil in 1833 and somewhat more until 1863; but total expenditures were greater north of the line (pp. 72-73). On the other hand, the Saint Malo-Geneva line also sometimes highlights a trend, such as higher levels of girls’ enrolment north of the line in both 1837 and, less dramatically, 1881 (p. 88). Typically, however, readers must stretch beyond the simplicity of thinking of France as divided into two nineteenth-century educational halves in order to follow Grew and Harrigan’s descriptions of alternate statistical “clusters” of departments. Sometimes adjacent departments cluster together, but
sometimes they do not; and for that reason the authors also challenge clichés about French regional differences in attitude and culture. In the case of pupil enrolment, the authors divide France’s departments into 8 groups (octiles) and confirm the familiar wisdom that northeastern departments, including the Seine (the location of Paris), led the way by 1832 and that departments in Brittany and the south-central region were the most backward (p. 74). Furthermore, departments in a leading position early in the century tended to remain leaders in later decades.

The authors also conclude that the Guizot Law of 1833, which required each commune to provide a school, was in the middle of, rather than the creator of, a notable period of expanding school building and enrolment (pp. 31, 56). Before the July Monarchy (1830-1848), the majority of children did not attend school. By 1876, five years before the Ferry Laws made primary school compulsory and public primary schooling free, France already had 85 percent of the number of schools that it would have in 1906, when universal primary schooling had been achieved (p. 40). Furthermore, three-fourths of the departments had the “equivalent” of full enrolment by 1870-71 (p. 59). Thus Grew and Harrigan view both the Guizot Law and Ferry Laws as responses to local initiatives and demands, not initiators of local action. Nonetheless, they also emphasize that the emergence of a more fully developed national education system was a trend which in and of itself encouraged still more schooling (p. 216).

The relationship between the central government and citizens’ preferences is also one—but not the only—component of Grew and Harrigan’s chapter on the “Catholic Contribution to Universal Schooling.” Two nineteenth-century regimes—the Bourbon Restoration (1814-1830) and the Second Empire (1852-1870)—had noticeably close ties to the Catholic Church; and such ties were, for political opponents, a reason to criticize these governments for intellectual obscurantism or promoting repressive traditional authority. Grew and Harrigan’s concern is not with ideological polemics but with the reality that, before the nation took over financing the salaries of public school teachers (1889) and more school building, localities bore the brunt of educational expense and often welcomed Catholic institutional contributions. Even before Louis Napoleon Bonaparte’s official creation of the Second Empire, legislators of the Second Republic (1848-1852)—alarmed by unruly crowds in the aftermath of the 1848 Revolution—had passed the Falloux Law (1850), which enabled members of Catholic religious orders to teach in public schools without possessing the official state credential, the “brevet.” In 1850, by which time more than 70 percent of all primary-school-age children received some formal schooling, 29 percent of school children attended private or public schools taught by Catholic religious; in 1876, 44 percent of all primary pupils had Catholic teachers, and the majority of girls, unlike boys, were so taught (p. 96). Typically, Catholic orders created and staffed
schools in departments which lacked a strong record for establishing public schools. Attacked by secular republicans after 1879, Catholic education had contributed significantly, nonetheless, to making primary education nearly universal by the late 1870s (p. 59). During the first decade of secularizing public schools (1879-1889) the weight of local traditions and beliefs prompted opponents of national policy to create private Catholic schools in more than half of the instances of secularization (p. 101).

As part of the inculcation of democratic political values in the minds of the next generation of male voters, the Third Republic also sought reform in the education of girls, destined to have influence as the wives and mothers of male voters. After 1879 most departments had to create new normal schools to train lay women teachers (most departments already possessed men’s normal schools), and only in 1901 were lay, women public school teachers half of all women primary teachers (p. 149). Although republican leaders decried the backwardness of existing girls’ schools and explicitly blamed this on the Church, Grew and Harrigan are more positive about the earlier history of girls’ education. They concede that the availability of schooling for girls typically lagged about a decade behind that of boys, but they also see in girls’ enrolment statistics (often in small, coeducational schools) evidence of parental demand and willingness to pay for girls’ education by mid-century (p. 133).

In case after case, then, where statistical data illuminate controver-

sies in French educational history, Grew and Harrigan provide careful and balanced interpretations. Intrepid readers also can encounter much of their statistical data in raw form in 63 pages of tables, 8 maps, and 3 graphs. Like other recent “revisionist” historians of French education, Grew and Harrigan demonstrate that most children went to school before the Third Republic. Yet they also credit the Third Republic with some important innovations: improvement in the quality of the curriculum, professionalization of the teaching corps, and significant increases in national spending on education. Such results occurred, they nonetheless argue, because of the public’s strong demand for primary education before the Third Republic.
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Education seems always to be in crisis, although the specific content of the crisis and the solution obviously reflect the times. The liberal reforms of the late 1960s and early 1970s attempted to address issues of relevance, equality, and individualization. The pendulum swung in the 1980s toward accountability and a concern with “back to basics.” The continued