
REVIEWS OF BOOKS

P. T. BAUER, *Dissent on Development - Studies and Debates in Development Economics*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1972, pp. 550.

P. T. Bauer's volume appears at a time when discontent with the state of development economics is endemic. The greater part of the difficulty stems from the fact that development economics has always been in tutelage to its more celebrated companion — growth theory. Growth theory itself in recent years seems to have been stranded in a dead-end. Its value as a tool for policy and decision-making is inversely related to its mathematical sophistication. As the latter grew over the years to rival that of the natural sciences, the link of growth theory to basic problems of development grew weaker and weaker to a point where its dissociation from the real world is almost total. This state of affairs cannot but be disastrous to development economics whose only claim to authenticity lies in being a verbal appendage to the theory of growth. The other source of frustration arises from the futility of attempts to define an elaborate theory of economic development, with the breadth and coverage characteristic of other branches of economics. The protracted search for general principles and universal presumptions, far from providing enlightenment, has served to distract attention from pragmatic issues of development policy whose analysis could have provided a strategic and tactical frame of reference for dealing with pressing problems faced by the Third World.

Bauer's work is commendable in highlighting the sterility of macro-economic models of the Keynes-Nurkse-Myrdal type in coming to grips with essential nature of underdevelopment. Any simple manipulation of savings ratios and capital coefficients, as in the Harrod-Domar dynamics, cannot

be expected to yield useful insights into the causes of stagnation in some economies and not in others. Bauer's analysis attempts to push the explanation of underdevelopment to its more fundamental causes and to embed it into the very nature of human and societal framework. In doing so, however, he assembles the most phantasmagorical array of psychological and sociological barriers to development which is enough to prostrate any planner. His long passages on the role of « significant attitudes, beliefs and modes of conduct » in the process of development may be correct as *obiter dicta* but are devoid of any operational validity or proof.

Only the very naive economist would deny that individual and societal attitudes are intimately woven into the fabric of economic development. Bauer merely erects straw men to punch at them when he says that economists, in their preoccupation with strictly technical relationships, have not been cognizant of the desirability of changing the nature of social and political relationships. The realization of the necessity of institutional changes as a concomitant of economic development goes back, at least, to Schumpeter, John Stuart Mill and Adam Smith. In any event, it is difficult to take seriously the unproved assertion that personal faculties and motivations are the sole cause of economic development. If that were so, one wonders how some of the present day developed countries were able to break the underdevelopment routine. On the other hand, if one were to interpret Bauer's results as simply a statement that certain types of attitudes and modes of conduct, and not others, are associated with development, one ends up with a meaningless tautology. The assertion that economic development requires a prior revision of attitudes and modes of conduct is just about as valid as the contrary assertion, *à la Marx*, that economic development itself filters into the sociological domain and dictates the necessary revision of modes of conduct and institutions.

Bauer draws attention to the fact that simple comparison of GNP indices overstates the extent of poverty in the less developed world, due to the existence of large non-monetized sectors of economic activity which conventional measures of GNP fail to capture, and he correctly argues for a improvement in basic data. But no amount of statistical refinement can hide the fact that three-fourths of world's population are accustomed to standards of living much inferior to those common in the western, industrialized world. To that, Bauer might answer that the poor alone are responsible for their misery, since they do not have the « correct » attitudes and beliefs towards prosperity (p. 78). He later cites success stories of Malaya, Gold Coast and Hong Kong who, after all, have been able to develop themselves by their own bootstraps. This generalization is, of course, relevant only to the extent that the rest of the world resembles Malaya, Gold Coast and Hong Kong.

This reviewer does not agree with Bauer's view that « external economic relations have served to promote economic change » in the underdeveloped

countries (p. 85) and that the « underdeveloped world benefits considerably from the presence of developed countries » (p. 131). On the contrary, there is mounting evidence that, given the present day structure of economic relations between the developed and underdeveloped world, the distribution of gains from trade is far from equitable, and that significant portions of underdevelopment can be traced to past and present economic policies in the developed countries — policies that are inimical to the growth of the poor regions of the world. A striking example of such policies are the tariff and non-tariff barriers against products in which the underdeveloped countries have a *prima facie* comparative advantage. A further example is the monopolistic practices of the multinational corporations that thwart genuine development in the less developed countries, and substitute it with a branch plant economy, which benefits only the developed world. Unfortunately Bauer's work is too occupied with « modernization of the mind » (p. 84) to concern itself with real problems of development.

JALEEL AHMAD

Sir George Williams University, Montreal

R. CAMERON, ed., with the assistance of F. F. MENDELS and J. P. WARD, *Essays in French Economic History*. The American Economic Association Translation Series. Homewood, Illinois, Richard D. Irwin, 1970.

Since the French language is obviously too difficult for American students and even professors — except for those specializing in matters French — it is a happy initiative of the American Economic Association to have sponsored the translation and publication of this excellent collection of essays in French economic history. The choices by Rondo Cameron and an advisory committee are interesting for substance and (to a lesser extent) methodology; the translations are readable; and some of the articles are rescued from rather inaccessible journals.

One essay goes from ancient to medieval times, and five deal with the Middle Ages. Six fall within the years from the Renaissance to the French Revolution (one cannot escape cultural and political periodization even in economic history). Nine essays deal with the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, of which two go beyond World War One. « French history » is expanded to make room for two essays on neighbouring countries, one on Swiss trade and transport and one on Belgian industrial growth. (Is it still necessary to have to argue the point that Belgium was the first area on the Continent to follow the British in « takeoff »? At any rate, it is good to have Craeybeckx's Belgian data and comparable French figures).

The range of themes is as wide as a volume of 400 pages can hold: agricultural life, long-distance trade and fairs, economic crises, guilds,

monetary circulation, population changes, sectoral analyses of industrial growth, railroad investment and the response of the iron and steel industry, the attitudes and behaviour of bankers, and the immediate consequences of the « free-trade » treaty of 1860. One piece deals with a specific source of data: the archives of the *octrois* (tolls at the city gates) and their utility for the study of nineteenth-century urban crises and their social consequences.

Cameron regrets the lack of articles on methodology and explains that the reason is not lack of worthy French contributions to the subject. But methodology shows best in its application, here as elsewhere. Anyway it gets specific discussion in the course of a number of articles: for example, in the essay on historical demography, in the guesstimating of agricultural productivity, in the weighting of output indices within and among industrial sectors, where Markovitch includes a section on the construction industry, so often slurred despite its importance in economic history. All this is useful, even if on the plane of nuts and bolts rather than the philosophic plane of « Methodenstreit ».

All the articles are of intrinsic interest. They appeared at various times between 1945 and 1970. Only two journals are represented by more than one article each: the modernizing « *Annales* » by four, and the venerable « *Revue Historique* » by three. Happily, Cameron gives space to some younger scholars, although omitting some of the masters of the field for reasons of previous publication in English or copyright problems. He has bravely eschewed the temptation to try for a « 21 best articles » or an « honour roll of French scholarship » in the discipline.

Since one cannot properly review 21 meaty articles at once (even with a more nearly universal competence than this reviewer's), one may distribute a few palms. Article of greatest general interest: YVES RENOARD on *The Wine Trade of Gascony in the Middle Ages*. Most ambitious time series: FRANÇOIS CROUZET's, *Annual Index of French Industrial Production in the Nineteenth Century*. Boldest use of scattered and of necessity doubtfully representative data: EDOUARD PERROY, *At the Origin of a Contracted Economy: the Crises of the Fourteenth Century*.

Most portentous rebuke to economic actors: « Objective laws do exist, independent of the will of men — even bankers » (BOUVIER, p. 367). Oddest definition of an oft-defined phenomenon: « The 'mercantilism' of the Old Regime was nothing but large-scale commercial capitalism » BERGIER, p. 121). Most revealing quotation from the archives: lines from an 1886 memorandum of the Crédit Lyonnais to its branch offices: « The resistance of the banker should increase in proportion to the insistence of the client. When a client insists strongly on obtaining some credit arrangement, it means he needs it badly, and that is grounds for refusing it » (BOUVIER, pp. 366-367). Too bad that French bankers failed to exercise this caution in floating Russian loans a little later.

Only attempt to use history to test theory: MARCEL RIST on *A French Experiment with Free Trade: the Treaty of 1860*. The Cobden-Chevalier Treaty was not quite one of free trade for France, as Rist of course points out. He uses considerable individual-firm data as well as aggregates in reaching his conclusions on the stimulating consequences for the balance of trade and for French industry of the winds of competition from Britain. His research generally confirms and amplifies the conclusions of ARTHUR L. DUNHAM's *Anglo-French Treaty of Commerce of 1860 and the Progress of the Industrial Revolution in France* (University of Michigan Press, 1930). Rist looks at a surprisingly brief moment in time for evidence on the effects of the treaty. His article dates from 1957, before there was much Coal and Steel Community experience, or any Common Market experience, to bring to bear on his theoretical concern, hence his choice of the 1860 treaty.

Palms should go to the editor for the explanatory pages introducing each chronological section and for the two very helpful short chapters which open and close the book: a critical introduction on academic organization and trends in research and teaching in *The Discipline of Economic History in France*, which brings out the slow recognition of the discipline in the universities and the relatively minor contribution of the economists, and an appendix of *Orientation to Research*, noting materials and guides available in American and British libraries, and in France. Cameron has included — how rare in an anthology — a subject index and even an index to the map of France, with locations for places for which there was no room on the map. The typesetters ruthlessly deprived many French words of the accents which are part of their spelling, but fortunately respected French names.

Cameron refers to Jean Marczewski's collaboration with Simon Kuznets. He might have added that it is Edmond Malivaud who has been responsible for the volume on France in the international historical series on national income growth inspired and edited by Kuznets and Moses Abramovitz.

To see how superior Cameron's is to so many anthologies, one has only to compare it to another new collection, which includes a number of articles on French economic history. *Social Historians in Contemporary France: Essays from Annales*, edited by MARC FERRO (Harper Torchbook, 1972) has no explanatory material, no index, and maximizes the difficulty in locating footnotes.

It is tempting to think of a follow-up volume to Cameron's some time. To that end, one may note some of the areas of research which could not find times; industrial labour (Coornaert treats labour briefly in an all-too-short statement on the guilds); price history; retail trade; wartime economic mobilization; industrial organization; competition and combination (on which there are some interesting sidelights in Caron's valuable study of railroad investment); colonial and foreign investment (of which the latter gets a brief mention in Bouvier's article on nineteenth-century banking mechanisms), and the

work of the important and distinctive French school of *géographie humaine*. From the countrymen of that great pioneer of comparative history, Marc Bloch, it would be interesting to have some comparative views, either systematic international comparisons or interregional comparisons within France itself. Zeller's reference to differences between France and England (p. 139) is excessively simplistic, and Nef, whom he cites, should not bear all the blame; at any rate, Zeller does not elucidate causes or consequences of the differences. CROUZET's, *England and France in the Eighteenth Century: a Comparative Analysis of Two Economic Growths* had already appeared in HARTWELL (ed.), *Causes of the Industrial Revolution in England* (Methuen, 1967), and it was a sensible editorial decision of Cameron's not to reprint anything already available, *in toto* or in substance, in English.

