

Without them the completion of the railways and other great public works would probably have been long delayed.

Other essays examine three aspects of the leisure activities of the English urban workers in the Victorian era — public houses, theatres, and broadsheet ballads. *Brian Harrison* discusses the public house (particularly those in London) as transport centres in the days of the stage coaches, as centres of recreation, and as places at which public meetings were held. In his description of the London stage *M. R. Booth* draws attention to numerous plays in which a contrast was drawn between the sufferings of the poor in the metropolis and the happy life that they had left behind in the countryside. Playwrights were reviving an old legend — which goes back at least as far as Peter Gaskell's book on »The Manufacturing Population of England« (1833) — which had depicted the life of the villager before the industrial revolution as an ideal state of existence. *V. E. Neuburg* covers familiar ground when he discusses the broadsheet ballads of the nineteenth century. When dealing with ballads on the royal family he states that they »often exhibited an adulatory, unsophisticated attitude to royalty which remains a characteristic of much journalism today«. But some ballads were highly critical of the Prince Consort. The song »Lovely Albert« depicted him as a poverty stricken German fortune hunter who had married Victoria for her money and had then turned traitor during the Crimean War. (»It is rumoured over Britain's Isle, That Albert's in the Tower«).

Historians have cause to be grateful to the editors of this exceptionally well illustrated collection of essays which brings together the results of the researches of various experts in the field of urban social history.

The second volume, like the first, includes some pieces of original research, while other essays are discussions based upon the researches of other scholars. Some of the chapters have been written by historians while others are from the pens of urban specialists, sociologists, or literary critics. The most useful contributions are those which attempt to give a reasonably comprehensive survey of some aspect of English urban life in the nineteenth century. *Rosen*, for example, has written an admirable account of the diseases and epidemics which flourished in Queen Victoria's reign while *Himmelfarb's* chapter includes a valuable criticism of Mayhew's »London Labour and the London Poor« and *Pierson's* contribution deals with some of the planned »new towns« of the nineteenth century (Saltaire, Akroydon, Crossley, Bournville, Port Sunlight). On the other hand the chapters on some of the great cities — London, Manchester, Leeds, Belfast, Birmingham — are somewhat disappointing since they deal only with particular aspects of their development. And, on the whole, the sociological chapters are equally thin. It is, for example, a little difficult to take very seriously the »hypothesis about the sanitary movement« in chapter 28 which appears to attempt to draw an analogy between the potty training of infants and the sanitary improvements in Victorian cities.

W. O. Henderson

Gwyn Harries-Jenkins, *The Army in Victorian Society* (= *Studies in Social History*), Routledge & Kegan Paul, London/University of Toronto Press, Toronto/Buffalo 1977, pp. XII, 320, clothbound, £ 5.50.

Recruiting advertisements in England today invite young men to »join the professionals«. A hundred years ago a more appropriate slogan would have been »join the amateurs«. As the author of this interesting survey observes, one of the most striking characteristics of the British army in Victorian times was its amateurism. Only in the artillery and the engineers

was a proper standard of expertise required. Despite its title Mr Harries-Jenkins's survey is concerned only with the officers and not with the men of the British army. He shows that officers were drawn largely from wealthy landed families. Even after the purchase of commissions was stopped they were still drawn from the same social class — and the same public schools — and most junior officers still needed a private income to maintain their accustomed standard of living. Patriotism, physical fitness, courage, and ability to command were rated more highly than book learning or professional skill. Although the average British officer may not have read Clausewitz he was likely to have seen far more service in the field than most German or French officers. It is true that between the battle of Waterloo and the retreat from Mons Britain fought only one war in Europe — in the Crimea — but her forces were almost continuously engaged in campaigns in every part of the world. What the British officer may have lacked in theoretical knowledge he gained in practical experience. Mr Harries-Jenkins discusses the attitude of the public to the army in the nineteenth century. Since Britain had the most powerful navy in the world and felt safe from invasion a small army of volunteers — quite different from the relatively large conscript armies on the Continent — was considered sufficient for the nation's needs. People were quick to condemn the army for inefficiency after a defeat but equally quick to shower praise upon it after a victory. The author recounts with some relish the failures of the army in the early stages of the Crimean war and the second Boer war. The fact remains that in the end the allies did take Sebastopol and the British army did defeat the Boers. In military affairs, as in some other aspects of national life, Britain showed a capacity for muddling through in Victorian times.

W. O. Henderson

Herbert Graubohm, Die Ausbildung in der deutschen Marine. Von ihrer Gründung bis zum Jahre 1914. Militär und Pädagogik im 19. Jahrhundert, Droste Verlag, Düsseldorf 1977, 444 S., kart., 58 DM.

Der Autor dieser umfangreichen Studie ist Berufssoldat in der Marine der Bundeswehr. Er hat sie als Dissertation am Fachbereich Erziehungswissenschaft der Universität Hamburg geschrieben. Wie viele andere hat Graubohm also von dem Privileg Gebrauch gemacht, das in den Sozialwissenschaften gar nicht so selten ist, nämlich darüber *wissenschaftlich* zu arbeiten, was seinen eigenen Lebensbereich alltäglich bestimmt. Er ist Soldat in der Marine, und er schreibt über die Marine (genauer: über die Marine in einer früheren Epoche). Er studiert Pädagogik, und er schreibt über Pädagogik. Dieses besondere, sagen wir: Theorie-Praxis-Verhältnis (zu einem Teil ist es mehr als ein Verhältnis zwischen Theorie erster und Theorie zweiter Stufe) wird am Eingang dieser Besprechung deshalb so betont, weil es natürlich Fragestellung und Ansatzhöhe der Arbeit beeinflusst. Dieser Einfluß nun läßt sich nicht, oberflächlichen Kriterien folgend, schlicht mit einem negativen oder positiven Vorzeichen versehen. Zwei Arten solcher oberflächlicher Wertungen sind etwa in den einander widersprechenden Sätzen ausgedrückt: Nur wer selbst Soldat in der Marine ist, versteht genug von ihrer Eigenart, um sinnvoll über sie wissenschaftlich arbeiten zu können — und: Angehörige einer (militärischen oder anderen) Institution können nicht mit wissenschaftlicher Distanz über sie Aussagen machen. Beide Sätze sind falsch. Graubohms Dissertation kann dabei gewiß als Beleg für die Widerlegung des zweiten Satzes benutzt werden, denn sie ist ihm viel zu gründlich geraten, als daß sie sich in die Reihe jener zeitweise (und auch heute noch) so prominenten Marine-Jubel-Literatur einordnen ließe. Worum geht es ihm? Er will das Ausbildungssystem der deutschen Marine von 1850 (dem Gründungsjahr) bis 1914 rekonstruieren und dabei insbesondere den Wandel der diesem System unterliegenden pädagogischen Normen und Zielvorstellungen beschreiben. Dabei geht er von