

Shopkeepers identified with citizens of republican Rome. If drastic measures were not taken, only a tyrant, only Caesar could restore order. The *Ligue* wanted the 1875 Constitution revised; direct elections and active citizen participation would assure popular control. Although the author classifies the *Ligue syndicale* as a radical republican movement, he qualifies this by noting the period of flux and uncertainty of the radical republican tradition in the 1880s and 1890s. Boulanger, for example, appealed to the Parisian working class buffeted by unemployment and foreign competition. Boulangism, according to Nord, can be seen as a movement of the left, social and democratic in its concerns, instead of the forerunner of fascism. The embryo of a French populism can be recognized in the *Ligue syndicale*, which combined moral conservatism and a faith in small ownership with a genuine radicalism that focused on citizen participation and issues of social welfare.

Although shopkeeper militants still stood on the left in 1890, within ten years they passed into the camp of the far right. Politics shaped its right-ward trajectory. Insufficient *patente* reform (a tax levied on all business enterprises), the ignoring of commercial defense, and efforts of the far right — Anti-Semites, Nationalists, and Christian Democrats — partially explain this move. The socialist movement's evolution toward militant collectivism alienated *ligueurs*. The Dreyfus Affair publicized how far *petit commerce* had evolved from its Radical past. Divided and in transition at the time of the Dreyfus Affair, the Parisian shopkeeper movement almost unanimously supported the new right, the Nationalist cause. "It was not so much that shopkeepers had changed as that the left and right had changed, the left proving itself increasingly unreceptive and the right increasingly sympathetic to small-owner politics" (492).

Through the *Ligue syndicale* Professor Nord examines lower middle class mobilization from which the new Nationalism drew its strength. The *grand magasin* and the new right, both extensively researched, appear in a fresh light when evaluated through the Parisian shopkeeper movement. Nord's work presents a case study, a specific instance of the larger phenomenon of petit-bourgeois protest, that contributes to the debate on the problem of the lower middle class.

Nord rejects "relative deprivation" and its variation "status anxiety" theses as inadequate to describe the crisis of the shopping district in old Paris in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Other interpretations are also dismissed for obscuring the role played by politics in channeling the *petite bourgeoisie* towards political reaction. Non-French examples of small-owner protest in Germany and America support the author's argument that a sequence of rapid, uneven expansion and abrupt collapse provided the motor force behind the politics of resentment.

Nord argues complex issues with precision and forcefulness in this thought-provoking book. His illustrations and tables are helpful and pertinent. He has given us a carefully-researched study that opens new avenues for investigation and reveals new dimensions to the Parisian economic life in the late nineteenth century.

Shirley J. Black  
Texas A & M University

\* \* \*

R.R. Palmer, ed. — *The Two Tocquevilles: Father and Son, Hervé and Alexis de Tocqueville on the Coming of the French Revolution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987. Pp. viii, 252.

Coincidence and irony are the hallmarks of this remarkable volume. That both the Tocquevilles, Hervé and Alexis, father and son, wrote on the coming of the French Revolution is a fascinating coincidence that has remained largely unnoticed; but R.R. Palmer has done much more than bring this fact to our attention. Besides translating and editing what the two men had to say about the immediate origins of the Revolution, a task done with his usual professional competence, he has also provided a generous introductory essay in which, with the wisdom born of a lifetime of research and

writing on the French Revolution, he explores the nature, origins, and significance of the similarities and differences between the two accounts.

Count Hervé de Tocqueville, born in 1772 of an ancient noble family of Normandy, imprisoned with his equally high-born young wife (a granddaughter of Lamoignon de Malesherbes) during the Terror, was a monarchist who had a successful professional career as a prefect under the Bourbon Restoration monarchy; following the Revolution of 1830, he refused to serve the Orleanist monarchy of Louis-Philippe and retired to private life. Eventually he produced two books, a *Philosophical History of the Reign of Louis XV* (1847) and the work on Louis XVI (1850).

His much more famous son Alexis, born in 1805, accepted the consequences of the revolution of 1830, took the oath to Louis-Philippe, and spent his life studying the "democracy" he believed to be the wave of the future. His classic two-volumes *Democracy in America* (1835-40) won him fame, admission to the Académie française, and election to the Chamber of Deputies, where he warned of imminent revolution. He accepted the Second Republic in 1848, and served on its constitutional committee and as its foreign minister. But with its overthrow by Louis Napoleon, Alexis in turn retired to private life, and offered his explanation for the second Napoleon's success with a second classic, his *Old Regime and the Revolution* of 1856. His planned continuation of this work (of which the draft material presented here is all that remains) was cut short by declining health.

An old-fashioned royalist, Hervé de Tocqueville exemplified a royalism that was critical and open-minded. For example, he was sympathetic to the bourgeoisie and inclined to blame the aristocracy and Louis XVI's advisors for failing to prevent the revolution. Alexis de Tocqueville is remembered as a nineteenth-century liberal, but his liberalism, "with its warnings against centralization of government and fears for democracy, was of a kind that is now considered conservative" (7). More of an aristocrat than his father, Alexis was "more inclined to see the bourgeoisie as agitated by confused ideas" (25). Although they agreed on much, the differences between them are often ironic.

