
REVIEWS OF BOOKS

M. CALEGARI AND OTHERS, *Guerra e commercio nell'evoluzione della marina genovese tra XV e XVII secolo*, in « Miscellanea storica ligure », II, new series I, 1972, pp. 238. Università di Genova, Istituto di storia moderna e contemporanea - Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Centro per la storia della tecnica in Italia.

In this volume, which is dedicated to the memory of the distinguished Yugoslav historian Jorjo Tadic, are collected five essays which appeared in the review « Miscellanea storica ligure ». They represent the first results of research on the Genoese navy in the modern period that has been carried out at the *Istituto di storia moderna e contemporanea e laboratorio di storia della scienza dell'Università di Genova*, in close collaboration with the *Centro per la storia della tecnica in Italia*.

The volume opens with the essay by MANLIO CALEGARI entitled *Navi e barche a Genova tra XV e XVI secolo* (Ships and boats in Genoa between the XVth and XVIth centuries), pp. 13-56. On the basis of examination of a wide range of archive material, mainly Genoese (including the series *Maritimarum*, the *Diversorum Communis*, notarial sources and those of *S. Giorgio*, which are kept in the Genoese State Archive, and the series *Introitus-Exitus* in the Civic Archive) the author has reached a number of conclusions regarding the consistency, composition and activity of the merchant fleet. The result is of great importance, especially as it was obtained from the study both of sources hitherto unused for a rigorous and systematic reconstruction of the fleet and also of documents discovered and reorganized by the author himself. The most important findings of the research are collected together in a series of

tables which provides the fulcrum to a narrative that singles out from a series of essential topics (discussed concisely in five paragraphs) the key to an understanding of the evolution, or rather involution, of the Genoese merchant fleet; this can be summed up as the reversal of the proportion of large to small ships that took place between the late XVth and the mid-XVIth centuries.

From a survey of the fleet rigged out for Carlo VIII in 1494, which is estimated, so far as the Genoese shipping is concerned, at about 270,000 *cantari* capacity, we pass to a detailed analysis of the entire Genoese merchant fleet during the period 1487-1509, with an examination of the total capacity involved and the different capacities according to types of vessels, from the heaviest down to the lightest, cogs and surface craft, for the years 1487, 1491, 1493, 1498, 1502, 1504, 1508, 1509. Calegari's description of the situation is further enhanced by detailed references to other subjects, like the payment of crews, the life-span of individual vessels, the methods of ship-building and time involved.

The second essay *Patroni di navi e magistrature marittime: i 'Conservatores Navium'* (Ship-owners and maritime magistracies: the 'Conservatores Navium'), pp. 57-92, is by the same author. If the first study involved research of a predominantly quantitative kind, the analysis concentrates on defining the political significance of the magistracy, examining its structure and functions both before and after Andrea Doria's reform. Against the background of social conflicts that were growing more and more radical, and which were to be resolved for Genoese society as a whole only with Doria's reforms, the ship-owning groups firmly determined to control and strictly discipline shipping operations by means of this new instrument, and at the same time to gain control of all the crafts and trades involved in the naval industry. In the final part of the work Calegari poses and answers the interesting question of the connections between the *Conservatores Navium*, the *Conservatori del Mare*, and the *Officium Maris*. « After 1546 », the author writes, « the functions hitherto exercised by the *Conservatori delle Navi* were taken over by the *Conservatori del Mare*. They are indubitably two names referring to the same thing and the same individuals » (pp. 55-56). Also by the late XVIth century *Conservatori del Mare* and *Officium Maris* were one and the same.

M. Calegari also collaborated on the third essay (VILMA BORGHESI-MANLIO CALEGARI, *La nave Bertorota, 1547-1561*, pp. 93-116). This describes the entire career of a ship (measuring some 27.5 m. long, 9.4 m. wide, height without masts about 4.7 m., 400 tons), from construction to scrapping, a period of fourteen years. All the costs of construction and the time required are described, and then the voyages, routes, ports of call and duration, together with expenses and profits, although the latter were usually slight. This, together with the division between ship-owning and purely commercial enterprises, is used by V. Borgesi and M. Calegari and applied

in a general sense, as well as directly in relation to this particular ship, to illustrate several fundamental elements in the crisis of Genoese ship-owners. « Ownership not directly interested in the cargo », the authors write, « with substantial investment (...) exposed to the risk of loss of profit », could not in the long run sustain « simple charter transactions, and could only rarely grow beyond the family dimension; in no case could it hope to widen its basic structure » (p. 109).

In order to draw up the biography of this ship, called *Bertorota* and also *S. Maria*, V. Borghesi and M. Calegari used a series of registers kept in the Savona State Archive (*Manuale di la fabrica di la nave fabricata fu in Celle* and other books, registers from the *Introitus-Exitus* in the Genoese Civic Archive, as well as papers discovered in the Genoese State Archive. As an appendix they have added an interesting inventory of the ship, dated 1st April 1557, and a list of its part-owners between 1547 and 1557.

The fourth study is by VILMA BORGHESI and is entitled *Informazioni sulle galee di Andrea Doria nelle carte strozziane (1552)* (Information on the galleys owned by Andrea Doria in the Strozzi papers), pp. 118-206. It is based predominantly on papers kept in the Florence State Archive. The author compares the features of a Genoese galley of the XVIth with a Genoese galley of the XIVth century and with Venetian and Florentine galleys of the XVth century.

The main topics dealt with in this study, which is enriched by a number of tables containing the more significant findings, concern the 'building standards', from the dimensions of the galley, with special reference to the length/breadth ratio in conjunction with the velocity/stability ratio, to the 'rooms' in the ship. She also treats the question of rowing with the change-over during the XVIth century from the 'zenzile' system (a small oar for each oarsman) to the 'scaloccio' (a large oar operated by several oarsmen) which allowed for greater speed. After discussing the technique of the cutting of the sails — even a slight error could adversely affect the seagoing capacity of a galley — V. Borghesi goes on to examine the types of rudder in use with the development of the 'bavonesco' which reduced the lateen rudder to an auxiliary function, and then examines some ship-building centres and master ship-builders, drawing attention to a document of great interest concerning construction costs for a galley in 1552. They amount to a total of 1,600 *scudi*, composed as follows: 711 for the timber, 170 for 380 Kgs. of bolts, 62 for pitch and tow, 10 for rudders and rigging, 40 for upper works on the stern, 7 for the dock custodian, 600 for labour. The last part of the essay is devoted to life on the galleys and their crews; the increase in the number of men per galley which was registered from the XIVth to XVIth centuries is connected with the increase in 'sailors' and 'rigging men', or those concerned with manoeuvring the sails. In the appendix the author has reproduced the XVIth century Florentine documents she used, which

bear the title '*Cose intese a Genoa da più persone a di di novembre 1552*', (pp. 152-192) and has added a most useful glossary of nautical terms (pp. 193-205).

The volume is concluded by CLAUDIO COSTANTINI with *Aspetti della politica navale genovese nel Seicento* (Aspects of Genoese naval policy in the XVIIth century), pp. 207-235. This is a detailed, stimulating essay in which Costantini provides some results of research (although of a quite adequately detailed nature) still in progress, undertaken by a group of maritime historians at the Institute, including some who were not directly involved in the drafting of the volume. He also provides detailed indications for future research (derived from his own sampling of hitherto unexplored materials) in that largely unknown field, XVIth century Genoa, where too many factors still remain masked by the general label 'decadence', not only in the narrow terms of technical, but also at the level of economic and social history.

The main topics treated by the author concern pirate activities in the Ligurian Sea throughout the XVIIth century and the activity of galleys and galleons of the State fleet in the second half of that century. The picture drawn by the author, which has largely been pieced together from documents in the Genoese Archives, while remaining in terms of a quantitative reconstruction open to greater integration and correction, due mainly to the wide dispersion and disorder of some of the sources, is still, however, a most valuable indication of the conflicts which were evident throughout Genoese society, between the aristocracy and the other classes, within the oligarchy between the Ducal Palace and the *Casa di S. Giorgio*, and sometimes even within the government itself. It is a virtue of Costantini that he never treats the conflicts over naval matters, even when they appear highly technical, in isolation from the wider conflict over the economic destiny of Genoa, which came to reveal, in the alternatives between 'commercial emporium', 'marine and ship-building centre', and 'finance centre', serious divisions in the ruling class.

The author traces the different, and sometimes contradictory, attitudes of the Genoese State towards pirates back to these alternatives; sometimes solutions aimed at strengthening the military defence apparatus were adopted, first resorting to a simple increase in the number of galleys, with the introduction of units of 'free men', that is with volunteer oarsmen, not galley slaves, in the 1640s, then with the introduction of high-sided vessels of the Dutch type, 'powerful and well armed', as contemporaries record, from the 1650s, or with solutions on the diplomatic plane.

In terms of this second political trend which, beyond the official positions, became prevalent during the XVIIth century and emerged clearly victorious after the French bombardment of 1684, Costantini elucidates the significance of the massive use — as the detailed tables show — of the

Republic's war galleys for transport purposes, carrying passengers of varying importance, troops for rotation duty in the fortresses of the dominion, silk from Sicily, and silver from Spain, and their more modest employment in operations in the pursuit and harrassment of pirates. When the projects for participation in oceanic shipping at the end of the 1640s with the Indies' Company and then in the course of the '50s and '60s with the *Compagnia Marittima S. Giorgio* had once again come to nothing, the State galleons, which were soon reduced in number from four to two, and had originally been destined to protect merchantmen in the convoy system, began, from about 1680, to play a part of some importance in the transport of silver from Spain in *pesos de a 8 reales* and in ingots, which had been traditionally performed, from the late XVIIth until the mid-XVIIIth century, by the State galleys.

GIAN CARLO CALGAGNO
University of Genoa

J. R. HARRIS (ed.), *Liverpool and Merseyside. Essays in the economic and social history of the port and its hinterland*, London, Frank Cass, 1971, pp. 287, £ 3.75.

