REVIEWS OF BOOKS

J.E. CRONIN - C. SIRIANNI (eds.), *Work, Community, and Power. The Experience of Labor in Europe and America, 1900-1925*, Philadelphia Temple University Press, 1983, pp. VIII, 318.

This anthology of original essays has three advantages. It deals with the labour movement and the working classes in Europe and America, thus following the concept of an Atlantic economy within which national differences can be analyzed and compared. It emphasizes a cultural history of the working class that integrates political framework and organizational possibilities. It deals with particular conceptual reactions to historical developments ("ideologies", "political lines") not as theoretical constructs of party factions or scholars but as responses of workers (and their representatives) to particular circumstances in particular trades at specific points of time. Nevertheless the volume is intended to be no more than "a first step" in reconstructing "the richness and vitality of workers' lives, beliefs, and protests and to locate the workers' politics and collective efforts more precisely in society"[5]. This goal, taken from E. P. Thompson and E. J. Hobsbawm, is applied to the early twentieth century, to the "long wave" of 1896-1920. Three historiographical developments serve as starting points for this revision: the studies explaining the coming of World War One in terms of the political and social crises of the nations involved; the replacement of the functionalist approach in labour history, ascribing to social democracy and the unions the task of adjusting first-generation peasant-workers to modern capitalism by an approach that takes into account the initiative and articulateness of working men and women as well as the "complex web of union organization, community life, and institutions of social support"[12]; the renewed scholarly interest in workers' self-organization following upon the events of the sixties.

In the introductory essay James E. Cronin attempts an overview of the structural transformations of the European working classes relating these developments to their changing political impact and social outlook. Like the other authors in the volume Cronin differentiates between socialism and social democracy (as well as numerous other interpretations of society and guidelines for action) rather than lumping all of them together under the broad designation of socialism, as the vast

majority of American scholars still do. Cronin points to a process in the formation of the industrial labour forces that is common to Europe and America, the emergence of an urban proletariat through the in-migration of rural labourers and peasants (or their sons and daughters) either from the surrounding countryside or from distant areas with a relative surplus population. Cronin's broad approach is pursued in the subsequent essays by Larry Peterson on revolutionary industrial unionism, especially in the years preceding World War One, and by David Montgomery on the insurgent political, national and class movements from 1916-1922. Both deal with issues that have been sorely neglected in the traditional labour historiography, and that are usually associated either with the formation of ethnic groups, community building or "radical" movements, industrial unions. The emphasis on business unionism in the U.S. and on the influence of political parties in the various European countries as well as the neglect of the intra-European migratory movements and their comparability with the transatlantic migration has served to obscure these important stages and aspects in the formation of the working classes in the Atlantic economies.

The international dimension of the labour movements of the time is analyzed in a case study by Steve Fraser of the cooperation between the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America and the Soviet Union in the early 1920s. Many other examples might have been used and a broad study of the change of some immigrants' perception of the U.S. republican features via a disillusioned struggle against "plutocrats", "Kaisers", "Cossacks" - all contemporary terms for the American elite and their tools - to an admiration for the Soviet workers' republic (and the subsequent disillusionment) is needed to fill this gap in historical knowledge. Until now essays like Fraser's on the ACWA provide tantalizing glimpses but cannot yet achieve a synthesis.

In the concluding essay Carmen Sirianni attempts to assess the success or failure echec of the various movements for workers' control. Workers' self-organization has to deal with established trade - union structures, with the framework set by the state (even if that framework is in a process of rapid change), with exigencies of a particular time (war production and national defence) as well as with particular historical traditions (stratification within the labour force of a particular branch of industry or transportation). A sophisticated analysis like Sirianni's is a great step ahead of those studies that measure working-class activity against such inflexible yardsticks as "productivity" or "socialism".

Several case studies complement these broader essays. Mary Nolan examines the social structures of two German towns and the development of a working-class culture, a social-democratic political influence and a self-organized militancy. Gary Cross, in a broader analysis, deals with France and the changing attitudes among workers and the French Left toward workers' control, productivism and the framework of economic structures and union organization. William Rosenberg traces the attempts at workers' control of the Russian railroads, the interaction between a progressive faction within the state's administration and the workers' new councils. He analyzes problems resulting from state-supported workers' self-organization,

as well as those resulting from the Bolsheviks' political reaction to self-organization and from the establishment of a new system. The radicalism of American labour, evolving from the 1909-14 strike "wave" and the syndicalism of the Industrial Workers of the World, from the pacifism and alternative political styles of the socialists and the high degree of militancy in the years during and immediately after the war is explained by Melvyn Dubovsky. He, too, argues that from the particular form of labour militancy a particular and long-lasting pattern of political reaction developed.

The essays are stimulating. They provide a long, not just a first, step toward a new view of labour relations and working-class culture in the Atlantic economies. They raise important questions for scholars working on similar issues; they are a must for adherents of the outdated Euro-or U.S. centred views of labour and working-class history.