Scholars may wish to turn from the Cameron volume to several of the newly published essays on problems of quantitative history, dealing extensively or in part with French economic and social history, by David Herlihy (the Middle Ages), David S. Landes (the « protostatistical era »), and Louise A. Tilly and Charles Tilly (modern times) in *The Dimensions of the Past: Materials, Problems, and Opportunities for Quantitative Work in History*, edited by JACOB M. PRICE and a colleague for the American Historical Association (Yale University Press, 1972). In addition to the essays, the extensive and discriminating bibliographies by Herlihy and Tilly-and-Tilly may aid in orienting some of the research which the Cameron *recueil* is sure to stimulate.

VAL R. LORWIN
University of Oregon

E. CHILL, *Power, Property, and History: Joseph Barnave's Introduction to the French Revolution and Other Writings*. London, Harper and Row Publishers, 1971, pp. 156.

Joseph Barnave, French statesman, 1761-1793, was both a participant in and a victim of the French Revolution. Despite a short life, his legacy is still valuable. Barnave's political contribution to his own age was made during years of leadership in the Constituent Assembly of 1789-91. A strong spokesman for the ideals of the Revolution, Barnave stumbled on an inconsistent stand against enfranchisement of free blacks in Santo Domingo. His fall, however, came with the revelation, by his political enemies, of his clandestine correspondence with Marie Antoinette. Between the end of his political influence in 1791, and his execution by guillotine in November of 1793, Barnave remained in Paris and Dauphiné reflecting and writing on the politics of his age.

Emanuel Chill has translated and edited Barnave's *Introduction to the French Revolution* along with several short selections from that author's

notebooks. In addition to the excellent presentation of the translated works of Barnave is a well-prepared introductory essay constituting the first half of the small volume. The introduction reviews Barnave's life and his works in addition to placing his writings and philosophy into a broader framework for reference and understanding. The quality of Chill's translations makes a reading of Barnave's essays a pleasure. They are devoid of any reminder that this was not the language of the author.

For the economic historian the essays here presented provide insight into the French Revolution. The philosophy of revolution as seen by a revolutionary, the place of the Revolution in history, the why of the Revolution, are all spelled out by one who participated in it and supported it, apparently to his death. Barnave's approach to the background of the Revolution in history places him with the stage theorists. In his view the Revolution was generated by French history as a necessary step in the development of a people and their government. In the Barnave model primitive society had little requirement for politics or laws, because property was relatively unimportant in their way of life. Once, however, society began to attach itself to the soil, the necessity of property rights, and a defence of these rights, became a precondition for social organization and government. Further, because institutional development was attached to land holding, those with the greatest holdings provided the strongest backing for the developing social framework and assumed positions of power within it. Thus, the natural democracy of unlanded society evolved into an aristocracy based on property holdings.

According to Barnave the common people exist within a framework of aristocratic or monarchical control until they evolve away from agricultural dependence to industrial and/or commercial interests. Such a shift revives the political strength of the individual. Recognizing newly won power the common people support the monarchy, using it to overthrow the rule of the aristocracy. Eventually the people realize that they can dispose of the monarchy, having no further use for it, the aristocracy being overthrown. Democracy is the final result. Barnave provides historical examples to support his contentions; he also examines exceptions for the purpose of explaining why they did not follow the suggested pattern.

In overview, *Power, Property, and History* makes the writing of a worthy French author/statesman available to English-reading scholars and students. Students and teachers of European economic history should employ this small volume for a first hand account of the period of the French Revolution and an example of a historical technique employed by later, and more renowned authors such as Marx.

DAVID O. WHITTEN
Aulorn University

C. M. CIPOLLA, *Cristofano and the Plague. A Study in the History of Public Health in the Age of Galileo*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1973, pp. 188.

Historians have frequently studied the effects of severe epidemic disease upon various communities at various times, but the focus has nearly always been on the traumatic effects, psychological, social and economic, for which the community was totally unprepared. The picture is almost invariably one of panic and irrational behaviour. Professor Cipolla, without any conscious effort to alter this view, nevertheless creates quite the opposite impression for the epidemic of 1630 as it struck the small town (population 6000) of Prato, Italy. By looking at the plague through the carefully collected statistics of Cristofano di Giulio Cessini, a local public official, Cipolla creates an « administrative view », a business-like approach based upon gearing up an organization already prepared for such events. This lays the foundation for a rather surprising conclusion not found in other plague studies. Cipolla concludes that the lack of public funds was the most important factor besides medical ignorance in preventing an appropriate response to the plague. The economic historian might want to know if this lack of funds was due to insufficient wealth in the community or to insufficient taxation of those who possessed the wealth, but Cipolla does not explicitly take up this question other than to cite a number of examples of both social inequality and general poverty. The medical historian would, of course, want to know if there were really any merit in the programmes Cristofano and the other officials in Prato wanted to carry out. In this regard, I think one should recall Zinsser's stress on the importance of the rat in history. All the programmes Cristofano was trying to institute depended upon the assumption that plague was contagious. Now only the pneumonic form of plague can be rightly called contagious, yet Cipolla himself shows that the plague at Prato must have been the simple bubonic type since the mortality rates were characteristically lower (about 50%), whereas in the pneumonic form the mortality is nearly 100%. In fact, one might speculate that the town's quarantine policies of « losing » infected houses might even have exacerbated the situation by depriving the infected rats of food thus causing the fleas to leave the dying rat for the human population and domestic animals, or conversely the rat might leave the « closed » house for others in search of food. If there be any truth in these possibilities, then Cristofano's seemingly unfortunate desire to save the badly needed money to « open » as many of the closed houses as possible (the town had to pay for a bare subsistence level of food for the closed houses), might have really worked in the town's favour. The willingness of these lay public health officials to reward themselves at the end of the epidemic (they were pleased with having lost only 25% of the population) suggests they may have fallen into the same trap as often caught physicians, namely taking credit for what Nature herself has accomplished.

As an economic historian, Professor Cipolla of course assumes the diagnosis of plague made at the time was in fact the correct one. Curiously enough he cannot completely escape the problem of diagnosis, for in his concern for accurate statistics he finds that Cristofano's records on the number of deaths markedly differ from those of another official, though both show the same general trend. Cipolla resolves this discrepancy convincingly by suggesting that Cristofano, who had no interest in minimizing the number of deaths, included all the diagnostically doubtful cases together with the plague cases.

Apparently Cristofano's figures do not include the age of the victims. When Cipolla cited a work to show the incredibly small amount of meat in the population's diet, one wonders about « aging » in the community for the degree to which our cardiovascular diseases were replaced by their epidemic diseases might make the plague seem « natural » to the populace as well as to the administrators. On the other hand, the older population may have had greater immunity. Whatever the extent of general fear in the population as reflected in the official's difficulty in obtaining personnel to carry out their programmes, they overcame it with higher pay.

The author might have tipped his hat to a more general work on the history of public health so as to put these officials in some historical context. More specifically, he might have utilized Manzoni's description of the 1630 plague in Milan in his *Promessi Sposi*, but these are only minor quibbles about an excellent book that brings badly needed statistics to the historical problem of epidemic disease. There are also graphically revealing scenes such as a wary physician attempting to make a diagnosis by shouting questions up to the patient's window.

As part of one of the last virulent epidemics in western Europe the plague at Prato certainly deserves the attention that Professor Cipolla has given it.

PETER H. NIEBYL, M. D.

The Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine

CH. ERICKSON, *Invisible Immigrants: The Adaptation of English and Scottish Immigrants in 19th Century America*, Coral Gables, Florida, University of Miami Press, 1972, pp. viii + 538. Illustrations, notes, and index.

Letters from immigrants are one of the most interesting sources for the study of American immigration. They are an invaluable aid for the study of impressions, feelings, and thoughts of the settlers involved in the great adventure of winning and building the New World. Unfortunately, such letters are very difficult to find. Important collections survive for only a few immigrant groups. The present volume edited by Charlotte Erickson

contains twenty-five series of letters written by English and Scottish immigrants in America to relatives in Britain. The letters are mostly from farmers, artisans and small traders who formed the bulk of British emigration to America in the first half of the nineteenth century. They have been organized according to the occupational status of the immigrants on their arrival in the U.S. The first group of letters is from immigrant farmers, the second from industrial workers, the third from immigrants in commerce and professional occupations in America. All the letters provide very valuable information on the motives which prompted English and Scottish peoples to emigrate to America, the ways in which they came, and the problems of economic and social adjustment which they faced in the new country.

The letters were written with three purposes in mind. They provided essential information for relatives at home about the opportunity to emigrate; they were often used as a means to obtain financial assistance from home; and they revived ties with the homeland and alleviated the sense of frustration and loneliness which the settlers felt in their new environment.

Until the middle of the last century the bulk of English and Scottish immigrants became farmers. Over half the letters in Erickson's collection are written by farmers who settled in the agricultural States of the Northwest (Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan). Although the immigrant population from Europe tended to move from rural areas and occupations to more urbanized and industrial regions, British immigration showed an opposite tendency. Influenced by the agrarian myth, they sought out, as Erickson says, « a less developed economy and less complex society than that which they left ». In the end both those from agricultural backgrounds, who had come hoping to get rich in America, as well as the handloom weavers from Lancashire and Yorkshire, whose only goal in the new country was survival, ended-up accepting, in the wild solitude of the American frontier, a lower standard of living than that which they had enjoyed in Britain. The feeling that British society was on the brink of ruin, the fear of losing status, of being declassed at home, made them willing to undergo more severe material privation in the new world. In return, life in the new continent improved, the need for economic independence was satisfied, the danger of commercial crisis averted, pleasures of country life were relished, family-values were restored. In short, everything which contrasted with the needs and the spirit of industrialized society found an outlet in the American West.

The area of settlement was influenced only in the smallest part by emigrant guidebooks, recruiting agencies, railways, steamship companies or land associations. Decisions concerning departure and ultimate destination were almost solely based on information contained in private letters. Practically, the mechanism of attraction and distribution was based on family ties. The family gave the necessary financial and psychological support for settlement. Several letters demonstrate that immigrants attached an enormous

importance to family consensus and close relations within the family was a basic condition of conduct.

To set up a farm in the West was not an easy task. The immigrants generally resorted to continual loans and depended on money remittances from relatives at home. Erickson rightly observes that the economic consequences of this behaviour were similar to those of money remittances from Irish and Polish immigrants in American industries to their homeland. In both cases savings generated in the secondary sector were transferred into primary production.

The need for money was sharpened by the fact that the immigrants settled virgin lands. In addition, the immigrants often employed British farming methods ill-adapted to American soil. For these reasons the immigrants had to get accustomed to a very low living standard. For some, earlier experiences made it easier to accept their new status as immigrants. Food, though inferior in quality and variety, was abundant. Clothing and housing were rudimentary. Public services were nonexistent. Yet farming activities were influenced by the market as settlers showed themselves to be responsive to commercial opportunities.