The appearance of a collection of studies such as the present volume makes only too evident the crucial absence of modern and general studies of any one of the British industrial and commercial cities in the period of the Industrial Revolution. General histories have tended to concentrate on particular regions, on specific industries, and, in so far as cities are concerned at all, on the change and stress created in social structure due to rapid urbanization. The general study of the dual process of industrialization and economic growth over the period in terms of any one of the great metropoli has been almost totally neglected.

The present collection of essays does not attempt to fill that gap for Liverpool and its hinterland, but does contain a number of contributions of particular interest which point clearly to the desirability of such a general study. The essays and articles which it contains are scattered over — rather than cover — a period reaching from the late seventeenth century to the General Strike of 1926; they are biased more toward economic than social problems and examine on one hand the general growth factors in terms of the Merseyside environment — of which Mr. Anderson's essay on the importance of the local attorney in the early eighteenth century capital and investment market provides a notable example — and on the other the process of growth and expansion within the port-metropolis, the development of com-

mercantile and political interests, of the mercantile structure, and of later labour movements.

Setting aside for the moment the value and interest of the individual contributions it is difficult to avoid a sense of dissatisfaction. This is not derived from the necessarily incomplete and fragmentary nature of the collection as a general study of Liverpool and its hinterland over these two centuries; given the format a surprising amount of ground is in fact covered. Nor is it derived from the often extremely limited and hesitant conclusions that are drawn — sometimes indeed prudence is overdone, but in general this serves to illustrate the huge gaps in previous research and the number of general hypotheses that have hitherto lacked substantiation at a local level. The dissatisfaction derives more from the lack of a general and consistent framework within which the various studies are presented. This is not to say that the old problem of regional studies, where research is left to speak for itself, is overlooked, although in some instances, for example in the essay on the Liverpool-based Africa Steam Ship Company, this is not always the case. The framework is weak, however, because the two principal interests expressed by the editor prove mutually divergent. On one hand the emphasis is on the causes and processes of economic growth in what was to become the second port in England, while, on the other, Liverpool and Liverpoolian developments are seen rather as a microcosm of the national process of industrial and economic expansion and treated as local case studies. Naturally a series of complex interdependencies and interactions run in both directions between the whole and the part, but put in these terms the two emphases beg questions which lead in different directions; on one hand, how did Liverpool develop in terms of the expansion of its own economic structure, of its mercantile activities and service functions, of its relations with a vast industrial hinterland, while, on the other, the question is rather the nature of the contribution of the development of Liverpool to the national process of economic growth. Given the wide chronological period chosen and the lack of previous studies of the port, it would have given greater consistency to have concentrated on one or the other, and preferably on the former.

The importance of regional studies can hardly be doubted, in particular in view of the shortage for England as compared with continental Europe. It is equally clear, however, that to escape the defects of isolation of subject and application — charges to which British local historiography is often oversensitive or overculpable — a solid and consistent methodological basis is necessary. With this in mind it can be argued that the identification and evaluation of the various endogenous and exogenous growth factors and variables in an area of the importance of Merseyside can only be achieved by first reconstructing on a local but non-sectarian basis the functional characteristics of the local economy, relating individual factors first to the structure

of, and developments within, that local economy, and then to the broader national process.

In terms of individual contributions the collection contains much that is of interest. Mr. Neal's essay on shipping in the early nineteenth century contains an important discussion of local sources and provides a prosperity index convincingly based on statistics for increased shipping tonnage registered in the port. Examining the structure of ship-owning and building before the advent of steam and iron frames, he shows that the long-term capital investment required in shipping was low, that it came almost entirely from local commerce and not from industry, that in this period capital costs were low and that large-scale joint-stock companies were unnecessary and rare. Mr. Williams takes the study of the activities of the merchant group in the period 1820-50 further. On the basis of information contained in the Customs' Bills of Entry he reconstructs the nature of the operations of the merchants involved in the boom cotton trade; he shows the extremely high level of specialization already present in 1820 (which tended not to change thereafter), and that as trade increased so an increasingly large percentage tended to be concentrated in the hands of the group of some thirty leading merchants. He also examines the development of commercial techniques, showing how many of the merchants' traditional subsidiary activities, marketing, broking, and underwriting, became specialized operations.

The essay by Mr. Bean and Mr. Baines on the 1926 General Strike on Merseyside provides the clearest examination of the social and employment structure of the port and its surroundings over the industrial period, and traces the beginnings of an organized labour movement. Despite the predominance of sectarian religious sentiments — in particular a general antipathy toward a large, unskilled, immigrant Irish labour force which provided the basis for a common Tory interest between the unskilled indigenous, and so Protestant, labour force and the civic authorities — the local trades union organization was well prepared for the May strike which was greeted enthusiastically and with great Union solidarity. The authors examine how it was that, in spite of this enthusiasm and solidarity, the strike on Merseyside was never really general. They analyse the relations between the local Council of Action and the T.U.C., the preparedness of the local authorities, and the structure of employment in an area characterized almost exclusively by service and transport rather than manufacturing or metal industries. Despite the solidarity of the Union organized labour force, the massive numbers of unemployed provided an essential reservoir for volunteer labour.

On the earlier period Mr. Harris' essay on the controversies over the acceptance and implementation of various canal projects in the late eighteenth century provides an insight into the structure of early industrial interests. At a local level, the monopolist aspirations of the early canal owners

were set off against the broader interests of the City Council, while at a Parliamentary level they were translated more in terms of land versus commerce, and at a national level were projected against a wider framework of hostility and jealousy from already established ports — in particular the coal ports of Cumberland and the North East which were anxious that Liverpool should not be connected to the inland Lancashire coalfields. Mr. Tolley's examination of the political reactions in Liverpool to the disruption of the America trade follows the divisions within the merchant interest itself; the essay would be of greater interest, however, had some attempt been made to follow the influence of such divisions in the development of Liverpool's political physiognomy.

It is strange, however, that the collection should include no studies devoted to the expansion of the port as such, nor to the development of service communications with the industrial hinterland. But this brings us back to our initial criticism; what is lacking is the vision of Merseyside as a particular and complex region in its own right, whose expansion posed and overcame a series of problems which were neither necessarily general nor national.

J. A. DAVIS
St. Antony's College, Oxford

J. HUGHES, *Industrialization and Economic History: Theses and Conjectures*, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970, pp. xii-336.

This book by Jonathan R. T. Hughes, professor of economics at Northwestern University, is not a history of industrialization in the narrow sense but a wide critical appraisal of the most significant stages and results of modern economic development. The geographical area studied is the West, comprising Europe and the United States, and chronologically it covers the two centuries from the English industrial revolution to the Second World War. In the preface Hughes states: « Emphasis has been placed on the role of institutions as well as markets, international migrations of people and capital as well as trade in commodities, social and political change as well as technical innovation ». A book dealing with subjects such as these promises to be significant and stimulating, and it raises numerous problems which until today have been resolved only by means of ingenious conjecture.

It is well known that the tragedy of the world population today is the unequal distribution of wealth, which is almost entirely concentrated in the industrial areas of the United States and Western Europe. Hopes that were placed by economists of the last century in the spread of prosperity throughout

the world, promoted by international trade, were disappointed because free exchange had an effect contrary to that foreseen. The doctrine of *laissez faire*, to put it crudely, only served to provide an ideological cover for the practices of British imperial expansion. The theory of international trade formulated by Ricardo and Stuart Mill proved to be fallacious because, despite its logical validity, it did not take into account the inequality of the initial economic and socio-cultural conditions of the countries competing on the world scene. In the first part of the book Hughes rightly concentrates on the analysis of these problems, providing statistical evidence unobtainable a century ago, but now generally available, and he shows the application of classic theories to be invalid. For purposes of comparison he proposes a scale for the classification of the various countries, taking into account all the social, cultural and ethnic, as well as economic, factors, that have determined their level of development. This provides a rapid survey of the different living standards and levels of wealth that are characteristic of the world economy today. Explanation of how this came about takes up more or less the remainder of the book.

Hughes starts from the premise that economic progress has been an exclusively Western experience and must, whether we like it or not, serve as the model which all countries aspiring to economic development must follow, even at the cost of sacrificing all their social and cultural traditions. The author then retraces the stages of European industrialization, describing the causes and effects of the English industrial revolution and the spread of the industrial economy on the Continent and in the United States. The development of an international economic system involving the intensive movement of raw materials, finished products, capital and labour, and the precipitation of the « civilized » world into the imperialist fever of the years bridging the 19th and 20th centuries, form the impressive and at the same time dramatic epilogue to this extraordinary historical period. This is the general outline of the book; one must mention that the analysis is always thorough and concise, the conclusions precise and often striking. One can have nothing but praise for the study, although with one reservation, and that is that Hughes does not express his own opinions clearly, especially on the more controversial and immediate problems such as for instance, imperialism, which merits some mention.

This chapter of European history is too well known to need repeating here. On the eve of the First World War the world was divided into a few great rich, independent states with immense territories under their dominion. The race for colonization had come to an end because the Europeans had conquered everything there was to conquer. Statesmen and political theorists vied with each other to justify overseas expansion on the basis of economic necessity that obliged them to enlarge the scope for the resources and invest-

ments at the disposal of their national economies. Imperialism was seen as a « necessity » of capitalist development. Other arguments were added to this, drawn from the traditional ideological, religious and cultural armoury which Europeans had used since the 16th century in undertaking their « civilizing » mission beyond the confines of the old continent. The contagion also spread to the Americans who were inspired by the words « manifest destiny » and determined to make their ethnic and cultural superiority felt in the race to dominate the as yet uncivilized peoples of the world. The image that the governments and nations of the West formed of their own conduct was false and inaccurate; it is however useful, to a certain extent, for the historian to understand how men of the time judged themselves, although his task is rather to investigate the true nature of things. What Hughes criticizes is not so much the ideological trappings, which have been discredited for some time, as the economic interpretation of imperialism of Hobson and Lenin. He develops a number of arguments to show that capitalism could have survived, and developed, even without aggression and military conquest, and that when this occurred it was because mistaken political considerations induced governments to turn the powerful instruments created by the industrial economy to military ends. He maintains that, however paradoxical it may seem, the mainspring of imperialism was, as well as human greed, the fear, disguised by scientific reasoning, that within the borders of the nation the industrial system could not develop beyond a certain limit, and that if this limit were overstepped the system would inevitably be threatened and collapse. The struggle to conquer new sources of supply and new markets or « outlets » into which they could pour products, capital and labour exceeding the absorption capacity of the national markets had this psychological motivation and was fed by reciprocal threats and acts of force. The statistics for investment and exchange of goods show that the quota of resources allotted to the colonial dominions had, until 1914, a very limited incidence in relation to the total amount of wealth produced. Must we then conclude, like Hughes, that the motivation of imperialism lies in psychiatric, rather than economic, history? Frankly, we are not convinced. However irrational it may often appear, human history results from a combination of forces in which nothing is left either to chance or to individual or collective madness. When discussing the origins of great catastrophes, be they wars or economic crises, one may at most speak of mistaken calculations or judgements.

