

## Urban History Review Revue d'histoire urbaine

URBAN HISTORY REVIEW  
REVUE D'HISTOIRE URBAINE

Slavin, Morris. *The French Revolution in Miniature. Section Droits-de-l'Homme, 1789-1795*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984. Pp. xviii, 449. Illustrations, maps, tables, index. \$55.00 (U.S.)

T. J. A. Le Goff

Volume 14, numéro 1, june 1985

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1017901ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1017901ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

### Éditeur(s)

Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine

### ISSN

0703-0428 (imprimé)

1918-5138 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

### Citer ce compte rendu

Le Goff, T. J. A. (1985). Compte rendu de [Slavin, Morris. *The French Revolution in Miniature. Section Droits-de-l'Homme, 1789-1795*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984. Pp. xviii, 449. Illustrations, maps, tables, index. \$55.00 (U.S.)]. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, 14(1), 89–90. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1017901ar>

ing. But it is far from the last word on the subject. Landlord-tenant relations still await their historian.

Victor M. Batzel  
Department of History  
University of Winnipeg

---

Slavin, Morris. *The French Revolution in Miniature. Section Droits-de-l'Homme, 1789-1795*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984. Pp. xviii, 449. Illustrations, maps, tables, index. \$55.00 (U.S.).

The Paris Section (ward) of Droits de l'Homme — known as Roi-de-Sicile until the overthrow of Louis XVI made its earlier name unfashionable — was at the heart of revolutionary Paris, running eastward from the site of the present-day Bazar de l'Hôtel de Ville department store almost to the Bastille and the famous revolutionary *faubourg* of Saint-Antoine, and northwards from what is now the Rue de Rivoli to cover the southern part of the Marais quarter. It is thought to have been one of the most intensely political Sections and was the home of a famous *enragé*, Jean-François Varlet, one of the prime instigators of the radical risings of 10 August 1792 against the constitutional monarchy and of 31 May 1793 against the National Convention itself. Professor Slavin has spent many years working through the Section's records and has written a sober and solid history of the area and its institutions from 1789 until 1795. This is a useful contribution to the growing literature on the Sections, in the wake of Albert Soboul's monumental study of *Les sans-culottes parisiens en l'An II* and George Rudé's *The Crowd in the French Revolution* (Oxford, 1959), and compares with recent monographs like H. Burstin, *Le Faubourg Saint-Marcel à l'époque révolutionnaire* (Paris, 1983), R. Monnier, *Le Faubourg Saint-Antoine* (Paris, 1981), François Gendron, *La Jeunesse dorée* (Québec, 1979), the articles of R.H. Andrews on the political personnel of revolutionary Paris, and Barry Rose, *The Enragés* (Melbourne, 1966) and *The Making of the Sans-culottes* (Manchester, 1983). For the general reader and the undergraduate, Professor Slavin's work has the added advantage that, like Rudé's and Rose's studies, it constantly refers the reader back to the general framework of revolutionary politics at both the national and Paris levels and thus can be read as a synthesis of the political history of radical Paris down to 1795. These intense struggles are covered in French treatments, but are insufficiently known to the regrettably growing army of unilingual English-speaking students.

This constant shifting from the local to the municipal and national scene appears to have been forced on Professor Slavin in part by the patchy nature of his records, but also perhaps because, despite its reputation, not a great deal seems

to have happened in Section Droits-de-l'Homme. Varlet started his career there, but for him it was more a spring-board (or sounding-board) than a political base; it was in the putchist committee of the Evêché that he flourished. In this account, the neighbourhood played no outstanding part in the siege of the Bastille, practically on its doorstep, nor in the agitation outside the nearby Hôtel de Ville, which led to the march to Versailles in the October Days of 1789. When the crowds invaded the Tuileries on 20 June 1792, threatening the Royal Family and creating general havoc, the section's National Guardsmen were rather embarrassed, and helped to restore order in the palace. Even after the section assembly was opened to poorer citizens, it could not bring itself to join wholeheartedly in the insurrection which toppled the monarchy on 10 August of that year. In the new political climate, the radicals occasionally got a majority together in the thinly-attended section meetings (on 27 March 1793 they sparked a movement to set up an insurrectionary committee which eventually masterminded the anti-parliamentary rising of 31 May), but the section only took a decisive radical stance after its assembly was packed with militants from other, more committed, sections in mid-May, in time for the *coup* against the Gironde. The next year, true to form, they wavered again when it was time to save Robespierre. The section's elected representatives prudently showed no enthusiasm for the doomed sans-culotte risings of Germinal and Prairial of the Year III (April-May 1795), and, like most of the other Sections, missed out on the abortive royalist rising of Vendémiaire (October 1795) (they were otherwise occupied, by a massive jailbreak at the prison of La Force).

What lay behind this long tale of indecision and inaction — massive indifference or fierce hung battles? Professor Slavin rightly tries to link the political struggles in the Section to neighbourhood social structures and conflicts. His analysis of the social background of the men in power as justices of the peace and as members of the civil committees, revolutionary committees, and other organs of the revolution shows that Droits-de-l'Homme conformed pretty much to the general Parisian pattern: an influx of lawyers in the period of the constitutional monarchy, with its limited franchise and relatively liberal political system; somewhat less legal men during the radical phase from the autumn of 1792 to 1795. The average age level of participants in section government declined as the Revolution advanced, and during the radical phase, the revolutionary committee, as elsewhere, tended to be recruited from farther down the social scale and among younger age groups than the men in the other organs of revolutionary power.

