they are. The issues are discussed in national and international contexts with richness and rigour.

The final reflection, however, puzzles me. Arnove writes, "What schools can do best, if they are given the leeway and support to do so, is teach communicative and computational competencies and cultivate the reasoning powers, ethical commitments, and aesthetic sensibilities of individuals of all ages" (p. 211). He goes on to say that the goal of education for democracy and for critical, participatory citizenship, and the respect for human differences and contrasting views are worthy ideals (p. 211). No doubt these are plausible goals and ideals. But I wonder if the author in setting these goals and claiming greater autonomy for the education system is separating the discourse from the concrete socio-political practice. For example, are these goals and aims attainable in the Nicaraguan society, where, as Arnove shows, there exists an incredible socio-economic gap produced by the economic model and reinforced by the demands of the International Monetary Fund? Perhaps the challenge is too overwhelming. However, this book is an excellent account of contemporary educational history in Nicaragua.

Rosa Bruno-Jofre
University of Manitoba

Christophe Charle, dir. *Les universités germaniques, XIXe-XXe siècles.* Paris: Institut National de Recherche Pédagogique/Service d'histoire de l'éducation, 1994. Pp. 167. FF 70,00.

The beginnings in North America of systematic postgraduate education, and the rise of the research university on both sides of the Atlantic are often credited to the German example. To take one American case, the Johns Hopkins University opened in 1876 with the aim of matching or even surpassing the German university. Titular professors at Johns Hopkins were distinguished scholars, dominant in university government and influential on American social and industrial policy. In this they differed little from their "mandarin" colleagues in Berlin and Göttingen. Most Johns Hopkins men studied in Prussian, Saxon, and Bavarian *Fakultäten,* and Hopkins students were encouraged to do likewise. By 1900, across the United States, universities and colleges claimed to be open to the winds of Germanic science, but not, be it said, at the cost of the traditional American emphasis on undergraduate teaching.

In Canada, the German example produced similar effects, but on a different timetable and in a different way. Recent biographies of Robert

Falconer and Sir Ernest MacMillan show a significant minority of University of Toronto professors in the arts and sciences had spent a semester or two in Germany, sometimes taking a degree. At Dalhousie, McGill, and elsewhere the story was very likely the same, although in the absence of systematic research we cannot be sure how extensive the Canada-Germany traffic was before 1914. We do know that in Canada (as in Britain), curricula were rarely if ever modified, or degrees invented, to conform with German practice. The German influence had instead to do with professional ambitions to know and be seen to know the most recent findings of science, and this whether or not one hoped to *add* to those findings. The Canadian reception of Germanic notions was unlike the American partly because of prior English-Canadian commitment to a "British" university outlook. And yet, the Canadians were energetic in their Germanism. After all, it was only after the Great War that U.S. graduate schools could begin to attract substantial numbers of aspiring Canadian academics; men and women who once had crossed the Atlantic only then began to cross the border in numbers.

These brief remarks suggest we have some way to go in assessing the force in North America (or elsewhere) of the German university "model." The publication of *Les universités germaniques* should encourage this type of historical inquiry. The editor himself provides a long essay comparing the Paris and Berlin professiorates 1870–1930, and an annotated bibliography (pp. 111–25) of recent work on the German university "in the world." Hartmut Titze (University of Lüneberg) and Rudolf Stitchweh (Max-Planck Institut) give syntheses of two great questions in German university history, the "social meaning" of academic selection (who gets in, who gets out, and what happens afterward to graduates), and the shifting sands of the curriculum ("differentiation of disciplines," as Stichweh calls it). M. Charle chose to round off the volume by reprinting Carl Schorske's previously published essay on Basel and its university, linking the careers of historians Johann Bachofen (1815–87) and Jacob Barckhardt (1818–97) to developments in civic politics, in State theory, and in the evolution of a new anthropologically oriented history. The volume ends with a dozen book reviews of recent works almost all on European university history, natural enough in a collection which also serves as a special issue of the journal *Histoire de l'éducation.*

After a fifteen-year lull, North American historians have once again taken up the history of disciplines and fields, the development of the professions, and the evolution of the university. The themes of North American and European schools of research are remarkably similar, to judge by the collection under review. Professor Titze's essay, for instance, considers the "social selection" of university students in a double perspective, (1) social/class background of students, and (2) overcrowding in the learned professions.

Using four convenient hinge-dates—1790, 1830, 1890, and 1930—Titze traces a lengthy intellectual-moral shift from widely shared belief that individuals should be responsible for academic success or failure, to the twentieth-century view that selection to a profession was a matter of knowing the "right stuff," and that the whole of society would benefit if very large numbers were given a higher education. Prof. Titze notes that the number of university students in Germany did not exceed 20,000 until the 1860s, reaching only 130,000 in 1930, but now 2 million in 1994.

Ironically, although academic unemployment and underemployment have reached levels never before seen in Germany, no one expects a student-led revolution in that country. For one thing, the elite status of university study has nearly disappeared with the opening of access to all. Thirty percent of young people undertake higher education now, and the public no long distinguish university students from all other young people. University students *cannot* lead social change as they once did or hoped to do. Second, if a student of the 1990s does not make it into the professions, people nonetheless accept that the examination and grading systems are fair—so what do failed students have to complain about? Third, students who do not "make it" are nevertheless usually employed, one way or another. The starving student or graduate is no more. If I were Chancellor Kohl, I would be reading Titze with care and with satisfaction. His policy has "worked," and students as a social category no longer pose a threat to his or even to a future regime.