The second group of letters in Erickson's collection were written by industrial workers, for the most part unskilled laborers, artisans, construction workers and miners. This group, like the farmers, were seeking economic independence. Their political ideas were quite radical. They looked to America as the land of freedom, while England remained the land of tyranny. Unlike the farmers, however, they were interested in politics. The agrarian myth, as the letters show, fascinated them, but agricultural work disappointed them. Their need for independence was very strong, especially among the earliest generations. Those who came later, during the second half of the century, were more interested in economic considerations than ideology. The immigrants stayed in the new country only as long as it suited their material interests. They spent their savings on remittances to relatives in England and on purchases of houses. Workers were more sensitive to economic incentives than farmers. Their desire to make good was reflected in their attitude to education. They fully understood the economic value of education and wanted their children educated.

The industrial workers generally came to America without families and at a young age. The migration chain was based on offers of assistance and aid from relatives and friends who had already found jobs in America. Some of their letters show dissatisfaction and disappointment. Many became wandering artisans. Unlike farmers, industrial workers showed high geographical mobility and were forced to practise many different kinds of trades. The American economy had needs and techniques quite different from England. Jobs were often irregular and as they were the last to be hired, they were the first to be dismissed. Their complaints were not about wages and hours

but rather about lack of work and payments in kind. Nevertheless, American employers were judged less tyrannical than their English masters. The adjustment of the immigrant industrial worker to the American economy was on the whole more precarious and uncertain than that of the immigrant farmer.

The third group of letters is from immigrants in commercial and professional occupations. They came from varied social backgrounds — agriculturists, skilled artisans, small traders and manufacturers, etc. Unlike farmers and workers they severed their family ties by emigrating. Social and geographical mobility was high. They differed from the other groups in that they had strong social ambitions. They emigrated not for economic reasons but to enhance personal and family prestige. In one sense, they were already uprooted before they came to America. As they were a literate class they established themselves in new fields — the liberal professions, public office, etc. They adjusted easily to American life without help from relatives or friends. They never considered returning to England should they fail in the new country. They were not on the whole any more successful than other groups of immigrants. They often confused personal happiness with excessive ambition, and though they received the highest recognition from American society, they were often quite miserable in their private lives. Their deep-rooted individualism led them to disdain community life.

Erickson does well in her book to emphasize the importance of the immigrant community in the process of assimilation to the American way of life. These communities worked as bearings between the old and the new world and made less traumatic the impact of American habits and thinking on the newcomers.

In conclusion, Professor Erickson's book is a very valuable study for scholars of American immigration. It offers a wide range of meaningful and well-organized sources, preceded by author's introduction which provide much insight on the motives and patterns of British emigration to America.

ANGELO OLIVIERI

Charles Warren Center, Harvard University

H. E. S. FISHER, *The Portugal Trade: A Study of Anglo-Portuguese Commerce 1700-1770*, Barnes and Noble, New York; Methuen & Co., London, 1971, pp. 171.

At first sight this appears a model study of trade between two countries. The two opening chapters are devoted to presenting an overview of the general course of Anglo-Portuguese trade, dealing respectively with the expansion of trade up to the 1760s, and the contraction during the 1760s.

The following five are devoted to various aspects of commercial organisation, the export of textiles, foodstuffs, the import of wine and bullion, and the employment of shipping. The final chapters are concerned with the question of seasonal and yearly fluctuations, an interesting and neglected subject, and the importance of the Portugal trade to English economic development. It should be said at once that Dr Fisher's manner of treating the subject is a far cry from the detailed monographs, crammed with minutiae, which an older generation of English economic historians produced. On the whole this succinct approach is a success in view of the ever mounting volume of secondary material historians working in any field must hope to master to keep abreast of their subject. When the several useful pages of tables, figures and bibliography are taken away only about 126 pages of text remain.

The most tantalising feature of this book is that, like so many works by English economic historians, the perspective of the work remains totally English. There is no lengthy discussion of the effect on the Portuguese economy to counterbalance the admittedly brief chapter on the trade's contribution to English economic development. In 1675 the Portuguese ambassador appeared before the Council of Trade in London and declared 'Portugall reaped no advantage by the Commerce of England, but England all from them'. (London, P.R.O. C.O. 391/1, 51). The impression left by this book is that this is very much the case. It is true that most of the goods supplied by the English were not luxuries, but necessities; nevertheless the flooding of the Portuguese market with English textiles caused the stagnation of the native industry, while the terms of trade showed an ever increasing balance in England's favour, rising to £ 900,00 per annum at a time when the total value of England's exports to Portugal was around £ 1,100,000. Dr Fisher rightly cautions the reader against treating these figures too literally (p. 19 and 140), but a substantial deficit could only be remedied by the export of silver from Portugal. As a result the English merchants resident in Portugal were encouraged to take an increasing share in Portuguese overseas trade, supplying Hamburg linens, French goods and Sicilian corn and even on occasion providing ships for the Brazilian trade (Dr Fisher is careful to remind his readers of the Brazilian dimension of Anglo-Portuguese trade). They also invested in vineyards and other aspects of the Portuguese domestic economy. One would have welcomed an estimation of the extent of this sort of penetration; the main evidence adduced in this book is in the form of contemporary visitors' comments (e.g. p. 130). There emerge some further anomalies, partly as a result of the absence of a chapter explicitly dealing with the merchant houses in England and Portugal. There exists, of course, detailed though somewhat outdated studies such as Dame Lucy Sutherland's « A London Merchant 1699-1774 » (1933) and A. R. Walford's « The British Factory in Lisbon » (Lisbon 1940), and Dr. Fisher discusses the various activities of the merchants under the separate heading of textiles, wines etc. The

multifarious range of relationships between merchants in London, the province and English factors in Lisbon and Oporto are never extensively explored in their own right. Thus we learn that the merchants shipped out textiles on their own account and were prepared to wait a long while for payment, perhaps even until the cloth reached Brazil, but that when they came to the return trade, the merchants did not act in the wine trade for themselves, but merely as agents for London and provincial wine merchants. The reason Dr Fisher suggests is that 'such enterprise was discouraged by the greater capital needed to export wine to England compared to importing English produce' (p. 86). Yet at the same time large quantities of bullion were being exported to England through lack of suitable return goods. Are we to conclude that there was more profit in exporting bullion rather than wine, or that investing money in vineyards or other trades was more lucrative? Or could it be that the English merchants in Oporto were much poorer than those at Lisbon? One might have hoped that Dr Fisher, who has used the records surviving in Portugal of these merchant houses, might have resolved these difficulties, and not left the reader trying to piece together his own version.

ANTHONY R. MICHELL
University of Hull

A. VON HAXTHAUSEN, *Studies on the Interior of Russia*, edited and with an Introduction by S. Frederick Starr, Chicago and London, the University of Chicago Press, 1972, pp XLV-328.

English-speaking readers will be grateful to Professor Frederick Starr for having returned to the original, that is the German edition, in producing this second English edition which will replace the translation by R. Farie which appeared in London in 1856 under the title *Russian Empire, its People, Institutions and Resources*. In fact the first edition contained only those passages that would be likely to interest English readers at the time of the Crimean War. The description of the provinces of Southern Russia and the pages relating to the Russian military potential had been reproduced entirely, at the expense of the sections devoted to economic and social problems and rural institutions.

In returning to the three volumes of the original German edition Professor Starr first cuts out the numerous repetitions which he carefully indicates with the appropriate punctuation. In a note on the translation (page XLII-XLV) signed by S. F. Starr and Eleanore L. M. Schmidt the principles they followed in the choice of texts are clearly stated and their major important omissions are explained. The parts of the greatest interest to the author, Baron August von Haxthausen, who was particularly concerned with the state

of agriculture and its part in the country's development, receives special attention and so reflects the curiosity about economics and social matters that was characteristic of the second half of the XIX century.

A well documented introduction, part of which was published four years before in the *Slavonic and East European Review* 44 (July 1968, pp. 462-478) with the title *August von Haxthausen and Russia*, contains much valuable information on the life and education of this Westphalian aristocrat who became known for his studies of the rural economy. He was in fact encouraged by the Prussian government who employed him to tour the various provinces of the kingdom with a view to producing a detailed report on the condition of the peasants which would serve as a basis for future legislation. This was not, then, his first undertaking.

The origins of the journey to Russia can be found in the essay which Baron August von Haxthausen published in the *Preussischer Staatsanzeiger* after the promulgation of the *ukas* of 2 April 1842 which was to create the new class of emancipated peasants in Russia. This article was reproduced very soon in the major European journals. Tsar Nicholas I's attention was drawn to it, probably by Count Peter von Meyendorff, who was Russian ambassador in Berlin and a friend of the author. After reading his reflections, which showed a thorough knowledge of the subject, the Tsar wrote to August von Haxthausen to offer his congratulations and invited him to visit Russia. Professor Starr describes in detail the opposition put forward by Benckendorff, the Tsar's chief of police, who feared the too liberal pen of the Westphalian economist. But the Tsar, who was hoping that this would offer him an opportunity to give the West a new, modern impression of his empire, not only gave the Baron recommendations to all the authorities but also allowed him to seek any material necessary to his research in the regional and domanial archives, so that his work was a systematic enquiry rather than a collection of impressions of local customs. Thanks to this imperial support our traveller was well received everywhere and was able to extract many statistical tables from the documents which he consulted or which were put at his disposal. He then followed the tradition of German scholars like Schlötzer, Müller, Evers, Georgi, Storch and Reutz, those masters of Russian youth who, in their various ways, founded the study of Russian national institutions (Preface, page 7). Accompanied by Dr. Heinrich Kosegarten, who helped him to edit several parts of the *Studies* and by a young interpreter provided by the Tsar, August von Haxthausen left Moscow in the spring of 1843 with the following itinerary: « The route took him to the Vladimir-Iaroslavl area and from there through the Volga region to Nizhnii Novgorod and Kazan and eventually across the steppe to the Caucasus and the Crimea. Late in the summer he turned northward once more, traversing the southern Ukraine to Kiev and thence to Moscow with a brief visit en route to Tula. Along the way he interviewed peasants, priests, landlords, and officials and during

brief stops drew the pen sketches that were later to adorn his volumes » (pp. XIX-XX).

Most of the remarks made by the observant traveller naturally concerned his own fields of interest as well as his own previous researches. The description of Moscow is impressive in its originality and especially in its concern with economic and social matters. August von Haxthausen was the first to stress the industrial nature of the town and to analyse the status of the different classes of the population. The two most important sections of the work are devoted to the province of Jaroslavl, which the author describes in detail, stressing the industrial activities that provided a complement to agriculture during the long months of agricultural inactivity during the Russian winter. Comparisons with the *modern* theories of Saint-Simon recur in the Baron's observations. The communal and rural institutions, the description of daily life in the villages, analysis of colonization and the slow development of national unity are the main themes of the *Studies*. Three chapters dwell on religious questions ('The sectarians', 'The mennonites', 'Religion in Russia') and reveal the history of the mental attitudes of a people which aroused the curiosity of Europeans in the last century. These observations on the sects and the different religious communities are striking in their clear analysis, as are those on the nobility which form the eleventh chapter.