DIRK HOERDER
Universität Bremen

J. KELLY, *Women, History and Theory: The Essays of Joan Kelly*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Joan Kelly, who died in 1982 of cancer at the age of 54, was a Professor of History at the City College of the City University of New York. She also for a time was the codirector of the Women's Studies Program at Sarah Lawrence College. In addition to this collection of essays she was also the author of *Leon Battista Alberti: Universal Man of the Early Renaissance*. But her influence during her all too short career went far beyond her writings, as the introduction to this collection, written by several of her friends, makes clear. She viewed scholarship and teaching as more than an individual quest for knowledge but rather as "part of a collective process to be shared in both its creation and its dissemination." She was at the centre of a network of feminist scholars whose lives and scholarship were transformed over the last decade and a half by the women's movement and by a Marxist-Feminist perspective on the past and the present.

This book consists of five essays, one on the history of the family, two on feminist theory and its application to various historical movements, one on women and the Renaissance and one on the methodological implications of women's history. The essays are provocative and well written. Their importance is not because they are based on new research or the discovery of new facts, but because they show an innovative and inquiring mind reworking traditional concepts and interpretations.

In her own introduction to these essays Kelly recalls that in 1971 while she was teaching at Sarah Lawrence Gerda Lerner asked her and other faculty members to contribute a lecture or a course about the relation of the history of women to their fields. She responded that since she was a Renaissance historian there was nothing she could offer about women. But a short time later, when she looked at the Renaissance from the vantage point of women, she remarked; "Suddenly the entire world of learning was open to me. It had a new and compelling attraction and was utterly questionable at the same time. Most compelling, and most questionable was everything I thought I had known about the Renaissance." (XIII)

One ot the tasks of women's history, Kelly argues throughout the book, is to call into question accepted schemes of periodization. The Renaissance, she suggests, reorganized society and opened up all kinds of possibilities for social and cultural experiences for men, but it was a period that had an adverse effect on women. The Renaissance introduced the modern relationship between the sexes, she points out. "Renaissance ideas on love and manners, more classical than medieval, and almost exclusively a male product, expressed this new subordination of women to the interests of husbands and male - dominated kin groups and served to justify the removal of women from an 'unladylike" position of power and erotic independence." (47)

But it is not just the Renaissance that has to be revaluated in the light of women's history. "For women progress in Athens meant concubinage and confinment of citizen wives in the gynecaeum." And the French Revolution "expressly excluded women from its liberty, equality and 'fraternity.' In addition to challenging traditional periodization women historians have also introduced sex as a category of social thought."

"Feminism has made it evident that the mere fact of being a woman meant having a particular kind of social and hence historical experience," Kelly argues. Borrowing from Marxist analysis she treats women as a social class and is particularly concerned with how women's secondary status in most periods of history flows from women's special relationship to work. Women's history also "open up the other half of history" and allows historians to view "women as agents and the family as a productive and social force."

Joan Kelly's friends and colleagues who write the introduction to this book conclude: "Joan Kelly's work points a new direction for feminist theory. It emphasizes the centrality of consciousness. It insists on the importance of women's own experience, including that of resistance and struggle, in demystifying misogynist culture. It urges the use of sex gender as analytic categories. The cumulative power of her work is measured by the extent to which her ideas have already been incorporated into history and theory..." (XXV-XXVI)

This warm and human book will make stimulating and provocative reading for those feminist historians who have already accepted many of the ideas and concepts. It also should be read by other scholars who may not accept all the ideas, but who will be stimulated, even perhaps angered, by a creative and speculative mind at work.

ALLEN F. DAVIS
Temple University

H.W. MORTON - R.C. STUART (eds.) *The Contemporary Soviet City,* Armonk, New York, M.E. Sharpe, Inc., 1984. XIV-262 pp., index bibliography.

Cities as part of the socio-economic landscape of the USSR have, belatedly, attracted the attention of competent scholars. This volume, an outgrowth of the 1981 conference of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, is a welcome addition to resources available to those concerned with the Soviet Union as well as to urbanists. The work of eleven researchers, mainly in academic positions in the USA (the editors are at Queens College CUNY and at Rutgers), it is largely written from the perspective of specialists on specific aspects of Soviet life. The authors show familiarity with the literature, and make generous use of Soviet sources. Several of the chapters report on primary research in the USSR or on interviews with recently departed informants.

The Contemporary Soviet City is a collection of 11 papers. Two overviews introduce the subject: each by one of the editors. Morton scans the almost intractable problems residents of all Soviet cities face: labour immobilities (and thus macro shortages), inadequacies in shelter, and failures in supply and distribution of food. Morton finds that coherent governance and effective planning are, largely, "mission impossible". Stuart, in explaining a fairly dramatic growth in the proportion that is urban, reviews the demography of the nation and the city system: a legacy of heavy immigration, significant excesses of births over deaths, and reclassification of settlements as non-rural. He anticipates a slowdown in urban growth and highlights the ageing of the population.