Although this is an essay in the best traditions of historical policy analysis, it is also a good introduction to one of the great political questions of the developed world, that is, what budgetary weight to give to university subsidies, to organized research, and to professional training in order to produce social peace and economic growth? The Stichweh paper on the organization of disciplines tackles the question of economic growth/diversification as if it were an instance of a still broader question: do academic disciplines (organized knowledge) appear, disappear, imitate one another, and differentiate for reasons internal to them? Or are they merely subject to pushes and pulls from the outside world, especially from social and economic interests? Or do academic fields acquire their forms just because academics working in departments and institutes force them into the moulds they do? For Stichweh, the answers are yes, yes, and yes.

In the land of Kant and Schleiermacher, Röntgen and Cantor, one would think the university would be dominated by philosophy or by natural science. Instead, the key discipline was philology, broad and inclusive. It managed to be philosophical and scientific at the same time. It provided standards for selecting a governing elite. And it was a convenient anchor around which to organize the whole university curriculum. Around it and inside it, new aca-

demic fields could (sometimes) flourish. After all, even Karl Marx and Max Weber could call themselves philologists. Stichweh concludes (p. 73) that innovation in the German university was partly a response to local conditions, partly the effect of a new and widespread research ethos, and partly an upshot of rapid numerical growth. It was *not* merely an effect of "modernization" (late capitalism, new ideologies of State and society). The study of "modernization" will thus be of little help to the university curriculum historian.

Christophe Charle follows these general arguments with an essay on the professiorates of the two greatest universities of Germany and France, Berlin and Paris. In a volume emphasizing the university, not just its links to "society," the Charle paper is a fitting capstone.

Like Titze and Stichweh, Charle aims to reach broad explanatory objectives using comparative prosopographical technique. He wants to distinguish the social situations of the two professoriates (1870–1930); to understand "from the inside" the functioning of universities and especially their next response to the demands of specialized research; and to analyze French attempts to decentralize just as the Germans were coming to accept the central claims of Berlin. The technique is by now familiar: analysis of professors' social backgrounds; statistics on numbers of professors in various disciplines; changes in correlation between social background and professional "success," that is, promotion to Berlin or Paris; figures on research productivity; and salary levels, particularly for comparison to other state and private-sector instruments. The results, once the usual difficulties of definition and procedure have been faced, show that the Berliners achieved their high posts at a younger age than their Parisian counterparts. Fewer German professors than French had to spend probationary periods in secondary schools and in the provinces before being "called."

German professors were a closed caste, unsympathetic to provincial colleagues and untouched by the increasing social diversity of German studentdom. French professors, on the other hand, constituted a sort of open gerontocracy, centralist but open to movement "up" from the provinces. When Hitler came to power in Germany, there were thus many scores to settle in the German universities, and the isolated Berlin professoriate found itself compelled (but often all too willing) to follow the Nazi star. The Parisian proas meanwhile maintained their steady, if unexciting, path through the scientifically fallow 1920s and 1930s.

More than Fritz Ringer and Konrad Jarausch, Christophe Charle has committed himself to the classic forms of collective biography. He sticks to his numbers and spends only a little time on individual cases. The results—as the findings on Paris and Berlin suggest—are impressive, and just abstract enough to permit cross-national comparisons.

In the end, *Les universités germaniques* is a better guide to the latest and best techniques in doing university history than it is to the German universities. Its two central essays on the German universities assume the reader knows a good deal about their administrative and curricular arrangements and thus emphasize methodological matters instead. But in the compass of fewer than two hundred pages, it would be silly to expect a close and concrete inquiry into German university life. The book aims to show how cross-national comparison is possible, and to attend to forms of evidence and argument that make sense in many places and many times. In these aims, it is a success and makes essential reading for anyone wishing to understand university history as practised in the 1990s.

William Bruneau
University of British Columbia

George L. Williams. *Fascist Thought and Totalitarianism in Italy's Secondary Schools: Theory and Practice, 1922–1943* (Studies in Modern European History, vol. 10). New York: Peter Lang, 1994. Pp. xii, 267. U.S.$49.95 text edition.

George Williams' work examines Italian Fascist educational theory and practice from the appointment in 1922 of the Hegelian philosopher Giovanni Gentile as Fascist Italy's first Minister of Public Instruction to Il Duce Mussolini's removal as prime minister in July 1943. The author is concerned with elucidating to what extent the Italian Fascist government succeeded in establishing a systematic educational structure that aimed at furthering the goals of the Fascist state. He focusses on three main themes: Fascist ideology as expounded by official Party organs and ideologues; curricular policies, particularly those relating to the teaching of Italian, history, and philosophy, in secondary academic schools; and the relationship between ideology and actual instructional practice. Williams also supplies two introductory chapters which provide useful background information on Italian Fascist ideologists and ideology and on the history of Italian education from 1859 to 1943.

Williams stresses the evolutionary nature of the Fascistization of Italian Schools. The seed was sown with the Gentile Reform of 1923, though this was still within the humanist tradition of Italian education. But as the Fascists became a stronger power in the state, school policy increasingly reflected the Party's political, social, and cultural ends. When Giuseppe Bottai's School Charter was issued in 1939 it marked the culmination of the school as "a state