
THE JOURNALS

*The Geo-history Faces with the Human Sciences: the Case of Etudes Rurales **

Maurice Aymard

French School, Rome

There can be no doubt that the period which was to prove decisive for the *Annales E. S. C.*, both in terms of their success and the stature which they achieved and still maintain in the world of French intellectual activity, occurred in the years after the last war. It was with the founding of the VI^e Section of the *Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes*, instigated by LUCIEN FEBVRE, and quickly followed by the establishment of the *Association Marc Bloch*, that the review's directors acquired the means for guiding historical research along the path they wished, for organizing its general orientation and for supplying it with new talents and ideas. The opportunities provided by these institutions were of course quite unique within the context of the traditional universities, but also they created for this new tradition of historical research the public which it deserved and enabled its results to become more widely known. In the 1950s this was done mainly through the *Centre de Recherches Historiques* and through the important series of publications which it produced. These included the *Cahiers des Annales* (now in its 35th issue) and the series published by the *Ecole Pratique*, under the following headings: *Affaires et Gens d'Affaires*; *Démographie et Sociétés*; *Ports, Routes, Trafics*; and others. These series contained major works by French historians, P. CHAUNU's, *Seville et l'Atlantique* and E. LE ROY LADURIE's, *Paysans de Languedoc* to mention only the most outstanding among them, together with translations of studies in foreign languages.¹

At the end of the 1950s however this success story began to take a new form with a large increase in the number of scholars working in the

* « Etudes Rurales » (Revue trimestrielle d'histoire, géographie, sociologie et économie des campagnes, publiée par l'Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, VI^e Section), Paris-La Haye, Mouton et Co., 1961-1974.

¹ MAURICE AYMARD, *The 'Annales' and French Historiography (1929-1972)*, « The Journal of European Economic History », 1972 (2), pp. 491-511.

VI^e Section and with the creation of a department devoted to 'Cultural Zones' (*Aires Culturelles*) in the *Centre de Recherches Historiques*. This marked the opening of those contacts, which F. Braudel had championed and sketched out, between the historian and the neighbouring disciplines of anthropology, ethnology and sociology. All were now for the first time to be taken together under the general category of Human Sciences, and the founding of the *Maison des Sciences* was to be the great accomplishment of the 1960s. But this remarkable extension in the range and number of research programmes, of scholars and of methods also started to point in a greater variety of directions and that unity of purpose which had characterized the previous decade began to give way to the acceptance of some degree of pluralism. It is against this background that the founding of the second generation of reviews should be seen. While all of them originated from the *Annales* and had the blessing and often the active support of its directors so sharing its more general premises, they also quickly became independent and established their own individual identity. Some of them were devoted to the more specialized treatment of specific geographical areas within the very broadly defined '*Aires Culturelles*' and attempted to develop a multi-disciplinary approach, for example: *Cahiers du Monde russe et soviétique* (1960); *Internord* (International Journal of Arctic and Nordic Studies, 1961); *Cahiers d'Etudes Africaines* (1960). Others were devoted to single disciplines, such as *Homme* (The French Anthropological Journal, 1961) and *Communications* (1961). Following the pattern set by the *Cahiers des Annales* these were all quickly complemented by a range of monographs, the *Bibliothèque Arctique et Antarctique*, the *Cahiers de l'Homme*, *Etudes sur l'histoire, l'économie et la sociologie des pays slaves* and many others.

But amongst these 'second generation' journals, the *Etudes Rurales* which were founded in 1961 were quite distinctive. For the apparent modesty of the journal's aims, its sober and concise manner of presentation which bordered at times on the austere, were in fact quite deceptive. The journal's main concern was with primary sources and in this sense it provided a very real compliment to the *Annales* themselves. The sub-title 'Quarterly review of the history, geography, sociology and economy of the countryside' echoes the classical 'Economies, Societies, Civilizations' of the post-war *Annales*. The very succinct introduction by the journal's two founders, the geographer Daniel Faucher and the historian Georges Duby, also echoed the tone of that manifesto with which some thirty years earlier Marc Bloch and Lucien Febvre had prefaced the first issue of the *Annales d'Histoire Economique et Sociale* (1929): '(This review)... is concerned with the scientific study of the countryside and of those groups of people who live either directly or indirectly by working the soil. Agriculture is a complex human, biological, and bio-technical activity which can only be understood if a range of different methods of study and research are brought together. This journal

will then turn to historians, to economists, to sociologists, to psychologists, ethnologists and of course to agronomists. It will attempt to follow that path which Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch so brilliantly and successfully pioneered in the field of purely historical studies'.

