movement centred itself on maternal education and efforts as the best long-term solution, Dwork explicitly defends this emphasis from feminist criticism. She asserts that working-class women wanted maternal and infant health centres in their neighbourhoods, and that therefore they must have favoured this emphasis on "mothercraft." (216-17) In defending "maternalism", Dwork implicitly agrees with its loaded message of women's responsibility being to stay home and give infants the proper feeding and attention they need. Surely women wanted medical and municipal help in dealing with infant diseases, but they may also have wanted help with improving their standard of living through facilities which allowed them to be employed. Further, they may have wanted jobs which paid decent wages without wearing them down so much that they could not look after their children.

Angela Woollacott
Case Western Reserve University

* * *

S.N. Eisenstadt, L. Roniger, A. Seligman, eds—*Centre Formation, Protest Movements, and Class Structure in Europe and the United States*. New York: New York University Press, 1987. Pp. 187.

Ira Katznelson, Aristide Zolberg, eds — *Working-Class Formation: Nineteenth-century Patterns in Western Europe and the United States*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986. Pp. viii, 470.

Eisenstadt, Roniger, and Seligman have collaborated on a book which is frustrating at best. Those historians who have a tendency to avoid theory will find this book a confirmation of their worst prejudices. This is unfortunate not only because it will further discourage those historians from theoritical exploration which could inform their work, but also because it may lead them to ignore some of the useful insights which this work contains.

The organizing concept of these essays is the "civilization approach" which assumes that the social context of political institutions and the symbolic meaning people give to those institutions, particularly assumptions of authority, justice, and the place of political activity in the overall conception of human action is important in determining the nature of those political institutions. There is a little here that most historians would either disagree with or find particularly new, although many of us will be disturbed by the author's propensity to downplay the significance of capitalism. These authors share the tendency of putting the character of the state, social institutions, or ideology ahead of economic structures with many contemporary sociologists and political scientists.

A second organizing concept behind these essays is the structuring of centre-periphery relations. The authors theorize that most of modern Europe and the United States had their centres constructed through a revolutionary process so that protest and struggle had certain legitimization within the symbolic and rhetorical ideology of the centre. Again this is not something most historians will find original. It has been an issue of some concern for American historians at least since the publication of the federalist Papers. However, most historians will have difficulty with the attempt to lift these basic concepts to the level of mega-theory. In the process the essays try to link the basic concepts of legitimization and symbolic coherence to tensions between the transcendental and mundane worlds as incorporated within western traditions stretching back to the first millennium before Christian era.

It is argued here that the symbolic traditions established in that millennium before the Christian era, centered around a basic tension between the transcendental and the mundane order, and that central to the organization of the centre was the ideological and structural attempts to reconstruct the imperfect mundane world in order to approach the transcendental ideal. Using this basic framework the authors of the various essays look at a series of sociological historians in comparative analysis in order to try and resolve some of the apparent contradictions presented by the problems.

Unfortunately in moving from theory to practice, much is lost. Often the authors use as references historical and sociological work which most historians will find dated and problematic, or use them in such a way as to miss the intent of their original argument. At other times, the comparisons combine both sweeping historical generalizations with a minutia of detail only vaguely connected to the general theory. The juxtaposition of historical detail and sweeping mega-theory made reading exceedingly difficult, and left this reader unimpressed with the larger theoretical orientation.

Yet there was a great deal of value buried within this work. The centre-periphery concept has something to offer historians as an organizing device for understanding particular national historical change. Although most of us readily accept the idea that ideology, legitimacy, and symbols of national identity as well as class structure and political organization are important in understanding historical continuity and change, however, the insistence of the authors of these essays on that interrelationship is an important note to us all.

Ira Katznelson and Aristide Zolberg have collected a series of essays that most historians will find more useful. The essays collected here address the question of working class formation in western Europe and the United States. Although Katznelson and Zolberg accept the importance of theory — using theory as a tool for recovering history, they also note that "theory is arid if not historically grounded." The authors of this volume want something that will "make sense of a series of comparative and historical puzzles about similarities and variations in the dynamics and character of class relations in different societies, and to provide...the tools to ask systematic questions about historical variations and their causes. Theory in short should help us to build on the insights of the best recent scholarship" (13).