Part II offers four detailed studies of the urban scene. Raimondo and Stuart discuss the finances of Soviet cities: not too effective as fiscal units even as their revenues as well as expenditures increase. The sources of the almost universal labour shortage are analysed by Moskoff: there are institutional practices as well as attributes of the population structure which perpetuate this feature of the urban economy. Juviler focuses on the family, emphasizing the shift to the nuclear unit with few children. And Shelley writes of crime and other forms of social pathology. The largest cities are less burdened: one more consequence of restricted access.

The quality of urban services is scrutinized in Part III. Field contrasts the ideological commitment to universal delivery of medical services with evidence of stratified systems and inequality of access found between small and large places. Dobson, looking at education, finds similar patterns. Garva, in assessing public transport, writes that service is poor and offers evidence of faulty planning as well. Schroeder, in his discussion of retail trade facilities, also concludes the sector is poorly organized and consumers remain not well served. A survey conducted by Gitelman rounds out this somewhat dismal picture. The bureaucracy (according to informants now in the West) functions well when pension matters are at stake, but much dissatisfaction lingers as residents deal with local governments on matters such as access to housing.

Several themes surface in virtually each of the chapters. The familiar dominance of the production enterprise, the lack of effective pricing mechanisms, and the confusing and often counter-productive signals issued by high levels of govern-

ment (including plan organizations) all serve to reduce the quality of urban life. The citizen constantly confronts shortages and what to the outsider can only seem to be arbitrary exercises of power. This glum picture is partly mitigated in its severity by the existence of a variety of informal, semi - or illegal devices in some of the sectors. These themes, of course, are simply the local, urban reflections of the phenomena and processes with which students of the Soviet economy and society, the system of governance have long been familiar. The detailed explorations at this more intimate scale is, however, a welcome addition to our understanding of the Soviet world.

What prospects? While each author writes in a rather critical vein, there also are indications of improvements. Local governments are being given more effective power. There is more housing than in the past. Citizens are being given access to services not related to job entitlements, and even some greater mobility is on record. We in the West need only recall the bleak urban past in earlier stages of our own industrialization.

Any collection of conference papers will perforce have some gaps. There is almost no mention of the internal spatial ecology of cities: densities, juxtaposition of land uses, etc. (but there is a good literature on this subject, both Soviet and foreign). While some intriguing differences in the Soviet city from its predecessors are noted (e.g., dominance, though not absolute, of apartment living), more could have been said. Land and its control, value (and valuation) are barely mentioned. And this reviewer, at least, would have wished for more discussion of urban planning: particularly its links to national, regional and sectoral planning as well as its ideological foundations.

The papers are well edited and generously footnoted as befits a series of research reports (some errors surfaced in the printing of Garva's tables). Inevitably there is some repetition - but few internal contradictions - as, for example, where growth in urbanization is covered by several writers. While a rich variety of Soviet statistical series is used (as are some intriguing if ephemeral research sources) a section on Soviet data and its limitations would have been, given the authors' expertise, a welcome addition.

Readers of this *Journal* should be warned that the volume is indeed a study of the *contemporary* city. The historical horizon appears somewhat truncated: with most of the analysis focusing on post-war years. While the economic facts as analysed are indeed important, consider just one phenomenon. The overwhelming attractiveness of the largest cities might have other roots as well. Then, too, the reader is at times left to wonder whether demography is largely to explain the immense contrast between core 'Great Russia' and the periphery (particularly Central Asia), a contrast well discussed in contemporary terms. The consequences are intense and have impacts on all phases of the Soviet economy and society, yet it can be argued, have origins in earlier eras. And is the oft-noted heavy-handedness of what we call the system only a Soviet phenomenon or as scholars have often determined (and as Gitelman briefly notes in his chapter), is this a "Russian tradition"? The editors remain agnostic "about ways in which the contemporary Soviet

city is similar to or different from its Western counterpart" (p. XIV). We also have questions whether the contemporary city resembles or is distinct from its Russian origins.

THOMAS A. REINER
University of Pennsylvania

H. Ch. MUI - L. MUI, *The Management of Monopoly: a Study of the English East India Company's Conduct of Its Tea Trade, 1784-1833*, Vancouver University of British Columbia Press, 1984, pp.XIV + 192.

