Even with the provision of much new information, Burnett has missed a number of opportunities in preparing this new edition. The text could have been streamlined in the innumerable passages where it bogs down into virtual compendia of house types, room measurements, construction costs, and so on. Burnett and his publishers should have taken a cue from Lawrence Stone and thought seriously about the many virtues of an abridged edition. The inclusion of a bibliography would have also added to the usefulness of the work, especially for students. More could have been done with the social dimensions of the subject, although this admittedly would have required substantial revisions and amendations. But it is, after all, a "social history". As it stands, Burnett covers only two themes in any depth — the types and the locations of homes characteristic of specific social groups. Richard Rodger, in his Housing in Urban Britain 1780-1914 (Basingstoke, 1989), gives an excellent overview of some of the topics Burnett might have included or at least dealt with in more detail. Among them are possible relationships between housing density and various social phenomena (like riots and suicides); housing as a socio-political issue, both locally and nationally; and the changing impact of company housing, migration and railways on urban and suburban housing trends.

Who should buy this book? Libraries and researchers that have an interest in this field and do not own the first edition should, by all means, purchase the second. It remains a fine scholarly treatment of its subject with many insightful observations. Of those who own the original edition, only large research libraries and specialists in the history of British housing should consider buying this new offering. Their money would be better spent on recent works by some of the other authors mentioned above.

Robert Glen University of New Haven

* * *

Robert Carlisle — The Proffered Crown: Saint-Simonianism and the Doctrine of Hope. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987. Pp. xii, 269.

After the death of Henri Saint-Simon, in 1825, several young men banded together to promote his ideas. Some were former Carbonari; others bankers and polytechniciens. Many had suffered socially from the prejudices of bourgeois society; illegitimate sons, sons of bankrupt fathers and Jews were joined later by women and workers. Over the next seven years, the Saint-Simonians developed a doctrine based on liberation from the constraints which inheritance and repressive codes of sexual behavior placed on society and individuals. A meritocracy of engineers, financiers and the like would administer society in the best interest of all producers; the dissociation of property and sexual relationships would usher in an era of personal fulfillment through serial monogomy. The Saint-Simonians proclaimed a religion which embodied the emotional inspiration for the creation of a new organic society based on co-operation and association. They spread their message through newspapers, numerous pamphlets and missionary preaching. The first phase of the Saint-Simonian movement ended in 1832, when leaders of the movement were found guilty of various infractions and given prison terms. The Saint-Simonians are usually remembered, now, because several went on to have prominent careers during the July Monarchy and the Second Empire.

Robert Carlisle has researched and written on the Saint-Simonians for more than thirty years; in his important new study of the movement between 1825 and 1832, he is primarily concerned with historiographic debates over Saint-Simonianism whose contours were set by the 1950s. Did Saint-Simonian doctrine break in certain fundamental ways with the teachings of Saint Simon? Was the Saint-Simonian leader, Prosper Enfantin, a bizarre megalomaniac or an important social thinker? Were Georg Iggers and Hannah Arendt right to see the Saint-Simonians as the forerunners of twentieth-century totalitarian movements? Can Saint-Simonian doctrine be divided into practical and fantastical dimensions — and the successful Saint-Simonians of the Second Empire be identified as those who spurned the latter for the former (as some of them intimated)? Did Saint-Simonians and/or Saint-Simonian doctrine have an important impact on the development of the French economy in the nineteenth century?

On the whole, Carlisle's answers to these questions are sensible and wellargued, although some require further exploration. On the issue of continuity, Carlisle points out that the roots of Saint-Simonian ideas of technocratic administration and an accompanying religion can be found in Saint-Simon's writings. Noting that Saint-Simon had little to say about either railways or women, Carlisle claims that Enfantin's Fourier-influenced ideas about sexuality and the need for a priest and priestess to administer sexual life (in the way that engineers and bankers would organize industrial development) are as much a natural development of Saint Simon's thought as expanded transportation systems. However, one suspects that had Saint Simon himself been around for Enfantin's mission to search for the woman-messiah, he would have said, to paraphrase Karl Marx on French Marxists, that all he knew was that he was not a Saint-Simonian. While Carlisle makes occasional reference to Saint-Simonian "silliness", he rarely allows himself the bemused tone which enlivens many other accounts of Saint-Simonianism. Carlisle is particularly kind to Enfantin. Where others have seen a self-centered manipulative man who broke brutally with individual followers, Carlisle presents a sensitive therapist who cut off relations with his apostles only when he had determined it was for their own good.

Carlisle rightly eschews efforts to divide Saint-Simonian thought into "practical" industrial and "utopian" sexual and religious components. He adjusts static chronologies of the Saint-Simonian movement by pointing out that the private discussions Saint-Simonians had among themselves were not necessarily reflected in their contemporaneous public pronouncements and often prepared the way for future developments. However, Carlisle should have made clear that if many future "practical" Saint-Simonians did not break with Enfantin over the issues of religion and sexuality, they also failed to take the active role in formulating this element of Saint-Simonian doctrine which they did in promoting railways and public works.