The questions Katznelson, et al, address center around class formation. They are particularly interested in the problematic area surrounding the Marxian distinction between a class of itself, that is class which is understood in structural terms, i.e., the social relations of production — workers relationship to the means of production, ownership of the tools of production, control over materials of production, markets, etc., and a class for itself, that is class which is understood in terms of conciousness. The authors of this work divided class into four categories in order to provide a better theoretical handle on the concept. They argue that at one level class can be understood structurally — in macroeconomic terms. Class also happens as lived experiences at work and at home. Moreover class at another level is a disposition to act in class ways. At the fourth level it can be represented as class-based collective action.

Using this four-part theoretical framework the authors look at class formation in France, Germany, and the United States. They are interested in the way particulars of the historical experience of producers in these countries contributed to their unique working class form. (England because of its historic role as a leader in industrialization and class formation as well as its role in the literature maintains a constant presence in these essays.) The student of working class history will find much of value in these essays. The authors bring together a massive amount of research in broad synthetic essays.

Although this reviewer felt that the four levels of class used in this volume are not a significant advancement beyond the class of itself – class for itself concept already familiar to most Marxists, the insistence that we should see class in both structural and human agency terms is an important addition to present scholarly discussion of class. Historians tend to fleetingly refer to the importance of both definitions of class (seen usually as co-determination) and then quickly sink into an exclusive use of one or the other — human agency usually dominating the English speaking world while structural determinism dominating the continent. If Katznelson's four levels provide a vehicle for moving scholarship toward an understanding of class which is both structural and voluntarist, then this volume of essays will certainly have a major impact on the study of class formation. The essays included in this volume succeed in linking together structural and cultural and consciousness elements in their analysis of class formation. They should become a model for future research.

I had minor problems with each of essays in the Katznelson, Zolberg collection. Alain Cottereau's essay on France makes much of the determining nature of the demography of France — its

low birth rate and limited immigration. Is it because France lacked industrial manufacturing jobs, or did France lack these jobs because of a lack of immigration? Both pieces on America exaggerated the availability of the American franchise. Immigrants did not have easy access to the polls. Residence requirements, citizenship, poll taxes in several states, age requirements, as well as racial and sexual discrimination kept a large segment of working population in America out of the political process. The fact that voter registration was controlled by existing political parties who were not at all eager to open the polls meant that immigrants let into the political process were carefully selected. The urban machines had no interest in enrolling massive numbers of immigrants as registered voters. Much of the success of the machine was due to their ability to deliver rewards to the older established immigrant or native neighborhoods. One way they did this was through control over the center city wards where large numbers of non-registered immigrants lived. These were the machine's rotten boroughs which facilitated control of the city by the machines. The thesis that American capitalists found an accommodation with labor unions in the pre-New Deal era will not bear close scrutiny. Most unionized American workers before the 1930s were in the building trades, or small craft shops. These were not the centers of American capital. AFL unions managed to force small entrepreneurs to an accommodation not American capital. Except for a short period during the First World War, American capital did not accept any accommodation with American labor. Also the distinction between manufacturing capitalism and industrial capitalism used by Jurgen Kocka should have been used in several of the other pieces.

Adam Seligman in the Eisenstadt, Roniger and Seligman volume addresses the issue of the failure of socialism in America. The same problem is also addressed by Shefter and Zolberg in the Katznelson, Zolberg collection. It is a tiresome issue. The discussion of it which commonly centers around American exceptionalism usually ends up focusing on the relative wealth of American workers, their mobility, the open frontier, the early opportunity to vote available to Americans, and/or the presence of immigrants. Most of these explanations fall flat under examination. Other countries with socialist parties had frontiers, mobility, and immigrants. Wealth is a difficult issue to evaluate particularly when trying to compare standards of living among workers in different countries. As previously stated, the opportunity to vote was hardly as universal as implied by these works. To their credit the authors of the American essays in the Katznelson – Zolberg collection point out that most of the studies of why there was no successful socialist party in America fail to note the obvious. American workers were a small minority of the voting population throughout the ninetheenth century. Most of our working class were immigrants; many of them were transients who had little possibility of being able to vote. That sector of the working class who could vote, the naturalized or native born skilled workers were no less drawn to socialism than their European equivalents. Socialism had its best success in America where it could succeed, that is in municipal or local elections in manufacturing cities. By 1914 American socialism looked surprisingly strong. The historical problematic is not why America has no socialism, but what happened between 1914 and 1932. This is a question which has been addressed by historians but generally ignored by social theorists. The question which these theorists ignore is why working class voters tend to get much the same kind of results whether they vote for a labor party or the Democratic party. Or phrased another way why has socialism failed in Europe.