Most of the *Studies* are concentrated on a remarkable analysis of the rural communes in which the author puts forward various original suggestions resulting from his detailed enquiry. All the same there is some imprecision: the collective ownership of the land and the periodical divisions in the Russian commune which Haxthausen considered to be an original phenomenon of the communal institution would seem to have taken place much later, since they would have been brought about by the intervention of the state and landowners, according to the studies by Miliukov and Serghievitch. One must not exaggerate the age of the Russian commune (Chapter 13 'Communes').

If politics scarcely appear in the *Studies*, the role and structure of the administration are continually present and call forth some interesting remarks from the author on the intervention of the state.

August von Haxthausen was not the first to publish observations on Russia. Professor Starr stresses that travel books enjoyed a great popularity then, which did not survive the appearance of the first steamboats and the railways. He gives a list of the principal works published on Russia before the *Studies* (p. XXII, note 37). More than thirty writers of all kinds had already dealt with the subject. Some of the earlier works, like that by the Marquis de Custine, did not make August von Haxthausen's task any easier, and he had to employ all of his charm and tact to be able to meet the *haut monde* of the capital as well as such members of the intelligentsia as Alexander Herzen and Peter Chaadev.

After returning to Germany in spring 1844 he spent four years preparing the first volume for publication. Drawing on his own experiences as a writer he rejected the bombastic style of his academic studies to choose a narrative form which makes his voluminous *Studies* easier to read and yet does nothing to spoil the quality of the information which far surpasses that of other travel accounts. In fact « having been preoccupied with the vision of peasant communitarianism since his youth, he could approach the Russian village commune with far greater breadth of understanding than anyone else of this era. The remarkably full account of the institutions of rural Russia contained in the *Studies* was undoubtedly the first attempt to bring the Russian commune into the sphere of European social thought » (p. XXV).

Professor Starr gives an account of Russian and European reactions after the publication of the *Studies*. His well documented examination stresses the widespread diffusion of the work and especially its impact on the social ideas of the time. One reason for the success of the *Studies* was that this detailed and lively description of the living conditions of the Russian peasantry coincided with the interests of the reformers for whom the agrarian question was of fundamental importance. But no one can give a better assessment of the work's importance than the editor, who concludes: « The *Studies* is a monument to this personal history of Baron Haxthausen, but it is more. First, it stands as an event in Russian intellectual history, for it reinforced and popularized what hitherto had been an exotic infatuation of a handful of scholars with the peasant institutions of Russia. Second, it is an event in the history of Russian state policy, for it bears witness both to Nicholas I's preoccupation with his reputation in Europe, and to his government's willingness at least to consider basic reforms. Third, it is an event in European thought, for it encouraged readers across the continent to include Russia in their consideration of the change taking place in Germany, France and England. Finally, it remains among the best travel accounts of its era and, as such, marks an important stage in the continuing process by which men become conscious of the implication of modernization for the societies in which they live » (p. XLII).

An interesting and very useful set of notes, which include the author's own notes and the editor's clarifications, help to elucidate difficult points and an index of both names and subject matter make this work an enjoyable source of reference. We must also mention the quality of the illustrations, for the editor reproduces the Baron's sketches.

FRANÇOIS JEQUIER
University of Lausanne

Sir J. HUTCHINSON, *Farming and Food Supply. The Interdependence of Countryside and Towns*, Cambridge University Press, 1972, pp. 146.

This interesting essay by a distinguished plant breeder and agriculturist deals with some broad issues of agricultural development. It covers a wide field, ranging from the origins of agriculture to the possibilities for feeding the increasing world population in the future. The main emphasis is on changes in farming techniques and farming systems in those regions from which the author has practical experience: Britain, India and Africa.

It is a central theme in the book that agricultural development is a gradual shift from extensive to intensive systems of land use, or to use the authors terminology: from exploitive systems which exhaust and degrade the soil to systems which improve and « domesticate » the soil. Plants and animals have undergone a very long evolution of deliberate domestication and improvement, while the use of land continued to be exploitive. Primitive agricultural systems used in Britain in the past, and still applied in Africa and India, use the land until fertility is exhausted or they degrade the land to a low level of basic fertility. Only at a late stage of development, which in Britain came with the introduction of the New Husbandry in the 18th century, is exploitation replaced by conservation and improvement of fertility. « The establishment of a highly productive agriculture involves the domestication of the soil as much as of the crop plants and livestock that live on it ».

What brings about this change from exploitive to soil improving agriculture? In the author's opinion, it is related to increasing urbanization, which raises the demand for marketable food. The introduction of the New Husbandry in Britain coincided with the industrial revolution, which created an expanding market for food and furthermore provided the base for the next step in soil improvement: the production of and use of chemical fertilizers. The author suggests that this two-step introduction of fertility improvement is peculiar to Britain and to some neighbouring countries of Continental Europe, while collection and distribution of organic wastes for fertilization never became an important factor in either African or Indian farming. India passed directly from the traditional land degrading system to the use of chemical fertilizer during the « Green Revolution ». He explains this by the difference in urban development. The industrial revolution in Britain provided an early stimulus to the introduction of « soil domestication » and increasing productivity in British agriculture, while « the low yield agriculture of most of Asia is geared to static and tradition-bound urban communities ». This was only changed recently, when increasing urban demand induced the use of chemical fertilizer.

At this point in the narrative, some readers will regret the author's decision to deal with only the countries in which he has been working, thus avoiding any reference to the development of agriculture in China and other countries of the Far East. The Chinese introduced soil improving systems

even before such systems were introduced in Britain, but, nevertheless, their urban sector remained as static and tradition-bound as that of India. The explanation is, in my opinion, that soil improving systems based on the collection and distribution of organic wastes for fertilization are introduced where and when population pressure exceeds a certain level, while the connection between urbanization and the introduction of soil improving systems is more complicated than assumed by the author. He misses an important aspect of the problem because, when speaking of increasing agricultural productivity, he fails to make clear whether he is referring to output per unit of land, or per unit of labour.

In countries and periods where agriculture uses little or no industrial inputs, the introduction of soil improving systems requires large additional inputs of labour, and this input of labour usually yields low returns per work hour. A change to such a soil improving system with low marginal productivity of labour, but high output per unit of land, may be a proper response to increasing population pressure, since it entails the use of more labour to produce more food, but if output per work hour in agriculture is reduced by this change, the agricultural sector may become impoverished and unable to provide an expanding market for the urban sector. It seems that the pre-revolutionary Chinese economy was caught in this trap, while the British economy escaped it because the industrial revolution shifted sectoral terms of trade in favour of agriculture.

The chapters dealing with the prospects for food production in the future point to the large possibilities for further technological improvement in agriculture, although the author is pessimistic concerning the possibilities for land improvement in the wet tropics. By contrast, he says about further development of crops and livestock that « the potential for further improvement is enormous in all agricultural systems, but particularly in those of developing countries ». He draws attention to the fact that it was a deliberate choice in India in the first instance to introduce the « Green Revolution » only on irrigated land, and he suggests that strategy for improvement of the rain-fed lands in India is both possible and necessary as a second step.

On Africa, the main conclusion is that what is needed in order to produce enough food is mainly improvement of transport and storage and other measures to encourage production of types of food and feed which are now imported from other continents, although they could easily be produced in Africa. Since population pressure is low and unused land is still available, production is more easily increased by extending the cultivated area than by fertilizer practice. It should be noted that in the last statement, the author shows that he is fully aware of the connection between population pressure on land and the change from exploitive to soil improving systems.

ESTER BOSERUP
Copenhagen

G. IONESCO, *Histoire de l'architecture en Roumanie de la Préhistoire à nos jours*, Editions de l'Académie de la République Socialiste de Roumanie, Bucarest, 1972, pp. 587, 3 maps.

Grigore Ionesco's book leaves the reader with two impressions — art history has brilliantly entered into its scientific phase and, particularly in the case of Romania, the social 'enjeu' (to use A. Scobeltzine's terms) which it reveals is on the same scale. Romanian architecture was created during the seven centuries of feudalism which succeeded the flourishing Dacian and Roman civilization and formed a prelude to the 'exotic' influences — from east and west — which came to dominate, without actually stifling, the native tradition between the late XVIIIth century and 1916. Following the standstill in architectural activity, economic take-off and a revival in building between 1922 and 1970 is seen by the author as part of the same process — although this is not to deny the advances made especially in urban social and cultural organization. This development is described in horizontal sections, and the author succeeds in relating it to popular traditions and customs, which he integrates into a highly skilful study of the relations of production. This book, then, contains a masterly study of the framework of life in the seigneurial period of the second feudal age, and forms a companion to the work on rural communities by H. H. Stahl which we are awaiting.

Primarily it is the interest in feudalism which is catered for here, in the second book (p. 39-379). But from the end of the *Tène* period with the *davae* of the Getae-Dacians which, as quasi-urban buildings, are comparable with the Celtic *oppidum* (a system of fortified buildings on the Orastie mountains) and, in terms of building techniques, with Cretan and Mycenaean architecture (*emplecton*), a real network of cities covered Transylvania. After 105-6 A.D. the capital Eulpia Traiana-Samizegetusa, Apulum (Alba Iulia), Porolissum (Miograd) and Napoca (Cluj) were established, protected by the *Limes Transalutanus*. Although these settlements and cities contained no real innovations compared with others we know, they were important because of their density and because they drastically reduced the attraction of the old restored Greek cities of Scythia Minor (Dobroudja). On the other hand the proximity to Romania of the only great medieval Christian state worthy of the name, Byzantium, lessened the shock of massive migrations; under Constantine rebuilding was carried out (for example, Tropaeum) at the time when the cities of the west were becoming overgrown.

This Byzantine protection, the direct substitute for Roman domination, and the appearance of an original feudal system — in so far as it emerged from the community districts which were later to be re-grouped to form the voivodships or *terrae* of the IXth and Xth centuries — were to determine the country's future. From that time the history of Romanian architecture

followed two paths. The peasants of Walachia, Moldavia and Dobroudja built extended houses (with a vestibule, veranda or balcony) which acted as the nerve-centre of enclosed farms that sometimes looked like fortified castles (p. 63-5). Wood was used almost exclusively for both farms and churches, so that the other field of architecture, that of the regional capitals, was distinguished by its elaborate use of stone and technical resources in the Byzantine manner. Romano-Byzantine civilization expanded after Dobroudja was re-integrated into the empire in the Xth century as a dukedom (*Paradounavon* or *Paristrion*), and in some places survived right up to the XVIth century (in the church at Dealu, for example).

