

## **The 'Invincible Dualism' of the Italian School System. History of a 'Controversial' Relationship from the Casati Law Debate to Gaetano Salvemini's Interventions in the Early 20th Century**

EVELINA SCAGLIA

*According to the heuristic historiographical category of 'invincible dualism', the following paper highlights one of the 'controversial' aspects of the Italian school system in the first post-unity decades, recognizing the presence of a cultural, social, and educational prejudice against the equal formative value of technical and vocational education. The analysis of Gaetano Salvemini's contribution, one of the most influential protagonists in the Italian debate on secondary education at the beginning of the 20th century, shows the persistence of a complexity of factors in play, starting from a lacking trust in popular education.*

**KEYWORDS:** SCHOOL SYSTEM, DUALISM, EDUCATION, ITALY, 19TH-20TH CENTURIES

The heuristic historiographical category of 'invincible dualism' opens up the way for a different interpretation of the history of Italian lower secondary school, starting from the way in which the problem of pre-adolescent education was tackled by Royal Decree 3725 of 13 November 1859, better known as the 'Casati law', approved by the Savoy government under full powers and then extended with the Unification of Italy to the entire Peninsula<sup>1</sup>.

Inspired partially by the Prussian model, the Casati school system was characterised by its subdivision into three orders of studies (elementary, secondary and higher one), which were in a hierarchical relationship with each other due to the elitist and selective nature of secondary and, even more so, higher education. After the last two years of elementary schools, education split in two branches: the grammar school-classical high school chain, reserved for the cultural development of the future ruling classes and considered as the only 'secondary' education path and the technical school-technical institute chain, designed to prepare the middle class of technicians. The law didn't mention vocational schools provided by various local entities (religious bodies, professional associations, private companies, etc.), which for decades in the Central-Northern areas had been operating for a heterogeneous population aged 10 and over. Despite their strategic function for the economy of the newly-born Kingdom of Italy-

country 'hang in the balance' between underdevelopment and growth, with a strong disparity between North and South and high illiteracy rates– they were excluded from the national school system because they weren't considered proper school due to their 'utilitarian' function of training for craft or industrial trades.

Elementary school, conceived as the main tool for 'making Italians' according to a well-known expression by Massimo d'Azeglio, later taken up by Francesco De Sanctis, failed to act as a 'springboard', since it was not guaranteed in those territories that needed it most, due to the lack of adequate economic resources in about 70% of Italian municipalities, charged of the responsibility for all related expenses. Among other things, only the lower two-year course was to be instituted by law by all municipalities, to comply with the compulsory education requirement up to the age of eight, while the upper two-year course was to be instituted only in municipalities with more than 4,000 inhabitants or with their own secondary schools. And yet, in various areas of the South and the islands, in the face of this structural lack of elementary education, there were a lot of grammar schools, in many cases 'isolated', i.e. without the simultaneous presence of a classical high school as their natural continuation, proving how much the cultural prestige and luster they carried had prompted various local personalities or entities to invest economic resources in their opening, rather than the more necessary elementary schools.

A school system that was mainly concerned with the advanced education of the *élite* could not have guaranteed the foundations of generalised economic progress, which needed the propulsive role of popular education, as had happened in some areas of Northern Italy in the first decades of the 19th century, when nascent industrialisation found a valid ally in the early literacy offered by festive parochial elementary schools and in the special training provided by technical-professional schools. Only later, as economic development had consolidated and expanded, secondary and higher education became decisive<sup>2</sup>.

### **The 'raw nerve' of the Casati law**

The poor response of the Casati law to the educational need of the working-class, mainly relying on a strategy of 'popularising' elitist culture to the masses, was also closely linked to its 'centralising' tendency in exercising the principle of public education<sup>3</sup>. This choice, in the face of the heterogeneity of political, economic, and scholastic systems in the pre-unitary states, instead of favouring the absorption of disparities, accentuated them. The resistance that arose at a local level against the Savoia's intervention, worsened by the 'differences of regime and political feeling between the various parts of Italy',

contributed to repress any possible impulse for renewal<sup>4</sup>. The liberals in power were convinced that only a school, conceived as an 'apparatus' invested with a 'public and civil function'<sup>5</sup>, could justify a direct intervention of the State in the promotion of a field, that of education, which until then had been in the various territories mostly a monopoly of the clergy, religious congregations and local entities<sup>6</sup>. The public school, like the army, was conceived as an institution deputed first and foremost to realise the process of the 'Italianisation' of the country, i.e. the construction of that linguistic, cultural and value-based unity that still laking after 1861. From here to the transformation of the school into a device for the 'reproduction' of social inequalities, the step was short<sup>8</sup>, as demonstrated also by the oscillation between the primacy of the principle of selection and the primacy of the principle of socialisation in the exercise of the scholastic function, particularly evident in the sphere of education for the 10-14 age group, which saw the priority accorded to humanistic studies based on classics unchallenged<sup>9</sup>. Nothing could be further from that spirit of elevating the 'humble labours of the workshop' to a new civil dignity and of freeing workers from the subordinate conditions of a despised manual work<sup>10</sup>, which had animated demands present in the Risorgimento debate thanks to men such as Carlo Cattaneo, one of the greatest supporters of the trinomial science-technology-economic development. They seemed far from being realised the recommendations, repeatedly expressed in Parliament by one of the 'founding fathers' of the united Italy, Camillo Benso earl of Cavour, in favour of the urgency of promoting popular and professional education to build a national education system in agreement, and not in disagreement, with the needs of civil society.

In this way, the Casati law showed its 'raw nerve', namely the failure to overcome the opposition between liberal and scientific culture, on the one hand, and manual activity and instrumental knowledge on the other. Behind it a twofold tendency, which was even stronger in the post-elementary schools: school was considered a device for the selection not for the promotion of each single pupil, while the adjective 'public' continued to be interpreted as a synonym of 'state'. This explains why, although the previous Boncompagni law (1848) provided for a channel of 'special' (vocational) schools alongside the secondary schools, the Casati law considered the newly established technical school as an integral part of the elementary order, as culturally inferior, despite the fact that it had been charged with the task of 'giving young people who intend to devote themselves to certain careers in public service, industry, commerce and the conduct of agrarian affairs, the appropriate general and special culture'<sup>11</sup>. Also, as part of this operation, the pre-existing constellation of practical and vocational schools (in the commercial, industrial, agricultural, nautical, etc. fields) were placed under the direct control of the Ministry of Agriculture, Industry and Commerce according to article 308,

as they were considered residual schools, not worthy of recognition in their formative role, but only for the spread of an utilitarian and empirical application of technical-practical knowledge. Yet, as illustrated by Mario Alighiero Manacorda, many of these schools were the expression of the Mutual Aid Societies as provided by the Albertine Statute in 1848<sup>12</sup>. Not to mention the schools founded by religious orders, such as the Lasallians and the Salesians, considered schools of the 'ignorant' in the hands of the clergy, to be excluded from any form of recognition by the public school system.