Zolberg rightly notes that "the exceptionalist problematic entails a distortion of reality that has long misguided research in this field." "This way of addressing the question gets us off to a bad start because it exaggerates the range of variation in the political orientation of various segments of the working class, within and between countries..." (454). That is not to say that comparative analysis is not useful, nor that there are not differences in national historical experiences of workers or in the creation of working classes. Both of these works point to the importance of understanding history in a transnational context, and in developing theories which can help us understand historical events and variations.

Although this reviewer found Eisenstadt's, Roniger's, and Seligman's book less convincing than Katznelson's and Zolberg's, Eisenstadt, Roniger, and Seligman do draw our attention to the issue of legitimacy and ideology which the writers in the Katznelson and Zolberg downplay. The

issue of legitimacy is important. It frames the structure of discourse, and discourse is central to ideology and struggle. Although most social historians will find the Katznelson and Zolberg collection more useful, there is something of value in both these works and they should both be read with care.

John T. Cumbler
University of Louisville

* * *

Jean Favier — *De l'or et des épices: Naissance de l'homme d'affaires au Moyen Âge*. Paris: Librairie Arthème Fayard, 1987. Pp. 482.

Jean Favier is a well-known French medievalist, professor at the Sorbonne, director of the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, and Director General of the French archives. In *De l'or et des épices* Favier teaches a general audience that the truly professional businessman evolved in the western civilization during the later Middle Ages and established the capitalist commercial civilization that in the author's eyes defines Europe. The book is thus the needed historical prelude to the familiar work of Fernand Braudel, for Favier here sets out origins for the system treated in that master's great *Civilization and Capitalism : 15th-18th century* (tr. S. Reynolds, 3 vols., London, 1981-84; originally *Civilisation matérielle, économie et capitalisme: XV^e^-XVIII^e^ siècle*, Paris, 1979).

Favier builds his case through nineteen substantive chapters, each developing a theme about the setting, personnel, organization, or operation of the commercial sector during the high and later Middle Ages. During the twelfth through fifteenth century mercantile life evolved within an economic space learned and reached by medieval traders and a social space among rulers, competitors, and strangers. Businessmen gained skills with monies, companies, credits, banks, risk, ships, and account books. They built personal careers and family fortunes, dealt with princes, and slowly shaped their own new collective identity and culture.

De l'or et des épices is richly — even luxuriously — written in narrative and anecdotal style. Favier ranges across medieval Europe to accumulate and fondly examine illustrative cases. A mere seven pages (220-26) on how medieval merchants did not specialize, for instance, treats Genoese dealings in the western Mediterranean, Levant, and Black Sea; Hanseatics carrying goods from Prussia, Russia, Scandinavia, Cornwall, Pomerania, Brittany, Bruges, and the Orient; the investments of Jacob Fugger and of Jacques Coeur; three regional trading enterprises in mid-fifteenth century Rouen; the careers of the Pratese Francesco Datini, the Venetian Andrea Barbarigo, and the Lübecker Heinrich Castorp. Brief translated extracts from evocative primary sources are often introduced. Readers already versed in scholarship on the medieval European economy will recognize Favier's familiarity with the landmark works. Others can use his substantial bibliography of major published books and sources. Confronted with a new and intriguing statement, however, all will occasionally regret the absent footnotes.

Broadly analytical interpretive history for a non-specialist audience is perhaps better-practiced on the eastern than the western side of the Atlantic. The experienced hand of Favier even here avoids the too common slip into the narrowly national that limits a book's appeal outside its homeland. General medievalists and social and economic historians of later periods in Europe or elsewhere should read *De l'or et des épices*. The book also deserves the translation into English which would permit more North American students and general readers to experience its sound and up-to-date synthesis.

Richard C. Hoffmann
York University

* * *