These brief lines contained the journal's full programme. The chosen subject matter was of course the most classical of themes in that French scholarly tradition which stretches back not only to the beginning of the century but in fact much further, to Michelet at least, and which denied the separation of history and geography, one seen as the science of time the other of space, attempting to unite the two in a single study of society. Such attempts stretch from Vidal de la Blanche and are now more than ever evident in the work of F. Braudel. So for the new journal the rural world was to be seen in its entirety, a 'human, biological and biotechnica complex' which would no longer be split up, in to its various natural and physical components on one hand and its human components on the other. Attention then was focussed on 'man and the soil', and whatever the geographers claims might be in this field, he was no longer conceded a monopoly but asked to share his work with other disciplines.

With the exception perhaps of those studies still rigidly trapped in an archaic framework of 'diplomatic history', 'literary history', 'political history' and so forth, all history must to some extent, if not predominantly, become the history of the countryside, for before 1850 it was by any consideration, and not that of number, production or population alone, the rural world which was preponderant, and this remains true until 1900 and even later if one leaves the industrial regions aside. Following the path set by Lucien Febvre, Robert Mandrou in his essay on historical psychology from 1500-1640² has shown the extent to which land and contact with it which was still very often physical and deeply influenced the ways in which man in the modern period has thought, felt and comprehended. This was true even of those living in the relative security of the towns, for even the greatest of these were still surrounded on all sides by open country. Without exaggerating one might claim that the great output of historical studies and research in France since the 1930s, and even more so since 1945, has done no more than reinforce this basic fact. Commenting on the success with which the study of tithes (which had been begun in 1966) and the study of agricultural production had progressed, E. Le Roy Ladurie claimed jokingly that: 'Inside every French historian there lies sleeping an agrarian historian, ready to leap into life at any moment...'³

² ROBERT MANDROU, *Introduction à la France Moderne, Essai de psychologie historique 1500-1640*, Paris, Albin-Michel, 1961 (Collection « L'évolution de l'Humanité », 52).

³ *Les fluctuations du produit de la dîme*, présentées par JOSEPH GOY et EMMANUEL LE ROY LADURIE, Paris-La Haye, Mouton, 1972 (« Cahiers des Etudes Rurales », 3).

The great originality of the programme of the *Etudes Rurales*, however, lay in a rather different aspect. They claimed to supercede the traditional and by then familiar symbiosis of history and geography, which became no more than a basic assumption. The field of study, the founders declared, must however be broadened in order to embrace all those contemporary disciplines which either touch on or are concerned with the rural world, hence economics, sociology, psychology, ethnology and agronomy. But the list is not of course exhaustive and is continually expanding, for example with the addition of anthropology and politics in particular. These approaches to the rural world are of more recent origin than those of the geographer or historian, and are concerned mainly with the transition from rural society of the past to urban society of the present. They are focussed mainly on the problems of cultural dislocation, economic and social change, the difficult processes of adaptation and the short or long-lived conflicts to which these give rise. While it is true that they in turn take much from both history and geography it is too often the case that the latter remain ignorant both of the new methods which are employed and also of the findings of their research, or else simply shy away and hile behind dismissive attacks on 'abusive generalizations'.

Alongside the great gathering of the human sciences which the *Annales* were championing and in which history, not lacking scruples of false modesty, claimed the central role, the *Etudes Rurales* provided an apparently more modest and also a more technical meeting point, a focus for discussion and debate, the function of which was however identical. The objective of bringing together the different disciplines of the human sciences was, as Isaac Chiva stated, a vital necessity: 'Because of the very close link between society and the countryside, between man and technique, between mental attitudes and economy, because of the weight with which history bears down on the present, the rural world is less suited than any other to be chopped up into discreet areas of specialized study. On the contrary it is highly suited to an approach in which economics, geography, sociology and history may be combined and work together, complementing each other without ever being able to dispense with one another'.⁴

The foundation of the *Etudes Rurales* in fact provided the opportunity for a general reappraisal and was also an indication of the great cultural changes which were taking place in the humanities in the late 1950s and early '60s. No longer was it considered proper that one discipline should dominate the others, although this modesty itself might at times appear to have been a weakness. In this case the review was designed specifically to complement others, to provide information on progress and on methods of

⁴ ISAC CHIVA, *Foreward to the special issue 13-14 of April-September 1964 devoted to « Recherches sur les campagnes françaises »*, pp. 5-6.

research, to propose new programmes and projects, help define them and prepare the way for the 'necessary syntheses'. The journal was then seen less as a front line unit than as a means for communicating ideas and for discussion and debate.

