tent les écrits de Bakounine par des correspondances ou autres types de sources émanant de ses relations et permettant de mieux comprendre le contexte slave et russe dans lequel il évolue pendant ces années. Les textes originaux, la plupart en russe, apparaissent en première partie, suivis de la traduction française s'il y a lieu. Cette formule permet la comparaison des textes et s'avère de première utilité pour l'historien. Toute la présentation matérielle du volume — notes sur les textes (453), index des noms de personnes, de périodiques et de lieux, portraits et fac-similés — ajoute au mérite de la publication et en facilite la consultation.

Même si certains des documents reproduits avaient déjà été publiés, même si Max Netlau, le plus complet biographe de Bakounine, avait eu accès à toutes ces sources, il n'en demeure pas moins que l'abondante documentation fournie par Arthur Lehning comble une lacune importante dans l'information dont disposaient les spécialistes du socialisme jusqu'à présent. Netlau écrivait entre 1896 et 1900 et, nonobstant la grande qualité de son ouvrage, l'historiographie aurait intérêt à se renouveler sur l'une des plus éminentes figures du mouvement révolutionnaire européen et sur les relations entre les socialistes du XIXe siècle.

Christine PIETTE-SAMSON,
Université Laval.

* * *


In the history of higher education students and student life are part of the world we have lost. David Allmendinger's monograph is a fine attempt to recover a portion of that world. He has rescued students from the neglect or condescension of traditional accounts by showing how students' backgrounds and college experiences shaped institutions of higher education in antebellum New England.

The decades from 1800 to 1860 were characterized, he argues, by "radical and largely unwanted" changes in patterns of student life and in disciplinary and administrative practices at ten New England colleges: Harvard, Yale, and eight new colleges founded before 1822. Compulsory residency and communal dining ended; most students boarded off campus with families or in boarding houses or co-ops. This novel independence from daily college supervision produced a peculiar "disorder" marked by "absences, tardiness, neglect of daily tasks, violation of routine". By 1840 colleges had devised alternative disciplinary measures including grading, merit rolls, and reports to parents. "Hereafter, order would be imposed through a student's daily academic performance — and discipline through the influence of his own family."

These "dynamic changes" were the consequence, Allmendinger claims, of an unprecedented influx of poor students who, lacking family assistance, required charity and/or supported themselves from wage earnings. Almost 75 per cent of charity students were aged 25 or older at graduation. Comprising between one quarter and one third of the student body, he claims they "imposed their need for economy upon college arrangements for food and shelter" and by their frequent absences in search of work "disrupted the college calendar".
The same decades also brought a major restructuring and expansion of sources of student aid, for traditional sources — local patrons, churches, towns and colleges — could no longer meet a rising demand. After 1815 new and far wealthier national educational charities enabled thousands of poor men to attend college and, unintentionally, provided them with a large degree of freedom from local disciplinary agents, including colleges.

To explain this dramatic increase in interest in college education Allmendinger cites “the idiosyncracies of personal history”, efforts by local clergymen and the impact of revivals on youthful piety, but assigns greatest influence to “family size and overcrowding on the farm”. He sees poor and older students as a minority in a “fundamental demographic movement” of New England youth away from overpopulated rural counties. Faced with “declining local opportunity”, attracted by growing demand elsewhere for college-educated teachers and ministers, exceptional numbers of sons set their sights on higher education.

Generally, Allmendinger writes well, employing a wide range of hitherto ignored college records with good effect. Sadly, it must be noted that in his 125 pages of text and notes Allmendinger has not provided sufficient evidence to support many of his observations and stimulating conclusions. For example, his detailed knowledge of social backgrounds and financial resources of students rests upon 50 cases, 47 graduates and three undergraduates of Southampton, Mass., between 1760 and 1860. Southampton, an overpopulated town, was apparently not selected at random. Only 15 students are classed as poor and eight of them graduated from one college, Amherst, between 1823 and 1840. There is no statistical basis for presuming that the ages and birth ranks of 15 Southampton students and the tax rank and assessed acreage of their parents’ land, can represent the circumstances of more than 3500 charity-aided or self-financed scholars in New England between 1800 and 1860. If Allmendinger had data on 150 or 200 poor students from, perhaps, 10 randomly selected overpopulated towns or counties, his documentation would be more persuasive. As it is, he has too little evidence to claim, for example, that “no rigid rule determined that students be ... from among oldest or youngest sons, or only from families above a certain economic and social level”. Some readers also will question Allmendinger’s treatment of religious motives and the role of revivals, and his reliance on Amherst college sources.

Allmendinger deserves praise for a difficult pioneering effort. *Paupers and Scholars* should stimulate further research into the neglected world of students.

David R. Keane,
University of Toronto.

* * *


With the recent expansion of ethnic studies in the United States there has been a noticeable proliferation of textbooks on this subject. While a few publications have broken new ground and added to our understanding of this vast topic, most have been a disappointment. Dinnerstein and Reimers’ book falls into the latter category.

The authors’ stated purpose is to present a “short survey” of voluntary non-English immigration to the United States from the 1840s to the present and to