Hoh-Cheung and Lorna Mui set out to make a good story from the English East India Company's China tea trade and they have done so with evident pleasure and much success. The study covers the half-century from the 1784 Act which assigned the tea monopoly and it lasted the next fifty years. That proved to be a period of war and economic change for Britain, in the throes of her early industrialisation, in her international role and colonial destiny. In the third quarter of the eighteenth century, her empire acquired a new profile, on one side losing the United States and on the other winning control of Bengal and so a claim to territorial power in Moghul India. The Directors in London recognised this broad strategy - the "enlarged principle" as they called it - of building an empire. They were a public company under charter with books open to Treasury scrutiny; they collected excise dues in London for the government; and their supercargoes in Canton seemed to have more the composure of diplomats than of dealers in tea. Thus, the East India Company did not always perform on commercial lines, and that when the problems of asiatic trade were pressing. A whole world economy was in question. When the original Company opened shop in 1600, the spice trade was all the rage; the follow-on came in silk and cotton fabrics finer than any Europe could manufacture. The eighteenth century turned to beverages - coffee from Java or the West Indies; and tea from China. They bridged the world: in 1773 English chests of China tea floated in Boston harbour to draw the brew of American independence. The monopoly granted by the 1784 Act was imperfect, to say the least. It competed with "monopolies" of other European countries entrenched in Asian trade. It contended with the West India lobby in Parliament to promote - and almost succeeding - the interests of coffee. Then there was the delicate matter of the balance of trade. Precious metals were key cargoes from Europe, but when supplies from the American mines began to fall after 1805 the Company looked around for substitutes and barter. The answer came in the nexus with Bengal opium: the drug traffic to China grew twenty times during the tea monopoly. And finally, supply was not a simple matter of monopoly control. Unlike the spreading territorial power in India, the Company was merely a trader, dancing attendance to

the Chinese "monopoly" in Canton. China tea, cropped by cohorts of small peasants, was slow to respond to the propensity to consume in Britain. From the early days of the monopoly the Company set out (1787) to stabilise the flow. They worked to a three - year rule - two years to and from Canton and a year's supply in the London warehouse. As for demand, the market for beverages in Britain was far from settled. The population was growing. Three decades before the monopoly the gin age was at its peak. When the monopoly began, the industrialisation of brewing was in full stream; and coffee was creeping up so that by the 1820s it approached parity with tea-consumption. All these challenges to tea benefited from either machinery or plantation culture. And to make matters worse there was the tariff policy of a government hungry for revenue to pay its debts: in 1819 the duty on tea was 100 per cent. How did the Company succeed? Hoh-Cheung and Lorna Mui show that the way forward lay in skilful marketing. The Company always watched closely both price and quality. Blending to suit tastes was crucial. The study shows the range of qualities on offer: the black teas - Bohea, Congu, Souchong, Pekoe; and the green - Singlo, Twankay, Hyson Skin and Hyson. They were carefully monitored in the London sales. The study is a pertinent commentary on the standard of living controversy. The demand for these luxuries was growing - the sales doubled during the monopoly. More than that, the market showed up at two levels. For households on small budgets, there was the cheaper black Congou - four-fifths of the total sales. And for the better-off, the great discovery was the fine quality of Lap-seng which soon had a fast take-up and high prices in the auctions. In the larger perspective, the study concludes that the Company's tea monopoly was not against the interests of the consumer. The Directors were content to let their returns depend on buyers in London. However, towards the end of the monopoly, the restrictions on the opium-tea trade in Canton were beginning to pall. In 1832 the Company's ship *Lord Amherst* took the ground further north - the crew said they were on their way to Japan but in truth they were looking for new openings along the Chinese coast. Success for the tea trade really came later in the nineteenth century when planters freed supply in India and Ceylon (Sri Lanka) by adopting machines and made industrial Britain a tea-drinking nation. In all, this study can be warmly welcomed for the fine way it has handled the trade in those expansive days when a true monopoly could not be had for love, money, or all the tea in China.

FRANK SPOONER
University of Durham

Th. J. SCHAEPER. *The French Council of Commerce 1700-1715: A Study of Mercantilism after Colbert;* Columbus, Ohio, Ohio State University Press, 1983, pp. 305

To explain the hegemony of the West over other civilizations historians have

turned their attention to the early modern period. The major recent works of Fernand Braudel and Immanuel Wallerstein illustrate the themes which dominate the study of this period: the expansion of the European economy from the Mediterranean basin to the world's oceans, economic growth and stagnation, the destinies of the bourgeoisie and the aristocracy, their relations to each other and to the state between 1500 and 1800[1]. The Council of Commerce in France during the last decade and a half of the Sun King's reign is one place where the interests of these social classes came into direct contact with those of the state early in the eighteenth century.

Thomas Schaeper's book thoroughly documents and clearly describes the workings of the Council from 1700 to 1715. The book is divided into two parts. The first part discusses the Council's creation, its organization and functioning, the oft-quoted memoirs on the French economy which the deputies drew up at the Council's inception, and the relations between the deputies and their constituencies. The second part examines the Council's work, its contributions to the development of the economic policies of the crown including trade with enemy and neutral nations, regulation of manufactures, the balance of trade, tariffs, duties, and monetary problems, the privileged trading companies, trade with the *mer du Sud*, Persia, and Russia, the colonies, fishing, and plagues as well as the Council's importance in the negotiations leading to the Treaty of Utrecht. Schaeper displays an impressive command of the archives in Paris and in the provinces that document the Council's activities.