The first issue of the *Etudes Rurales* (April-June 1961) established the pattern and illustrated the desire for collaboration. After an introduction the first contribution was from Daniel Faucher one of the review's two founders, and dealt with the problem of triennial crop rotation, one of those topics which have been of central interest to historians since Bloch's *Caractères originaux* and equally to geographers,⁵ but a topic of great importance also for the sociologist, the economist and the agronomist. Modifying the arguments of his predecessors Faucher suggested that triennial rotation should be seen as only the beginning of a process of development which in the 'champagnes' of the Paris basin led to the formation of an 'open-field' landscape in some areas — although the relationship was far from necessary or direct — together with a rigid system of communal regulations and collective institutions. The article by R. Chevalier shared the same concept of permanent agrarian structures which imprint themselves on the landscape. Using the evidence of aerial photographs Chevalier succeeded in distinguishing the traces of the Roman centuriations which are still visible and have in some cases wholly — in others only partly — survived subsequent reorganizations of the land. Etienne Julliard then contributed an article on urbanization in the countryside in Western Europe taking a quite different perspective. He argued that land was organized and managed in a methodical and specific way by the urban centres, and that geography, or the information which it provides, can then be used to explain the administrative action taken. The final article, by P. de Saint-Jacob, dealt with Burgundy in the late 16th century and was concerned with the main features of that total disruption of the land-owning and farming systems brought about by the ravishes of the Wars of Religion. The consequences were the destitution of the peasantry, the absorption of communal assets by indebted corporations, the appearance of large scale purchasers, both noble and bourgeois alike, who bought up the peasants' land, together with the development of share-cropping — the main aspects that is of the massive exploitation of those areas where the peasantry was poor and lacked the capital to enable it to farm directly.

There was also an article by the economist J. Klatzman in which he discussed the obstacles which make any economic calculations about the agricultural sector extremely difficult. The statistics that exist are either inadequate or more often quite unsuitable because they tend to confuse what should be rigidly distinguished, and so tend to disguise such essential features

⁵ ROGER DION, *Essai sur la formation des paysages français*, Tours, 1934.

as 'psychological' and cultural barriers. These are not only difficult to define but may well 'hinder' progress and certainly render completely useless any notion of an 'economic optimum' which is calculable with only the greatest of difficulty but which even then remains quite meaningless in the context to which it is applied. On a similar theme Marie Moscovici drew attention to the peculiar nature of personality formation amongst children in rural environments.

It is not our intention to give a mere list of contents. In spite of the range of topics, which were often far removed in time and space from one another, and also the great variety of methods employed, the unity of this first issue of the *Etudes Rurales* lay in a group of themes which were common to all the authors. For the countryside — the domain that is of the illiterate, of sources that survive through oral or unconscious repetition alone, where what changes changes in response to major developments which are themselves equally silent — is at the centre of a vast area of shadow and uncertainty; it can be approached only indirectly, with little real preciseness, by approximation — yet this great mass of the unknown also requires to be whittled down with the greatest care and accuracy, and makes it essential that there is full collaboration between the various disciplines that come to confront these problems. In that collaboration of course lies the goal of the journal.

Almost fifteen years have now elapsed and during this period the journal's progress has been maintained, making it possible for it to become established and for us to attempt some preliminary assessment. One must look first at the development of the editorial policy adopted by the founders and contributors, and also mention a number of shifts which have occurred which are significant although altogether less deliberate. As any other creative product a journal exists in time and in a specific cultural context, to which it is subject and to which it responds — and the more lively and flexible it remains the more precise its responses.

A multi-disciplinary objective may in the worst of cases be no more than a front, and even in the best remains a difficult task, but the *Etudes Rurales* have from the very start been distinguished by the fact that it has succeeded in maintaining a balance amongst the different disciplines which it has attempted to bring together. Where sacrifices have been made they have been made willingly at the expense of the two original founders, history and geography, which have played the role of hosts, and to the advantage of the guests, that is those disciplines most concerned with the contemporary world and its problems and those which seem most able to recast and reformulate traditional problems and methods. The special issues, however, which are published at regular intervals, always return to the initial task and are devoted to multi-disciplinary studies of some specific problem — for example research on the French countryside (13-14, April-Sept. 1964), Polish agri-

culture (25-26, Jan.-June 1967), the map of rural France (27, July-Sept. 1967), and most recently urbanization in the countryside (49-50, Jan.-June 1973).