In these choices, according to Giuseppe Castelli, the Italian ruling class lacked a 'vision of the country's real needs, tendencies and aptitudes', which led to the spread in public opinion of the prejudice that the 'vocational schools' were merely 'simple charitable conservatories of assistance for children less privileged by fortune', left to the 'goodwill of private individuals, charitable works and local administrations', but not worthy of state intervention<sup>13</sup>. The same discourse should also be extended to apprenticeships, which were common experiences for many children and young people from the lower classes, often forced to evade compulsory education for an early start in workplaces. Promoted in traditional settings (artisan workshops, merchant stalls), industrial settings (factories, spinning mills, etc.) through forms of learning the trade by imitation on the job, or pious works, orphanages, and houses of correction, where young people used to learn a job through imitation in the first post-unification years it involved about 13,329 pupils. In the following decades, the Salesians, the Giuseppini, the Pavonians, the Artigianelli and the Brothers of the Christian Schools stood out, in enriching these learning experiences, for systematically offering adequate tools and knowledge to cope with the needs of the new capitalist industrial context, starting from those cultural sensitivities that would flow into Pope Leo XIII's encyclical *Rerum Novarum* in 1891, in response to the spread of secular and materialist ideologies of socialist inspiration among the working masses.

Behind the condition of 'indeterminacy' and 'silence' in which these formative opportunities for Italian preadolescents were left by the Casati law, it is possible to discern the 'elitist and hierarchical' inspiration of the entire Italian liberal (moderate and radical) world, affected by a sort of 'social classism' that also had among its effects an 'aristocratisation' of the mentality of much of the bourgeoisie, ready to swell the ranks of the privileged few who had access to high school, in the name of an assumed principle of 'social distinction' à la Bourdieu<sup>14</sup>. Hence the tendency to define with the term *zavorra* (ballast) all those— coming from petite bourgeoisie and artisan classes— enrolled by parents in grammar or technical school with the 'incautious aspiration' to climb the social ladder reaching future job positions in public administration, with the risk of turning grammar school into a passepartout school and technical school into a general culture school with modest professional aims.

The 'inadequacy' with which the Casati law tackled the problem of 10–14 years old education can, at this point, be reread as a symptom of the 'incompleteness' of the bourgeoisie revolution in Italy and the 'impossibility' of the school system to govern the tumultuous emergence of the popular classes on its own. Paradoxically, however, it represented the 'best coefficient' capable of prolonging its life, initiating a condition of permanent reformism, due to the 'inability' of the law itself to respond to the modernisation process of the Italian society in the Centre-North. The Italian school system didn't have up-to-date cultural tools capable of sanctioning a real connection between education and the extension of its practical usefulness<sup>15</sup>. The various attempts at change, often announced but almost never realized, went hand in hand with the difficulty in conceiving 'less rigid and more open forms of schooling', but also with the refusal to make the most of what had already been done by non-state initiatives, in terms of early literacy and professional training of workers, indispensable for breaking the vicious circle between unemployment/underemployment and the social and cultural backwardness of the country.

The statistics were clear: the 1871 census, ten years after the proclamation of the Unification of Italy, still reported a worrying illiteracy rate of 72.96% of the population of both sexes, with negative peaks especially in the most 'remote' regions of the South, such as Calabria and Lucania. The rate recorded at the first census, in December 1861, had been 78%, while in 1863 the schooling rate of the Italian population aged between 6 and 12, of both sexes, was 43%, with a wide disparity between the 83% recorded in Lombardy and 14% in Sicily<sup>16</sup>. The fact, that the Lombardy territories of the former Lombard-Venetian Kingdom had a higher literacy rate than other areas of Italy, should be read in close relation to what has already been stated above, regarding the long presence of a network of parochial schools for the education of the people encouraged by Habsburg legislation and a network of technical-professional schools for the training of workers. A heritage that the Casati law was unable to exploit and extend to other regions.

Faced with this fact, even Dina Bertoni Jovine, a well-known communist scholar, does not hesitate to recognised that: 'there was fear, in 1859, of accepting the lesson that came from Cattaneo, from Sacchi, from De Sanctis, there was fear of modern science and technology, fear of breaking away from the schemes of the Jesuit school, mistrust of the educated peasant who had been removed from superstition and submission, even if all these qualms ended up consecrating, at a time when the most serious national problems should have been set exactly, with the mind turned to the future, such a delayed pace of progress as to give the impression of stasis'<sup>17</sup>.

## Continuity and discontinuity in the first post-unification decades

The fact that the high illiteracy rate in Italy had scarcely diminished in the first decade of the unification confirmed the limits of the hierarchical and elitist criteria adopted by the Casati law, especially in terms of formulating an adequate response to the so-called 'social question', as the positivist historian Pasquale Villari would have defined it in his article entitled *La scuola e la quistione sociale in Italia*, published by the journal "Nuova Antologia" in 1872. From the very first lines, he highlighted the issue of a national school system 'broken' after elementary school into two orders of schools, classical and technical, hierarchically placed and reproducing the division of Italian society into two 'peoples'. Like so many other exponents of the shrewder liberal class, including Aristide Gabelli, Villari refused to appeal to the 'easy and retrograde shortcut of social control through ignorance', preferring to conceive of the school as 'a powerful factor of social regulation' and 'a compulsory route to modernisation'<sup>18</sup>. This position did not, likewise, lead to the adoption of new strategies of action towards the lower classes, who were increasingly pressing at the gates of the national 'stage', continuing to believe that the improvement of their living conditions— while necessary, to cope with the scourge of misery— should not call into question the pre-existing social balances. And, even more, he did not recognise the formative value of 'popular culture' and the 'knowledge of the hands', indispensable for overcoming the conception of education as a process governed from above, closely linked to the function of political socialisation of the masses.