Schaeper uses his knowledge more to correct the factual errors of other historians than he does to advance the understanding of the relationships among the growth of capitalism, the expansion of international trade, the development of the modern bureaucratic nation-state and their effects on social relations. He takes an explicitly revisionist position. Against those historians who have argued that the creation of the Council was a concession by Louis XIV's government to growing criticism from merchants of its mercantilist policies, and therefore a sign of the monarchy's weakness and bureaucratic disorganization, Schaeper argues that the Council supported the crown's policies and that these were as mercantilist after 1700 as they had been in Colbert's time; only rarely did the Council oppose the crown or the royal ministers to whom the Council reported. While Schaeper adduces a great deal of evidence which supports his position, some of it raises questions about his interpretation.

[1] FERNAND BRAUDEL, *Civilisation matérielle, économie et capitalisme, XVe-XVIIIe siècles*, 3 vols. (Paris: A. COLIN, English translation, *Civilization and Capitalism, 15th-18th century*, 3 vols., translated by Sian Reynolds (New York: Harper & Row, 1982-1984); Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (New York:, Academic Press, 1974) *idem., The Modern World System II: Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World Economy, 1600-1750* (New York: Academic Press, 1980)

Schaeper's revisionist view is based on a three-pronged attack. His first offensive is to discount the evidence that supports the earlier view. Although he shows that suggestions for a Council of Commerce had been voiced earlier from outside the government (p. 9) and that merchants criticized the monarchy's mercantilist policies (p. 6), Schaeper does not believe the Council was created in response to criticism from merchants. Rather, the initiative for the Council came from the government itself, "to administer trade and industry more knowledgeably and efficiently." (p. 5) This is Schaeper's second point. Third, he argues that the creation of the Council does not show that royal ministers lacked Colbert's self-assurance or were indecisive, or that the government was weak or fragmented . Rather, it was created to better coordinate decisions of the Controller General of Finances, who was responsible for internal trade, and those of the Secretary of State for the Navy, who was responsible for external trade. Louis de Pontchartrain had occupied both posts before he became chancellor in 1699. When he left them to take up his new duties, they would again be divided between two occupants. Pontchartrain suggested the creation of the Council to coordinate their decisions on commercial matters. (pp. 11-13).

While Schaeper argues persuasively that the crown had its own reasons for creating the Council in 1700, he is less convincing when he tries to demonstrate that merchant criticism of the government's commercial policies was irrelevant or that administrative weakness played no role in the government's decision to create the Council. On this last point Schaeper may object to the words chosen by Lionel Rothkrug, the main target of his attack, to describe the conditions that led to this administrative innovation[2]. Rothkrug refers to "several different agencies which understook the task of economic regulation" as "fragmentation of authority[3]." Nevertheless, Schaeper himself admits that "Pontchartrain suggested the creation of a Council of Commerce as a means of preventing future conflicts between the two officials." (p. 12)

In fact, Schaeper's attack on Rothkrug is all too transparent. Rothkrug is Schaeper's straw man. In *Opposition to Louis XIV* Rothkrug is not primarily concerned with the origins of the French Council of Commerce, but rather with the origins of the French Enlightenment. In relation to his subject Rothkrug's analysis of the writings of Council members like Decasaux du Hallay of Nantes as a source of ideas which later became identified with the French Enlightenment remains undiminished[4].

[2] LIONEL ROTHKRUG. *Opposition to Louis XIV: The Political and Social Origins of the French Enlightenment* (Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press, 1965).

[3] Ibid., p. 373.

[4] See also DENIS RICHET. "Autour des Origines idéologiques lointaines de la Révolution française:Elites et despotisme," *Annales: Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* XXIV, 1 (January-February 1969), pp. 1-23.

The division of the book into two parts itself raises questions about Schaeper's argument that the Council supported the crown. In the first part, which describes the Council's organization, Schaeper shows that the Council was far from unanimous or homogeneous, but in the second part, which describes the Council's position on issues, he deliberately treats the Council as a unit. This approach masks differences of opinion among the Council members. As Schaeper puts it, "out of the thousands of affairs discussed in the Council of Commerce during this fifteen year period, he uncovered only ten instances in which the commissaires rejected an *avis* that had the unanimous support of the deputies." (p. 29) However, in a footnote he acknowledges that "There were many cases in which the deputies were divided. On these occasions, of course, the commissaires had to reject the views of one group and side with the views of the other." (p. 29, n. 38) Thus, Schaeper admits that unanimity did not exist even among the deputies, those Council members most likely to hold views different from those of the crown.