From the XIIIth century Hungarian feudal overlordship which was powerful but also very foreign to these native or orthodox origins established in the boyard lands (the *terrae maiores*) and architecture of colonization whose connection with the Teutonic style of Marienburg was particularly striking. Castles reminiscent of those in the Holy Land (e.g. Cetate Alba, now in the U.S.S.R.) and late Gothic basilicas (S. Mary of Sibiu, Transylvania, 1350) were built. But in fact in Moldavia in particular a national and even patriotic architectural style developed which derived from the dying world of orthodox religion which finally came to influence and dominate it. This was because the building and reconstruction plans of Stephen the Great (1457-1504) were based on a deliberate political and often mystical choice (p. 182 et seq.). Such influences were often of distant origin if one considers, for example, that the region of Jassy was still influenced by Armenian and Georgian decorative styles at the beginning of the XVIIth century (e.g. the Church of the Three Hierarchies).

Neither was this popular trend halted by Ottoman influences (the Turco-Phanariot regime in Walachia-Moldavia) which were confined strictly to decoration and quite remarkable comforts, or by the Austrian Baroque movement (through the government of Transylvania). Indeed adherence to the orthodox religion and patriotism were one and the same for the people when the national feudal system crumbled and foreign domination was consolidated: the Jesuit church of Cluj and the cathedral at Blaj are the results of propaganda from Vienna which in the second half of the XVIIIth century was attempting to bring various communities into union with the Catholic church through economic measures.

It would be wrong to say that Grigore Ionesco reduces the XIXth century to a period of decline even if it does suffer from any comparison with the feudal past. The author is too skilful to commit himself to such a phrase. But however much those middle-class progressives of the 1850's struggled with the relics of the previous regime and against foreign political influences, how cosmopolitan and dull they seemed to us; the worst kind of French academicism triumphed with its ally of the Great War. Only a few architectural examples of rural and popular origin (which remind us of the attempts

to revitalize a native architecture style in Spain, for example, in the same period) emerged among the buildings which established the French influence in Bucarest (banks, schools, etc.).

The champions of national emancipated art were Ion Mincu and Petre Antonescu; the revival of a « national specification » (the outstanding features of which the Socialist Republic has fortunately been able to preserve) in the capital that grew up after the First World War and the building of recreational facilities is due to them. There can be no doubt, either, that the new detailed survey and a new legislation have also facilitated this revival by amalgamating traditional features of the Romanian countryside (as in the case of the *ovartale*) and the sort of ideas which led to the construction of large independent residential estates in which it has been possible to maintain quite exceptional green areas, even around the mines in the Jiu valley.

The work contains a very useful archaeological and historical bibliography as well as some remarkable illustrations (when they are in black and white!). But above all it must be acknowledged as an exemplary work of *histoire totale*.

J. P. CUVILLIER
University of Toulouse

T. KEMP, *The French Economy 1913-39. The history of a Decline*, New York, St Martin's Press, 1972, pp. 183.

The poor performance of the French economy between 1913 and 1939 has been the subject of much debate. The best known aspects of the problem have been statistical — an annual growth rate of 1.27% for industrial production and of 1.13% for the P.I.B. But thanks to the studies that have appeared the hypotheses are being better formulated and reduced in number. It still remains necessary however to choose a plausible explanation for what appears to have been a decline. This is what T. Kemp has attempted to do in this concise and well organized work.

The author attempts to provide a general picture of the country and emphasizes from the outset the regional and sector lags which handicapped the economy. He discusses the importance, in terms of the labour force which it immobilized, of the agricultural zones of West and Central France where *per capita* production in 1913 (taking a regional average) was hardly 45% of the figure for Paris. Again, in relation to manpower, there was the weakness of the technologically advanced industries which employed no more than 5%-7% of the active population. There was also a very slow rate of concentration both in agriculture — small farms of 1-20 hectares accounted for 42% of the total cultivated area in 1929 — and in industry where establishments employing 20 workers or less accounted for 55% of

the wage-earning labour force. Over the years progress was clearly made, but these weaknesses did not disappear. The rigidity of these structures limited improvements in production.

Kemp then contrasts the country's apparent wealth in 1913, its colonial and financial expansion, the absence of an industrial proletariat with various weaknesses in its economic apparatus — the lack of social security, its fiscal system (by which the backward sectors survived) and its immature demographic variations. He examines the industrial mobilization which made possible the victory of 1918 and points out the resentment of small entrepreneurs who had no share in the war contracts and the discontent of the workers, many of whom had served their factory apprenticeships under abnormally severe conditions. Finally in the 1920's, while recognizing the country's recuperative power, its industrial wealth and the State's cooperation in this, he stresses the preservation of the traditional dualistic structure. This he explains in terms of the immigrants who prevented the redistribution of the labour force, of the success of exports which increased the prosperity of many of the older sectors etc. He also emphasizes the depreciation in savings capital, as it was not until 8 years after the war that the commercial budget was balanced and the double tax reform of April-August 1926 made it possible to recoup the foreign deficit, balance the budget and stabilize the currency.

Paradoxically, XIXth century France seemed to refuse to die. Neither the economy nor society changed in any radical way. And the biases, which in the past had so often worked against towns and industry, continued. The fall of the franc in particular was blamed on speculative manoeuvres rather than on more apparent causes such as the imbalances created during the war, the tax concessions which protected agriculture and small traders, with the resulting weakness of the State etc.

Starting from these facts, then, the author attempts to explain, in the second half of the study, the slump which followed as the industrial growth rate fell to negative levels, to — 1.1% per year between 1929 and 1938. To do this there were two alternative hypotheses open to the author.

1. Taking a general view, four factors could be examined. The termination of reconstruction and the fall in foreign prices which cut back French exports by two thirds (in value) from 1926. Overproduction in agriculture and the drop in national revenue (of one eighth in volume) between 1932 and 1935. Growing obsolescence of plant during the years of inflation (the deposits in commercial banks calculated in constant prices remained some 30% less between 1920 and 1927 than in 1913). The phase of investment was also too short; gross capital formation only rose to 18.5% of the P.I.B. for four years between 1928 and 1931, while between 1922-27 and 1932-38 it averaged only 14.7%. Logically one would then expect the world crisis to have found itself out of step here and its effects to have been

cushioned — financial expansion was slighter in France than abroad. It is also well known that France was relatively unscathed. On the other hand, as the restructuring of the economy was not accomplished the revival of June 1935 — due to the rebalancing of the agricultural market, reconstitution of stocks etc. — created a relatively modest increase in production, but also renewed inflation. Between 1935 and 1938 prices rose on average 15% annually, parallel to the 1920's. The foreign balance of payments also fell; the rise in the volume of imports was 23.9% in 6 months, while exports remained static.

2. A second approach is possible, if we look first at individuals, their attitudes and subsequent reactions. In the first place one might discuss the prejudices of the French public — the refusal to devalue with the British and Americans, although that made it impossible for French exporters to sell or to renew stock or plant. There was also the refusal to spread the tax burden more equitably and to use the budget as a means of investment — which accounts for the repeated attempts to squeeze the economy and, as returns shrank faster than expenses, the increase on the budget deficit. Between 1932 and 1935 this immobility produced results which were quite the reverse of what had been anticipated. Secondly, after the crisis it was the desire to create growth that led to the Popular Front. But unfortunately it did not achieve the desired goal. The government wished to increase demand by raising salaries and limiting working hours, without distinction. As a result the employment for supervisory personnel was reduced, shifts were put on short time, costs increased and the economic revival was delayed. In the same way the franc was devalued, but not sufficiently and without the necessary control of exchange rates. The result was that confidence was upset, capital was exported, and the increase in import prices accelerated inflation and made further devaluations necessary. The franc lost 76% of its value abroad in 19 months.

There is then a choice between two explanations. Either one adopts the structural analysis described first, emphasizing the way in which labour was kept on or transferred to sectors with low productive levels. The resulting stagnation of the 1930's can then be explained, all the more because the crisis of 1929 was not initially severe enough to eliminate marginal enterprises. On the other hand a classical examination of political action and its psychosocial origins can be made. Here one would consider the losses in revenue suffered by the rentiers between 1922 and 1927 and by the workers between 1928 and 1935 and then these groups can be used to explain the reformation of the political parties in power, to describe their aims and establish the reasons for their failure. In fact as Kemp shows (p. 111 and 119-24) the neo-cartel involuntarily contributed, by the unsuccessful deflation, to the revival of 1935-36, while the Popular Front adopted a reflationary policy (without devaluation) and in fact halted expansion.

But is there also a possible third alternative? The study of the structures ends here in 1929 and makes little of the giant enterprises which were created or else just emerged between the wars. No mention is made of the new ruling classes formed early in the century who won the war, opened up new industrial sectors, devalued, reformed social assistance, established general economic planning, organized state investments and then simply vanished between 1932 and 1937. Nor is there any reference to the fact that productivity — in terms of total product in relation to man-hours — increased by 2.23% annually between 1913 and 1938. In short, because the study is orientated towards the past it demonstrates extremely well that traditional France was still not adapted to the modern world — but it also suffers by neglecting the possibility of a parallel process of rejuvenation. But such a balance is restricted by the nature of the existing studies — and so the problem of France's economic renaissance must await future historians.

MAURICE LÉVY-LEBOYER
University of Paris - X Nanterre

S. KOSCIALKOWSKI, *Antoni Tyzenhauz, Lithuanian Court Treasurer*. Volumes I, II. London, 1970-71, p. 686 and 567.

A major posthumous work by Professor Koscialkowski (who died in 1960) entitled « Antoni Tyzenhauz, Lithuanian Court Treasurer », volumes 1 and 2, was published in London in 1970-71. The subject and scope of the work is best described by the sub-title — which is unfortunately omitted — « Studies of the internal affairs of Lithuania at the beginning of the reign of Stanislaus Augustus ». This book constitutes the life-work of the author who was a professor of Vilno University between 1921 and 1939. The author collected the basic material from the archives before 1914 since when he has published partial results of his research. Basically the work was ready for publication in 1939. This is of major importance, as during both world wars some of the archives used by the author were either totally or partially destroyed.

Antoni Tyzenhauz was an unusual occurrence in the history of the Republic in the second half of the XVIIIth century. A wealthy nobleman, although not a magnate, and a contemporary of the last king Stanislaus Augustus Poniatowski, he gained his complete confidence. An ambitious man, ruthless, full of ideas and initiative, Tyzenhauz in 1765 received into his administration enormous estates, the so-called royal lands, on which lived more than 160,000 souls and the profit from which was assigned for the needs of the king and his court. Managing the profits from these states, Tyzenhauz proceeded to found many manufacturing industries, mainly in Grodno, as well as scientific and cultural institutes. In the course of ten

to twenty years some fifty different manufacturing industries were established, employing about 1,850 hired workers, among them many foreigners, and huge numbers of peasant-serfs. The position of court treasurer enabled him not only to administer the profits of the royal treasury but also the public treasury of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. In general the author makes a negative appraisal of Tyzenhauz's economic activities. The retrograde reform of the estates (the return of manor farms and serfdom) worsened the position of the local population and led to the outbreak of peasant uprisings on the Szawelski estates in 1769. From the financial point of view manufacturing failed as an undertaking, for the products did not find customers. They could only exist with the support of subsidies from outside, that is from the crown estates. The problem of marketing the products was not solved by the Commercial *Kantor* (Office) which was unable to tackle successfully the problems facing it. On the other hand Tyzenhauz contributed to the improvement in the administration and to a rise in the profits of the state treasury of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, but even on this he was met with criticism in parliament in 1780.