The reference to Villari provides an opportunity to reflect on how the widening of the social basis of the state, prefigured by the extension of male suffrage with the 1872 law and the raising of compulsory education with the 1877 Coppino law, did not intend to call into question an idea of the people as a 'collective soul manifesting itself in prerogative and mythical forms and, not infrequently, in disruptive and dangerous episodes of insubordination', which had to be constantly disciplined through the elementary school and the army<sup>19</sup>. This limitation continued to persist, despite the interest of several Italian educators inspired by Positivism in initiating a process of renewal of teaching-learning methods, improvement of teacher training, expansion of the contents of teaching programmes and, more generally, attention to the still precarious conditions (on the threefold material, moral and cultural levels) in which schools were 'made'. A sign of this attitude was what Villari stated again in another passage of his intervention in the "Nuova Antologia": 'What do you want him to do with the alphabet who lacks air and light, who lives in dampness and stench, who has to keep his wife and daughters in the public street all day long? You will never achieve anything. And if one day you succeeded in teaching that multitude to read and write, leaving them in the condition in which they

find themselves, you would set up one of the most tremendous social revolutions. It is not possible that, understanding their state, they would remain calm. Here then is a social problem of the highest importance, placed before you'<sup>20</sup>.

The tendency to maintain the *status quo* was corroborated during the governing years of the historical Left by the decision to intervene in the school field exclusively by bureaucratic means, through ministerial circulars and regulations<sup>21</sup>, and also by a lower investment in economic terms, a decision influenced by the decrease of the faith in the education as factor of improvement of citizens' formation. The recent events of the Paris Commune (1871) had shown how the education of the people could lead to a weakening of the social cohesion, because individuals became more critical and aware towards authority and the maintenance of the established social order<sup>22</sup>. Not to be underestimated, then, were the difficulties shown by the Italian ruling class in undertaking a fundamental renewal of the state structures, according to its traditional double function: modernization and preservation of the status quo<sup>23</sup>.

'The minister actually had his hands tied: despite all the fine words, in tune with the climate of those years, especially after the Seventies, being science and culture (but not without the comfort of cannons) the secret of the power of nations, the school languished, nor would the Left [...] gave those problems a very different perspective'<sup>24</sup>. The launching of a number of parliamentary enquiries on crucial social and economic issues, from secondary education (with the Scialoja Inquiry of 1872) to industry and agriculture, represented more an attempt by the Italian parliament to 'stall' in searching for effective solutions to these problems, than the will to eradicate them by intervening at their roots.

The Coppino law itself sanctioned the compulsory nature of education from the age of 6 to 9, free and secular (i.e., *Prime nozioni dei doveri dell'uomo e del Cittadino* [*First Notions of the Duties of Man and of the Citizen*] took the place of the catechetical teaching), revealing the new orientation of Italian governments after the breach of Porta Pia and the outbreak of the so-called 'Roman Question' between the Italian State and Catholic Church. It did not sanction a decisive turning point in the educational evolution of a country still held back in its process of modernisation and involvement of the popular base by the fear of the advance of the 'fourth state'. The 1880s were marked by the inevitable and intensified emergence of social conflict, which saw an increase in pressure from the popular movement, whose two 'ideological-cultural referents' were, respectively, Socialism and the Catholic-social movement. With the advent of the Prime Minister Francesco Crispi, the liberal ruling class was faced with the problem of 'displacing the barracks and not the schools', in a context dominated on the pedagogical-cultural level by the *querelle des anciens et des modernes* between the supporters of the

classical high school and the promoters of a school of modern culture. Significant of the structural limits (in the double meaning of political and cultural), with which the Italian *intelligencija* faced the ever more pressing demand to open the doors of post-elementary education was an intervention published in 1888 in the "Nuova Antologia" by Aristide Gabelli, who was counted among the group of drafters of the new curricula for elementary schools. Gabelli was ideally responding to the son of a grocer, who wished to attend grammar school to become a doctor in the future. He affirmed that, for his 'utilitarian' educational needs, he would have to turn to a *parterre* of 'special' institutes (popular high schools, technical institutes, vocational schools, etc.), and not to attend the grammar school, until then the only way of access to liberal professions (such as medicine) or, more simply, to well-paid state jobs. The formative character of the grammar school-high school chain was considered, by intellectuals like Gabelli, in danger of being irreparably compromised by the *zavorra* of unfit but ambitious people who, like the grocer's son, insisted on attending it in the hope of a social rise<sup>26</sup>.

The increase in enrolment that occurred, in the last decade of the 19th century, in the numerous Italian grammar schools and, above all, in the technical schools (where from 1891 to 1899 there was an increase from 29,000 to 38,000 pupils), was an unequivocal symptom of the imperative need for post-elementary schools expressed by the classes traditionally excluded by education. This need, however, could not continue to find its 'release valve' in the dualism of the Casati school system, which had not yet recognized even the primacy of the modern cultural axis. The Italian school system, in other words, was incapable to deal with an emerging mass society and a shift in the economic balance from the traditional agricultural-commercial to the industrial sector.

The repression of the popular uprisings of 1898 by the general Bava Beccaris's cannons sanctioned on a political level the exhaustion of the post-Risorgimento path that had been completed up to that time, including the positivist idea that the elementary schools alone could ensure the harmonious integration of the bourgeoisie and popular classes. Behind these facts was the failure of liberalism in the face of the initial process of national democratisation and the increasingly accentuated popular protagonism<sup>27</sup>. On a cultural level, the *fin de siècle* crisis of Positivism resulted in a real 'bankruptcy of science', which would make way for the advent of neo-idealism, whose greatest Italian interpreters were the Southern philosophers Benedetto Croce and Giovanni Gentile.

### **The advance of new demands at the beginning of the 20th century**

The beginning of the new century, opened with the dramatic assassination of King Umberto I, marked the start of a new political era of Italian liberalism, better known as the



'Giolittian age', which in the face of the political and cultural crisis of the late 19th century attempted a renewal 'from within' capable of confronting the formation of a first industrial base in the country and, at the same time, the tendency towards the enlargement of the civil sphere and popular participation. The national social scenario was still not the rosier: the overall illiteracy rate of the population stood at around 48.5%, with a sharp increase instead of a decrease of the gap between the North and South of the Peninsula.

The statistical data for the school year 1901-1902 shows that the 6-9 years old population, directly affected by compulsory education, had a school attendance rate of 74%, which dropped to 64% in the 9-10 years old age group, and then further to 26% in the 10-12 years old age group, testifying to the fact that only 365.356 preadolescents attended school in a total cohort of 1,377,181 people of both sexes<sup>28</sup>. At the beginning of the twentieth century, school was still an experience lasting no more than 3-4 years for a good portion of Italian children, who were unable to continue their studies due to an early start in workplaces, the material, moral and cultural misery of their families and the lack of schools in the most remote areas. However, if we analyse the data referring to the southern regions, we discover that in Calabria only 35% of boys and girls aged between 6 and 9 attended school in 1901-02, a percentage that decreased to 33% in the 9-10 years age group and even to 13% in the 10-12 years age group, a trend that contrasted with the presence of a rich supply of grammar schools. Alongside a high rate of school mortality, therefore, existed what Ernesto Nathan called a high rate of 'universitarianism'<sup>29</sup>, namely a high 'intellectual unemployment' experienced by that relatively small number of young people who had completed their university studies and who risked flooding, year after year, into the pockets of *spostati* ('social misfits'), as they could not find a job position matching their personal aspirations and school qualifications.