The chapter of the book dealing with the ideological side of industrialization deserves special praise. The history of the interpretations of economic progress and its social consequences, from Smith to Marx and Keynes, is complex and varied, but Hughes has sketched its essential features confidently, giving special prominence to Karl Polanyi's interpretation of industrialization given in his book *The Great Transformation* (1944), which is all the more significant when one considers that this work has never until now made the

mark it deserves, and for a particular reason. Polanyi wrote his book under the influence of events between the two wars and, by attributing to the Second World War a significance that really belonged more properly to the First, that is the crises of the old order and the breakthrough into an unknown and in many ways menacing world, he made an error of historical perspective that deprived the book of the credit it deserved. But apart from this flaw which can be imputed to the author's faith in the international economic mechanism created by industrial capitalism, the work reveals all his extraordinary historical insight.

In Polanyi's view industrial civilization is based on the denial of any ideal other than profit and so, in practice, on the triumph of pure egotism to the detriment of any moral values. Since such a civilization, left to itself, that is left free to develop according to the logic of its own inherent forces, would lead mankind to destruction, the State intervened to control the process of development and direct it towards more humane objects. But despite the efforts made by governments, the contradiction remains, and it will lead to the destruction of the institutions into which industrial expansion has been channelled for the past century. In fact Polanyi's predictions have been only partly realized. If no trace remains of the « balance of power », the guiding principle of 19th century diplomacy, and the Gold Standard, and if the doctrine of the free self-regulating market has collapsed, the liberal State, although continually modified and transformed, has managed to survive. But Polanyi's observations regarding the American experience are especially pertinent. Since the United States has built up its industrial economy without having to liberate itself from the fetters of feudalism, the American people has been able to slowly erect many social obstacles to the market economy during its history. The federal government has been the principle instrument of social control over economic activity and its legislation has extended to control every aspect of the latter. This process has always been accompanied by the protests of businessmen and free trade economists, but in the end, it is this which has smoothed out and made more palatable the industrial development of the United States, and has preserved the institutions of the country until today.

The main problems of the world economy from the immediate post-war period to the 1950s are analysed by Hughes in the last chapter of the book. Here too it would have been worth making some detailed comment, but, given the summarizing nature of the studies, which are intended as an appendix, we shall confine ourselves to mentioning them. And the same should be said of the well-planned bibliography at the end of the book, for it fits in perfectly with the text and sets the seal on the work as an excellent reference book and scholarly study.

ANGELO OLIVIERI
University of Bari

M. KUCZYNSKI and R. L. MEEK, *Quesnay's Tableau Économique*, edited, with new material, translations and notes, London, MacMillan and New York, Augustus M. Kelly, 1972, pp. IX-XXXIV; I-XII; 1-22; 3-35; 1-6, Appendix A pp. 8.—

Since its conception in 1758, François Quesnay's *Tableau Économique* has excited admiration, scorn, fury and bewilderment, and sometimes all four. If the meaning of the *Tableau* has always — and probably will always — aroused conflict, the uncertainty as to what it actually was handsomely complicated the problems of its interpretation. Between them, Marguerite Kuczynski and Ronald Meek have finally laid the latter devil to rest. Despite their becomingly modest reservations — for example, their suggestion that a printed 'first edition' may yet come to light or perhaps an 'ur' first edition or some variant of a later edition — their presentation of *Quesnay's Tableau Économique*, edited, with new material, translations (Meek) and notes (Kuczynski) so completely accounts for and identifies all existing copies of the *Tableau*, and all the heretofore confusing Physiocratic or commentator references to it, as to push — for this student at least — all potential new discoveries into the realm of antiquarian curiosity. (Of course a new version of *Hamlet* may turn up tomorrow too...). Thanks to Meek's detective reasoning as to the identification of the first two 'editions' and Kuczynski's actual discovery of the third, we can now follow the development of Quesnay's thought together with its embodiment in successive *Tableaux* through the crucial years 1758-1759, prior to its public emergence in the revised edition of Mirabeau's *L'Ami des Hommes* in 1760. Let there be no misunderstanding: for the first time scholars can now address themselves to the discussion of the 'classical' formulation of Physiocratic theory on the basis of commonly accepted texts. The accomplishment is enormous and places all subsequent students of early economic doctrines squarely in the editors' debt.

The present edition consists of introductions by each of the editors; a facsimile of the 'third edition' with interleaved English translation; extensive notes including systematic comparisons to the texts of the 'second edition' (part of the 1894 British Economic Association's publication of a collection of documents from the Archives nationales) and Du Pont de Nemours's 'edited' version in *Physiocratie* (1767); an appendix to the notes comparing the 'third edition' to the revised and enlarged version in *L'Ami des Hommes*; and two appendices containing respectively the *Tableaux* and texts of the 'first' and 'second' editions, in the original French with interleaved English translations. The meticulous scholarship involved in establishing the numerous correlations and variations represents a *tour de force* perhaps only fully appreciated by those who have had occasion to work with the original texts or to wade through the tomes of learned experts on Physiocracy. In the best of all possible worlds, it should not be necessary to insist that such a major contribution comes to us from two Marxists, but in the present one, it is

worth noting that the edition under review stands as brilliant testimony to the high level of professional scrupulousness to which the best Marxist scholarship in this field has risen. Kuczynski and Meek have solved an objective problem with acumen and presented their results elegantly: their work will serve equally scholars of all ideological persuasions. The quasi-total absence of any editorial interpretation in itself requires comment — but more of that later.

Homogeneous as the edition may be — and its evenness of tone is so great as to pass unremarked — it does represent the efforts of two individuals. Ronald Meek provides the initial introduction and the English translations. Both as editor and translator, he is elaborating upon his own earlier work, *The Economics of Physiocracy: Essays and Translations* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963). In both capacities, he operates with the apparent effortlessness and expertise of long experience. But, as his notes to the present work testify, his performance here is best understood in conjunction with selected passages of his former volume. In 1963 he had already moved far in his sorting out of the mare's nest of *Tableau* 'editions',¹ but had never seen the 'third edition', whose existence had only been reported by Schëlle in 1905 without public situation of the whereabouts of the actual copy.² In this 1972 introduction, he recapitulates his original, correct identifications while filling out the vagaries of generations of scholarly misapprehensions. His principal revision of his earlier discussion of editions 'one' and 'two' lies in his judgment that the manuscript form of 'one', may actually be 'one' — that contrary to what he had previously assumed, no printed 'one' ever existed.³

Meek's translation of Quesnay's prose merits notice all on its own. First, however, a reading of his « Preface to the Translations » in the earlier work forms an absolutely indispensable complement to the 1972 translation.⁴ Meek has accomplished that rare feat of rendering the prose of a most distinctive stylist in such a way as to remain true to the original while becoming readable in the second language. Clearly he has given great thought to the best means of proceeding and his own principles of translation fully justify his general approach. The result loses little of Quesnay's somewhat archaic and rough-hewn quality, and whatever demands this places upon the uninitiated are amply rewarded by the coherence of the style in English and its surprising fidelity to the feel of the French. This being said, I have one or two bones to pick: Throughout, Meek translates *classe des dépenses productives* and *classe des dépenses steriles* as 'productive expenditure class' and 'sterile ex-

¹ MEEK, 1963, pp. 269-272.

² GUSTAVE SCHELLE, *Quesnay et le Tableau economique*, « Revue de Economie politique », t. XIX (1905).

³ Kuczynski disagrees with him on this point. Cf. KUCZYNSKI and MEEK, eds., p. xxv.

⁴ MEEK, 1963, pp. 37-42.

penditure class'. On the face of it, this can be accepted as unexceptional. I do not question his adoption of productive, sterile, expenditure or class. What I do question is his juxtaposition of the individual words. *Classe* in French is every bit as ambiguous as 'class' in English: it can mean social grouping, it can also mean merely category (sort, variety) as in classification. Now, particularly in his early work (no doubt significantly prior to his close association with Mirabeau) Quesnay showed considerably greater interest in objective economic processes than in human beings as active, independent agents. The point of the Tableaux is to demonstrate circulation of expenditure. It would seem to me, accordingly, more appropriate to render the operative phrases 'class of productive expenditures' and 'class of sterile expenditures' and thus allow the English more fully to perpetuate the ambiguity of the French. This may seem trivial, but the element in Quesnay's thought which exemplifies what Marx called the fetishism of commodities is one which deserves greater attention than it has yet received.

My other questions pertain to similar points which may also seem insignificant at first glance. On page v, Meek translates «...dans un bon *État* de grande culture...» as «...a satisfactory *state of affairs* in which large scale culture was being carried on...» (my ital.). *État* in French, as in English, means both state as in the State and state as in state of affairs. Why Meek chose the latter eludes me. *État* in the original was capitalized — the usual Physiocratic way of designating the State — and lest there be any doubt, on page vi it appears uncapitalized and clearly meaning state in the general sense. (Meek appropriately renders it 'basis'). The slip could have been just that — a slip — but with a translator of Meek's meticulous care, one wonders. And if it was not a slip then its intent cannot have been other than implicitly to minimize the role of the State in Quesnay's thought which is indeed to slight a crucial aspect of Physiocracy. The voluminous literature on legal despotism to the contrary notwithstanding, the subject remains worthy of serious attention.