Questions concerning the legacy of the Saint-Simonians are at once easier and more difficult to answer. Carlisle correctly dismisses 1950s portraits of Saint-Simonians as forerunners of various forms of totalitarianism as anachronistic and based on poor scholarship. He prefers to see the Saint-Simonians as radical bourgeois who advocated fundamental change in order to realize liberal ideals like reward of merit. However, Carlisle — an affirmed Saint-Simonian sympathizer — is perhaps insufficiently sensitive to the limitations and dangers of institutions which he identifies as Saint-Simonian in nature. Carlisle cites "the relations of present-day Western banks with Third World economies" as an example of Saint-Simonian economics realized (78); yet, such relationships embody problems well worth recognizing. And

his question, later on the same page, "But is Enfantin's solution any more grim that Foucault's understanding of liberal society's prisons as a paradigm of the way all social life ought to be?" is either garbled Foucault or an awfully weak endorsement of Enfantin's social vision. Carlisle neatly responds to criticisms of the Saint-Simonians as soulless technocrats by arguing that their avowed humanitarianism should relieve them of such charges. Yet, how their "scientism" and their vision of the good society — to use the terms of contemporary social theorists — come together is never quite clear; Carlisle could have sharpened his exposition of Saint-Simonian thought by analyzing this aspect more critically.

The legacy of the Saint-Simonian movement to the economy of nineteenth-century France has been the most hotly debated historiographic issue concerning the group. While much of Carlisle's work since his 1957 dissertation on the Saint-Simonians and the Paris-Lyon railroad has focused on this question, it is only a sub-theme of *The Proffered Crown*. Barrie Ratcliffe doubts that Saint-Simonian thought influenced French economic development or that the Saint-Simonian experience had a significant impact on former Saint-Simonians' economic activities. Carlisle supports the more conventional argument that Saint-Simonian thought was an important element in French economic development; he offers a more radical reading of the influence of the Saint-Simonian experience by stressing the unity of all elements of Saint-Simonian ideology rather than singling out plans for railways or joint-stock companies.

I lean toward Carlisle's interpretion of the lifelong impact of youthful immersion in Saint-Simonian thought, but would stress two additional elements that shaped their later economic activities. First, through the Saint-Simonian experience, many individuals formed close and longstanding relationships which themselves facilitated later economic activities. Second, Saint-Simonians who remained in lifelong contact sifted through their experiences; their later economic activities must be analyzed in light of these re-evaluations. I agree with Ratcliffe that wide-ranging claims about the impact of Saint-Simonian ideology on the development of the French economy may need reassessment in light of recent work in French economic history.

The Proffered Crown is a careful intellectual history which will be recognized as the standard history of Saint-Simonianism (through 1832). There are, of course, many other avenues for historians of Saint-Simonianism to explore. One is to approach the movement from the angle of women and proletarians, the privileged targets of Saint-Simonian thought. Several historians, including Joan Moon and Claire Moses, have examined Saint-Simonian women, a subject Carlisle addresses indirectly from the perspective of Saint-Simonian ideas of sexuality. (Enfantin's exultation of the "feminine" had the immediate effect of reducing the power of individual women in the movement.) Jacques Rancière has assessed relations between bourgeois and workers in the Saint-Simonian movement and seen in them the fundamental stresses which ideologies of labour would create in all socialist movements. James Briscoe's work implicitly questions Carlisle's Enfantin-centered vision of Saint-Simonianism. Briscoe situates Saint-Simonian ideology within wider currents of contemporary social thought and identifies a transformation, particularly among the Saint-Simonians who broke with Enfantin in late 1831, from a division of society into travailleurs and oisifs to a more class-centered division into prolétaires and bourgeois in the years of social conflict following the Revolution of 1830.

Another promising approach would be to compare the Saint-Simonians and a radical youth group of another period such as the French Maoists of the late 1960s and early 1970s. (This particular pairing can be seen as the underlying premise of Rancière's work.) For the Maoists, the École normale supérieure played a somewhat analagous role to the École polytechnique for the Saint-Simonians; their ambivalent relationship to the events of May 1968 is reminiscent of the Saint-Simonians' attitude to the Revolution of 1830. As with the Saint-Simonians of the Second Empire, one can also see the post-Maoist careers of many one-time Maoists as rooted in the exhilirating aspirations and painful "lessons" of their groupuscule years. And several former Maoists, including Serge July of Libération, have been successful in pioneering new types of cultural dissemination, arguably the late twentieth-century parallel to the nineteenth-century Saint-Simonians' enthusiasm for new forms of communication through canals and railways.

Donald Reid University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

* * *

Richard Flacks — Making History: The Radical Tradition in American Life. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988. Pp. xii, 313.

Out of the chasm between History and our own lives grows the fantasy that we can escape History or the dream that we can make it for ourselves. For each person, each morning, the hope of escape is the more rational one, because it is far more manageable...Accordingly, the alternative dream — that today we can make History — is inescapably not going to be spontaneously experienced or readily accepted by very many (especially if, as is often the case, entertaining that alternative might actually ruin your day.) Yet, that alternative is at the heart of the left tradition (284).

The strength and the appeal of this sociologist's commentary on the current political situation in the United States is a readiness to get to human basics. As this excerpt will show, we are led to think political reality through until we are able to see it as daily life. "History" in this book really means what Aristotle meant by "Politics". And like Aristotle, Flacks sees everything mundane in its political dimension.

It fits this vision that Flacks has given us generous portions of autobiography. He tells us that he was one of those "red-diaper" babies of the 30s, raised in "that peculiar New York Jewish milieu...in which one took for granted a concern for politics" (vi). His parents were American Communists, who, of course, lost their teaching jobs in the 1950s. By the time that national politics turned radical again, Flacks was a young academic, in place to be a mentor to the founders of the Students for a Democratic Society. Though he admits to strong nostalgia about the SDS days, he says he does not regret the withering away of all of the "institutional left". He accepts that the New Deal, which his parents in their time taught him to despise, and the Great Society, which he in turn taught the youth of the Sixties to despise, in fact accomplished so much real "democratization" of American life that the masses cannot be led anymore by Parties, nor by any other kind of institution.