But what lay behind these changes is not readily apparent, as Professor Slavin would himself admit. Droits-de-l'Homme was a strange neighbourhood. Like the Saint-Germain quarter, its money — noble wealth — deserted it in the first years of the Revolution, with presumably disastrous effects on the local economy. What was left was a heteroge-

neous population of about one-quarter to one-third bourgeois (predominantly rentiers, landowners and legal men) and the rest mainly artisans. The latter cannot be said to have been concentrated in any one occupation, except perhaps for the building trades. This was unlike the situation in the nearby Saint-Antoine quarter where, if we are to believe R.M. Andrews, the preponderance and structure of the furniture and related trades created a solidarity of habit, dependence and interest between the local artisans and the wealthy master-craftsmen of the section. When the chance came, these characteristics made it easier to build a local Jacobin political machine there. Though Professor Slavin does not suggest this, it is possible that the more heterogeneous social mix in Droits-de-l'Homme hampered similar developments, making the section on the one hand more turbulent and accessible to fringe politicians like Varlet, but on the other, more fragile and susceptible to takeovers from the left or the right. In Droits-de-l'Homme, Professor Slavin interprets the influx of younger artisans into the revolutionary committees in 1793-4 as a sign of the retreat of the properties, wealthier and employing classes from power. But there were still some pretty solid citizens in power, even on the local revolutionary committee, dominated by two jewelers, one merchant-jeweler, a *traiteur*, a building contractor (*maçon entrepreneur*), a surgeon-dentist, etc. Might not the composition of the revolutionary committee in 1793-4 bear witness, not to a takeover from below, but to a similar but more timid attempt at a coalition of employers and dependent artisans under the banner of *sans-culottism* as was found in Saint-Antoine; its aim, to oust the legal and rentier élites which predominated before 1792?

And what of the role of plain fear in generating revolutionary conformity? Given what was going on at the nearby Commune and in some of the neighbouring sections, it is no surprise to find that Droits-de-l'Homme was the sort of neighbourhood where quick footwork was the supreme civic virtue. In this, it might be added, Droits-de-l'Homme was less anomalous than it might seem. Even the Gravilliers section, to the north-west, famous as the home grounds of the arch-*enragé* Jacques Roux, proved as fickle to its martyr-hero as Droits-de-l'Homme was to Varlet. On 25 June 1793, the activists in Roux's section assembly had unanimously backed his truculent rebuke to the Jacobin-dominated Convention for failing to guarantee the poor a proper food supply. Only a few days later, at the urging of Danton's man, Léonard Bourdon, the section meeting denounced his initiative; they could take a hint. But Professor Slavin's ward politicians are above such considerations: they are the sort who "embrace the peoples' cause" (p. 83); they are mightily impressed, we are told, by the Feast of Reason in Notre-Dame because "the minutes of the assembly, read in the Commune" say so (p. 358).

Without denying the need to take account of genuine revolutionary idealism and naiveté, it might be suggested that to account properly for the often anomalous behaviour of

this and other sections would have required a willingness to treat revolutionary rhetoric, and ritual protestations of poverty and revolutionary purity with more scepticism than is shown here. It would also demand a more flexible prosopographical method — and a documentation which in this case was perhaps not available — linking the study of the individual revolutionary personnel not only to their general social milieu but also to the networks of parentage and clientele in which eighteenth-century people moved.

T.J.A. Le Goff  
Department of History  
York University

---

Logan, Kathleen. *Haciendo Pueblo: The Development of a Guadajarán Suburb*. University: The University of Alabama Press, 1984. Pp. xiv, 141. 3 maps, 15 black and white plates, index. \$16.00 (U.S.).

*Haciendo Pueblo* ('Building a Community') is a monograph dealing with the development of a lower income Mexican suburb called Sta. Cecilia with special emphasis on the position and political actions of women. Logan examines the history, economic life and social organization of this new settlement established on the outskirts of Guadalajara in 1968 and compares it with other low income neighbourhoods or "slum" areas of other large Latin American cities. Special attention is paid to how the inhabitants of Sta. Cecilia have attempted and partially succeeded in overcoming the problems associated with building their own community (both as a physical site and a network of human interaction), making a living in an urban context and solving such problems as severe water shortages and inadequate government services.

*Haciendo Pueblo's* introductory chapter describes the process of urbanization in Latin America in general, including its numerous squatter settlements. Chapter two describes how the suburb of Sta. Cecilia grew up on the outskirts of Guadalajara in the wider context of the development of modern Mexico. This is followed by a more detailed treatment of the economy, social life and the two institutions that are the most influential in Sta. Cecilia — the municipal government of Guadalajara and the Catholic Church. The last section of the book analyzes the role of a well-funded community development agency called *Accion Comunidad* originally founded by a group of architecture students and subsequently administered by young professionals of middle class background.

The author, who spent more than two years living in the community under investigation, makes a number of observations which reinforce the findings of previous studies of