Finally, on page 18, where Quesnay while speaking of France at the time of Charles V refers to the *domaines* of the French kings which at that time did not even comprise a third of the kingdom. In the corresponding English, *domaines* appears as « properties ». Although property can be defended as a choice, it would not seem the best one: 'lands' with its attendant ambiguity — does it mean lands of the office (national territory) or lands of the man, feudal holdings or modern properties? — would have better conveyed the sense of the original. Property holds a very special claim on Physiocratic allegiance and plays a central role in the doctrine. But when the Physiocrats say property, they mean modern absolute property, free from feudal impediments.⁵ Property, all Physiocrats argue, constitutes the basis of society.

⁵ FRANÇOIS QUESNAY, *Observation sur le Droit Naturel des Hommes Réunis en Société*, « Journal de l'Agriculture, du Commerce et des Finances », II (September 1765).

Without such property no market can function, no grain can attain its 'proper price', no agricultural kingdom become rich and prosperous. When a word enjoys such weighty significance for the entire corpus of a doctrine, it seems a pity to detract — be it ever so slightly — from its clarity.

Kuczynski, who discovered the 'third edition' of the *Tableau* and who has already edited it in German,⁶ provides the second introduction, the notes to the Third edition, and the correlations with *L'Ami des Hommes*. (The comparative notes accompanied the earlier German edition). Her scholarship could speak for itself were it not a pleasure for the reviewer to pay tribute to the graceful and impeccable mastery of a craft little practised these days. Not only do the notes provide a running series of variants in the 'second edition' and Du Pont's *Physiocratie*, but they also address themselves to all possible technical difficulties or confusions in the text of the 'third edition'. In particular, they raise and offer possible solutions to all questions resulting from Quesnay's mathematical calculations. Note 24 to page viii affords an especially striking example of her technique. Trying to explain a numerical inconsistency in the original text, she offers two earlier attempts by herself and Meek to solve the problem. Then, admitting that they are both dissatisfied with those suggestions, she offers two more, leaving the reader with both an understanding of the reasoning followed and the possibility of accepting either proposal or trying his own. More striking even than the logical virtuosity is the familiarity with the workings of Quesnay's mind — what errors of calculation or reasoning he would have been likely to make and why.⁸

Kuczynski's own introduction, « The Search for the 'Third Edition' of the *Tableau Économique* » reads a little like the highest class detective story, say Poe's « Gold Bug ». Now that the edition has been found it may seem simple, but to put oneself back a decade and imagine confronting the available evidence conjures up unbelievable difficulties. The ultimate discovery depended as much on unraveling the veiled allusions of late 19th-early 20th century scholars and Du Ponts as upon knowledge of the Physiocrats. The tale must be read to be appreciated. Suffice it to say that Kuczynski does it full justice, even if one does wonder what instinctive feel for the dramatic

⁶ MARGUERITE KUCZYNSKI, *Tableau Économique von François Quesnay*, Berlin DDR (1965).

⁷ *Notes to the 'Third Edition'*, p. 7.

⁸ I was puzzled that in note 37 to page x, p. 8, she saw no explanation for a shift from 3,000,000,000 in the 'Third Edition' to 2,000,000,000 in *L'Ami des Hommes* for the « value of furnishings and utensils of four million houses estimated on the average at about one year's revenue or gains of four million heads of families... ». Having shown in note 24 that we would expect the income for each individual head of family to be 505, it seems clear that the annual income of four million heads of families would be about 2,000,000,000 (4 million \times 505). So once again we are dealing with an original arithmetical error subsequently corrected.

lead her to withhold, even now, the title of the volume in which the « Third Edition » is bound.⁹

The rediscovery and publication of Quesnay's 'Third edition' should not, under any circumstances, be reduced to the level of an elegant piece of sleuthing or a scholarly curiosity. The editors as a rule eschew interpretative commentary on the text, but the very neutral scholarly apparatus Kuczynski has mustered bears witness to the importance of the discovery and its present edition. In that sense, her variants and correlations speak for themselves: The 'Third edition' does differ from the first two as well as from *L'Ami des Hommes*, *Philosophie rurale* and *Physiocratie* as all these differ among themselves. Kuczynski's selection of the 'second edition' and *Physiocratie* as the operative points of comparison — and therefore those included in the immediate notes — tells us a great deal about her interpretation of the development of Physiocracy, and should we have any residual doubts, the concluding paragraphs of her introduction, in the one explicitly interpretative foray, spell it out. The 'Third edition', she argues, confirms, by its « very composition and content » Quesnay's statement in *Observations sur le Droit Naturel des Hommes Réunis en Société*, « The basis of society is the means of men's subsistence and the wealth needed by the power that is to defend them ». So, she insists, « The primary factor, then, for Quesnay, was the economic base ».¹⁰ Hence the juxtaposition of the 'Second' and 'Third' editions in the notes: we are quite correctly invited to witness at close range the development of Quesnay's thought in order to appreciate its organic unity.

But why *Physiocratie*? Here again the concluding remarks in the Introduction help. What is true of the early editions — the intimate association between graphical representation and intellectual interpretation, the latter's dependence being clearly underscored by its role as 'explanation' of the *Tableau* — « is not the case in *Physiocratie*, where the maxims are given without being connected up with either graphical representation or 'Explanation', where all comments built on numerical relations embodied therein are deleted, and where, above all, the superstructure is given precedence over the basis in the new introductory maxims I to IV ».¹¹ So *Physiocratie* figures in the notes so as to show the corruption of Quesnay's original conception at the hands of his followers — specifically Du Pont. Now, I share Kuczynski's impatience with Du Pont as editor. He could not let anything pass through his hands without correcting it and his « corrections » have given rise to unending confusions. But his compulsive behaviour in this regard belongs, at least partly, to the study of his own complicated psychological

⁹ For the curious, the volume is one of the editions of *Philosophie rurale* at the Eleutherian Mills Historical Library.

¹⁰ KUCZYNSKI and MEEK, eds., p. xxxiii.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

make up, and the mere fact of his corrections should be distinguished from their content.

Kuczynski reproaches Du Pont, above all, for the nature of the changes. She holds him responsible for distorting and adulterating Quesnay's original materialism. And in so doing, she joins a goodly company: Marx, for example, had little respect for the Epigones of the Physiocratic sect. Any serious justification of the much maligned disciples against the master must await another occasion. Here I should simply like to point out that Quesnay's historical materialism rested upon the free operation of the market. Land was the source of all wealth, but the products of the land over and above the advances — the free gift of nature — only attained the quality of wealth by virtue of their market price. Value resided not in grain, but in the price of grain. But the realization of the 'proper price' required the existence of absolute private property interacting on a free market. This necessary condition for the functioning of the process depicted in the *Tableau* did not obtain in 18th century France. Quesnay undoubtedly formed his model of the market through observation of England. Accordingly, at least in some measure, the market that constituted the cornerstone of his system remained a picture in his mind's eye. If his followers, like Du Pont, in daily contact as they were with the actual conditions of the entrenched special privilege obtaining in France, sought an alternative route to the implementation of the master's goals, can they be totally condemned? Increasingly, all the Physiocrats looked to reform and, most important, to education to transform their contemporaries' historical consciousness so that they would accept as 'evidently' advantageous that very market upon which Physiocracy rested. After Gramsci's work on hegemony and the organic relationship of historical base to superstructure, even Marxists should be willing to accept their attempt as legitimate.

ELIZABETH FOX GENOVESE
University of Rochester, N. Y.

P. MOLAS RIBALTA, *Los gremios barceloneses del siglo XVIII. La estructura corporativa ante el comienzo de la Revolución industrial*, Madrid 1970, in 4°, pp. 674 plus appendices.

The rise of Catalan industry in the XVIIIth century is one of the most notable factors in Spanish economic history. It was in this period that the region went markedly ahead of the remainder of the country. Within a century the population of Barcelona trebled. The basic factors which contributed to this growth have been known for some time; the introduction and extremely rapid development of the cotton and calico industry, the encour-

agement given by the *Junta de Comercio* which was founded in 1758, the opening of the American market, and the gradual disestablishment of constraints culminating in 1789 with the total emancipation of manufacture. Although not examining industry directly, Prof. Pierre Vilar's great study which appeared in 1962 contributed a number of clarifications which enable us to understand these changes better.

It is customary to contrast the old guild system, which was traditionalist and interfering, with the new capitalist industries founded on the tenets of emancipation. A young scholar, Señor Pedro Molas Ribalta, has put the question as to what exactly took place in Barcelona. His study is the result of lengthy research and has been sumptuously edited in collaboration with the Confederation of Spanish Saving Banks; it demonstrates that the problem is by no means as simple as might at first appear. Many of the guild members themselves contributed, albeit unknowingly, to the destruction of the organization to which they belonged.

In studying the guilds of Barcelona the local archives have provided a superabundance of material, especially the Municipal Archives, the Central Library, the Notarial Archives and the *Colegio Mayor de la Seda*. Unable to exhaust all of these, Señor Molas has concentrated on the textile industry.

His book is composed of four sections; the structure of the guilds, their relations with the State and with society, the study of certain individual sectors, and finally that of textiles.

The guilds of Barcelona were first established in the XIVth century, increased in number in the XVIth century, experienced something of a decline in the XVIIth century, and subsequently expanded once again in the early XVIIIth century. But the guilds were far from being homogeneous. There was a higher rank, that of the 'colleges' (which correspond to the French *corps*) in which the masters were known in Catalan as *artistes*; they were drawn largely from the liberal professions. Lower down the scale came the majority of the guilds (called, in Castilian, *gremios*, and in Catalan *gremis*) the members of which were known as *menestrales*. The importance of these distinctions was clearly shewn in 1732 when the goldsmiths, after prolonged efforts, obtained the permission of Philip V to set up a college. Of course different trades received varying recognition. The humblest were the cobblers (*sabaters de vell*). Within each guild too inequality was the rule; some masters had shops, others did not and worked as day-labourers. The guilds had a religious character and participated in the festivals of Holy Week, Corpus Christi, and of their patron saints. They were equally mutual assurance organizations. In all then they closely resembled other West European guild systems. Yet not surprisingly the development of the *gremios* of Barcelona in the XVIIIth century presents certain peculiarities.