In the light of this multi-disciplinary approach geography has had to change considerably. It is still tied largely to its familiar themes; rural habitat, and habitation, the agrarian landscape, the structure of property and cultivation, migration and labour in the countryside. But on the whole the sort of Human Geography which is closely rooted in the narrow framework of a small region or even a '*pays*', and which were it not for the pejorative implications one might otherwise term traditional, has been influenced greatly by these new interests and has registered two major changes. The first concerns space and is demonstrated by the upsurge in work on topics outside the strictly national field, both in Europe itself and the Mediterranean but increasingly outside Europe and in particular the developing countries which provide the example of traditional rural civilizations still closely tied to the past. The second change concerns methodology, and both demand further attention.

Although sometimes covered, as in the case of Cuba for example (1962, 64, 68, 69) and Iran (agrarian reform), the problems of development and under-development tend to be relegated to the background. The main attraction of the Third World lies in the example of rural societies that are quite different from those of Western Europe. For even when they do reflect very closely various features of medieval or modern life in the Christian West, it is still imperative that they be studied in their own terms and not simply by reference to some external model. Just as they have their own techniques, crops, systems of rotation, their own agrarian landscapes and rural habitat, their own ways of life, either sedentary or nomadic, and their own social structures so too do they have their own laws, their own ways of thinking and perceiving, of organizing time and space, life and death. In the sense in which anthropologists and ethnologists use the term, they are bearers of a culture.

This culture is often threatened with complete destruction by industrial civilization, as witness the dislocation of traditional agriculture in the Algerian Ouarsenis studied by Djilali Sari (47, July-Sept. 1972). But a culture is also able to develop and borrow from outside such external features as it can absorb. Henri Raulin ('The Psychology of the Tropical Peasant', 7, Oct.-Dec. 1962, p. 67) argued that: « The act of borrowing must satisfy an existing need or else create a new one that is compatible with the immediate life of the group. So what is borrowed must find a favourable milieu. To be assimilated it must be stamped with the mark of the borrowing group, be able to take on a 'local' appearance, and adapt itself to the availability of necessary raw materials. It is then mainly groups of similar levels of development that borrow and lend... Invention is the fruit of a collective creative

act... and in societies of a comparable level of development techniques are on the point of being invented while in others these inventions have already been accomplished. In certain cases there is then a close connection between borrowing and invention ». This helps to explain why it should be that given similar techniques (in the case studied by Raulin the problems arose from demands created by a market economy) the outcome may be success or may be failure, which can be understood only in relation to the total situation. Here then we find the geographer working very much in company, relying on the complementary researches of the ethnologist, the anthropologist and the psychologist.

This multi-disciplinary experiment carried out between 1960 to '70 and devoted to the traditional agrarian civilizations of Africa, Asia and Latin America was not an accident. It resulted from a whole series of decisions taken at an institution level regarding the organization of scientific research, and was also related to the composition of the research teams established to carry out the studies. But it was also part of a broader cultural movement dominated by the great 'structuralist' wave, the force of which was at that moment being felt throughout the human sciences. It inevitably had repercussions, directly or indirectly, on methods employed in geographical studies in European countries and especially in France. However, one must not exaggerate these changes, which often only amounted to making more explicit and attempting to establish on a coherent scientific basis tendencies already inherent in human geography.

From the time of Vidal de la Blache the geographer has never been content simply to remain a geographer. He became a historian. But history was slow in learning the lessons he taught and the historian forgot, for example, in analysing the industrial revolution in France (which was always considered too slow and too retarded in comparison with the English model) what all the regional geographical studies had clearly shown: that is that the 1840s marked the heyday of rural France, a demographic peak and maximum exploitation of the land. Nor did the geographer ignore sociology, especially political sociology, the importance of which A. Siegfried had pointed out. Neither did he neglect agricultural studies. Technical equipment, the organization of the habitat, family and social units — on all these he collected material which anthropologists and ethnologists could later interpret and reclassify according to their needs. Research into land and the inhabitants of the countryside was also part of his normal work technique. He knew all that such research could permit him to learn, especially about those oral traditions going back four generations, when grandparents remember in distorted fashion what their parents had told them. March Bloch saw in this way of transmitting knowledge one of the most solid foundations of rural conservatism.