Both phenomena, although so different in their consequences, had a common origin in a national school system of a hierarchical-elitist nature, which in privileging classical secondary education had ended up relegating popular education to the task of offering 'nothing more, nothing less than what is necessary and useful to each individual to enable him or her to fulfil the duties of his or her state'<sup>30</sup>. In a national scholastic and pedagogical landscape characterised by such imbalances, the first autonomous professional associations of teachers were born at the national level, such as the Federazione Nazionale Insegnanti Scuole Medie (FNISM, Italian National Federation of Secondary School Teachers) founded in 1901 by Giuseppe Kirner, the Unione Magistrale Nazionale (UNM, National Union of Elementary School Teachers) founded in the same year under the leadership of Luigi Credaro and, in 1908, the Associazione Magistrale "Niccolò Tommaseo" (Association of Elementary School Teachers "Niccolò Tommaseo"),

destined for Catholic teachers and entrusted to the leadership of Maria Magnocavallo (future director of the didactic section in the teachers' magazine "Scuola Italiana Moderna", from 1916). These realities, whose background was rooted in the teaching experience at local level, also claimed the creation of a 'popular school' to respond to the greater educational needs advanced by the lower social strata (due both to the accentuation of emigration and to the action of promoting popular literacy by Socialism and Catholic Populism), in respect of which the contribution of extra-curricular organisations- preparatory, parallel and subsequent to the ordinary elementary school courses- was much hope for indeed.

The issue of popular education for Italian children represented, in its social dimensions, one of the priority themes also of the political debate within the Giolittian ruling class, even though its scope was rather limited, as it was still tied to the thesis that culture, like freedom, was 'the effect of particular circumstances of social location'<sup>31</sup>. This meant, for example, that the constant increase in enrolments in technical schools and subsequent technical institutes, which occurred especially in the industrialising Centre-North of Italy, was equally unsupported by the increasing cultural relevance of science, technology, and labour, which caused the exacerbation of scholastic dualism<sup>32</sup>. A sign of this was, firstly, the intervention of Minister Nicolò Gallo, who, to stem the 'spotty' expansion of the *zavorra*, decided to re-establish stricter selection criteria in the Italian school system by resorting to the traditional examination system. His attempt was 'neutralised' just two years later by his successor Nunzio Nasi, who restored the *status quo ante*, thus bringing back the 'bogeyman' of a narrow selection but leaving the problem unresolved.

Vittorio Emanuele Orlando, Minister of Public Education during the second Giolitti government, adopted a new measure to tackle the overcrowding of schools for the 10-14 age group. Firstly, he set up a commission of enquiry to collect, coordinate and publish all the provisions concerning elementary schools, secondary schools, and special schools dependent on the Ministry of Public Education, the results of which became part of the Royal Decree of 13 October 1904 aimed at introducing a new regulation for examinations in those schools. Along the same lines came the proposal to reorganise the elementary course into a four-year period (consisting of the 'elementary course' proper) followed by a subsequent two-year period (called the 'popular course'), the latter designed for working-class and petite bourgeoisie children who did not intend to continue their studies, but who were to be put in the conditions to fulfil the compulsory education requirement raised to the age of 12 years<sup>33</sup>. The law instituting the 'popular course' (Law 407 of 8 July 1904) was also approved thanks to the parliamentary support of the socialist Filippo Turati. 'On the whole, the new two-year course was considered a response to the long-standing demand (dating back to Antonio Labriola) for a genuinely

popular school, adhered to the needs of the working classes and also, for this reason, more effective in its educational action. Only a teaching close to reality, to material culture, to the concrete working occupations of the great masses, would have been able to bridge the gap between education and the illiterate multitudes, permanently binding lower class children to the school, which until then had remained detached and extraneous to their way of life [...] In this sense, the new two-year course established by the Orlando law could have been a 'truly popular school', giving a broad space to manual work, drawing, labour legislation, agriculture, domestic economy'<sup>34</sup>.

In the facts, however, these premises found limited realisation, because of the pedagogical approach adopted (once again, the idea was to bring to 'high' culture to the people, instead of enhance the heritage of popular culture) and the way chosen for its implementation (all Italian municipalities had to set up the four-year elementary course), while the popular course was only opened in the larger municipalities. Unfortunately, the so-call popular courses failed to cover a large part of the Italian territory, especially the more literate in the Centre-North, where the municipalities were smaller but the need for education felt by the population was far greater. In the end, only 1,200 Italian municipalities opened a 'popular course', out of a total of 8,000<sup>35</sup>.

To discourage the school dropout, it would be established that children would have to repeat the highest grade of elementary schools available until the age of 12. In addition, measures were foreseen such as non-admission to paid employment in public administrations or moral realities for those who did not have an elementary school leaving certificate<sup>36</sup>. The 'popular course' was conceived as a sort of 'social service', for less gifted children, who continued to attend elementary school until adolescence, often due to the difficulties to adapt the school schedule to the agricultural work calendar. The simultaneous increase in compulsory education to twelve years of age would have ensured a greater correspondence between the end of school and entry into the workplaces, as would have been envisaged a few years later by the law on the work of women and children (T. U. 818 of November 1907 and R.D. 442 of 14 June 1909), which set 12 as the minimum age for the admission of children to workplaces. Children who did not have a certificate of attendance at all compulsory classes in the municipality could not be issued with a work booklet.

There were also still many pre-adolescents, not included in the statistical surveys, who attended schools in the technical-professional sector, considered- as we have seen- 'residual'. It would have been better for them to reform that system creating a school for 10-14 year old where the separation between manual and intellectual work, executive and managerial functions would have been systematically eliminated, to avoid one of the greatest threaten to human life by the capitalist productive system: the increasing loss

of control by workers over their work and a new hierarchical configuration of society, this time between 'bosses' and 'workers'<sup>37</sup>.

Therefore, the Orlando law showed, behind the official façade of attention to the theme of popular education in the context of the profound changes experienced by Italy during the 'Giolittian age', the risk, soon become real, of perpetuating a conception of the elementary course as a pathway with the dual value of preparatory school for middle school studies (now less effective as the course had been reduced to four years), on one side, and 'encyclopaedic' dead-end school for those who did not wish to continue their studies, on the other.