At the close of the War of the Spanish Succession the new Bourbon dynasty largely did away with the traditional institutions of Aragon in the

famous decrees known as the *Nueva Planta*. The guilds passed from the jurisdiction of the municipality to that of the *Audiencia*, formed the basis for the establishment of a new tax, the catasto, due to the Intendant Patino (1716). The administration of this tax has provided a wealth of documents, although their value has been contested on the grounds that returns were grossly under-estimated. In the second half of the century the problem of the *gremios* was brought before the public. Increasingly liberal measures were enacted between 1797 and 1798 and produced an animated reaction. After the French invasion the Cortes of Cadiz adopted a liberal legislative programme and with the decree of June 8th 1813 deprived the guilds of their privileges. Thereafter they were at the mercy of political upheavals. Reestablished by Ferdinand VII to their privileges by the measures of 1815 and 1823, they were finally subjected to common law in 1836.

Although criticized by Campomanes and successfully opposed by Jovelanós, the *gremios* found defenders in Barcelona such as the famous scholar Antonio de Capmany and the lawyer Romá Rossel. They were defended as the guardians of public order, protectors of morality and on the grounds that they guaranteed the quality of manufactures. But in fact many of the guild members themselves supported emancipation, undertaking commercial and industrial activities independently of the *gremios* and so contributing to the formation of a the middle-class in Barcelona.

Until the *Nueva Planta* the merchants, who formed a distinct order (*estament de mercaders*), had held an important place in municipal government. Thereafter they were eclipsed. Then from 1758 to 1763 a reorganization was effected on royal authority. Henceforth the *Cuerpo de Comercio* was amalgamated with the ancient Consulat and with an executive body, the *Junta de Comercio*, which was to play an important part in the process of economic development and displayed a decidedly liberal spirit. It should be noted that in this body were united the traditional *mercaders*, independent merchants whom the administration described with the less than flattering title *vagos*, and finally members of the *gremios*.

The number of the guilds in Barcelona remained relatively high throughout the century. At the start they numbered 97, scarcely fewer than in Paris (124). However their membership was restricted. The total number of artisans inscribed never surpassed 4,000, a very modest figure. In 1800 the membership was distributed in the following manner; nearly two thirds in industry, one third in commerce, six per cent in the liberal professions. The presence of agricultural guilds should also be noted, composed of gardeners with small-holdings within the city or of peasants from the surrounding areas. Among the commercial guilds the *corredores de lonja* (in Catalan *corredors d'orella*) the predecessors of our modern stockbrokers, held an important place. A guild under the patronage of St. Julian grouped, under the title *Julians mercers vells*, widely varied professions among which predominated

iron-mongers. This was dissolved in 1801. The *botiguers de teles* or cloth merchants formed between 1740 and 1760 the most dynamic trading group in Barcelona. They engaged in contracting, in supplying marine stores, in insurance, and also in the calico industry. This active guild in 1766 assimilated that of the *botiguers de tall* which specialized in the sale of woollen cloths and many of whose members had also entered the calico industry.

The final section of the book rightly concentrates on the textile industry. The traditional draperies were controlled by the suppliers (*paraires*) and declined. In 1807 13 cloth works still existed, but many of these no longer belonged to the *paraires*. In 1825 the guild had only three members and was dissolved at its own request.

On the other hand, the silk crafts experienced a period of prosperity in the XVIIIth century. They were seven in number; the *velers* or producers of silk cloth, *velluters* or makers of velvet, *barreters d'agulla* who produced principally hose, *perxers* and *passamaners* who provided galloons and passementerie, *tintores de seda*, and finally the *torcedors de seda*, the silk throwers. Raw silk came from Aragon and Valencia. The most active group were the *velers* who in 1753 numbered 37 masters and 281 journeymen; their wealth enabled them to build between 1762 and 1764 a sumptuous hall. Between 1760 and 1780 they played a decisive part in the development of the calico industry. The galloon, lace and hose makers had less influence but still provided work for a large number of journeymen.

The final chapter is devoted to the calico industry which enjoyed a total emancipation. Despite appearances, however, Señor Molas does not depart from his field of study, for we learn that it was the members of the old guilds who took part in this new activity. In this case he restates facts already well known, the foundation of the first workshop in 1738 (Canals and Canet), the establishment of the first cotton-spinning premises around 1766, the formation in 1772 of the celebrated *Compañía de Hilados de Algodón* which brought together 22 workshops with a total of 875 artisans. Its composition tells us much of the origins of the businessmen and merchants of Barcelona. Of the 22 participants, 2 were *ciudadans honrats* drawn from the elite of the middle class, 4 came from the *Cuerpo de Comercio*, 11 were independent merchants, and 8 — or one third — came from the *gremios*.

In his conclusion the author emphasises the considerable part played by certain guild members in the industrial revolution and in the formation of a new bourgeoisie. In this situation the decline of the *gremios* was only natural. Many vanished spontaneously without the necessity of royal intervention. Señor Molas' book is praiseworthy for its attention to detail and accuracy. Numerous tables added to the text summarize legislative measures or provide genealogies of the leading families, numerical data are illustrated by graphs and the geography of the workshops within the town by maps. The absence of an index is the sole cause for regret. In studying the *gremios* Señor Molas

has succeeded at the same time in providing us with a very rich picture of Barcelona society in the XVIIIth century. He has shown us once again that reality is more complex than the devotees of general theories are prepared to admit.

HENRI LAPEYRE
University of Grenoble

M. MORINEAU, *Les faux-semblants d'un démarrage économique: agriculture et démographie en France au XVIII^e siècle*. Paris, A. Colin, 'Cahiers des Annales' no. 30, 1971, pp. 387.

Michel Morineau's study is central to the debate which for some years now has been going on among economic historians of the Ancien Regime. To summarize rapidly and schematically the positions adopted it is sufficient to note that the supporters of the thesis of a slow but relatively continuous improvement in agricultural yields in Western Europe from the Middle Ages until modern times, of which the leading exponent is the Dutch historian Slicher Van Bath,¹ are opposed by those who see a recurrent secular — and even millennial² — stagnation in yields right down to the end of the Ancien Regime, allowing naturally for marked short and middle term variations. Slicher Van Bath's statistics — or rather the use to which he has put them — have been refuted; E. Le Roy Ladurie has even described Van Bath's conclusions for France as a 'mirage chiffré'.³

The Eighteenth century is clearly central to the controversy. Was it in fact the century of a rapid increase in agricultural yields, so rapid that it upset the basis of an Ancien Regime founded on the stagnation or the extremely slow long-term improvement of production,⁴ the century of physiocracy and of the 'agricultural revolution'? Or was it on the contrary a century of minor advances, of a 'mere acceleration of a traditional process of improvement' but which caused no radical change, a century as the previous of

¹ SLICHER VAN BATH, *Yield Ratios, 810-1820*, « Afdeling Agrarische Bijdragen », No. 10, Wageningen, 1963.

² AXMARD, MAURICE, *Rese e profitti agricoli in Sicilia 1640-1760*, in « Quaderni Storici », No. 14, Ancona, maggio-agosto 1970, pp. 416-435.

The yields of the plain of Lentini in Sicily in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries correspond exactly to the figures given by Cicero two thousand years earlier.

It is also worth drawing attention, in so far as agricultural yields are concerned, to the transactions of the Third Congress of Economic History held at Prato in 1971, where a considerable amount of time was devoted to the problems of agricultural productivity in Europe in the twelfth to the seventeenth centuries.

³ Paper read at the 3rd Congress of Economic History, Prato, 1971.

⁴ On this see: E. LE ROY LADURIE, *Les Paysans de Languedoc*, Paris, S.E.V.P.E.N., 1966.

stagnation in agricultural yields, the major revolution in this field taking place only in the late nineteenth century?

Connected to the problem of the 'agricultural revolution' is the problem of a contingent 'demographic revolution'. Was the eighteenth century a century of 'demographic explosion', as has been generally believed, or on the contrary one of relative stagnation?

Examining attentively the situation in France — where both the agricultural and the demographic revolutions took place in the nineteenth century — Michel Morineau opts for a negative conclusion on the eighteenth century and supports his thesis with some extremely interesting arguments.

The trend studied by the author proves to be basically retrogressive. The agrarian statistics of 1840 — the first seriously undertaken in France — permit him to draw up a table of yields for the whole country. The results are hardly striking; the national average did not exceed 9.5 quintals per hectare, with a variant of between 5 and 15 quintals, that is of yields frequently found in France of the Ancien Regime. There is however an initial observation to be made. The author is able to draw up, for a certain number of 'pilot' regions, comparisons with yield figures for the eighteenth century. Now this method is wholly acceptable, provided that the figures employed do not represent any purely incidental influences which might disguise a real process of evolution. In this respect the figures drawn from the Lorraine inquiry of 1761 do not really seem informative to us, since they represent above all the effects of a climactically unfavourable period; a sequence of cold years — which would make themselves felt acutely in a country whose climate was already continental — led throughout Europe to a fall in yields and a widespread increase in prices, particularly after 1764. This does not exclude *a priori* a secular movement of increased yields. But the other examples however are more testing, and this qualification does not prevent us agreeing with Michel Morineau's conclusions — that is that there was not in the eighteenth century a marked increase in yields or an 'agricultural revolution'. Even the English example does not contradict this affirmation; if her average national yields at the end of the eighteenth century were higher than those of France (some 13 quintals per hectare) it was because regional variations were less pronounced. But the most prosperous regions did not exceed the yields attained in the North of France. Also the ceiling set at 15 quintals was not surpassed.

The retrospective method is again used effectively to examine a number of long term statistics, in particular those for the 'dîmes' of Onnaing and Quarouble, two villages in northern France. From these it emerges that the grain harvests at the end of the Ancien Regime did not exceed the extremely high levels which been attained in the years 1420-30, 1520-40, and in particular 1600-1640. They do however indicate certain changes during the eighteenth century which seem to us to be of importance and to which we shall return.

