methodology and terminology as cultural and political barriers to winnow out or translate issues with raw and immediate political connotations into what are called "scholarly" formulations, but are really a-political (i.e. conservative) statements of problems in a politicized world? It is time that Comparative Educationists addressed themselves to these and other similar questions.

C. H. Katz
The University of Calgary

* * * * *

Hubert C. Johnson. *Frederick the Great and His Officials.* New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1975. Pp. 318. $17.50.

To many, the image of Frederick the Great is one of a fierce warrior and indefatigable imperialist who promoted Prussian power and laid the foundation of the future German empire. All this is correct, but it does not do justice to a remarkable man of many parts. Thomas Carlyle called him "the last of the Gods." Others referred to him as the "roi philosophe" and as the sage of Sans Souci. During his declining years and in spite of an unattractive personal appearance, he was "der alte Fritz" and Fridericus Rex to his admiring subjects.

In point of actual fact, Frederick II (1712-1786) has not always been credited with significant achievements in areas other than the military. After a rebellious and miserable youth, during which he was on the point of being executed by his own father, he ascended the throne of Prussia in 1740 and had a long reign until his death. The positive side of his youth was marked by a Francophile education under the guidance of a Huguenot refugee, as well as by an interest and competence in flute playing and musical composition.

French thought and culture exercised a deep influence on Frederick's life. His admiration for and correspondence with Voltaire is well known. In addition, he felt the impact of D'Alembert and other thinkers of the Enlightenment. Furthermore, his Gallic fanaticism was not only manifest in his 40 volumes of French language literary, historical, and philosophical writings, but also in his neglect of Lessing and Goethe. Indeed, he would regard French as a language fit toward humans and German as proper toward dogs.

Frederick's free-thinking attitude was instrumental, no doubt, in his furtherance of religious tolerance, freedom of conscience, and a relatively free press. He succeeded in advancing agriculture and industry, instituting judicial and administrative reforms, and introducing a French-type and unpopular system of taxation. While he looked upon himself as "the first servant of the State," he turned out to be a Father-figure rather than a figurehead.

It would not do, in an essay emphasizing the peaceful arts, to omit the military exploits of Frederick the Great, as he was already styled during his lifetime. His three Silesian wars, including the Seven Years' War, resulted in the territorial aggrandizement of Prussia, generally at Austria's expense. He was brilliant as a battlefield leader, so much so that Napoleon became an assiduous student of his military methodology.

In the area of education, Frederick exhibited many Progressive tendencies. By way of example, he objected to rote memorization and other mechanical modes of instruction and learning. To him, meaningful education should con-

centrate on the arts of thinking for one's self, reasoning, and understanding, and especially the cultivation of the pupil's intellectual independence. Although he favored the classics, he also insisted on the proper teaching of the German language to his subjects, so that, in time, it might become a respectable literary medium. Actively encouraging the development of primary, secondary, teacher, and higher education, he organized a Prussian-wide state structure of education. This was systematized and amplified after his death particularly in the form of an all-embracing Allgemeines Landrecht in 1794, but it was Frederick who laid the groundwork for what was to become the most internationally influential education system of the following century. Considerable details about Frederick's impact on Prussian education may be found in Ferdinand Vollmer's "Die preussische Volksschulpolitik unter Friedrich dem Grossen" (*Monumenta Germaniae Paedagogica*, vol. LVI, Berlin, Weidmann, 1918).

If scholarly attention has not been adequately paid to the cultural and educational activities and achievements of Frederick, even less recognition has been given to the significance of his functions as administrator of a growing state. To redress the balance, Johnson has prepared a study, originally a Ph.D. dissertation at the University of California (Berkeley), of the actual administration of the affairs of government under Frederick II. Specifically, the book aims "to set aside the concept of the 'military-bureaucratic state,' and associated descriptive words: 'bureaucracy,' 'militarism,' 'autocracy,' and 'absolutism,' and to try to evaluate the governmental policies of Frederick the Great in an eighteenth-century context . . . to explain how leadership within the Prussian state was shared between the king and other individuals, including officials, businessmen, and jurists" (pp. 3-4). The author's assumption is that administration was not a one-man job and that its policies and procedures were subject to change in the course of time.