Yet, in the second part of the book where Schaeper discusses the Council's position on royal economic policies, he treats the Council as a unanimous group. He does not systematically report the views of the deputies apart from those of the commissaires or other Council members. Some deputies may have been consistently less favourable toward mercantilist policies than others and have even upheld views similar to those associated with eighteenth- and nineteenth-century economic liberalism. However, by treating the Council as a unit rather than as a group of individuals with differing and even conflicting ideas, Schaeper can ignore the views of the minority who were critical of the crown. Nevertheless, his discussion of the avis issued by the deputies suggests that a more nuanced analysis would have been possible (p. 27).

Furthermore, the Council's very organization acted against merchants who opposed the crown's view being selected to sit on the Council or having much influence on it. The most important Council members consisted of, at first six, later seven, then eight commissaires, royal officials appointed by the crown, and 13 deputies. Eleven of the deputies were elected by the chambers of commerce or local assemblies of major French cities, mostly seaports: Bayonne, Bordeaux, Dunkirk, the cities of Languedoc, Lille, Lyons, Marseilles, Nantes, La Rochelle, Rouen, and Saint Malo. The remaining two deputies, who represented Paris, were chosen by the crown. However, even though the deputies were chosen by the merchants and municipal officers of the cities they represented, the crown could interfere with their selection in several ways. The method of recruiting the Council members suggests that critics of the government's policies were unlikely to be selected to serve on the Council.

Moreover, the Council's organization gave the deputies very little hope of overturning or reversing royal policy. The crown-appointed commissaires were the only Council members who had the right to vote. The deputies could speak only if they were called on. And, not only were the deputies subordinate to the commissaires, but the Council was subordinate in turn to the royal ministers to whom it reported, because it did not have the power to issue *arrets*, unlike its predecessor

under Colbert and other royal Councils. Given the way the council was constituted, any expression of opposition by the deputies on the Council might better be interpreted as indicative of views that may have been more widespread than their prevalence in the deputies' *avis* and *memoirs* alone suggests.

Another argument Schaeper puts forward to prove that the Council supported rather than opposed mercantilism, as earlier historians argued, is to equate mercantilism with Colbertism and then to show that the deputies agreed with Colbert's mercantilist policies. In doing this, however, Schaeper ignores French mercantilist policy between the end of Colbert's administration in 1683 and the creation of the Council in 1700. Nevertheless, his own evidence reveals that the deputies' criticisms were aimed at the excessive tariffs and inflexibility of Colbert's successors. (pp. 60, 65) Here Schaeper appears to be grasping at straws to refute earlier historians.

From reading Schaeper and his predecessors, it appears that the records of the Council of Commerce contain evidence to show that its members supported mercantilist policies on many occasions and anti-mercantilist and even liberal economic policies on others. Unfortunately, Schaeper's presentation of the evidence does not resolve or explain the dilemma. Moreover, to show that the majority in the Council supported mercantilist policies does not prove that some of its members did not advance arguments similar to those of the French Enlightenment.

In sum, Schaeper's book raises many questions. It would be the perfect foil to use in a graduate seminar against the works of other historians with whom Schaeper explicitly disagrees, together with the deputies' 1700-1701 memoirs (which can be found transcribed in a 1921 Harvard doctoral dissertation by Laurence B. Packard, "Some Antecedents of the Conseil du Commerce") and with the seven volumes of the *Lettres, instructions et memoires de Colbert* edited by Pierre Clement (Paris: Imprimerie imperiale, 1861 - 1882). Students could be assigned the task of deciding which historian they find most persuasive and presenting evidence to justify their decision.

ANNE C. MEYERING
Michigan State University

B. VOGEL *Allgemeine Gewerbefreiheit Die Reformpolitik des preussischen Staatskanzlers Hardenberg (1810-1820)* Gottingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983, pp. 340.

The essays contained in this volume provide a wide ranging analysis of the origins, nature and results of the reforms which the State Chancellor Karl August Hardenberg sought to promote in Prussia in the early XIXth century. The volume is the fruit of long research on archival and secondary sources and the author has already published a number of essays on aspects of Prussian social and economic

life in the XIXth century [1]. In this new volume she seeks to provide a general interpretation of the period.

The book divides into two sections, and the first of these is concerned with the role of the state in the process of European industrialization, and in particular the characteristics of the 'revolution from above' that were present in the German case, and hence the critical role played by the state bureaucracy and the ways in which it influenced those who held political power. The second part of the book examines individual reforms in greater detail, with particular attention to the measures designed to emancipate economic activity from corporate restraints (*Gewerbefreiheit*), and their consequences for the social and economic structures of Prussia as a whole. The theoretical and practical shortcomings of these reforms are often emphasised [2].