In the demographic field the conclusions are similar: in fact in terms of a 'demographic revolution' France in the eighteenth century experienced only a very weak population growth which is also best explained in terms of a recuperation of the losses occasioned by the crises of the late seventeenth century; the 'recensement' of 1700 showed a very low figure and the subsequent expansion was largely accounted for by the provinces particularly devastated during the wars of the late seventeenth century: Alsace, Lorraine, Franche-Comte, Hainault, Rousillon.

The eighteenth century was then a century of recovery in which, in the field of both agriculture and demography, the great gaps created by the 'wretched' seventeenth century were to be overcome. To support this conclusion one could cite the findings drawn from English rural parish registers: at Hartland and at Colyton⁵ the curves for marriages and baptisms only regained the higher levels of the seventeenth century towards the years 1810-1830.

Did not these great gaps that were to be made good provide the great 'opportunity' of the eighteenth century? And had not the high mortality rates of the seventeenth century, in causing an increase in the average size of cultivated holdings, in setting off a crisis in landed rents and in some cases also a redistribution of property eventually beneficial to the peasants, also undoubtedly initiated a process of capital accumulation and so consequently of opportunity for investment in land for large numbers of proprietors? If yields did not exceed the ceilings established in the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the harvests from 1720, however, reached very high levels and did not shift until the end of the century. Even the difficult years 1760-80 were easily 'liquidated', as witness Michel Morineau's tithe statistics. All this was very different from the previous evolution when the peaks of production were persistently followed by spectacular crashes. Very good harvests had been an exception, in the eighteenth century they became the rule.

The same can be said of the demographic situation. What vanished in the eighteenth century in certain regions of Western Europe were the great peaks in marriage and baptism curves in 10, 20 or 30 year periods, swiftly followed by huge mortality concentrations, which benefitted a more gradual but less contradictory process of evolution. What typified the economy and demography of the Ancien Regime was first and foremost a chronic instability in which periods of brilliant prosperity were followed by those of catastrophic collapse. Was it not in fact against such saw-edged movements of the graph that the eighteenth century peasants, thanks to the surplus margin bequeathed by the seventeenth century, were able to erect effective controls and brakes? Was not the great victory of the eighteenth century that gradual

⁵ Repeatedly cited; see for example: E. A. WRIGLEY, *Demografia e Storia*, Milano, Mondadori, « Il Saggiatore », pp. 72-3 and 82-3.

but continuous curve, as opposed to the fragmented curves of the preceding centuries?

It is necessary to make some qualification. This victory was not shared by all peasants nor by all countries — nor even within individual countries by all regions. If, as Michel Morineau remarks, the eighteenth century ended with the appearance of new economic difficulties and the beginnings of a new movement of proletarianization among the peasant masses, without any doubt such problems did not have everywhere the same weight or the same consequences. They led — as we intend to show shortly — in the Kingdom of Naples in the years 1770-80 to a straight forward return of those contradictory mechanisms of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and to a reinstatement of the obstacles to development; a pattern of evolution which was experienced in numerous other regions of Europe and of France.⁶ Elsewhere on the other hand, in northern France and in England, these problems, although they existed, did not jeopardize the advances of the century but provided rather a stimulant for economic development. There was no return to the mortality rates of the Ancien Regime.

Far reaching regional variations are evident. But by the end of the eighteenth century the economic geography of contemporary Europe had been established, with its zones that had effected their economic 'take-off' and went on to 'make' their industrial and agricultural revolutions, and with those which instead fell back in to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

In making an Aunt Sally of one of the 'myths' most solidly rooted in our historiography — that of the 'wonderful' Eighteenth Century — Michel Morineau's work gives rise certainly to many more questions than he succeeds in resolving, but it also revives a series of problems which have been taken as settled; for this one cannot do less than praise it.

GERARD DELILLE

Italian Institute for Historical Studies, Naples (Italy)

J.-P. RIOUX, *La révolution industrielle*, Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1971, pp. 256.

Given the flood of informative works on the industrial revolution, this study by Jean-Pierre Rioux, who is a young lecturer of history at the University of Paris, would not normally get attention; however as it is a successful and intelligent work, it deserves some mention and comment here.

⁶ In the west of France for example. See the recent work by F. LEBRUN, *Les hommes et la mort en Anjou aux 17^e et 18^e siècles*, Paris-La Haye, Mouton, 1971, p. 562. The numerous parish statistics which he reproduces illustrate, except for the town of Angers itself, very high concentrations of mortality rates at the end of the eighteenth century.

The criteria which the author followed in writing the work are explained in the preface. The industrial revolution — an expression coined by English and French socialist writers in the mid-19th century to describe the deep social changes brought about by the growth of factory production on a large scale, used by Stuart Mill and Marx, and later introduced into academic historiography by Toynbee and Mantoux — was, until the beginning of the 20th century, a largely European phenomenon. Economists and historians alike have described its effects and sought its causes within this area. Cyclical depressions caused uncertainties about the unity and continuity of the economic mechanism set in motion by the English industrial revolution; these have been resolved by attributing the crises to unexpected changes in techniques and in the types of raw materials and sources of energy employed in the process of production. Today, however, the definition of the industrial revolution as a merely technical revolution is no longer satisfactory; it was criticized and rejected years ago by Nef and Ashton. More recent historiography tends rather to emphasize the preliminary factors — accumulation of capital and labour, size of industrial concerns, the formation of sufficiently extensive areas of exchange, and agricultural revolutions — which permitted the spread of technical innovations. More recently still attention has been focussed on the data concerning the growth, or acceleration, of the rhythm of production, and its beginning. We all know how popular, until some years ago, were Rostow's ideas on « take-off » which aroused both agreement and criticism. It is true that the industrial revolution today appears in a different light than in the past. The concept of development is increasingly associated with that of underdevelopment, and the subject of unbalanced growth at all levels occupies scholars increasingly. From this has resulted the hypothesis that the industrial revolution drew sustenance by impoverishing the « proletarian nations » of Asia, Africa and South America. Faced by such a wide and complex field, Rioux has decided to adopt a strictly historical approach, to concentrate on the facts and state the most important conclusions resulting from previous historical inquiry. The material has been organized within a very precise framework in which the industrial revolution is considered as the final stage in the formation of capitalist methods of production, — the vital transitional stage, to use the author's term, from a phase of incomplete pre-capitalism to one which has all the essential features of capitalism: continuous technical progress, the unlimited mobility of capital pursuing profit, the total distinction between those owning the means of production and the working class. From this perspective are derived the chronological limits of the study, which largely coincide with the period of so-called « liberal capitalism ».

The book is composed of six chapters, dealing respectively with the early conditions of the industrial revolution, technical skills and new means of

communication, real industrial growth, first in Great Britain, France, Germany and the United States and then in Austria, Italy and Japan, the mechanism of exchanges and cyclical crises, the development of cities and the birth of the working class, and the final victory of the middle class. In this way all aspects of the industrial revolution are examined and the problems are stated in a clear and balanced fashion. The book can be read without difficulty and with profit. Only a few words of comment need to be added in conclusion.

Rioux emphasizes that wherever the industrial revolution succeeded it caused fundamental changes and transformations. The irreversible process of growth was the result of the combined effect of demand, individual initiative, search for profit and the use of new techniques. The changeover from mercantile capitalism to industrial capitalism caused a deep social rift between the middle-class owners of wealth and the rest of mankind, owners of work power which was reduced to an object of exchange. Growth was achieved through merciless selection, guided exclusively by the search for individual gain, and brought about discrimination and exploitation between dominant and dominated economies, between strong and weak regions, between employers and workers. The need for development, in no way weakened by the first great crises of overproduction, led to imperialism, colonial expansion and war when industrialization was complete. But the industrial revolution did not bring only disaster; on the contrary, it increased man's means of survival to an extraordinary degree, gave work to increasingly great numbers of men, and raised the standard of living of workers employed in factories, after the first terrible privations. It is true that it created barriers that were difficult to break down and stirred up resentment and conflict between classes, but, in return, it produced a new civilization based on the expression of individual virtues in social, as well as in cultural and artistic life. For historians, then, it has always been an obvious paradox.

Despite the similarity of the forms it took, the process of industrialization followed different lines in each country, varying with national characteristics. It is useless to seek a « model », drawing conclusions for instance from the English experience, for the initial mechanism of industrialization appeared in widely differing forms. Yet despite this variety there is a single unifying thread linking all the industrial revolutions; it was described by Marx with these words: « Large-scale industry », he said, « is the basis of world history, making every nation, every individual, dependent for the satisfaction of their needs on the whole world... ».

The truest and most disturbing significance of the industrial revolution is perhaps this unification of the destinies of all peoples.

ANGELO OLIVIERI
University of Bari

R. SARTI, *Fascism and the Industrial Leadership in Italy, 1919-1940*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1971, pp. XII, 154.

Since the publication of the now classic work, *Battaglie economiche tra le due grandi guerre* by FELICE GUARNERI (1953), the connection between big business and fascism has been the object of many inquiries. Some of these have been conducted with a political bias (e. g. ERNESTO ROSSI, *I padroni del Vapore*, 1957), and cannot be considered as proper historical investigations. Other works are more objective and have been written by historians who have finally decided that the business history of the Fascist era also deserves some consideration.

Roland Sarti is a young historian who has had the courage to face this controversial and entangled subject. The literature on it is divided into at least two different tendencies: Marxist, which relates the political events to the development and the crisis of the capitalist system, and a second, which emphasizes the different social and political facets of the regime. Although some of Sarti's conclusions may satisfy the former, the work generally falls into the latter category. In this case, however, the distinction is not very significant, for his inquiry simply adds new pieces of information to the complicated mosaic of the relations between the industrial and political class; a mosaic which a protagonist such as Guarneri or a contemporary such as Grifone (PIETRO GRIFONE, *Il capitale finanziario in Italia*, 1945) have already clearly composed. All Sarti could do was to collect further evidence from historical sources so far neglected. These are essentially documents from the *Associazione fra le Società Italiane per Azioni* and from the *Confederazione Generale dell'Industria Italiana*.

