

sud-américain offre aux Argentins une vitrine mondiale capable de potentiellement diffuser une image positive et réhabilitante. Cette occasion est récupérée de diverses façons par l'appareil politique, tant par les tenants du pouvoir que par les opposants du régime, et c'est sur ce thème que porte l'analyse des auteurs. La proposition d'une hybridation des sociologies de l'action publique et de celle des mobilisations, permettant l'interrogation de l'une et de l'autre, s'inscrit au sein des constats de cette réflexion.

Le dernier texte de cet ouvrage, préparé par Christophe Jaccoud et Dominique Mala-testa, cible précisément l'action publique par le politique en s'attardant au cas intéressant de « L'action publique saisie par la Pensée sportive : le cas de la loi anti-hooligan en Suisse ». L'analyse se veut ici entièrement consacrée à la façon dont les pouvoirs politiques suisses ont utilisé les comportements inadéquats des spectateurs lors de rencontres de football afin d'engager un débat menant à l'adoption d'une loi anti-hooligan en 2007. Ce questionnement de la prise en charge policière et de sa reformulation alimente la réflexion des auteurs qui voient dans cette législation une nouvelle rationalité juridique qui juxtapose une norme de comportement et une norme de sanction (p. 186-187). Son expression se ferait ici, entre autres, par certaines convictions sur l'intention morale du sport en tant qu'agent de bonnes valeurs, de même que par une source réflexive menant à l'adoption d'une législation ambiguë.

Dans l'ensemble, cet ouvrage campe assez bien les éléments fondateurs de l'analyse sociopolitique du sport. Le vecteur identitaire se veut en toile de fond et permet un angle d'approche intéressant. L'analyse historique y est précise et concise. Une des nombreuses qualités de cet ouvrage est de soulever des questionnements importants relatifs au lien entre la sphère sportive et politique. Le lecteur qui le désire peut se laisser plonger au cœur même de ses propres référents identitaires et culturels par son positionnement face au politique, certes, et également à un second niveau de réflexion portant sur son imaginaire et ses perceptions de « l'autre » et de « l'ailleurs ». La cible en est une « footballesque » et essentiellement européenne, ce qui peut, à la longue, désintéresser le lecteur ou l'amateur de football. Toutefois, le sociologue, l'analyste politique, l'historien, voire l'éthicien, y trouveront de très bonnes sources de stimulations intellectuelles.

Jocelyn East
Université d'Ottawa

HOYLE, Richard W. (ed.) – *Custom, Improvement and the Landscape in Early Modern Britain*. Farnham, Surrey and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011. Pp. x, 317.

The central issues of the agrarian history of early modern England – tenures; rents; enclosure; engrossing; innovation and its diffusion – have been established for over a century. Yet knowledge of the course and complexity of change, and insights into its causes and consequences continue to develop. This stimulating collection contributes in both ways. It is empirically rich, providing an abundance of valuable information to illuminate further the economic processes involved. It is also distinctive in approach, emphasising in various ways the social, cultural and political dimensions of economic change.

'Improvement', as Richard Hoyle points out in his introduction, could describe several things: changes in estate management policy intended to enhance the landlord's income; the adoption of new techniques to improve yields; the transformation of landscapes to render them more suitable for intensive farming regimes. All of these are well represented here. Paul Warde traces the development of the concept over two centuries, showing how a word originally used in the limited sense of enhancing rents became "infused with new meaning" (p. 128): a general sense of betterment, a public good, even a national mission; increasingly presenting change in a positive light. Henry French surveys the enclosure of urban commons (a largely neglected subject). Bill Shannon reveals the reclamation of the Lancashire mosses by 'approvement' (the right, within limits, of manorial lords to enclose the waste). Julie Bowring brings a fresh perspective to the drainage of the Fens. Elizabeth Griffiths, Briony McDonagh, and Alasdair Ross examine (respectively) the transformation of the Hunstanton, Norfolk, estate of Sir Hamon and Lady Le Strange, the commitment to improvement of Mrs Elizabeth Prowse of Wicken, Northamptonshire, and the conversion of shielings to arable on the Grant estates in Stathspey: all three providing particularly telling material on how the ambition to improve was fostered by both precept and example.