Johnson starts with an analysis of the Prussian centralized organization as of Frederick's accession. The young monarch inherited his father's governmental policies which stressed an increase in public revenues, the maintenance of peace and order, and the support of the army. Frederick William I insisted upon an honest bureaucracy and upon punishment of overt opponents of his policies, but he rewarded loyalty, treating "his ministers as near equals" in official meetings. His son was to continue some of the traditions and to modify others.

One of the difficulties facing Frederick II was the presence of "noble Dummköp" in the General Directory of War and Finance, established in 1722 to consolidate and control basic governmental functions on a centralized basis. During 1740-1756, the Generaldirektorium, which originally loomed large in the table of organization, began to occupy a more modest niche in the Prussian bureaucracy. It was not at all easy for an enlightened despot to deal summarily with his civil service and ministerial officials. As a result, there developed a stalemate during the first quarter-century of Frederick's reign "due to mutual misunderstanding and to the efforts by the bureaucrats to protect their elitist position in Prussian society (p. 71). An alternate road was necessary if the kind was to introduce innovations into his administration.

Fortunately for his plans, Frederick had the services of a number of most capable persons, such as Samuel von Cocceji, who instituted a system of the recruitment, training, examination, and promotion of qualified individuals for

the judicial bureaucracy. The success of such officials, many of whom were trained in universities, led to the adoption of personnel reforms in the other branches of the bureaucracy — particularly the Generaldirekorium and the Spiritual Department (religion and education). As Frederick's chancellor and head of the judiciary, Cocceji extended the state's "general authority over all educational and religious functions within the realm . . . [and] tightened supervision over the curriculum, the standards for the granting of degrees, and the conduct of students and professors" (pp. 127-128). This was accomplished through the Consistory of Higher Education, which inspected the universities, evaluated the professors with regard to continuation of tenure, and submitted for the king's approval all courses and all requirements for university entrance and exit. "The judiciary now possessed almost absolute control of the operations of higher educational institutions" (p. 129). In addition, since the various consistories were under the jurisdiction of the judicial bureaucracy, it soon became obvious that the latter controlled admission to the professions — education, religion, law, and medicine. But Frederick, too astute an administrator to allow one component to attain full ascendancy over the others, was able to achieve some sort of bureaucratic balance of power.

The author traces the relation of economic forces, war, and territorial acquisition to the emergence of a professionalized core bureaucracy. The educational and professional requirements rose in proportion to rank in the government service. That the impact was even visible on the level of technician was evident from a recruiting poster in 1778 which announced jobs for those who "have the necessary school science, are able to write in a good hand, to reckon adequately, and who prove themselves capable" (p. 229). Chiefly instrumental in the achievement of this reform was Ludwig von Hagen, "the greatest official to emerge in Prussia during the later half of the reign of Frederick the Great" (p. 211). He left a civil service revitalized in leadership, more confident in operation, and more responsive to changing conditions and demands than it had been in 1740" (p. 242).

An interesting and intriguing aspect of Frederick's rule was the "cosmopolitan bureaucracy" of Dutch, French, and English functionaries. These provided ideas which were usually better appreciated by the king than by his subjects. Frederick was flexible in his approach to administration, constantly searching for workable plans to lead his country "to a position of economic parity with the advanced states of the west" (p. 271).

If Frederick the Great was a master of military matters and only a "dilettante" in the cultural sphere, he was no authority on administration. His undoubted success as a monarch, however, was derived from the contributions of capable officials who thrived on the king's experimental and flexible attitude. "Frederick arbitrated between rivals, encouraged rivalry, and rewarded the executives he respected with extraordinary authority, increased salaries, and other more prestigious signs. But he did not dictate nor determine what was to be done according to some blueprint" (pp. 281-282).

Johnson's monograph is objective and properly documented from archival sources and scholarly studies. It is a highly informative work for specialists in history, social science, and education. The flaws are minor: a rare misprint (p. 127), and omissions of some first names (*e.g.*, Minister of Justice Reuss).

William W. Brickman
University of Pennsylvania