Italian intellectuals such as Gaetano Salvemini and Alfredo Galletti pointed out, in their highly successful volume-investigation *La riforma della scuola media* (1908), that 'in a country in which popular education is a myth for most people, and for those for whom it is not a myth, it is totally insufficient, let us remember that in almost all civilised countries education is compulsory for eight years. Those youngsters from the less poor proletariat and the petite bourgeoisie, who have the ambition to elevate in some way their very poor elementary education, should be with every care encouraged in this desire, they should find everywhere schools suited to their humble mentality and dispensers of practical and immediately profitable instruction'<sup>38</sup>.

In reality, if they had decided not to attend the two-year 'popular course', which was an end in itself and in several areas and cities was not even activated, the admission to technical school would have been fraught with obstacles, much more than the admission to the grammar school for upper class children who left the four-year elementary school. Strong socio-cultural-economic inequalities in access to post-elementary education continued to persist, as denounced by Galletti and Salvemini, even though they were in favour of a plurality of schools for preadolescents according to their status<sup>39</sup>: 'in the technical school out of 100 pupils all the 17 richest pass well or badly, and 65 of the poorest are mercilessly crushed and rejected. Which is as much as to say that our middle schools oppose in their first stage greater stumbling blocks, not to those who tend towards higher professions and aspire to high culture, but to those who demand an education somewhat less inadequate than elementary'<sup>40</sup>. This demonstrates that the popular demand, underlying the device adopted by Orlando, was proving in its first years of implementation to be more 'assumed' than 'real', since it continued to hide the traditional selection mechanism that drove the differentiation of educational pathways and the 'evident injustice' that this entailed in terms of access to a degree of education higher than elementary.

Some measures to combat illiteracy adopted under Law No. 383 of 15 June 1906 were of little use; municipalities in Southern and insular Italy received state subsidies for the

functioning of elementary schools, some schools, due to their special conditions, would have even passed directly to the State. The same applies to other actions which were supposed to foster forms of assistance for schoolchildren. Why did these initiatives not achieve the desired results? One of the main reasons was the decision to continue reading the issue of popular access to post-elementary education in terms of increasing *zavorra*, due to the permanent separation between school and work, as the result of a 'cultural prejudice' so deeply rooted in the most important figures of the pedagogical debate of the time, such as Gaetano Salvemini and Alfredo Galletti, but also Giovanni Gentile and Giovanni Calò. Although starting from different philosophical and cultural points of view, they focused exclusively on the evils of the classical middle and high schools crowded with too many 'untalented' students, who in the absence of an adequate number of other types of schools (commercial, industrial, nautical one, etc.) were knocking more and more insistently on the doors of grammar schools.

The only solution identified by Salvemini to meet the demands of economic-industrial modernisation was to envisage a 'modern' middle school, less compromised by the 'advancing utilitarianism' in the new capitalist society, because the traditional *pestatori di gerundi* (pedantic teachers) of classical languages would be replaced by the *pestatori di gerundi* of modern languages, without, however, giving in to the temptation to make room for technical teaching (still conceived as 'special'), or even work itself.

### **The confirmation of dualism from the work of the Royal Commission to the Minister Luigi Credaro**

The contrast between the 'intransigent classicists', in favour of the preservation of the classical cultural axis in secondary schools, and the 'modernists', in favour of the introduction of a modern cultural axis, characterized also the debate that followed the resolution undertaken by Orlando's successor, Leonardo Bianchi, with the establishment of a *Commissione reale per la riforma della scuola media* (Royal Commission for the reform of secondary school) on 19 November 1905<sup>41</sup>. It was chaired by Paolo Boselli (former Minister of Public Education in the two Crispi governments) and saw the presence of authoritative members such as Pietro Blaserna, Girolamo Vitelli, Vittorio Fiorini, Camillo Corradini, Gaetano Salvemini, Alfredo Galletti, Andrea Torre, Giuseppe Picciola, Giovanni Vailati and Giovanni Rossi. From the outset, Bianchi declared himself in favour of the establishment of a single and comprehensive lower secondary school, without Latin, with three following 'branches' with distinct and peculiar characteristics, corresponding to three higher secondary schools: the normal school (for the initial training of elementary school teachers), the technical institute, the high school

(subdivided into two branches, the modern and the classical one)<sup>42</sup>. To silence the inevitable polemics that had arisen regarding a proposal that up to that moment had had no credit in the Italian political and pedagogical scene, Bianchi pledged his interlocutors that it was a 'compositional choice', which would allow to overcome 'that apparent disagreement between the traditions of the past, the spirit, culture and beauty of Latin, and the aspirations of new times'<sup>43</sup>. Despite this, the work of the commission was characterised by many troubles, due to the resignation of Gaetano Salvemini, Alfredo Galletti, Girolamo Vitelli and the vice-president Pietro Blaserna, who disagreed with the innovative proposal of the Minister.

It seems useful, in this regard, to compare what Lamberto Borghi and Carlo Lacaïta say about Salvemini's position. According to Borghi, the historian from Molfetta, who had completed his high school studies at the local seminary like most of the protagonists of the post-unification bourgeoisie, 'remained firm to the vision of the school as an agent of adaptation and reproduction'. For him, change and innovation were the work of the social forces in struggle. The school incorporated the changes that had already taken place. The transformation of society is not a task for the school. True transformative education unfolds outside it. Thus, Salvemini, the great fighter for the political and social renewal of liberal Italy, underestimated the contribution that schools could make to radical change. Nor did he depart from this early position later on in his life<sup>44</sup>.

Of a different tone is Lacaïta's reading, according to whom 'Salvemini's thesis of several differentiated schools was part not only of a realistic discourse and concerned with adhering to the objective conditions of the proletarian masses, but also of a revolutionary discourse that assigned the role of alternative historical subject to the working class as such'<sup>45</sup>. This was because Salvemini took into account certain important reasons, which were dominating the Italian panorama in the 'Giolittian Age': the transformation of bourgeoisie following the growth of tertiary occupations (in the face of the enlargement of public authorities' social functions) and the formation of a modern productive structure, but also the contextual process of 'bourgeoisification' of broad popular strata and the traces that the Southern experience had left in Salvemini in terms of 'the danger of a pathological expansion of the intellectual petite bourgeoisie'. Both interpretations emphasise the complexity of the factors at play in the Italian early twentieth-century debate, all present in the reflections of Gaetano Salvemini.

