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will. To come to any other conclusion it would be necessary to examine the city's elite more closely than does Preston to determine the extent to which they shaped the Southern urban ethos. Studies of Atlanta after World War II by Floyd Hunter and Kent Jennings have depicted an unusually unified ruling class who presumably played a major role in reshaping Atlanta as an automotive metropolis. They are but shadows in Preston's work. The city-building process is for him largely self-generating, with an occasional boost from the more vocal members of the chamber of commerce and motor clubs.
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Tony Judt's attack on that grandfather of French historical institutions—*les Annales*—gives pause to the Canadian urban or business historian, especially since Judt is both a socialist historian and an historian of French Socialism. An examination of three recent French monographs treating labour, urban, and business history may permit an evaluation of Judt's criticisms.

Leaving aside Judt's particular disdain for the histories of Charles Tilly and Edward Shorter, his criticisms of modern *Annalesistes* are fourfold: their over-reliance on the simplistic and unhistorical explanations of anthropologists and sociologists, or what Judt calls their urge to "anthropologize history"; the well-known French penchant for structural history in which the common people become "passive and stable"; a Braudel-inspired tendency for such a long global view that historical events, the narrative, and the fundamental historical process are ignored in favor of a "glut" of "minute and marginal matters" such as the colour of eyes in the first empire; and, finally, the accusation that the *Annalesistes* neglect their founders' admonition to begin with well-defined historical problems. The result of the latter is an ultimate denial of class and ideology.

In his history of the Norman city of Caen, Jean-Claude Perrot

---


2 The importance given by French historians to Claude Lévi-Strauss and Braudel's emphasis on Georges Gurvitch are examples of this tendency.
cannot be accused of neglecting the problem. In classic Annaliste form, Perrot confirms his confidence in fonctionnalisme and in la science urbaine, places his subject in its economic and demographic context, and then sets out to show the relationship of ideology to the urban reality. Two volumes later, Perrot is still insisting that Caen is a city whose eighteenth-century experience represents the victory of an all-dominant merchant capitalism. The century symbolizes the end of religious domination in Caen, the secularization of its structures, the removal of its religious symbols and even its cemetery—all of which were replaced by institutions of profit.

A Norman city with a population of over 30,000 in 1789, Caen is an example of a second-rank French city, a centre of regional, commercial, and administrative importance. Unlike Paris or nearby Rouen, Caen escaped industrialism and thus represents a relatively pure instance of pre-industrial institutions. This permits important comparisons of its barracks, poorhouses, prisons, couting-houses, bishops palaces, and law courts with early nineteenth-century Montreal, a city likewise gripped by seigneurial tradition, merchant wealth, and clerical power. After the mandatory chapter on geography, replete with landform, soils, tides, and floods, Perrot details the local population and social classes, as well as immigration and emigration, marriage statistics, and the treatment of vagabondage. Of particular interest, because of its Canadian imitations, is the important contribution to emigration from Caen of orphans being dispatched to rural wetnurses. Montreal, Quebec City, Halifax and Kingston were important garrison towns, and the historian of these centres can make comparisons with Caen, the marriage rate of its soldiers, and the social influence of its officers. Penniless migrants and beggars were a problem in eighteenth-century Caen: the men were shipped to the galleys, women were whipped.

The French, of course, specialize in the consumption and study of food, and Perrot is no exception. Using municipal and hospital records, Perrot examines milk production, the types of bread, cider consumption (and its effect on facial colour!), and the relationship of food production and industry location. Since the transportation of food for workers was the heaviest transport item in the pre-industrial period, industries clustered in areas of food surplus. Nor will social historians want for raw data concerning the relationship of the numbering of houses to developing literacy, the transfer of profession from father to son (50% in 1790), or the social effects of technological innovation, and the resistance of guilds and families to technical change. Perrot's conclusions concerning the textile industry's relative lack of success in Caen are interesting. The production of food was so entrenched, he argues, that enclosure or wool production could not be imposed. Nor would local peasants accept textile work except in periods when low grain prices forced them to augment family income. Finally, the richness of local agricultural life attracted bourgeois capital into rural investments.