One of the most striking features of Vogel's study is the critical manner in which the author approaches a number of general concepts whose meanings are perhaps too often taken for granted. This is particulary evident in the way that she questions the meanings of the term 'industrialization' and the state's role in this process, together with the notion of a 'revolution from above' which has become established as a general framework of interpretation within which to set Prussian reform policies in this period. This last point takes us both to the heart of a major historiographical issue [3], as well as to the more general arguments that the author

[1] B. Vogel, Die "Allgemeine Gewerbefreiheit" als burokratische Modernisierungsstrategie in Preussen' in D. Stegmann (ed.), *Industrielle Gesellschaft und politisches System* (Festschrift fur F. Fischer) (Bonn, 1978), pp.59-78: 'Revolution von oben' - Der "deutsche Weg" in der burgerliche Gesellschaft?' in *Sozialwissenschaft Information für Unterricht und Studium* vol. VIII 1979 pp.67-74: Id 'Reformpolitik in Preussen in *H. J. Puhle & H. U. Wehler* (eds.), *Preussen im Rückblick*, (Göttingen, 1980), (Geschichte und Gesellschaft, Sonderheft 6, pp. 203- 223.; Id 'Staatsfinanzen und Gesellschaftsreform in Preussen in *H. Bending* (ed.), *Privatkapital, Staatsfinanzen und Reformpolitik im Deutschland der napoleonischen Zeit*, (Ostfildern, 1981), pp.37-57; *Id.* (ed.), *Preussische Reformen 1807-1820*, (Konigstein, 1980).

[2] 'The first part of the study will deal with the aims, objects and results of the reform policies introduced by a small reforming elite, while the second will examine the *Gewerbefreiheit* as an example of a process of modernization promoted, or rather conceded, from "above". B. Vogel, *Die allgemeine Gewerbefreiheit*, (Göttingen, 1983), p. 17

[3] The debate is too wide to permit any simple description, but there is a general division between those who have minimised the economic and above all the social consequences of the reforms (cf. W. M. Simon, *The Failure of the Prussian Reform Movement: 1807-1819* (New York, 1971); E. Klein, *Von der Reform zur Restauration. Finanzpolitik und Reformgesetzgebung des preussischen Staatskanzlers Karl August von Hardenberg* (Berlin, 1965) and those who argue that, despite frequent shortcomings, they did have a greater impact (H. J. Puhle, 'Entwicklung und Fehlentwicklung' in Id & H. U. Wehler (ed.), 1980, op. *cit.*, pp.11-42; Barrington Moore, *Soziale Ursprünge von Diktatur und demokratie*, (Frankfurt, 1969) - and among the others the present author too. The second chapter of the present volume contains fuller bibliographical references.

develops in her essays. She rejects the idea that the reforms can be dismissed as artificial and impracticable because devised and imposed from above, rather than being products of revolutionary change within Prussian society, stressing on the other hand the specific aims of social and economic change that inspired these measures. As a result, her book provides a general revaluation of the nature and consequences of the reforms introduced by Hardenberg and his assistants between 1810 and 1820.

The first part of the author's case is based on a detailed analysis of the relationship between state and society in Prussia, and in particular of the bureaucracy which, constituted the heart of both. She examines the ways in which, from the end of the XVIIIth century, the bureaucracy began to emerge as a class in its own right, which was quite distinct from both the nobility and the bourgeoisie, although its ethos, education and culture remained closest to the aristocracy. But in addition, the bureaucracy's influence in the administration of the Prussian state also expanded rapidly [4].Turning to the concept of the 'revolution from above', the author stresses that the reform programme did not originate within the bureaucracy as a whole, but more specifically within a small group who were from the start quite distinct in terms of their social backgrounds and outlook, from the administration as a whole. The group that came together around Chancellor Hardenberg were not nobles, but nor were they either products of the great schools of public administration which were the pride of the Prussian state. The members of the 'Staatskanzleramt' and the *'Departement für Handelund Gewerbe'* were often seen as parvenues, but they were above all intellectuals with strong political commitment, and specialist skills in economic, financial and social matters. Their guiding belief was the neccessity of bringing Prussia up to date, and they watched with keen interest not only the developments in neighbouring and revolutionary France, but also in Great Britain which provided the model for liberalism and reforms[5].

The reconstruction of the social background of the group that was formed around Hardenberg enables us to understand how it was that a programme which was designed to bring about very radical economic and social change could have originated from the highest echelons of a bureaucracy that enjoyed enormous social, economic and political privileges. And precisely because this programme originated from a specific group, it also aroused fierce opposition within the bureaucracy itself, so that the success of the programme remained largely dependent on the political fortunes of its promotors.

Opposition did not only come from within the ruling class, but also from public opinion which strongly supported the preservation of corporate privileges. The numerous protests made by the urban guilds have, in Vogel's view, served to give a distorted picture of generalized opposition and resistance amongst the artisan workers to the new style of organization that accompanied the 'Gewerbefreiheit':

[4] Cf. chapters 4 & 5 of this volume.