The Bianchi commission's works lasted almost three years; the outline of the draft law on the organisation of secondary schools was only handed over to the following Minister of Education Luigi Rava in February 1908. The outlined picture was very different from Leonardo Bianchi's initial declarations, as the single lower secondary school was replaced by three differentiated schools (grammar, technical, complementary/post-

elementary school), re-proposing in their very nature and denomination the pre-existing orders. The same type of approach was also adopted for upper secondary schools, with the confirmation of a 'traditional' division into high schools (classical and modern ones), technical institutes and normal schools. Once again, a strategy of differentiation of the educational channels offered in the post-elementary courses was adopted on the basis of their original nature and purpose, which concealed behind it the insuperable principle of differentiation of educational goals<sup>46</sup>. Only a few questions were left open, concerning respectively the initial training of teachers in the normal school (in the face of an incipient male teachers' crisis, due to a generalised professional de-qualification of the teaching profession, increasingly sought after by women<sup>47</sup>) and women's secondary education (with the hypothesis of opening state female schools).

Neither Gaetano Salvemini and the other protagonists of the Royal Commission, nor even the subsequent interventions of the minister Luigi Credaro (supported by the UNM, the democratic and radical Left, a part of the socialists and the liberals Nitti and Sonnino), in favour of the state avocation of elementary schools and the creation of school welfare patronages in every municipality (Daneo-Credaro law of 4 June 1911<sup>48</sup>), seemed to pay attention to minority demands, but no less significant, such as those in support of a 'laboratory school' model advocated by the cotton industrialist Dario Turri in 1906<sup>49</sup>, the year in which a process of reorganisation of vocational education in schools of arts and crafts was initiated by Minister of Agriculture, Industry and Trade Francesco Cocco Ortu<sup>50</sup>. With the hope of opening schools 'to all classes of citizens, that is, to all intelligences and to all gifted vocations', Turri focused on the *scuola di cose* ('school of things'), as he called his idea of a *scuola di lavoro* ('school of work'), closely linked to economic resources and the needs of the local community. He had in mind the experiences of Krefeld, Lyon, Zurich, Vienna, but above all the German *Gewerbe Schule* (vocational school), very similar to the school opened by the *Società di incoraggiamento d'arti e mestieri* in Milan. 'For us, an Industrial School is a field of personal research and individual study [...] Everyone can draw from it what they want and what they can, because they draw from their own bucket, not from the common well of science': this is a model of an 'individualised school', not an 'academy school' like those of the Italian national school system<sup>51</sup>.

In actual fact, this direction was not taken in Italy, preferring to activate the first modern grammar and high school sections from 1911 onwards under Minister Luigi Credaro. This was a 'meagre' solution for a school system which had already shown its own limits, after the 'telluric tremors' caused in the *fin de siècle* Italian political scenario by the inexorable advance of new political subjects, such as Catholic popularism and reformist socialism, capable of pointing out 'the scarce ideological productivity of traditional classicism' and

'its scarce political tension'<sup>52</sup>. Credaro's choice gave up the project for an organic reform of secondary education, due to the lack of possibility of translating it into a concrete political proposal, both because of the aftermath of the economic crisis of 1907 and, above all, because of the disagreement within Italian ruling class regarding the idea of school and the general conception of society<sup>53</sup>. He 'realistically' preferred to take the path of an institutional solution of limited scope capable of responding immediately to the social, cultural and economic needs of the country at the beginning of the 1910s, in line with the neo-Herbartian instances of a school of modern and scientific culture supported, among others, by Alfredo Piazzini and Giovanni Calò, and capable of corresponding to a greater psycho-pedagogical attention to the plurilateral interests present in each individual pupil. In this sense, it is possible to identify in the modern grammar-school sections a transposition, in terms of organisation and didactics, of the principle of balance between the historical-literary axis and the scientific one, already advocated in the second half of the 19th century by the Herbartian Federico Paulsen, now also pursued by the Italian Neo-Herbartians in the name of the definitive overcoming of the 'intransigent exclusivism' of the 'classicists'<sup>54</sup>. The original dualism of the Italian school system for the pre-teen age education was inexorably confirmed. Although different proposals of reform and a rich debate animated by several scholars, it remained unchanged until the beginning of the 1960s, with the Italian comprehensive school introduced by law 1859/62.

EVELINA SCAGLIA  
*University of Bergamo*

<sup>1</sup> Most of the issues, here presented, are taken from my contribution: E. Scaglia, *L'istruzione per la fascia d'età 10-14 anni e il dualismo "invincibile"*. *Storia di un rapporto "controverso" dalla legge Casati alla legge 1859/62*, in E. Damiano, B. Orizio, E. Scaglia (eds.), *I due popoli. Vittorino Chizzolini e «Scuola Italiana Moderna» contro il dualismo scolastico*, Studium, Roma 2019, pp. 17-40.

<sup>2</sup> V. Zamagni, *Dalla periferia al centro. La seconda rinascita economica dell'Italia (1861-1990)*, Il Mulino, Bologna 1990, pp. 250-251.

<sup>3</sup> 'The spirit of the law was undoubtedly clearly centralising, that is, it aimed to establish a decisive prevalence of the central administration over the entire school organisation. This is demonstrated, in our opinion, not by any alleged exceptional powers that the minister would have had, but by the fact that the bodies that should have limited and controlled the prerogatives of the head of the department, by the very way they were constituted, were unable to fulfil their function' (cf. G. Talamo, *La scuola dalla legge Casati alla Inchiesta del 1864*, Giuffrè, Milan 1960, pp. 14-16, my transl.).

<sup>4</sup> V. Castronovo, *Storia economica d'Italia. Dall'Ottocento ai giorni nostri*, [1995], new enlarged edition, Einaudi, Torino 2006, p. 4.

<sup>5</sup> G. Bertagna, *Autonomia. Storia, bilancio e rilancio di un'idea*, La Scuola, Brescia 2008, pp. 25-26.

<sup>6</sup> M.C. Morandini, *Da Boncompagni a Casati: la costruzione del sistema scolastico nazionale (1848-1861)*, in L. Pazzaglia-R. Sani (eds.), *Scuola e società nell'Italia unita. Dalla Legge Casati al Centro Sinistra*, La Scuola, Brescia 2001, pp. 9-10.

<sup>7</sup> T. De Mauro, *Storia linguistica dell'Italia unita*, Laterza, Bari 1991, pp. 108-109.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. P. Bourdieu, J.-C. Passeron, *La riproduzione: teoria del sistema scolastico ovvero della conservazione dell'ordine culturale*, [1970], tr.it., Guaraldi, Rimini 1972.

<sup>9</sup> M. Barbagli, *Disoccupazione intellettuale e sistema scolastico in Italia*, Il Mulino, Bologna 1974, pp. 18, 21.