Tyzenhauz's insolvency as an administrator of the royal estates, as well as the action of some groups of noblemen, supported by the Russian ambassador Stackelberg, led to his fall in 1780. He was removed by the king from his administration of the crown estates and in general lost the king's confidence. Two court actions resulted from this, relating to the court treasury and the national treasury respectively. Tyzenhauz lost both of them.

Tyzenhauz's economic activities made a great impression on his contemporaries, who were impressed by his drive. But the rapid collapse of the manufacturing industries (after 1780 they were slowly liquidated) shows the fragility of the whole undertaking. The main reason for their failure was that their products were dearer and inferior to foreign products, hence their manufactures did not find customers. In addition one ought to take into consideration the prejudices of the wealthy classes against domestic production. Among the nobility especially there existed deeply rooted habits of buying foreign articles in Danzig on the occasions when they sold their own agricultural products there.

About 18 years ago W. Kula studied the activities of Tyzenhauz in his excellent studies of the manufacturing industries in Poland in the XVIIIth century (Warsaw 1956) while the Soviet historian D. L. Pochilevith studied the history of the crown estates. Apart from these, several studies have appeared which are devoted to Tyzenhauz's cultural activities.¹ These authors

¹ W. KULA, *Szkice o manufakturach w Polsce XVIII w.* (Brief Studies of manufacturing in Poland in the XVIIIth century), Warsaw 1956, pp. 139-162, 309-448; D. L. POCHILEVICHI, *Krest'jane Belorussii i Litvy vo II pol. XVIII v.*, Vil'njus 1966 and other works by this author.

had not of course seen S. Koscialkowski's full publication. One has to remember that since Koscialkowski wrote research methods have improved and the understanding of the historical process and the role of the individual has changed. Despite this, even now Professor Koscialkowski's work undoubtedly remains the most versatile study of the internal affairs of Lithuania and White Russia in the second half of the XVIIIth century. It can serve as an example of the total, integral understanding of the historical process. One has to admire the extent of the research, the penetration of the author's investigations, the mastery of the vast range of facts, events, and details of every kind, and the clarity of expression. The author treats his hero without adoration, sensibly and impartially, although perhaps with some sentiment. *

LEONID ZYTKOWICZ
University of Toruń

D. E. MOGGRIDGE, *British Monetary Policy 1924-1931*, Cambridge (England), the University Press, 1972, pp. X+301.

«The 'Norman Conquest of \$4.86' was ultimately an act of faith in an incompletely understood adjustment mechanism undertaken for largely moral reasons» (p. 28). This is the opening sentence of Mr Moggridge's final chapter, which might more accurately be called «Summary» than, as it is, «Conclusions». In it he analyses forcefully, and in lapidary phrases that one is continually tempted to quote, the reason why sterling returned to the gold standard in 1925 at the rate of \$4.86 = £1, and why it proved, six years later, impossible to maintain that rate.

For the choice of \$4.86 as the rate at which to return to gold it is impossible to find any reasoned basis. The case for it went by default, no alternative rate being given any real consideration. In Mr. Moggridge's view, however, an exchange rate at least 10 per cent lower than \$4.86 would have been somewhat more appropriate (p. 105).

In one of five appendices, Mr. Moggridge reproduces a memorandum which Winston Churchill, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, wrote in January 1925 asking for answers to possible criticisms of a return to gold; and also four replies. Two of these were from Sir Otto Niemeyer, then (as the author's helpful «Dramatis Personae» reminds us) Controller of Finance at the British Treasury. The other two were from Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England from 1920 to 1944, and Sir John Bradbury, a former Permanent Secretary to the Treasury.

All three advisers took the rate of \$4.86 for granted. Mr. Norman, who as Mr. Moggridge points out (p. 244) lacked data from which to make any

* Translated by Mrs. B. Warden.

more than a rough guess at the causes and implications of balance of payments strains, wrote that « there is no alternative to Gold in the opinion of educated and reasonable men. The only practical question is the Date » (p. 270). Sir John confined himself to arguing against the practicability of a managed currency (pp. 272-76). Sir Otto's advice continually emphasized the long-term and ignored any short-term effects of the prospective revaluation. « This long-term emphasis », says Mr. Moggridge, « plus an implicit belief that exchange rates once fixed were immutable, probably contributed heavily to the outcome ». No-one except Mr. Keynes and Mr. McKenna, neither of whom then held an official position, attempted to point out just how long and difficult the short-run might be (p. 235).

The limitations of the advice given to the Chancellor in the memoranda cited are summed up by Mr. Moggridge as follows:

For a decision as to a rate of exchange not to involve a consideration of the current account and relative price implications of the step under consideration in relation to official policy goals seems almost foolhardy, as does the completely innumerate nature of the decision-making process... Churchill's memoranda had phrased the problems involved in a manner which cried out for analysis, but neither he nor anyone else really demanded it (p. 234).

Thus, in many respects, misleading is perhaps too strong a word to apply to the advice tendered to Churchill in 1925, if only because it implies active consideration of the problems involved: non-existent might actually be more appropriate (p. 230).

So far as there was a rational basis for the decision to return to gold at \$4.86, it appears to have been based on two expectations and one pre-supposition. The more important of the expectations was that inflation abroad would remove any initial disparity between British and foreign prices and costs. In fact, American prices, on which British eyes were largely fixed, did not rise, while French prices actually fell because the franc was returned to gold at a rate which undervalued it. The other expectation was that the Bank of England would, and could, maintain the improvement in the exchange rate which \$4.86 represented. Much of this book is devoted to Mr. Moggridge's exposition of the reasons why this expectation was frustrated. Finally, the pre-supposition which underlay much of official thinking in 1925 was that the City of London and its institutions deserved special consideration because their invisible earnings played so large a part in balancing the balance of payments. But the use of sterling as the currency for the settlement of international accounts was not wholly due to the efficiency of the City. It depended also on the fact that the United Kingdom loomed large in world trade, so that working balances of sterling were extensive; and the desirability of such balances was wholly dependent on the stability of the currency. For sterling to retain its importance as an intervention currency, especially in the face of the challenge from New York, the maintenance of the exchange rate was all-important. As Mr. Moggridge

points out, *any* exchange rate, so long as it remained stable, would have served the City's turn. The importance attached to the City was therefore no argument for \$4.86; rather it was an argument for a lower rate which had a better chance of being maintained.

Once the resumption of gold had been achieved, the best that the Bank could do was to disguise sterling's weakness. Its tactics are described in detail by Mr. Moggridge in two chapters (8 and 9) which reveal, with the aid of documents which have only recently become accessible, the nature of its operations on the gold and foreign exchange markets, and its use of moral suasion in the capital markets.

As the extensive bibliography shows, Mr. Moggridge has cast his net extremely widely. His book, except to some extent for the chapter of « Conclusions », is not easy reading, but it constitutes an authoritative examination of a problem which has interested economists for forty years.

J. KEITH HORSEFIELD
Newport, England

D. C. NORTH and R. P. THOMAS, *The Rise of the Western World: A New Economic History*, Cambridge, University Press, 1973, pp. 171.

Students of the economic history of the United States need no introduction to the senior author of *The Rise of the Western World*. For others, Douglass North is an American pioneer in economic history. His *Economic Growth of the United States, 1790-1860*, published in 1961, is generally recognized as a study at least partially responsible for ushering in the era of the « new economic history » in the United States. In addition to regular contributions to the journals, and other books, North has offered up *Growth and Welfare in the American Past* (1966), *The Growth of the American Economy to 1860* (with his protégé and co-author of the volume under review here, Robert Paul Thomas, 1968), and *Institutional Change and American Economic Growth* (with Lance E. Davis, 1971). North has had considerable influence on the direction of the « new economic history » in the United States with his constant contributions to the literature in that area of study. His approach employs economic theory as a tool for clarifying historical change, not a cloud to disguise it. Further, his objectives are always clearly delineated and worthy of attainment. His writing is characterized by its readability. This most recent work of North and co-author Thomas will in all probability wield heavy influence on the development of the « new economic history » in Europe. There can be little doubt that it will influence the American approach to European economic history.

Rise of the Western World is a natural development from *Institutional Change*. In *Rise* the authors concern themselves with the institutional changes accounting for economic growth and differential economic growth in Western

Europe. The North/Thomas approach, while not entirely new, narrows down and expands on what most economic histories of Europe either gloss over or bury in a mass of chronology. North and Thomas are not offering a complete economic history of Europe, but instead, a clearly defined investigation of what occurred in Western Europe to account for that area's world-wide impact in the modern era. Further, the authors are concerned with the fact that all of Western Europe did not develop equally. The Netherlands and England surged ahead in the war against Malthus, while France and Spain lagged behind. An explanation for that phenomenon, the key to economic growth, is the quest of the investigation.

North and Thomas isolate the development of private property rights as the distinguishing feature of Western Europe accounting for both the outstanding growth of that region and differential growth within the region. In Chapter One the authors make their case for property rights as the principal explanation for the growth phenomena in question. In Chapter Two they provide an overview of the entire study. The time period to be analysed is specified and justified here. The tenth century is the chosen starting point because feudalism was firmly established by that time and preconditions for change were evident. The commercialism of the Middle Ages was in embryo. The cut-off date of 1700 is explained by the contention that institutional change had progressed sufficiently by that time to bring the private rate of return close enough to the social rate, so that increasing productivity had become an important determinant of the system. In other words, by 1700, whatever Western Europe required for domination of the economic world had already spawned and was not to be stopped.

Part II, Chapters Three through Seven, is devoted to the time span 900-1500. The authors set out in essential detail the variation between the private rate of return and the social rate at the onset of the period. They additionally explain the price paid by society for the difference as well as the circumstances necessary to generate movement towards a smaller differential between the two. Further, the differential is explained. The prevailing economic order of the early Middle Ages was dictated by the social conditions of the age. As these conditions changed, however, so did the institutional requirements necessary for the survival of society. Population change, the resurgence of commerce, and technological changes are each analysed relative to their impact on the institutional structure. The impact of these changes was so evident by 1200 that the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries are discussed separately as to their essential social alterations and the resulting institutional adjustments.

The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are discussed as Part III, Chapters Eight through Twelve. By the sixteenth century nation-states of Western Europe had developed to a stage revealing governments with discernible planned fiscal policies. Because the need for, and establishment

of positive fiscal policies on the part of central governments had a direct bearing on the development of private property rights, North and Thomas elaborate on this essential element of their model. Then, after conditions of the early modern period are spelled out for Europe in general, the authors offer explanations for the failure of two potential successes, France and Spain. The inability of these two nations to remain competitive with the Netherlands and England is explained in terms of developing private property rights in the latter two, and stagnating private property rights in France and Spain.