[5] "That they formed a sort of 'brains-trust' constituted in itself an important distinction and meant that they were selected on criteria which differed from other functionaries. Their supervisory role often gave rise to conflicts with the established hierarchy, which in turn encouraged and strengthened the feeling of being an 'outsider' which was evident among many of those who worked in the Staatskanzeleramt" VOGEL, *op. cit.* p. 63.

in fact the opposition came primarily from the strongest of the guilds (the bakers, butchers, and brewers) who were quick to oppose any attempt to reduce their monopolies. These reactions are examined in close detail in the final chapters of the book, which trace the outcome of the individual reforms that Hardenberg introduced between 1810 and 1820.

Taking only the more general aspects of her analysis of these reforms, the author lays particular stress on the links between the agrarian reforms that were introduced at the end of 1808 and the commercial and economic reforms that followed at the end of 1809. While the central role of agrarian reform in the modernization of the Prussian state is generally acknowledged, the 'Agrarreform' of 1808 has generally to be linked to the need to reorganize the army and to prepare for the war of emancipation[6]. But Vogel argues that the agrarian reforms were in fact directly related the the subsequent programme of economic reorganization and *Gewerbefreiheit*[7]. These links, she argues, have never been given their full importance because of the failure to understand that the reform policies were predicated on the quite new belief that the country's development was dependent first and foremost on changing and reorganizing the existing relationship between the primary and secondary sectors of the economy: that is, between the countryside and the cities [8]. It was this that explains why the impact of the reforms was more immediate in the countryside, more delayed in the cities and on the artisan producers. In the countryside, the *Gewerbefreiheit* complemented earlier changes in the relations between the rural masses and the landowners by establishing equality of rights and free labour. This encouraged the expansion of more entrepreneurial forms of farming, including often the creation of new rural industries, which in turn provided increased and more stable incomes for the rural population and also greater productivity as a result of improved methods.

In the case of the urban artisans, on the other hand, the reforms could not provide any immediate solution to an economic sector that was already deeply in crisis. The reforms here served rather to speed up and facilitate changes that were already taking place, thereby contributing to the new economic structure within which industrialization would take place in the 1830s. But even if the reforms did not worsen the situation of the artisan producers, as Hardenberg's opponents claim-

[6]Cf. V. Gropp. *Der Einfluss der Agrarreform des beginnenden 19 Jahrhunderts in Ostpreussen auf Höhe und Zusammensetzung der preussischen Staatseinkünfte*, Berlin 1966: H. Harnisch 'Die agrarpolitischen Reformmassnahmen der preussischen Staatsfuhrung in dem Jahrzehnte 1806/1807' in: *Jahrbuch fur Geschichte* 1975, 2, pp. 57-87.

[7] It has rarely been noticed that "the 'allgemeine Gewebefreiheit'" was also, in addition to the emancipation of the peasants, a necessary step towards resolving the problem of population growth and employment ofter the reorganization of peasant society": B. Vogel *op cit* p. 135.

[8] The term Gewerbe carried a wider meaning in this period than in the later part of the century, embracing 'Agriculture, artisan production, manufacturies, trade, roads, canals and transport' (Stein Nassauer Denkschrift, Juni 1807 quoted in K. F. vom Stein *Briefe und amtliche Schriften* (ed.) W Hubatsch. Bd 2/1, pp 380-403), or virtually every sector of economic activity.

ed, they did little to alleviate the social costs of a structural crisis. Yet at the same time, improved conditions in the countryside, rising real - wage levels amongst rural workers, the removal of obstructions to the free movement of persons and goods, all served to stimulate the internal market, which was in turn to play an important role in the subsequent process of industrialization.

Hardenberg's economic reforms seem therefore to have created a sound basis from which the later industrial expansion of the Prussian economy could draw roots: yet in social terms the reforms were less effective. The attempts to integrate the weaker and more marginal social groups into the structures of a new and nascent capitalist society did not survive Hardenberg's death. Political and administrative leadership then passed to a coalition of bureaucracts, landowners and representatives of a new middle class who proved more interested in consolidating their own political and economic power than in guaranteeing the rights of those who as a result of the *Gewerbefreiheit* had been accorded full rights of citizenship[10].

Both by virtue of the range of source materials on which it draws and also the freshness of the conclusions that it presents, this volume is an important contribution to our understanding of the Prussian reforms during the Napoleonic period. It is above all a deeply researched collection of monographs, which contain a constant series of reflections and observations on established historiographical conclusions, and whose considerable interest and value will be best apreciated by a specialist audience.

ILARIA ZILLI
Naples, Faculty of Maritime Economics

[9] Scharnweber, one of Hardenberg's principal associates, argued that in the not too distant future some two-thirds of the population would be composed of 'wage earners and apprentices', or in other words dependent workers, and that it was therefore the task of the *Gewerbereform* to integrate these people into the structures of production and to transform them from marginal peasants into full citizens.

[10] There is an interesting reference in one of the concluding notes to the fact that during the famous debate in the *Frankfurt Paulskirche* some twenty years later, the distinction between dependent and independent workers was still considered to be sufficiently important to justify giving electoral rights to one but not the other.