Curious though it may be, given the excellent personal relations between the two men, it appears likely that Alexis de Tocqueville never read his father's *Survey of the Reign of Louis XVI* or ever discussed with him his own project for a book on the same subject (of which he had completed only seven draft chapters on his death in 1859). So bright that "he began to think before learning anything," as Sainte-Beuve put it (cited 10), Alexis was absolutely determined to avoid repeating the commonplace things that had been said about the origins of the Revolution; his conscious goal was identification and analysis of great social forces and long-term trends that lay below the surface of passing events. Although Hervé called his account a "philosophical history," he was generally content to tell what happened, using narrative to explain cause and effect. But if one uses the criterion of the consensus of historians of the present generation, it is ironical that it was Hervé who often got the story "right." The father highlighted events and developments that modern historians agree were crucial (such as the September 1788 ruling of the Parlement of Paris on the form of the coming Estates-General, the role of the debate over the "doubling of the Third," and the impact of the American Revolution and American constitutional ideas) and that his son either omitted entirely or downplayed. As Palmer's analysis suggests, enthusiasm for unexplored materials and unconventional explanation can lead the historian to "underestimate the importance of what is already known or believed" (9).

And yet it is Alexis de Tocqueville who is justly famous for his innovative contributions to historiography (as well as sociology), while his father did no more than write a "common-sense history of a kind that can be, and is, superseded and replicated in every generation" (7). It was Alexis, not satisfied with easy or obvious explanations, who took "the risk of bold generalizations, statements of fact not confirmed by later researchers, and declarations of belief arising more from ethical attitudes than from empirical observation," and thus "gave more to think about" (27). Palmer's discussion of how the Tocquevilles practised these two kinds of history, narrative and analytical, in addition to providing new insights into the nature and significance of Alexis de Tocqueville's achievements, offers ample stimulation for our own philosophical reflection.

The volume is a satisfyingly complete piece of scholarship. In addition to the thought-provoking introduction, the carefully selected excerpts from Hervé's history (about half the original), and the expertly edited drafts and notes for Alexis's unfinished study, Palmer includes excerpts from the younger Tocqueville's correspondence concerning the writing of the planned book. There is also a helpful glossary of contemporary French terms and an index designed to assist in comparing the two Tocquevilles. One minor quibble. To say, as Palmer does in the context of the calling of the Estates-General in 1789, that "it had been many generations since the nobility and the clergy as organized bodies had functioned as political institutions at the national level" (19), seems an unwarranted neglect of the political role the higher clergy had been able to exercise through the periodic meetings of the Assembly of Clergy.

In summary, this is a book to be read, pondered, and cherished by students of the French Revolution, Tocqueville scholars, and anyone seriously interested in the problems posed by historical method.

Richard A. Lebrun  
*University of Manitoba*

\* \* \*

Detlev J.K. Peukert and Frank Bajohr — *Spuren des Widerstands: Die Bergarbeiterbewegung im Dritten Reich und im Exil*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1987. Pp. 223.

The fate of the German miners and their unions in the Third Reich forms the primary subject of this book. Its publication was subsidized by the West German mineworkers' union, and at least some of the problems of *Spuren des Widerstands* (Traces of Resistance) appear to come from an admirable but not entirely successful attempt to bridge the gap between the academic community and a wider readership in the labor movement. The book is compiled from separate contributions by the two authors and from documents of the 1930s. The result is a collection of often very interesting material that never forms a coherent whole.

Detlev J.K. Peukert, a leading scholar of working-class and Communist Party resistance to the Nazis, opens the book with "Perspectives on the Resistance," which outlines clearly (and sometimes too obviously) the problems entailed in writing a history of clandestine and informal activity under a brutally oppressive regime — so little is recorded, and what is recorded comes from problematic sources like Gestapo files, exile publications and oral history. As he notes, these problems are only exacerbated by trying to write about trade union resistance, because unions need legality, and virtually cease to exist without it, while political activity more easily can become conspiratorial. While this is well said, Peukert's insistence on the need to assemble "small stones into a mosaic" (11) may have become a rationale for the loose structure of the book.

Chapters II and III were put together by Frank Bajohr, a doctoral student, and form a biography of Franz Vogt, a leading official of the Social Democratic miners' union (as well as SPD politician) in the Weimar Republic, and a prominent member of socialist exile groups after 1933. The first of these two chapters is actually an autobiographical letter of Vogt to his children from exile in Amsterdam in 1934. It is indeed a moving, even exciting document, but Bajohr's biographical chapter which follows is often repetitive, and includes information on Vogt's life before 1933, and political activity before or during the Third Reich, which is marginal to the announced topic of the book. A lengthy speech of Vogt to the Prussian Parliament in 1932 is included for no clear reason. Any transition to the next part of the book, written by Peukert, is lacking.

For scholars this next part is the most rewarding. In Chapter IV Peukert discusses the problems of trade union resistance under the Nazis. Most underground groups were smashed by the Gestapo by 1936. Only at the leadership level were socialist, Communist and Christian unionists able to