economy that dissipates leisure. Surely these were very general (albeit interesting) matters, subconscious rather than deliberate in the minds of New England children and their adult mentors. Added to such generalizations as the proposal that "there was something heady in the air of New England that emboldened young people to seek their liberty . . . ," these relatively incidental concerns compel me to urge caution as you consider Dr. Axtell's theory of deliberateness and the data he presents to support it.

Isn't it strange, though, that stripped of certain self-conscious nods to historiography with a capital H, books like *The School Upon a Hill* inform, stimulate, please. Unlike his 17th century namesake, Daniel, James Axtell must not for his pains be "drawne . . . hanged . . . his intrealls burnt . . . quartred . . . boyled . . . and his head sett up . . ." On the contrary, he should be read. For when a scholar writes this well, one is inclined to cry "the hell with revisionism!"

John Calam
The University of British Columbia

Terry Nichels Clark, *Prophets and Patrons: The French University and the Emergence of the Social Sciences.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973. Pp. x, 282. $12.00.

To the uninitiated the mysteries of the French education system are legion. It seems quite appropriate, therefore, for chapter one of this interesting study which combines the approaches of both intellectual history and the sociology of knowledge to present an extensive summary of the formal structure of the French system of higher education. We are introduced to some of the major facts of 19th and early - to mid - 20th century French academic life: centralization; the primacy of Paris in the *universite* system, which included the *lycees,* the *Grand Ecolés* as well as the Sorbonne and provincial institutions; professorial chairs; the *baccalauréat, licence, agrégation* and the *doctorat d'état;* the *Ecole Normale Supérieure;* the *Ecole Pratique des Haut Etudes;* the *Collège de France;* and the *Institut de France.* Through an analysis of these formal structures, the author traces the path that one who aspired to a Sorbonne professorship might normally have followed: *Lycée* and *baccalauréat* examination to the *Ecole Normale Superiéure,* where one studied for the *licence* and *agrégation,* examinations which provided the qualifications to teach in a *lycée* and perhaps a university faculty while working on the *doctorat d'état,* the degree which was normally a requirement for a faculty professorship. In addition to this formal progression through the educational hierarchy there were, of course, many less tangible factors and influences which could affect one's career. The argument of this book is to suggest and document the interaction between the formal and informal structure of career patterns in the French system of higher education and their relationship to the career patterns of the social science disciplines, especially sociology, as they sought to establish themselves among the traditional disciplines and fields of study in faculties and for examination purposes in the last one hundred years or so in France.

The central theme concerns the individual and collective personality and power respectively of the "patron" and the "cluster." As Clark puts it, "The cluster was an association of perhaps a dozen persons who shared a minimal core of beliefs about their work and who were prepared to collaborate to advance research and instruction in a given area. They also generally hoped thereby to advance their careers" (p. 67). He goes on to note that "the cluster was generally organized around one or two incumbents of central chairs — at the Sorbonne or, less often, the *Collège de France* — who shall be referred to as the patron(s)" (pp. 67-68). One might somewhat jokingly suggest that what we are looking at is an academic mafia, in which allegiance and loyalty to the patron ensured the possibility of favoured treatment within the limits of individual background and attainments, when preferred academic positions fell open. One cannot escape the impression, and one is not intended to, that the academic career of any individual was very largely the artifact of sponsorship and negotiation. Scholarly creativity was more a necessary than sufficient condition for success and not always even that.

Clark offers some interesting contrasts to the French system with brief looks at Germany and the United States as alternative types of academic structures. The German system of chairholding fostered a more integrated social unit, composed as it was of advanced students and professorial assistants, rather than other chairholders. The system was a form of academic apprenticeship, but its relatively decentralized structure gave the chairholder only limited authority beyond his own university compared to the French professor, but in a sense greater authority within it, as he alone established examination and thesis standards. In general "the prestige hierarchy of German universities, while obviously present, was far less steep than in France; without administrative centralization, it was an insufficient structural incentive to create clusters" (p. 85). The extent of decentralization in American universities provides an obvious contrast to the French university system. There exists considerable horizontal mobility and one would be hard put to point out any significant centralizing forces other than national professional organizations with their annual meetings, their informal personal networks and their publication of monographs, journals, newsletters and conference proceedings. Although one would not deny the existence of competitive and even antagonistic "schools," factions, associations and geographic regions, the extent to which individuals have the power to control appointments, standards, ideologies, etc., cannot begin to compare with the French patron and cluster.

Part II of Clark's study, entitled "The Institutionalization of the Social Sciences," examines the foundations and quest for legitimacy of complementary and competing paradigms in the human sciences and the personalities and groups associated with them. Clark analyzes the interaction between cultural, ideological and academic norms in his attempt to explain the difficulties faced by the social sciences in their struggle for acceptance as a legitimate part of the examination system and thereby of the academic establishment. In the course of this analysis we are introduced, not only to the different "schools" of thought in the human sciences, but more importantly to the personal style of those men who arose as the prophets of this new outgrowth of eighteenth century rationalism. The most notable figures, Saint-Simon, Comte, Le Play, Broca, each espoused a creed, a basis for studying man, ranging from positivism through social reformism, to physical anthropology. Each had a core of loyal followers. Each following had factional and succession disputes. All served as intellectual and institutional precursors for the more academically impressive men who were to follow in their footsteps, most notably Durkheim, Siegfried, Tarde and Levy-Bruhl.