The most effective utilization of this material is seen in Chapter II which analyses the forging of the relationship between the industrialists and the Fascist leaders in the years 1920-26. Sarti presents a picture which is much more complex than that traditionally accepted. The industrialists' front was not always united. The leaders of *Confindustria* were the owners of large industrial and financial empires whose interests did not always coincide with those of the smallest entrepreneurs. On the other hand, the Fascist party included men such as Rossoni, whose syndical ideals potentially represented a threat to the supremacy of the big industrialists. The outcome of the frictions and conflicts among syndicalists, big entrepreneurs and small businessmen was a compromise (*Pact of Palazzo Vidoni*, 1925) which revealed the ability of Mussolini to mediate between opposing factions. The reader can also gain from this analysis, and this is a positive aspect of the work, a better understanding of the complex personality of the dictator.

Ultimately, the compromise of 1925 was to the advantage of the industrialists. They were able to secure many advantages also in the thirties, when

the state was forced to take measures against the recession. Even though the industrialists showed some perplexity about the intervention of the state, by the end of the thirties the benefits to big industrialists outweighed the losses. This conclusion is not new and, at the present state of our knowledge, I should say it is also indisputable. Sarti reaches this thesis partly as a result of his investigation and partly by quoting extensively from existing literature. Other historians have used the more explicit term of industrial and financial oligarchy when talking about the industrial class, but the conclusion is the same. Big industrialists benefited from Fascist economic policy as well as from colonial wars. At the end, when Mussolini's fate was decided, they were ready to abandon him to his destiny and prepare for the advent of new leaders.

When historians speak of rewards accrued to industrialists, the economics of the thirties inevitably comes into the picture. Although Sarti has the right to claim that economics is not a discipline that historians must necessarily digest, some comment can be made on his work. One immediate remark that economists or economic historians can make to historians who write on this period is that they usually neglect existing sources on the economy of the Fascist era. It would be enough to quote the proceedings of the *Assemblea Costituente* (1947) to find a considerable amount of information on industry, agriculture, finance and international trade. Some of those inquiries, such as that on industrial concentration and cartels, would have provided direct support for Sarti's thesis. The same can be said about the publications of the *Associazione fra le Società Italiane per Azioni* which include a monthly bulletin (« Business and Financial Report ») that offers much information on the business situation and the annual reports of corporations.

On the basis of these sources and other statistical material, recent research suggests that, in spite of the recession, economic benefits accrued to large corporations throughout the twenties and thirties. There is evidence that between 1929-1932 laborers employed in industry benefited, in terms of real income, at the expense of capital, whereas for 1932-39 capital regained from labor that which it had previously lost. Large corporations, however, were able to preserve their share of the market and to maintain profits through the process of industrial and financial concentration. Those who paid for it were medium and small firms. Sarti states that this phenomenon was a refutation of the Marxist dichotomy between labor and capital. Contemporary Marxist economists, particularly Maurice Dobb and Paul Sweezy, on the other hand, consider this conflict within the capitalist class as a typical product of the evolution of the capitalist system toward concentration. This and other minor points concerning industrial concentration should be reviewed by Sarti.

On the whole, however, his thesis that big business benefited from Fascist economic policy can be supported by economists and economic historians. In this regard, a final comment, or better an invitation, should be addressed to all scholars interested in this topic as well as to private business and public agencies. More extensive and exhaustive research has to be done on single branches of industry and large corporations. There are many obstacles, among which the most irksome is the secrecy and inaccessibility which surrounds many private and public sources. Scholars can only wish that reticence and fears about the past may soon yield to the interest of scientific investigation.

Finally, Sarti sets forth his conclusion concerning the political and economic heritage left by Fascism. Following Guarneri's incisive judgment, he concludes that the political attitude of the industrial class of the Fascist era was always to bet on the winning horse. Today, given the political disengagement of many people, the low stature of the political class and the authoritarian attitude of the bureaucracy, the legacy and inheritance of Fascism may again assert itself in opposition to the turmoil and ferments that shake Italian society. It is a stern conclusion which seems particularly up-to-date in the spring of 1972.

PIERLUIGI PROFUMIERI
University of Connecticut, Storrs

- I. SCHIAPPOLI, *Napoli Aragonese: traffici e attività marinare*, with a preface by E. Pontieri, « Biblioteca di studi meridionali » n. 3, Napoli, Giannini, 1972, XVI-282 pages, L. 4,000.

We must be grateful to Giannini of Naples and to Professor Luigi de Rosa, the editor of the new and much appreciated collection « Biblioteca di studi meridionali » in which this volume appears, for offering students and all those who are interested in the history of Southern Italy this work by the late Irma Schiappoli which is as lively and stimulating as ever. The author lost her life in December 1942 in an air raid on Naples, within a few days of finishing her study on the Aragonese navy of Naples. This study, like some of her shorter works which had already been published and of which some are included in this volume, was carried out under the direction of Ernesto Pontieri. In addition to the study on *La marina degli aragonesi di Napoli*, this volume contains an essay dedicated to *Il conte di Sarno (contributo alla storia della congiura dei baroni)*, while a short but acute and penetrating study on *Isabella di Chiaromonte, regina di Napoli* is given in the appendix. It must be noted, however, that although there are three studies collected under a single title, they form a homogeneous rather than

random collection, not only because of the predominance of the study on the Aragonese navy, but because the characters dealt with in the other essays are closely related to many moments and events of capital importance in the Kingdom's political and economic life which are treated in the first.

The work is, then, basically concerned with the Aragonese navy of Naples, which is certainly not an easy subject to tackle, even if the study was made prior to the heavy losses inflicted on the Aragonese material in the Naples State Archive. Of these documents the author used mainly the valuable *Cedole di Tesoreria* series through which, with great intelligence and skill, she reconstructs the role — both political and economic — played by the fleet under the Aragonese. Here it is necessary to specify whether the military or the merchant fleet is intended. One of Miss Schiappoli's most valuable contributions to the history of the Aragonese navy of Naples consists in the rich documentation she offers to demonstrate the existence of a conspicuous permanent war fleet during the reign of Alfonso I (1442-1448) which, however, under the reign of his son and successor, Ferrante I (1458-1494), was to give way to an increasingly large merchant fleet. The latter, if necessary, could also be armed. The fact that this transformation took place not under Alfonso I, who was the first and only Aragonese sovereign to place himself at the head of his war fleet, but under his successor, Ferrante I, was not caused by any lessening of the threats to the Kingdom from the sea — by the Turks, the Angevins or Venice — but because the finances of the State did not permit the Exchequer to maintain a large and well equipped military fleet. Nevertheless, as Miss Schiappoli points out, the military fleet had an important function not only in the «conquest» of the Kingdom by Alfonso I, but even more in defending it, particularly from the Angevin threat during the reign of Ferrante I, while it was also the only defence against Turkish raids. The capture of Otranto by the Turks in 1480-81 — an interesting Turkish report on which is to be found in E. Rossi's article *Notizie degli storici turchi sull'occupazione di Otranto* in «Japigia», 1931, no. 1, pp. 182-191 — could be contested thanks to the fleet, even if on this occasion, as on others, it had to be strongly supported by private shipping.

The merchant fleet received particular attention under Ferrante I, who encouraged its growth with all the means at his disposal, often participating personally and privately in the financing of vessels and of the trade in which they engaged. Under Ferrante I Count Sarno's private fleet, in which the sovereign himself held considerable financial and trading interests for a certain period, exercised an important function in the Kingdom's economy. The incentive to enlarge the merchant fleet derived undoubtedly from the seafaring and trading experience of the Aragonese — regarding which one must mention the fine book recently published by DEL TREPPO, *I mercanti catalani e l'espansione della corona aragonese nel secolo XV*, Napoli, Libreria

Scientifica Editrice, 1968 — but the deterioration of the state finances, especially under Ferrante I, and the far from prosperous condition of the private coffers of the Aragonese sovereigns were the chief reasons for the progressive strengthening of the fleet. And, of course, a strong merchant fleet, which could if necessary be chartered or requisitioned for military purposes, made possible a reduction of expenditure on the war fleet.

This apt naval policy — which reflected the Aragonese principle that a Kingdom surrounded on many sides by the sea could not be defended without an adequate sea force — gave satisfactory results; on one hand it provided the Kingdom with a good protective « umbrella » when needed and on the other it allowed it to compete effectively with the navies of those other Mediterranean states which had « seafaring traditions, experience and vessels stronger and bolder » than those of Naples.

It was consequently a heavy blow for the economy and security of the Kingdom when this fleet decayed progressively and was finally destroyed under the last Aragonese, who were hemmed in and overwhelmed by the transalpine preparations for a descent on the Kingdom which was to bring their reign to a close.

The author takes Count Sarno, Francesco Coppola, as a proof and symbol of the favourable climate for trade and shipping under the Aragonese. He was a man of humble birth whose skill and intelligence had enabled him to accumulate a huge fortune through shipping and trade — in which, as we have seen, Ferrante I himself did not disdain to take part for a time, in partnership with Coppola — besides allowing him to occupy important public positions. Yet this man, so favoured by fortune and by his king, who had given him the title of Count Sarno, did not hesitate in 1485-86 to join the famous conspiracy of the barons against Ferrante. The author examines with great care the reasons that led Coppola to join the representatives of a class which, at heart, he disdained.

A figure who, on the contrary, was capable of rising above the intrigues at the court of Ferrante I and the political passions of the moment was Queen Isabella of Chiaromonte, the essential traits of whose character and culture the author describes with admirable discernment. She also examines the important role played at the Aragonese court by Ferrante's active and watchful Queen at various critical moments in the life of the Kingdom when threatened by the pretensions and naval power of the Angevins.

Miss Schiappoli's work sheds particular light on the dynamism of Southern Italy in the second half of the 15th century, which had repercussions not only on the country's political life — deprived thereafter of its political independence for over two centuries — but also on its economic and cultural life.

ANTONIO DI VITTORIO
University of Bari

- M. I. TUGAN-BARANOVSKY, *The Russian Factory in the 19th Century*. Translated from the 3rd Russian ed., 1907, by Arthur and Claora S. Levin under the supervision of Gregory Grossman. Homewood, Illinois: Published for the American Economic Association by Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1970, pp. XVII + 474, \$ 8.75.