- <sup>10</sup> C.G. Lacaita, *Istruzione e sviluppo industriale in Italia 1859-1914*, Giunti-Barbera, Firenze 1973, pp. 17-18.
- <sup>11</sup> According to Casati Law, art. 272, which dedicated the entire Title IV to the subject 'Of technical education'. For more details, see the different perspectives offered by: A. Tonelli, *L'istruzione tecnica e professionale di stato nelle strutture e nei programmi da Casati ai giorni nostri*, Giuffrè, Milano 1964; F. Hazon, *Storia della formazione tecnica e professionale in Italia*, Armando, Roma 1991; C.G. Lacaita-M. Fugazza (eds.), *L'istruzione secondaria nell'Italia unita 1861-1911*, FrancoAngeli, Milano 2013.
- <sup>12</sup> M.A. Manacorda, *Storia illustrata dell'educazione. Dall'Antico Egitto ai giorni nostri*, Giunti, Firenze 1992, p. 202.
- <sup>13</sup> G. Castelli, *L'istruzione professionale in Italia*, Vallardi, Milano 1915, p. 41.
- <sup>14</sup> G. Bertagna, *L'istruzione tecnica e la formazione professionale*, in M. Bocci (ed.), *Non lamento ma azione. I cattolici e lo sviluppo italiano nei 150 anni di storia unitaria*, Vita e Pensiero, Milano 2013, pp. 62-63.
- <sup>15</sup> G. Gonella, *Dalla legge Casati alla Costituzione democratica*, in Id., *Cinque anni al Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione*, vol. 1: *La rinascita della Scuola dopo la seconda guerra mondiale*, Giuffrè Editore, Milano 1981, pp. 74-100 [speech given by Minister Gonella on 24 October 1949 at the Senate of the Italian Republic, closing the debate on the P.I. Budget].
- <sup>16</sup> The statistical data are taken from: G. Vigo, *Istruzione e sviluppo economico in Italia nel secolo XIX*, UTET, Torino 1971, p. 74, table n. 30.
- <sup>17</sup> D. Bertoni Jovine, *La legge Casati nella critica contemporanea*, in "I problemi della pedagogia", n. 1, a. V, 1959, p. 117. By the same author see also the essay: *Storia dell'educazione popolare in Italia*, [1954], Laterza, Bari 1965, pp. 131- 240.
- <sup>18</sup> These are issues developed by Giorgio Chiosso on the figure of Aristide Gabelli, also extended here to Pasquale Villari: G. Chiosso, *Istruzione primaria e condizione dei maestri tra Otto e Novecento*, in M. Cattaneo-L. Pazzaglia (eds.), *Maestri, educazione popolare e società in "Scuola Italiana Moderna"*, La Scuola, Brescia 1997, p. 29.
- <sup>19</sup> C.G. Lacaita, *Istruzione e sviluppo industriale in Italia 1859-1914*, cit., p. 72.
- <sup>20</sup> P. Villari, *La scuola e la questione sociale in Italia*, in "Nuova Antologia", vol. XXI, n. 4, 1872, p. 494.
- <sup>21</sup> 'The reality is that in substance the school policy of the Left moved in line with the division of responsibilities introduced by Casati and assumed by the governments of the Right' (cf. L. Pazzaglia, *La scuola fra Stato e società negli anni dell'età giolittiana*, in L. Pazzaglia-R. Sani (eds.), *Scuola e società nell'Italia Unita. Dalla Legge Casati al Centro Sinistra*, cit., p. 174).
- <sup>22</sup> G. Talamo, *Scuola e nazione in Italia nei primi decenni post-unitari*, in P.L. Ballini-G. Pécout (eds.), *Scuola e nazione in Italia e in Francia nell'Ottocento. Modelli, pratiche, eredità: nuovi percorsi di ricerca comparata*, Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere e Arti, Venezia 2007, p. 37.
- <sup>23</sup> Id., *La scuola dalla legge Casati alla Inchiesta del 1864*, cit., p. 67.
- <sup>24</sup> M. Raicich, *Le polemiche sugli studi classici circa 1870 e l'Inchiesta Scialoja*, in Id., *Scuola cultura e politica da De Sanctis a Gentile*, Nistri-Lischi, Pisa 1981, p. 296.
- <sup>25</sup> S. Zaninelli, *Cultura, economia e società nell'Italia crispina*, in M. Cattaneo-L. Pazzaglia (eds.), *Maestri educazione popolare e società in "Scuola Italiana Moderna" 1893-1993*, cit., p. 20.
- <sup>26</sup> 'The son of the grocer wants to be a doctor, the carpenter's son is on his way to becoming a lawyer, the shoemaker's son will be an engineer. [...] The shoemaker, the grocer, the carpenter, and with them many others, who had nothing to do with books, do not intend studies other than their direct and immediate usefulness. What they care about is the academic degree because it opens the door to the profession and makes bread' (cf. A. Gabelli, *L'istruzione classica in Italia*, in "Nuova Antologia", vol. XVII, n. XIX, 1888, pp. 385-409). On Gabelli's contribution to the primacy of classical education, see: G. Bonetta, *Aristide Gabelli, l'istruzione classica e la formazione della classe colta e dirigente*, in Id. (ed.), *Aristide Gabelli e il metodo critico in educazione*, Japadre Editore, L'Aquila 1994, pp. 97-122.
- <sup>27</sup> For a summary of these scenarios, see: C.G. Lacaita, *Istruzione e sviluppo industriale in Italia 1859-1914*, cit., pp. 1-107.
- <sup>28</sup> The statistical data are taken from: G. Vigo, *Istruzione e sviluppo economico in Italia nel secolo XIX*, cit., pp. 88-89, table n. 39.
- <sup>29</sup> Cf. E. Nathan, *Vent'anni di vita italiana attraverso all' "Annuario"*, Casa Editrice Nazionale Roux e Viarengo, Torino-Roma 1906, cited by: M. Barbagli, *Disoccupazione intellettuale e sistema scolastico in Italia*, cit., p. 29.
- <sup>30</sup> G. Vigo, *Istruzione e sviluppo economico in Italia nel secolo XIX*, cit., p. 92, which quotes a statement by the abbot Giuseppe Bagutti from 1840.
- <sup>31</sup> L. Borghi, *Introduzione ai lavori del convegno*, in CIRSE, *Istruzione popolare nell'Italia liberale. Le alternative delle correnti di opposizione*, edited by G. Genovesi-C.G. Lacaita, FrancoAngeli, Milano 1983, p. 11.
- <sup>32</sup> C.G. Lacaita, *Istruzione e sviluppo industriale in Italia (1859-1914)*, cit., p. 100.
- <sup>33</sup> According to that framework, it's important to underline that the four-year elementary course was only conceived as a preparatory course for further development, while the 'popular course' presented inside a dualism between general culture and technical training.