Clark assigns the most important place in this struggle for the legitimation of the social sciences to Durkheim and those called the "Durkheimians." It is agreed that through Durkheim's brilliant career as writer, editor, lecturer, *universitaire* and spokesman on public morality and ethics, sociology was brought into the university system. Durkheimians were professional scholars committed to university careers; for them social science was not dabbling but their major research activity. Durkheim accepted as his collaborators in the *Année sociologique* only persons with such devotion. And the scope of sociology as Durkheim defined it through his chair of *Science de l'Education* at the Sorbonne allowed professors of law, education, linguistics, religion and other students of human behaviour to consider their work sociological. This was possible, Clark suggests, because of Durkheim's view that "ultimate principles of human behaviour lay in the social, not the individual, realm" (p. 170). Therefore, sociology constituted the core of all social science research and all such research could be done sociologically.

This position was embodied in the Durkheimian journal *Année Sociologique*. Clark argues that

> The *Année* was thus far more than a journal. It shared many goals and performed many functions of a modern social research institute. As a collectivity it could — and did — realize two of Durkheim's basic ideals: Scientific objectivity and intellectual excellence. As a firmly established social fact, the *Année* provided both exteriority to minimize subjective bias, and constraint from association with hyper-critical minds, to maintain standards at a consistently high level. These two goals overshadowed the others. (p. 183)

It published important articles on theory and method as well as syntheses of empirical research studies. It also served as a visible focus for recruitment, integration and control within the Durkheimian cluster.

The third, and final, part of this book examines the continuing progress of the social sciences in France after 1914. Perhaps the most evident pattern we can observe is the seemingly fragmentary nature of social science research brought about paradoxically by the highly centralized structure of French higher education. Cluster follows upon or confronts cluster. The administrative unity of education seems to have impeded scholarly unity. There developed no significant French counterpart of the German and American scholarly association able to transcend for the most part institutional and factional differences.

Institutionally the social sciences in France seem not to have fared too well. Clark points out that except for history and geography the social sciences have enjoyed only a tenuous existence within the secondary curriculum and are still not available in the *licence-agregation* sequence; sociologists, anthropologists and psychologists would, after a *licence* in their own field, take the philosophy *agregation* as their university teaching credential. The ease of association and identification between the social sciences and national culture has also retarded French participation in international academic bodies, participation which might have served to counteract fragmentation through acknowledgement of at least quasi-universalistic standards in the international social science community. However, Clark has made a convincing argument that the structure of French higher education has discouraged this kind of integration at home and abroad.

For anyone interested in history of education, intellectual history, sociology of knowledge, French higher education, structural analysis, history of the social sciences, etc., this book will make fascinating reading. It is well documented and generally well written although sometimes the style is a bit opaque and cumbersome. To have a thorough appreciation of Clark's argument, it is helpful to have a reading knowledge of French, since many passages from letters and other documents quoted in the text or in footnotes are not translated. I must also draw attention to one irregularity which I found most annoying in a book of this scholarly stature: there seemed to be no consistent pattern at all to italicization of French terms. This is primarily the fault of the editor and one would have expected more from Harvard University Press.

In general it is this reviewer's opinion that *Prophets and Patrons* is an excellent book. It reminds one of the importance to social science research of clearly identifying the parameters within which one finds social reality being constructed in other words, to explore the degree to which social reality, in this case a network of competing academic and conceptual clusters, depends on the external imposition of one structural form rather than another. On the other hand, this book has given insufficient attention to the problem of explaining how both the status quo and change arise, as it were, from within the same structural parameters. The dialectic of structure and social reality must not be ignored.

Richard D. Heyman
The University of Calgary

Lloyd deMause (ed). *The History of Childhood.* New York: Harper & Row, 1974. Pp. xi, 450. $3.95 (paper)

The History of Childhood, edited by Lloyd deMause, had its beginnings in 1968 when the editor presented to the Association for Applied Psychoanalysis a paper in which he outlined an evolutionary theory of historical change in parent-child relations, and proposed that the Association sponsor a team of historians to research the major stages of child-rearing in the West. Lloyd deMause felt that the central force for change in history was neither techology nor economics but "the 'psychogenic' changes in personality occurring because of successive generations of parent-child interactions." Ten writers, including the editor, participated in this major research project and produced what they consider a pioneer volume, one that points the way to further exploration and research of an area heretofore very much neglected by the historian.

In the first article deMause enlarges on his psychogenic theory, the main thrust of which is that until parents had developed the ability to empathize with their children, overcoming