The book under review is an important Russian economic classic, a historical study of the development of Russian industry from the 17th down to the end of the 19th century, coming from the pen of a major Ukrainian economist and world renowned author on trade cycles.¹ Although Tugan-Baranovsky's business cycle theory has left a permanent mark in economics, his contribution as an economic historian, particularly to the industrial history of Russia, has been largely ignored in the English-speaking world. Professors Levins' excellent translation fills this gap and thereby renders a great service to the science of economics. Their translation is from the third, revised Russian edition of Tugan's *Russkaia fabrika v proshlom i nastoiashchem: Istoricheskoe razvitie russkoi fabрики v XIX v.* (The Russian Factory, Past and Present: The Historical Development of the Russian Factory in the XIXth Century), St. Petersburg, 1907, reprinted 1922. For this truly pioneering effort in economic history Tugan received his Ph. D. degree in 1898 at the University of Moscow.

The book was first published in 1898 as Volume I of a projected longer study. According to the author, Volume I was intended to be only a historical study concerning the nature and general significance of Russian industrial development in the 19th century. Volume II was planned (see « Preface » to the 2nd, 1900, edition) to be strictly theoretical and promised to include an analysis of the significance of the factory in Russian life and to analyse the fate of Russian capitalism. Regrettably, no other volumes have been published and, contrary to the translators' claim that « the manuscript of a second volume was apparently almost completed » (pp. vii, 445), there is no conclusive evidence that this volume was ever written. On the contrary, there is sufficient proof that by 1900 Tugan in all probability cooled off to the project which, after all, aimed to defend the position of legal-Marxists against Populists on the fate of Russian capitalism. At this time, fully em-

¹ M. I. Tugan-Baranovsky was the most noted economic theoretician in the Slavic world of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. He was born on January 8 (o. s.), 1865, in the village of Sol'one, Kharkov province, in the Ukraine. He died of a heart attack on January 8 (o. s.), 1919; he was 54. In this relatively short time, in addition to a multitude of major articles, he wrote over 23 books on economic subjects. For T.B.'s biographic sketch and his contribution to economic analysis, see LUBOMYR MARIAN KOWAL, *Economic Doctrines of M. I. Tugan-Baranovsky* (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Dept. of Econ., University of Illinois, 1965); revised and rewritten, it is scheduled to be published in 1973.

bracing idealism and cooperative socialism, Tugan moved away from not only Marxian economics but also his sociology. He could no longer continue with the project which would examine Russia's factory system from the materialists position, stated thus in the « Preface » to Volume I: « It is not the consciousness of men that determines their social being, but the latter which determines the forms of their consciousness » (p. xi).

There had been very little research on the history of Russian industry before 1898. In his pathbreaking study Tugan-Baranovsky examined thoroughly the Russian archives of the Department of Trade and Manufactures, the Imperial Free Economic Society, the Ministry of Finance, and many others. Also, unlike any other Russian researcher before him, he paid special attention to periodical literature. The result of this endeavor was a penetrating study of the development of Russian industry, the first of its kind in Russian economic literature. This book passed through three Russian editions during the author's lifetime (1898, 1900, 1907); four reprints of the third Russian edition appeared after the Bolshevik Revolution (1922, 1926, 1934, and 1938). Curiously enough, all these reprints were undertaken in the U.S.S.R. despite Tugan-Baranovsky's status as a banned « bourgeois » author and one who « ended his activity in the camp of the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists and was an active participant in the bourgeois counter-revolution of 1917 in the Ukraine ».² Apparently Tugan-Baranovsky's study is an irreplaceable source of historical information. Naturally, the work, which has the mark of first rate achievement, and is well documented, well analysed, and well written, cannot be easily discarded even by the orthodox Soviet economists. The only other foreign translation of Tugan's work is the German translation from the 1st Russian edition; it was edited by B. MINZES, *Geschichte der russischen Fabrik* (Berlin: Emil Felber, 1900), 626 pp. The German edition is not simply a bare translation, since the author himself completely rewrote and polished whole parts of the work. Also, the German edition, not handicapped by censorship, is more complete than the Russian edition (see, *Geschichte...*, p. xi). For this reason, the English translation would have greatly benefited had the translators compared the two texts and showed whatever differences there are between them, at least in the footnotes if not in their « Translators' Preface ».

At any rate, before us is a major study which in many respects has more than just local Russian value; in a way, it gives a description and analysis of

² [O.O. KRULIAK], *Legal'nyi Marksyzm na Ukraïni 90-i roky XIX st.* (Legal Marxism in the Ukraine, 90th of the 19th century) in « Z istoriï ekonomichnoï dumky na Ukraïni » (On the History of Economic Thought in the Ukraine) (Kiev: Adak. Nauk. Ukr. RSR-Institut Ekonomiky, 1961), p. 344. For a short while Tugan-Baranovsky served as a Finance Minister of the Ukrainian Central Rada, which was the center of the Ukrainian liberation movement. At this time, he declared himself to be a Ukrainian patriot and assumed the leadership of the Ukrainian scientific, economic, and cooperative life.

the origin and development of capitalism in general. With his sharp theoretical intellect and strict formulation of thought, Tugan-Baranovsky approaches the economic history of Russia not only as an economic historian but even more as a theorist. He not only presents a factual history of Russian industry, especially with respect to the number of factories and the industrial proletariat, but contributes much to the creation of a theory of capitalist development in Russia and in general. That is why Werner Sombart rated this book as excellent and used examples from it to illustrate his theory of the role of the state in the genesis of modern capitalism. Undoubtedly it is the most important work on the history of Russian industrialism.

In order to fully comprehend the significance of Tugan-Baranovsky's book, one must understand the social milieu in which it was born. Briefly, in the 1890's a heated debate raged in Russian economic literature between legal-Marxists (led by Tugan and Peter Struve) and *Narodniks* (Populists, represented by V. P. Vorontsov and Francis Danielson) concerning the possibility of capitalist development in Russia and the extent to which the Russian peasant economy had been able to resist capitalist encroachment. The conflict was waged principally over the question whether Russia was already engaged in the «normal» process of capitalist development, or whether she could still hope to escape from it. Tugan did not believe that the growth of Russian capitalism would be a unique experience and argued that capitalism was already an important part of Russian life. The *Narodniks*, however, claimed that in the West capitalism developed naturally, by itself, whereas in Russia it was an alien growth foreign to the Russian soil and was sustained only by artificial measures on the part of the government. Thus, one of the main charges in the Populist accusation against capitalism is its artificiality. Tugan's *The Russian Factory...* resulted from his desire to refute empirically the above mentioned beliefs of the Populists, especially with respect to the number of factories and urban workers, the fate of village artisans, and the availability of markets on which Russian capitalism could develop.

The discussion of «artificiality» vs. «naturalness» in the development of Russian capitalism, lost the last shadow of pertinence after the publication of his dissertation. In Tugan's view,

that which the backward economist of the West called artificial, the backward economists of the East call natural, and vice versa. Both are equally mistaken. The relationships of capitalist production are just as artificial as those of feudal production. The whole thing is that these backward economists cannot understand one very simple thing: The division of social institutions into natural and artificial ones explains absolutely nothing... (p. 6).

The author shows that from the reign of Peter I capitalism has become essential to the nation's progress. Indeed, it was under Peter and by direct intervention of the government that large-scale production arose in Russia.

But, in Tugan's view, « There is not the slightest doubt that without active support of the government Russian industry would not have developed ». There is not a single country in the world, he says, whether in the West or in the East, where capitalism would have developed without active state support. Consequently, it is necessary « either to recognize that everywhere in the world capitalism is an artificial phenomenon, or to abandon this idle talk about artificiality and naturalness (p. 7). And thus, Tugan's aim was to give an exposition of change in the internal organization of the Russian factory and to show how the original merchant-owned factory was converted in the course of the 18th century into a gentry-owned factory based on forced labor; how the latter factory system was gradually dying out and was being replaced by the modern capitalist factory. He succeeded in bringing to light fascinating material on early manufacturing under conditions in which serf villagers were forcibly turned into factory workers, as well as in tracing the growth of modern factories in the nineteenth century Muscovite Russia.

The coverage is broad, as may be seen from the topics the book treats: (in its Introduction) « The Factory in the 18th Century », (in Part I) « The Pre-Reform Factory » and (in Part II) « The Factory in the Post-Reform Period ». In the eight chapters of Part I, Tugan investigates with painstaking detail such topics as the growth of large-scale industry, the condition of farmed-out workers, the position of laborers on the manorial and the possessional factory, wages, workers' unrest, factory legislation, *kustar'* industry, and surveys the literature on the question of Russian industry in the pre-Reform epoch. In Part II, the author speaks of contemporary legislation, wages after the Reform, the struggle between the factory and the *kustar'*, and in the concluding chapter offers a survey of economic literature on the question of the Russian factory in the 19th century.

The Russian editions of *The Russian Factory...* were published without an index, as were most works in Eastern Europe in the nineteenth century and later. To facilitate the use of the English edition, the translators have supplied an Index of Names, Places, Journals and Newspapers, and Subjects. This feature alone substantially improves upon the Russian edition. Also, in addition to the « Translators' Preface », they have added two appendices, one on « Russian Weights and Measures » and the other a « Glossary and Key to Translation of Important Terms ». This carefully translated, edited, and indexed volume should help in correcting our neglect of an essential aspect of economic history in nineteenth century Muscovite Russia. *The Russian Factory* will be of interest to students of economic history and the history of industrial capitalism in an underdeveloped nation and, generally, to anyone interested in Russian intellectual history. Also, it seems to me, this book is an indispensable handbook for anyone specializing in the Soviet Economy. Its excellent style makes it a pleasure to read. One difficulty is that no bibliography was given in the Russian edition, so that the translators are unable

Reviews of Books

to give one. In this reviewer's opinion, the AEA Committee on Research and Publications could have chosen a more significant work of Tugan's for its « Translation Series » if the criterion for selection had been his contribution to *pure economics* rather than to the industrial history of Russia. For example, his works on business cycles, distribution theory, a very interesting critique of Marx, etc., still await a translator. Nonetheless, *The Russian Factory...*, from the standpoint of economic history, is without doubt an outstanding work.

LUBOMYR M. KOWAL
University of Michigan-Flint