What sets *Rise of the Western World* apart from other volumes with similar goals is not so much, in the view of this reviewer, what the authors want to do, but, instead, how well they have done it. The idea that economic institutions respond to social change and in turn influence further change is not new. The North/Thomas volume is distinguished by the authors' concise formation of their thesis, delineation of the area of application of the thesis, and the thorough presentation of supporting evidence and final conclusions. There can be little doubt that this book will have a strong impact in the United States. American students of European economic history can be expected to embrace this text. Hopefully Europeans will respond similarly. No student of the economic history of the United States, Europe, or the western economic community can afford to ignore *The Rise of the Western World*.

DAVID O. WHITTEN
Auburn University

A. PIATKOWSKI, *Agricultural Estates Belonging to the Town of Elblag in the XVIIIth and XVIIIth Centuries*. Wrocław-Warsaw, Polish Academy of Science. Historical Institute, 1972, pp. 192 and 5 maps.

It is commonly believed that the former Polish Republic constituted an enormous area where serfdom and servitude were completely established and where the manor-farm using serf labour was the classic and almost the only form of organization of agricultural production on the large estates. Meanwhile Jan Rutkowski, one of the most outstanding Polish economic historians, drew attention almost half a century ago, to the role of hired labour on the state-owned estates in Prussia during the second half of the XVIth century.¹ This is especially true of the vast estates belonging to Malborg castle, later known as the Malborg estates, situated in the fertile district of Zulawy in the delta of the river Vistula. The peasant farms of that

¹ J. RUTKOWSKI, *Pańszczyzna i praca najemna w organizacji folwarków królewskich w Prusach za Stanisława Augusta* (Serfdom and hired labour in the organization of royal estates in Prussia during the reign of Stanislaus Augustus), in «Historical Annals» 1928; reprinted in his «Studies of the history of the Polish village in XVIth-XVIIIth centuries», Warsaw 1956, pp. 109-126.

district were rented and subject only to a minimum burden of servile duties and were the subject of a detailed study by A. Maczack,² while the landowners' farms were studied by J. Szpak.³ Moreover the existence of manors using hired labour on the estates belonging to the larger towns such as Torun and Poznan and situated in the surrounding districts was confirmed.⁴ But a manor, whether based on serf labour or using hired labour, was not the only form of organization of large estates in Poland.

Here before us is a scholarly work by a young researcher, A. Piatkowski, the title of which is given above.

The town of Elblag, one of the three so-called « great » towns of old Prussia, similar to the two remaining — Gdansk and Torun — owned large estates of about 512 km.² in area. The number of peasant settlements in that area in the middle of the XVIth century was 65, while in 1772, at the time of annexation of Elblag by Prussia there were as many as 121. The peculiarity of that vast estate was the absence of landowning manors, that is of farms managed on behalf of the town, which was the landowner. All the arable land was in the hand of the peasants. Generally speaking, these were large holdings, usually 2-4 (with the upper limit of 8) *włoki chełmińskie* * in area, that is, 33.5 to 67 (or possibly up to 134) hectares. These large holdings constituted a special characteristic of Prussia and probably also appeared in large numbers all over the southern and eastern coasts of the Baltic, while large areas of the rest of the Republic were at that time dominated by smaller holdings of less than one *włoka* in area. The large holdings were burdened by high money rents to the landowners.

From the point of view of the rights regarding the use of land, several categories of population can be distinguished i.e. village heads (*die, Schultze, maires des villages*) as well as the so-called free peasant tenants and emphyteuts (long-term tenants). The most numerous and at the same time typical group were the tenants. Their freedom was limited to the extent that they were subject to the town council and could not leave the land without its consent, but on the other hand they possessed hereditary rights to the use of the the land. However the rights of long-term tenants (emphyteuts) were defined

² A. MACZAK, *Gospodarstwo chłopskie na Żuławach Malborskich w pocz. XVII w.* (Peasant holdings in Malborg Żuławy at the beginning of the XVIIth century), Warsaw 1962.

³ J. SZPAK, *Kierunki produkcji dworskiej w Ekonomii Malborskiej w XVI w.* (The direction of the landowners' production in Malborg estates in the XVIth century), Wrocław 1972. The fundamental problem of the costs of production on farms using hired labour in these estates needs further research.

⁴ J. MAJEWSKI, *Gospodarstwo folwarczne we wsiach miasta Poznania w.l. 1582-1644* (Farming in the villages of the town of Poznan during the years 1582-1644), Poznan 1957; I. JANOSZ-BISKUPOWA, *Rachunki folwarczne miasta Torunia z XVI i XVII w.* as a historical source in « Historical Notes », vol. 32/1967, book II, pp. 55-64.

* Translator's note: *lancei Culmenses*, a Polish land measure.

by long-term contracts. The tenants' compulsory labour obligations to the town did not take the form of agricultural labour because, as we have said above, there were no manors on these estates.

Unfortunately, the sources tell us very little about internal organization and the functioning of peasant holdings. These were, of course, commercial holdings, similar to those in the Malborg estates. They supplied the market of the nearby town with grain as well as livestock, as much of the meadow and pastureland was favourable for this type of production. In contrast to the situation in other parts of the country, livestock breeding constituted an independent branch of husbandry and not a subsidiary to corn growing. Because of the extent of the land and the heavy soil they required intensive human and animal labour. According to records made by the Prussian authorities at the time of annexation the peasant holdings employed seven people on average, including the adult members of their own families. It would have been very instructive to have a « model » calculation of the costs of production, in both financial and material terms, of such holdings and also of their « profitability ». But the lack of sources is a major barrier; the peasants did not keep accounts.

A fundamental question arises — why was it that in certain parts of the old Republic this different type of peasant holding developed which distinguished itself sharply and clearly from the situation existing in the greater part of the country? It can probably be explained by the proximity of developed markets, the comparative ease with which surplus products could be disposed of and also cheap transport to these markets. These factors explain the development and existence of large and independent peasant holdings. But why did the landlord of the estate — in this case the city council — not organize production itself? After all, we know that in villages belonging to certain towns such as Poznan and Torun, where there was no serfdom either, there were manors using hired labour. But the answer to this question will demand further research which ought to extend beyond the political boundaries of the old Republic into the neighbouring Baltic states.⁵ It is necessary to point out, however, that the organization of agricultural production based on large and independent peasant holdings discussed here certainly conformed to the conditions of the feudal system. Because of the conditions for the use of the land, the peasants were subject to the jurisdiction and administration of their landlord — in this case the town council.

Translated by Mrs. B. WARDEN

LEONID ZYTKOWICZ
University of Torun

⁵ M. BISKUP, *Über die Rolle und die Bedeutung des Grundbesitzes der grossen Städte von Königlich Preussen im XVI-XVIII Jahrhundert*, in « Problemy reżitija feodalizma i kapitalizma v stranach Baltiki », Tartu 1972, pp. 52-78 (*Dopolnitel'nyj vypusk*).

F. C. SPOONER, *The International Economy and Monetary Movements in France, 1493-1725*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (Harvard Economic Studies, vol. 138), 1972, pp. vii-354.

The present work, here extended to 1725, is an English version of a 1956 publication in French (*L'Economie mondiale et les frappes monétaires en France, 1493-1680*, Paris, Colin, in the *Monnaie-Prix Conjoncture* series of the VI^e Section of the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes). A product of enormous erudition, its core is an annual set of estimates for the 233-year period of the total value of French coinage of copper, billon (a fractional currency alloy of copper and an admixture of silver), silver, and gold, derived from reports of the mints in some 60 towns. This statistical core is the heart of a wideranging investigation of the alternate ascendancy of gold and silver in the international economy during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Chapter 1), French monetary theories and institutions (Chapter 2), French economic activity during successive coinage periods (Chapter 3), the output of the mints, by regions and by metals (Chapter 4), the relation between total coinage, price movements, and the foreign exchanges (Chapter 5), and a macroeconomic view of the money stock — constructed from the cumulative coinage — « national income », and royal revenues (Chapter 6).

The book is copiously illustrated: five plates picturing the chief coins struck; atlases of ten-year totals of the coinage in France; maps depicting (a) the location of the mints, by zones, (b) which cities in Europe had foreign exchange dealings with Lyons and with Amsterdam, and (c) the share of Spanish gold and silver imports that flowed to countries in Europe. These are all admirably drawn. The reader is then all the more disconcerted by the generally poor quality of the graphs of time series. The reduction in their size to fit the printed page is excessive, and they sometimes show too many lines that are not readily distinguishable (see graphs 14-16). If the discussion accompanying the graphs were sweeping, these strictures might matter less. However, it is usually detailed; what is even more disturbing, figures cited in the text cannot be verified by consulting the plotted lines (see, for example, graph 2-4).

The impact of this study of monetary history parallels the author's statement about the country that is the focus of his research: « I set out to study it from the viewpoint of separate regions and cities... I hesitated to speak of France as an integrated economic unit since, during the long two centuries of this study, its more characteristic features seemed imperfectly knit together » (p. 300). In respect of microeconomic and political detail, this book is a remarkable achievement. By contrast the author's success in knitting together the detail is not equally well sustained. A variety of subjects is discussed in a piecemeal fashion, usually well informed and a tribute

to scholarship, but occasionally obscure — high-flown rhetoric masking inadequate analysis. Few overarching themes are developed.

The setting for the study is the internal development of the French monetary system during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Various indicators suggest that the money economy was well established during this period. As the author notes, « The flow of tax remittances, perfectly or imperfectly achieved, implied also the sale of cash crops, the use of money in commercial transactions, and inevitably the development of monetary institutions » (p. 6). Prominent among these was the network of provincial mints, which were farmed out by auction to private contractors who undertook to coin a minimum quantity of currency. A group of money changers operated in various towns to convert bullion or foreign specie into French coin, they in turn undertaking in principle to pass on to the nearest mint uncurrent precious metals and coin. Finally, the existence of the *Chambre des Monnaies*, which in 1552 was established as a sovereign court — the *Cour des Monnaies* — to regulate all matters concerning the currency, bespeaks the importance of the role of money.

During the two centuries covered by the study, the currency system was based on real metallic units that circulated (e.g., gold écus, silver testons) and imaginary metallic units (e.g., livres, sous) that served as the money of account. Prices were expressed in the imaginary units, and the real units were valued as multiples or fractions of the imaginary units. The number of real coins and hence the weight of gold or silver involved in any transaction varied with the rating of the coins in *livre tournois*, the imaginary unit.

Because of its weakness in relation to the currencies of neighbouring countries, the *livre tournois* was repeatedly devalued. The author believes that the price inflation in France from 1471 to 1598 (prices rose over six times during this interval, or at an average rate of 1.5 per cent per year) is mainly attributable to the depreciation of the money of account rather than the depreciation of the precious metals and hence is a count against the quantity theory of money (p. 92). Inflation in France at a higher rate than its trading partners experienced clearly would enforce devaluation of its currency, but it is not clear to me why the author regards this fact as invalidating the quantity theory.