Such schemes, of course, could come into conflict with 'custom': the second major theme of the collection. As Hoyle observes, the maintenance of custom as a set of established rules and expectations, worked only when both landlords and tenants subscribed to it. Such consensus could be sustained. Landlords and tenants usually cooperated in mossland approvement in Lancashire. The Le Stranges combined improvement with respect for custom and Elizabeth Prowse eschewed forms of improvement she considered socially damaging. But where it was lost, the overriding of custom meant contention over rights and entitlements, litigation, sometimes riot. Such conflicts have been much studied, but again these essays offer rich examples of their complex and varied nature: James Taverner's lifetime of litigation with various lords of North Elmham, Norfolk (Hoyle); Anthony Bradshaw's determined attempts to compile and preserve the customs of Duffield Frith, Derbyshire (Heather Falvey); the resistance of urban freemen to the curtailment of their common rights (French); the new interest groups and new sources of conflict that emerged in the drained fens (Bowring); the sense of betrayal expressed by tenants in the Norfolk Brecklands whose lords' extension of their foldcourse and warren rights threatened the sustainability of local agriculture – ironically leading tenants to advocate enclosure as a means of restraining them (Nicola Whyte).

As so often in agrarian history, it is in the rich detail provided by these case studies that we encounter the full complexities, ambiguities and ironies of a massive process of change, its causation and motivation and its varying chronology and outcomes in particular places. Collectively, they also highlight some general issues to be noted. Hoyle observes that 'improvement' in its initial sense, much in evidence in the early sixteenth century, may have slowed after the 'commotion time' of the 1549 risings; but it moved forward rapidly from the 1580s. Both he and Shannon suggest that the chronology of English enclosure supplied by J.R. Wordie may need revision as more is revealed of how much enclosure through 'approvement' was achieved silently before 1640 (some forty thousand acres in the Lancashire lowlands alone, for example). Warde and Hoyle bring out the extraordinary power of the enlarged notion of improvement to justify change,

especially when backed by crown and parliament and the cooperation of interested tenants. As they show, its eventual victory in the minds of those who most mattered was almost complete; a cultural shift of enormous significance. By 1650 there was no counter argument against improvement of comparable power, even when the outcome of confidently advanced improvement projects was ambiguous (as in Bowring's fens, where inadequately maintained drainage works caused new problems and failed initially to achieve the major shift to arable cultivation envisaged) or even utter failure (as in Strathspay, where rental income declined, eventually precipitating the wholesale clearance of the small farms established on former shielings).

Custom had formerly provided such an argument, and the contributors have much to say about the initial battles fought over the nature of customary practice; emphasizing how present interests and anxieties shaped narratives of past practice (Whyte); how memory involved selection and suppression (Falvey); how litigation over custom turned on what Hoyle calls "rival attempts to control memory" through the advancement of "rival memories, both self-serving" (p. 63). Some attempted to fix custom in writing – a tactic vividly illustrated in the cases of James Taverner (Hoyle) and Anthony Bradshaw (whose remarkable fifty-four stanza "Comendac[i]on of Duffield Frith", intended to aid the memories of the "poorer sort and ignorant", is printed in full by Falvey). It was a long struggle, and if 'improvement' eventually carried the day decisively, it was never wholly lost. As Whyte puts it, "memories of a former customary landscape . . . became integrated within local narratives of place" (p. 125). By then, however, new landscapes had been created, and with them a mental re-mapping of the entire national territory through which, as Warde argues "the whole land was divided into the improved and the unimproved, a distinction of great significance which has persisted to the present" (p. 142). This collection does much to explain how that came to be.

Finally, congratulations to Ashgate for providing footnotes rather than endnotes: a small but very welcome victory for custom.

Keith Wrightson
Yale University

JASANOFF, Maya – *Liberty's Exiles: American Loyalists in the Revolutionary World*. New York: Knopf, 2011. Pp. xvi, 462.

For obvious reasons, scholars and popular writers often turn to the year 1776 when describing the birth of the United States. Less often chronicled in what are too often modern hagiographic accounts is the fate of the roughly sixty thousand colonials who remained Patriots to the British Empire and fanned out across the globe in the years after the Continental Congress broke with the Crown. Maya Jasanoff, the author of the admired *Edge of Empire: Lives, Culture, and Conquest in the East, 1750-1850*, here combines her own archival research with hundreds of monographs, articles, contemporaneous pamphlets, published diaries, and memoirs to explore the myriad reasons why colonists opted for a life of exile rather than remain part of the new American republic.