

The dearth of moderates was the most important roadblock. The staid, sometimes reactionary city government clashed bitterly with the civil rights leadership of Dr Robert Hayling and the NAACP. In the minds of civic authoritarians such as Mayor Joseph Shelley, the civil rights movement was Communist-backed extremism. Struggling to combat this Cold War mentality by supporting such measures as the biracial committee set up in June, 1963 to review race relations, white moderates were denounced and ostracized. Older black St. Augustinians, whose leadership would have been invaluable, saw Hayling, a newcomer to their city, as too aggressive, and consequently withheld support from demonstrations, the biracial committee and other integration strategies. Without a restraining centre, leadership on both sides often assumed the most unyielding forms as Cold Warrior whites faced militant blacks. These two poles battled for St. Augustine over three long years.

Equally as crippling was the disinterest of St. Augustine businessmen in promoting racial change. Emphasizing traditional mores, the economic community responded to black civil rights demands with threats of unemployment. Ancient City businessmen shared not only an inherent belief in black inferiority but also the conviction that property rights took precedence over civil rights. To coerce these traditionalists into accepting a new era of integration, local black leaders and the SCLC moved to cut tourism profits thirty to sixty percent in 1964 from 1963 levels. Violent demonstrations and mass arrests sent a very anti-Ancient City message to northern and mid-western vacationers. Only after facing a vigorous civil rights effort did businessmen retrench from unwavering commitment to the past.

The refusal of St. Augustine's bankers and merchants to adopt a more liberal policy toward racial change reflected an attitude of obstinacy prevalent among the city's white ruling class. The perceived necessity of white dominance in education, government, and economic life, reinforced by years of conservative social interchange, made whites hostile to the most innocuous innovations. The tragic irony, which the author all but ignores, is that the city leaders' fierce determination to maintain control left blacks with little alternative but to seek the outside intervention a closed, conservative system fears most.

Although Colburn retells many violent episodes in St. Augustine's integration history, his book is not obsessed with local militance. Rather, the author astutely shows how the real victories came from judicial rulings. Yet *Racial Change* tends to be too methodical in its old-fashioned, day-to-day account of 1963-65. Its narrative is strong, particularly in describing white and black paranoia in the early 1960s; its analysis of origins, on Jim Crow patterns of development and eventual disuse, is much weaker. Focusing on a short period in a small city, however, Colburn makes clear that "die Stadtluft macht frei" becomes status quo — comparatively — only after the most violent of storms.

Carolyn Q. Wharton,
University of South Carolina

* * *

Geoffrey Crossick and Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, eds. — *Shopkeepers and Master Artisans in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. London: Methuen, 1984.

This is an ambitious anthology. Intended to help fill a gap in the record of social historical research, its net effect is rather to make the reader appreciate that gap all the more acutely. The "petite bourgeoisie", defined from the beginning by its neither/nor status in the capitalist order of things, carrier of no one's hopes for utopia, subject to no special suffering, perpetrator of no special evil, has languished in undeserved neglect. In this book are six specialized studies (on Birmingham metal wares, Parisian groceries, French and British shopkeepers' movements, Viennese artisan families, and rural artisans of the Beauce) plus four national surveys of the petites bourgeoisies of Germany, Britain, France, and Belgium.

The first thing that strikes one about these essays is the difficulty of drawing neat boundaries. The *petite bourgeoisie* is not coterminous with all retail trades, "petit commerce", in the useful French expression, nor with all master artisans; nor is the exact level of success and exploitation that leads into the bourgeoisie proper easy to identify. All the national surveys presented here struggle with this problem, a problem made more difficult, and more urgent, by the tendency of social historians in recent years to define the working class widely to include many self-employed artisans, outworkers, even peddlers, depending on the case. Many more case studies will be required before this question can be dealt with satisfactorily; several of those presented here at least make the contours of the problem eminently clear: Clive Behagg's piece on Birmingham, Alain Faure's pathbreaking exploration of Parisian grocers, and Josef Ehmer's quantitative study of inheritance and residence patterns among Viennese artisans all amply illustrate the great fluidity of the boundaries between debt-ridden retailers, well-established shop operators, substantial manufacturers, and chain-store pioneers. Not only were individuals constantly moving between these groups, but the range of possible statuses tended to expand (both up and down) in most trades. Clearly, we cannot know who the working class is or who the bourgeoisie is until we better understand the broad *terra incognita* in between.

The second important impression gleaned from these essays is the fact that the nineteenth century was the heyday of the *petite bourgeoisie*, not the era of its decisive demise. Not only did it grow substantially in size (no matter how it is defined), but by the end of the century it had found a new political voice, indeed was in some ways the principal beneficiary of the maturation of mass political parties and parliamentary forms of government. National differences in the way the *petite bourgeoisie* used its new-found voice are particularly striking; this class seemed especially prone to the influence of distinctive national political traditions. The remarks of Crossick's concluding essay are revealing in this regard.

Crossick and Haupt are to be congratulated for this latest effort in a series of collaborative enterprises aimed at waking the profession up to the importance of the *petite bourgeoisie*. The one cautionary note worth sounding is that it would be dangerous to make the *petite bourgeoisie* into yet another semi-isolated subfield of research. The whole challenge of studying this group is to see how their presence altered or modulated the sharp polarities of political conflict, and influenced the consciousness of other classes.

Williams M. Reddy
Duke University

* * *

Denys Delâge — *Le Pays Renversé. Amérindiens et Européens en Amérique du nord-est, 1600-1664*. Montréal, Boréal Express, 1985. 416 p. Notes et références, bibliographie.

In *Le Pays Renversé*, sociologist Denys Delâge proposes a comparative study of the interaction between the largely horticultural Amerindians, French, Dutch, and English in northeastern North America against the background of economic and political transition in Western Europe and in the conceptual framework of Immanuel Wallerstein's world system. It appears at a time when Bruce Trigger has studied French relations with the Natives in the same "heroic age" (although he also gives necessary attention to the pre-1600 contacts) and James Axtell has published a comparative history of French/English/Amerindian contacts in the same period. In general terms, Delâge's interpretation accords more with Trigger's anthropological approach than with Axtell's historical approach. All three authors would willingly accept the classification of ethnohistorians, yet each approaches the period and its salient events from a different perspective.

Delâge, as one might expect, adopts a model for his overview and comparative evaluation. To fit the peoples and events into this explanatory model, the author conceives of North America