He subscribes to a familiar fallacy, namely, that a monetary explanation of inflation to be valid requires that all prices move in unison. « During price inflations, it was noticeable that food prices, cereal prices in particular, rose relatively more than other commodity prices... It discredits the explanation that the inflation was entirely due to monetary causes and widens the possible explanations to the pressures generated by increasing population on available resources for food » (p. 268). The monetary explanation in fact emphasizes a distinction between relative price movements and movements

of the general price level. The common monetary effect on all commodities and services has superimposed on it the forces that affect relative prices. The monetary explanation asserts that specific demand and supply factors condition relative prices and the exchange ratio between a set of monetary and real influences determines the general price level. Empirical investigation leads monetarists to the conclusion that persistent inflations are not reducible to real influences.

The author undertakes two quantitative exercises. In the first, he correlates index numbers of wheat prices in Paris and total French coinage (over various subperiods, with coinage leading or lagging up to five years, wheat prices reported alternately for calendar and for harvest years, and coinage, first annually, and then as a 30- and a 40-year moving average). One would expect a priori that real forces specific to wheat production in the Paris area, and not monetary influences generally, would dominate the movements of the price series. The author acknowledges that annual mint output is a poor measure of the current money stock and that the moving average would tend to approximate it more closely. Still, some of the coefficients with the moving averages of coinage leading are surprisingly high: .70 in 1522-1680; .75 in 1551-1610; .80 in 1532-1550.

In the second quantitative exercise, the author derives estimates of the money stock from 30-year cumulative moving averages of the total coinage, as a lower limit, and the 60-year counterpart as an upper limit. He compares the estimates with the trends in smoothed estimates of national income, derived from minimum budgets calculated in current prices and multiplied by population estimates, as a lower limit, then doubled to form an upper limit. He also includes in the comparison published estimates of the royal revenues. Strong upward trends are observable in the three series over the full period, most pronounced in the money estimates, but retardations and accelerations in sub-periods are not synchronized.

If the author had some inhibitions in presenting these estimates, the reason was not the paucity of statistical information, but rather his relativist view of economics. According to him, « Economic theory today, it must be admitted, tends to minimize the role played by changes in stocks of bullion in altering the level of prices and economic activity. Yet classical economics, in conditions more akin to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century France, would not be so hasty in arriving at such conclusions » (pp. 295-6). Surely, economic theory does not vary with historical periods; the tools economists have developed are applicable to all centuries and to economies at different stages of economic development.

Had the author approached his subject in this spirit, he would have applied the tools of economic analysis in a systematic way. To cite only one example, would not the theory of optimum currency areas help explain

regional divergency in currency preferences, concerning which he provides much illustrative material? This book is a monument of an older kind of scholarly enterprise: prodigious detail and limited analysis.

ANNA JACOBSON SCHWARTZ

National Bureau of Economic Research, New York, N. Y.

Turgot on Progress, Sociology and Economics. A Philosophical Review of the Successive Advances of the Human Mind. On Universal History. Reflections on the Formation and the Distribution of Wealth. Translated, edited and with an introduction by RONOLD L. MEEK. Cambridge, The University Press, 1973, pp. 1-185.

It has always been a pleasure to read Turgot, be it his *Réflexions* which more than anything else ensure his name remaining placed among those of the foremost interpreters of the economic development of their time, be it his reports made in the course of his work as *Intendant*, such as the famous *Mémoire sur les Prêts de l'Argent*, reports which were never mere administrative papers, but always the accounts by an exceedingly well-informed and far-seeing administrator who had pondered deeply on the matters with which he had to deal.

I have now had the pleasure of reading the *Réflexions* in English, together with two very early pieces of work by Turgot, of a rather different nature, in R. L. Meek's translation so admirably rendered as it can only be achieved by someone who has attained profound knowledge of the author's personality and time, in the extent and way in which he was of his time, and went beyond it. For if Buffon is right in saying « Le style, c'est l'homme », then a true translation which does justice to the man and to the way of expressing « himself », must rest on the basis of such broad knowledge and deep insight. To give an example: the happy choice of « natural philosopher » for Turgot's « physicien » (v. Meek, p. 45, and Turgot, in the Schelle edition of his works, vol. 1, p. 218) can only come to one who is thoroughly at home in Turgot's philosophical and historical orbit. And I would go further — further than Meek himself goes in his remarks on his translator's rules, when he says, somewhat apologetically, that he has not attempted to disguise the « oratorical flights » in *A Philosophical Review*, just as he has respected the « somewhat staccato character » of the *Réflexions*¹ (p. 34). One has only to compare the present translation with the previous ones of various works by Quesnay and to see how Meek

¹ Meek also speaks of their having been « no doubt written down hastily » (p. 19). One would wish that he had taken the trouble of giving a few instances in support of his statement.

there preserves the somewhat antiquated, at times even cumbersome, structure of sentence and argument, as compared with the effect of limpidity in the case of Turgot, in order to appreciate fully this side of Meek's work.

But his greater merit lies elsewhere. It lies in the happy, though, as his Introduction shows, by no means accidental juxtaposition of the *Réflexions* with the two very early pieces of work — not so much because the latter bears witness to the depth of learning and to the breadth of view of a Turgot barely 24 years old, when he pronounced, in Latin, his discourse on *the Successive Advances of the Human Mind* before the closing session of the *Sorboniques*, and made, probably only little later, his copious notes *On Universal History*, but rather, as Meek says with regard to the *Réflexions*, that the « great system of economic theory at which he had arrived by the end of 1766... cannot be fully understood... without an appreciation of the way in which its leading propositions were connected with Turgot's historical and sociological theories » (p. 14 f).

There is, first, the three-stages-theory of the development of mankind as hunters, shepherds, husbandmen, reflected in their various achievements (language *inter alia*), and in their instruments of social organization. Turgot seems to have gleaned its elements from *De l'Esprit des Loix* (1748), where Montesquieu mentions it, as the historian of French Enlightenment, W. P. Wolgin, has pointed out, obviously without realizing the important implications of his thought.² Meek comments: « ... the clarity with which Turgot expressed the idea,³ the way in which he refined and developed it, and the uses to which he put it, mark him and not Montesquieu out as the one who really deserves the name of innovator »; innovator, moreover, of a theory « of great importance in the subsequent development of social science in the eighteenth century » since it made possible « a plausible explanation of *differences* between societies » and « facilitated the formulation of a general theory of the *development* of society from lower to higher levels » through « the unfolding of certain immanent laws of history » (pp. 6, 10 and 11). The agricultural stage, as far as France is concerned, still dominates when Sully points to the pastures and the working of the land as « les deux mamelles de la France », and also in Turgot's time, for the framework within which Turgot sets the early parts of the *Réflexions* is undoubtedly still an agricultural one, to no small extent even still « rooted in feudal soil ».

The human needs are the main factors making for development; there lies the impetus for the realisation of that perfectibility which is a major tenet of

² *Die Gesellschaftsformen der Französischen Aufklärung*. Aus dem Russischen. Berlin 1965, p. 41.

³ An index — useful although it reaches in no way the quality of that in *The Economics of Physiocracy* — enables one to assemble easily Turgot's various statements on the matter.

Turgot's profound faith as an enlightened humanist, and he sees the instruments for passing from the means ensuring merest survival to less restricted means of subsistence as being mainly developed in the sphere of economic activity. From the emergence, in the agricultural stage, of the crucially important social surplus, Turgot traces the development of « towns, trade, the useful arts and accomplishments, the division of occupations », the creation of a leisured group which « bends all its strength to the cultivation of the arts » (p. 43), the interconnected development of commerce with « astronomy, navigation and geography » (p. 47), the rôle of towns as sanctuaries of the arts and sciences in times of barbarism, and the preservation of the « mechanical arts », in times of decline, by the « needs of life » (p. 55).

If Meek traces here — and the same applies at least equally to *On Universal History* — the parallel between Turgot's intellectual processes and those of Smith and Marx, if he explains that all three began with what was, in varying degrees, a materialist theory of history and from this went on to develop a system of economics (p. 19), then we are indeed reminded of Marx's famous sentence in his Preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*: « ... the anatomy of civil society is to be found in political economy » followed by the explanation: « The mode of production of the material means of existence conditions the whole process of social, political and intellectual life ».⁴ The parallel goes further, for all three conceived the historical processes of social organization not as arbitrary, but as « law-governed... processes which operated independently of the wills of individual men » (p. 27).

Now in the *Réflexions*⁵ we begin to enter upon a fourth stage. This emerging « commercial » stage, as it is called, not all that happily, in *Philosophie rurale*, where Turgot, close to the Physiocrats, though never dominated by their system, may, in Meek's opinion, have first come across the idea, is in the *Réflexions* the subject partly of actual economic phenomena, partly of an idealized forecast of conditions where the « commercial » (capitalist) values are not only decisive in agriculture, as the Physiocrats have it, but have penetrated the whole economy on an equal footing in commerce and manufacturing as well. Meek points out to us that Turgot appreciated, in a truly remarkable way, that « one could arrive at an understanding in depth of... a society... by beginning with the analysis of the 'machine' in the type of society which historically preceded it and then asking oneself what alterations in its work-

⁴ Quoted after the translation by E. Burns, London 1957.

⁵ We owe R. L. Meek thanks for clearing up to such a high degree the confusion surrounding the various editions of the *Réflexions*. Carrying on the investigation started by Schelle in 1888, of the changes made by Du Pont, as editor of the *Réflexions*, a document, now in the possession of Columbia University, enabled Meek to establish the authenticity of the 1788 edition to an extent never reached before. In my edition of *Tableau économique by François Quesnay*, Berlin 1965, I had, going in the same direction, once more raised the question; but it is Meek who has answered it.

ing were brought about when a new class » — in this case that of capitalist entrepreneurs — « entered upon the historical scene » (p. 20). « His very postulation of an entrepreneurial society » Meek sees as « a highly remarkable achievement, given the time and place in which he was working: Turgot evidently possessed to the full that peculiar feature of genius which sometimes allows it to observe not only that which *is* typical, but also to discern and analyse that which is *becoming* typical » (ibid.).

Of course I am falling short of doing justice to the rich design of Meek's Introduction when he weaves the complicated pattern of the inter-related ideas Turgot puts before us in the three selections. Still less am I doing justice to Turgot himself, to the wealth of his ideas, formulated moreover, time and again, with the conciseness almost of proverbs; to the dialectics of thinking involved, e.g., in the theory of the equilibrium on the returns on capital, reached only on the basis of the inequality of the differentiated returns (*Réflexion*, § LXXXV-LXXXVIII); to the interesting identification of commerce with the « spirit of equality », supposedly because it rests, under the conditions assumed by Turgot, on the exchange of equivalents, etc. etc. To put it briefly: this is a fascinating ensemble, with a fascinating introduction.

MARGUERITE KUCZYNSKI
Berlin-Weißensee