If merchant capitalism is Perrot's dominant theme, Yves Lequin concentrates on the working
class of Lyon, 1848-1914, and, within a regional context, studies the dialectic between class and nation. (Judt, incidentally, specifically excludes Lequin from his criticisms.) Whereas Caen was peripheral, pre-industrial and rural, the Lyon region was central, heavily industrialized, and highly urbanized. Lyon's population was 177,796 in 1846 with the local silk industry employing 40,000. There were 31,000 ribbon-makers in the surrounding region and 7,400 coal miners. Unlike Caen, the Lyon region had a surplus population, and its bourgeoisie invested its capital in industrial production. But in 1848 the demarcation was not sharp between rural and industrial work; production units were small; the worker often remained on the farm, and in some cases they controlled the means of production. Urban domination took another form. "Lyon projected its dynamism into often-distant villages and rather than workers migrating to industry, it was industry which went to the workers" (I, pp. 43, 45).

By 1914 the Lyon region was characterized by increasing industrial diversification into steel, glass, chemicals, and automobiles, by increasing technology, and by the replacement of the atelier or workshop by the factory. Even today a drive along the Gier River from St. Étienne towards Lyon gives an impression of tidy and depressing nineteenth-century factories. The muscle for these mills, foundries, and factories came not from the agricultural sector, which was still expanding, but from industries in decline, from female and child labour reservoirs, and from migrant Italian workers. For like Perrot, Lequin emphasizes the great strength of French agriculture. Even in the heavily industrialized Lyon area, industry functioned in the shadow of agriculture and followed its seasons and cycles: "c'est l'agriculture qui mène le jeu" (I, pp. 156-7). Again, as in the Caen example, Lequin emphasizes the overwhelming strength of the father's occupation in the choice of the son's, neither marriage nor mobility broke the general rule that workers' offspring followed their parents into the factory.

It is in volume two that Lequin emphasizes the bleakness of the Lyon industrial experience and the daily reality of class. Children worked sixteen hours a day in the coal mines, and some, exhausted, were carried to factory doors by their mothers. If Lyon is the city of haute cuisine for its bourgeoisie, its workers survived largely on bread (a kilo a day). In the mid-nineteenth century workers understood their exploitation, as a Lyon judge put it, in terms of "the antagonism of labour and capital" and expressed their dissatisfaction in strikes, unions, and strong mutual-aid societies. But the Lyon worker's class militancy was always diluted by his regionalism and his patriotism. Faced with a choice between their Communist union's anti-militarism and their national uniform, the Lyon worker chose the latter, "proof that the working class, despite its organizations and ideologies, could not escape the mainstream of national thought, the proclamation of internationalism did not overcome the permanent reality of a latent xenophobia" (II, p. 319).

Louis Bergeron's study of Parisian bankers, merchants, and manufacturers gives yet another perspective on French capitalism. Bergeron's work divides into four
themes: the social and spatial network of the great Parisian capitalists in the post-Revolution years, the evolution of the Bank of France into commercial banking, the role of Paris in the emergence of the cotton textile industry, and the adaptation of Parisian capitalists to economic cycles and their deep roots in property investment. One of Bergeron's repeated arguments is that "at least at the level of Parisian big business, it is only a schoolboy who would imagine any conflict between land and stock investment" (p. 9). This insistence is interesting given the debate among Montreal urban historians as to the relationship of landed wealth and industrialization. According to Bergeron, rich Parisians, aided by their dominant wealth, their access to central political power, and their ability to adapt to changing circumstances, easily made the transition to industrial capitalism. Bergeron has, however, what he calls a "constant impression of ambiguity" concerning this movement to industrialism (p. 212). Bankers were involved with merchants, arms manufacturers, and textile producers at all levels as owners of factory buildings, as shareholders, or as company treasurers. The most important relationship between Parisian banks and industry was in mining. Some of the greatest French fortunes, based largely on property in Paris, were among the first to invest heavily in the cotton industry.

Certainly Perrot, Lequin, and Bergeron all exhibit the traditional Amaliste attention to geographic and economic determinism, and French historians have used Marxist terminology for a generation. But Judt may be correct in discerning less emphasis on class and ideology. French intellectuals have seen the reforms of 1968 steadily eroded. This very school year has been marked by a Giscardian attack on universities. At the same time the French Communist Party, the obvious political expression for intellectuals of the Left, has been undergoing a long agony of sclerosis and Stalinism (witness the Jean Ellenstein case). Judt's plaint may emphasize the renewed power of the Right and the resulting timidity of socialist intellectuals in the university and in politics.
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