<sup>34</sup> C.G. Lacaita, *Politica e istruzione popolare nel movimento socialista*, in CIRSE, *Istruzione popolare nell'Italia liberale. Le alternative delle correnti di opposizione*, cit., p. 53.

<sup>35</sup> A. Galletti-G. Salvemini, *La riforma della scuola media. Notizie, osservazioni, proposte*, con prefazione di G. Vitelli, Sandron, Milano-Palermo-Napoli 1908, p. 81.

<sup>36</sup> Since 1913, young people who applied for admission to work, even though they had not fulfilled their educational obligation, were required to do so by attending evening or festive schools, which represented the 'last frontier' of popular literacy; in this regard, Minister Orlando opened 300 of those schools in Southern Italy, to which were added those promoted by the initiatives of the National Association for the Interests of the Italian Mezzogiorno (ANIMI), founded in 1910.

<sup>37</sup> C. G. Lacaita, *Istruzione e sviluppo industriale in Italia 1859-1914*, cit., p. 101.

<sup>38</sup> A. Galletti-G. Salvemini, *La riforma della scuola media. Notizie, osservazioni, proposte*, cit., pp. 62-63.

<sup>39</sup> See also what Salvemini affirmed in a paper published by the journal "Critica sociale" on 16 July 1905: '[...] Germany, England and the United States have solved the problem, not by destroying or balefully deforming the old schools, but by creating, alongside the old classical school, other schools of a purely modern or mixed type, equalising the diplomas of all these schools for admission to university institutes, and letting each person choose the type of studies that best corresponded to his/her tastes and social condition. And, with a marvelous system of vocational, commercial, agricultural, arts and crafts schools, they have taken away from the secondary schools proper, i.e. preparatory for university studies, that population that does not ask anything from the school other than the solicited qualification for specific economic functions'.

<sup>40</sup> A. Galletti-G. Salvemini, *La riforma della scuola media. Notizie, osservazioni, proposte*, cit., p. 63.

<sup>41</sup> For a reconstruction of the debate at the time, see: Sotto-commissione dell'educazione della Commissione alleata in Italia, *La politica e la legislazione scolastica in Italia dal 1922 al 1943*, con cenni introduttivi sui periodi precedenti e una parte conclusiva sul periodo post-fascista, Garzanti, Milano 1946, pp. 1-58; F. Cambi, *Alla ricerca dell'"asse culturale" per la scuola secondaria*. Gentile, Salvemini, Gramsci, in CIRSE, *L'istruzione secondaria superiore in Italia da Casati ai giorni nostri*, cit., pp. 193-242; A. Scotto di Luzio, *La scuola degli italiani*, Il Mulino, Bologna 2007, pp. 19-31.

<sup>42</sup> Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione, Commissione reale per l'ordinamento degli studi secondari in Italia, *Relazione*, vol. 1, Tipografia Ditta Ludovico Cecchini, Roma 1909, p. 4.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>44</sup> L. Borghi, *Introduzione ai lavori del convegno*, in CIRSE, *Istruzione popolare nell'Italia liberale. Le alternative delle correnti di opposizione*, cit., p. 18. The issue is analysed more extensively by the same author in: *Educazione e autorità nell'Italia moderna*, La Nuova Italia, Firenze 1951, pp. 96-118.

<sup>45</sup> C.G. Lacaita, *Politica e istruzione popolare nel movimento socialista*, in *ibid.*, p. 55.

<sup>46</sup> Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione, Commissione reale per l'ordinamento degli studi secondari in Italia, *Relazione*, vol. 1, cit., pp. 14-15.

<sup>47</sup> R.S. Di Pol, *Cultura pedagogica e professionalità nella formazione del maestro italiano*, Sintagma, Torino 1998, pp. 121-139.

<sup>48</sup> On this issue, see: G. Graziani, *Luigi Credaro e la politica scolastica dell'età giolittiana*, in "I problemi della pedagogia", n. 1, a. VII, 1961, pp. 76-106 and n. 2, pp. 276-290; C. Betti, *La prodiga mano dello Stato: genesi e contenuti della Legge Daneo-Credaro (1911)*, CET, Firenze 1998; G. Bonetta, *L'avocazione della scuola elementare allo Stato*, in L. Pazzaglia-R. Sani (eds.), *Scuola e società nell'Italia unita. Dalla Legge Casati al Centro-Sinistra*, cit., pp. 213-237.

<sup>49</sup> [D. Turri], *La scuola industriale di Bergamo. Proposte e programmi, Dicembre 1906*, Stab. tipo-litografico frat. Bolis, Bergamo 1906. On the Turri affair see what has been written by: G. Bertagna, *L'istruzione tecnica e la formazione professionale*, in M. Bocci (ed.), *"Non lamento ma azione". I cattolici e lo sviluppo italiano nei 150 anni di storia unitaria*, cit., pp. 67-70.

<sup>50</sup> The same sector, it should be recalled, was subsequently reorganised by Law No. 854 of 14 July 1912 and Regulation 1217/13, providing for blue-collar vocational schools for arts and crafts (1st grade), industrial vocational schools (2nd grade) and industrial institutes (3rd grade), without building a proper system.

<sup>51</sup> [D. Turri], *La scuola industriale di Bergamo. Proposte e programmi, Dicembre 1906*, cit., pp. 13-14.

<sup>52</sup> Archivio centrale dello Stato, *Fonti per la storia della scuola. L'istruzione classica (1860-1910)*, edited by G. Bonetta-G. Fioravanti, Ufficio centrale per i beni archivistici, Rome 1995, p. 50.

<sup>53</sup> L. Pazzaglia, *La scuola tra Stato e società negli anni dell'età giolittiana*, in L. Pazzaglia-R. Sani (eds.), *Scuola e società nell'Italia unita. Dalla Legge Casati al Centro-Sinistra*, cit., p. 209.

<sup>54</sup> G. Calò, *Il liceo moderno, l'insegnamento classico e la filosofia*, in "La Cultura filosofica", n. 1, a. VIII, 1914, pp. 59-96. For a general reading, see: L. Ambrosoli, *Scuola e riforma dell'età giolittiana*, in P. Guarnieri (ed.), *Luigi Credaro nella scuola e nella storia*, Atti del convegno internazionale, Sondrio, 15-16 September 1979, Società storica valtellinese, Sondrio 1986, pp. 51-65.