However, the nature of these interdisciplinary studies remained empirical, even accidental, and often still only approximative. They were the « gift » of the geographer and « gifts » cannot be discussed. As a result of the changes that took place in the 1960s this became institutionalized, so inevitably becoming more formalized. It was agreed that it is not enough simply to set specialists to work on the same theme to produce an interdisciplinary work. Each may confine himself, and equally his reader, within his own specialist field of knowledge, without ever establishing any further dialogue. For this to occur the work has to be carried out in common — and this is the meaning of the « cooperative research programme » (R.C.P., to use the official jargon of the C.N.R.S.) which was then launched in France on the American model.

The first began in 1963, under the direction of Georges-Henri Riviere, in Aubrac, an agricultural area in the heart of the Massif Central. The reasons for this choice were defined by Isaac Chiva, the editorial secretary and co-editor of *Etudes Rurales*, in significant terms: « since it presents marked archaic features and has a very particular technical, economic, social and cultural character, Aubrac appeared to be a declining area without any real economic and urban core connected with the distant metropolis by a particular system of temporary migration (seasonal or permanent) ». Obviously the study is of tremendous importance, for while there is still time it will be possible to document as fully as possible in Aubrac an example of traditional agrarian civilization in an area of the French countryside which has managed to survive, at the cost of certain inevitable changes and distortions, until the present. This will provide invaluable evidence since the research was carried out on the spot with the object of filling in all the gaps which the written sources have left.⁶

A second R.C.P. (1966-69) was devoted to northern Burgundy (Chatillonais), « a land of extreme contrast to Aubrac... a region with about 30,000 inhabitants scattered between a small town, Chatillon-sur-Seine and 115 villages. Since it was situated near Dijon and Troyes and influenced directly by these towns and Paris, this region... entered its phase of modernization after the end of the First World War, after undergoing many great economic and demographical changes from the end of the XIXth century. Both its modern mixed and livestock rearing economy and the mobility of its population appear to be the causes, and the proof, of an accelerated integration into the national society » (I. CHIVA, 32, p. 44). The nature of the research is summed up in the binominal which best illustrates the cultural models

⁶ Four volumes have appeared to date: *L'Aubrac 1. Géographie - Agronomie - Sociologie économique* (1970). *L'Aubrac 2. Ethnologie historique* (1971). *L'Aubrac. Carte et catalogue des montagnes* (1971). *L'Aubrac. Ethnologie contemporaine* (I et II 1972-73), Paris, Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

employed in the human sciences: tradition and adaptation, archaism and innovation.⁷

These, then, with all their imperfections and limitations, were the new interdisciplinary studies which set the pattern. They did not imply any criticism of studies that followed the concepts and customs of « traditional » human geography. But because of the impact they caused they helped to bring about a reappraisal and the opening of a debate which questioned many of the geographer's assumptions. G. Nicolas-Obadia stressed this in a poetical reference to the book by J. Beaujeu-Garnier *La géographie, méthodes et perspectives*: 'geography does not have a monopoly over a subject (man and land) nor over an approach to this subject.'⁸

At present geography again seems to be under attack, for it is being challenged on that very ground which it might well have assumed to be within its own field of interest. A. Leroi-Gourhan's 'Centre de Formation aux Recherches Ethnologiques' has set a team of students to study the Normandy village of Haleine (E.R. 11, July-Sept. 1963). It was also the 'Groupe de Sociologie' which decided to study a village in Lorraine on the borders of the steel manufacturing belt (the village is referred to as G.F. as only the initials are given) to serve as an archetype for a regional typology of the French countryside. Three studies were included in their programme: one historical, another economic, and the final devoted to social organization and relations, the family and political power...⁹

It has not only been geography that has had its methods and objectives called into question and been required to justify them, for the other partner, history, has been treated in a similar fashion. The various articles show historians moving freely in that general period covered by the *Annales*,

⁷ The first studies by JEAN CUISENIER, *Le Châtillonnais. Matériaux et hypothèses pour une recherche ethnologique, sociologique et économique*, P. MATHAL et P. EURARD, *L'évolution en longue période de l'agriculture d'une petite région: le Châtillonnais*, et S. WOLIKOV, *Enquête Châtillon: problèmes d'histoire démographique et sous-professionnelle*, were followed by the first publications: MARIE-CLAUDE PINGAUD, *Paysage, population et histoire foncière dans le Châtillonnais: l'exemple de Minot (Côte-d'Or)*, « Etudes Rurales », 32, Oct.-Dec. 1968; F. LOUX and M. DE VIRVILLE, *Le système social d'une région rurale: le Châtillonnais (ibid., 35, July-Sept. 1969)*; T. JONAS and F. ZONABEND, *Cousinage et voisinage*, « Echanges et communications. Mélanges offerts à Claude Lévi-Strauss pour son soixantième anniversaire », La Haye, Mouton et Co., 1969, I; G. CALVET, *La vigne et le vigneron de la côte du Châtillonnais*, « Etudes Rurales », 41, Jan.-March 1971, pp. 57-86; H. RAULIN, *La Communauté villageoise en Châtillonnais*, « Etudes Rurales », 48, Aug.-Dec. 1972, pp. 39-77; M. PETITOT-MAURIÉS, *Forêt communale, droits d'usages et affouage en Châtillonnais (ibid., pp. 78-104)*; J. GASCHE, *Agriculteurs et ouvriers: études des activités et des contacts sociaux dans une communauté villageoise, ibid., pp. 105-119*.

⁸ G. NICOLAS-OBADIA, *De l'autosatisfaction à l'interrogation, ou la crise de la géographie de langue française vue par Jacqueline Beaujeu-Garnier*, « Etudes Rurales », 51, pp. 125-133.

⁹ C. KARNOOVH, *L'Oncle et le cousin*, « Etudes Rurales », 42, April-June 1971, pp. 7-51.

stretching from the 12th to the 18th centuries. They concentrate on certain pre-selected areas, such as the Low Countries, Provence and the Mediterranean regions which are privileged with the possession of reliable and early written records. Sometimes one can almost detect a quiet, complacent, purring. Outside their contributions to the interdisciplinary debates, however, the finest examples of the historians' contribution lie in two major collective projects. The first of these was devoted to deserted villages¹⁰ and led directly to the founding a medieval archaeology devoted to the study of the village, peasant habitation, technical equipment, everything in fact covered by that broader term 'material civilization'. The second of these projects was launched in 1966 by the *Association française des historiens économistes* and was devoted to a study of agricultural production based on tithe records.¹¹ This is the study which E. Le Roy Ladurie and J. Goy now wish to reattempt on an international, or at least Western European, scale. So it can be seen that in both cases the frontiers of research have been broadened, traditional questions have been rephrased and in turn have given rise to new ones and have provided the historian with new sources which he is now able to use and interpret.

The modification of the roles of the two host disciplines in the gathering which has taken shape around the *Etudes Rurales* has been paralleled by the rapid development of all those studies rooted more directly in the contemporary world. The date is important: the 1960s saw the rapid transformation of the French peasantry, a major reduction in the agricultural labour force, and the sudden transition to extremely industrialized and at the same time commercialized production, which was completely integrated into the national economy. This gave rise to many often spectacular economic and political tensions. But there were also less noticeable changes, which were just as decisive, in occupations, habitat, religion, family structures — everything was questioned at the same time and in the same historical context. The countryside ceased to be a silent world ruled by repetition alone, which had for so long been the case.

From the titles of a series of articles bordering on the fields of sociology, economics, politics, ethnology and social psychology, it is clear that the *Etudes Rurales* took a major interest in this decisive discontinuity which affected not only France but most countries of Western Europe in the period of rapid industrialization after the war. « Agricultural exodus », « The sociology of the agricultural occupations », « Rural migrations », « Social and professional dynamics », « The professional inertia of the farm bosses », « Rural under-employment » etc. Etienne Julliard emphasized this clearly in

¹⁰ J. LE GOFF and R. ROMANO, *Paysage et peuplement rural en Europe après le XI^e siècle*, « *Etudes Rurales* », 17, April-June 1965, pp. 5-24.

¹¹ *Les fluctuations du produit de la dîme*, cit.

his introduction to the special issue on « The urbanization of the countryside » (49-50, Jan-June 1973). « A turning point in rural history, a transformation in the countryside », « the end of the peasants » — one or another of these expressions is constantly used by anyone describing the countryside of the industrialized nations of today. And this is not merely a new « agricultural revolution ». The greatest changes that are taking place today are of another kind... in fact it is the collapse of the old agrarian civilizations, which have been weakened for a century... Even if these two groups still lead a very separate existence the fact remains that the integration of the rural population into a global society and economy is progressing by any different means ».

Without adhering to an over-rigid formula the editors of the *Etudes Rurales* have succeeded, then, in overcoming those false issues which might have lead them astray — although at times only by virtue of far from easy changes of course — and have kept their review alive and, in the closest and most rigorously scientific way, alert to the changes unfolding in the modern world.