Victoria, and the South African War. Francophones commemorated Dollard des Ormeaux and the Patriotes and, in 1924, erected an illuminated cross atop Mount Royal. Rouge and clerical nationalisms — hitherto antagonistic — merged in the 1920s (in part, Gordon claims, as a response to anglophones’ pro-conscription chauvinism during the Great War) and joined a secular consumer capitalism to revive Saint-Jean-Baptiste festivities that had declined in the late nineteenth century.

The author contends that, by the twentieth century, nationalism had become the overriding concern of the heritage elites, to the exclusion of memories particularized by class or gender. Unlike his subjects, Gordon does not ignore class and gender: he insists that Montreal’s public commemorations were the product of a particular class culture, and he notes the general absence of women from heritage societies as well as from most of the city’s commemorative statuary. He also remarks upon the particular kinds of masculinity (middle-class and patriotic) embodied in Montreal’s monuments. This gendered analysis could perhaps have been further developed, taking into account the important work on iconography and the public sphere by historians such as Joan B. Landes, Lynn Hunt, and Mary P. Ryan.

Moreover, Gordon makes tantalizing allusions to alternative ways of occupying public space and to more spontaneous kinds of claims to public memory: brawls between Irish and French-Canadian canal workers in the 1840s; the impromptu funeral procession for tavern-keeper Joe Beef (Charles McKiernan) in 1889; the anti-conscription riots of 1917; and the crowds who turned out to welcome the returned soldiers of Quebec’s 22nd Battalion in 1919. Fuller discussions of these noisier, sometimes rougher claims would complement Gordon’s detailed analyses of the more decorous disputes among competing heritage elites. In drawing out other “uses of the streets” (to borrow historian Christine Stansell’s phrase), such discussions would also contribute a more dynamic element to a history centred on the static markers of memory that are monuments and plaques. Finally, they would help to support Gordon’s argument that the study of public memory allows us to examine “nationalism’s underlying popular foundations” (pp. 17, 172).

Making Public Pasts acknowledges the importance of “mental geography” (p. 141) to public memory: particular moments in time are commemorated through specific sites or spaces. In mapping the plaques and monuments that began to dot Montreal’s landscape at the turn of the last century, Gordon encourages urban historians to consider the competing memories and histories constructed alongside the new monuments to modernity that were factories, skyscrapers, and department stores.

Magda Fahrni
Université du Québec à Montréal


In writing the half-century of history of a single business enterprise, Jonathan Grant offers a fresh perspective on conventional wisdom about the tsarist regime and its
relations with private enterprise, the character of private companies in Russia, the nature of Russian economic development, “monopoly capitalism” in Russia, and Russian relations with Western Europe.

Grant’s method is to focus on the Putilov works in St. Petersburg, one of Russia’s largest heavy industrial companies before the Revolution and a centre of workers’ discontent. The book is strictly business, and the reader will not find discussions like those in several recent studies on Moscow industrial figures regarding the lifestyle or political, social, and cultural interests of men of business.

Among the principal issues discussed are business strategy, the policies and personnel of the Putilov board of directors, company financing, product lines, profits and losses, and relations with various agencies of the Imperial government. Grant’s basic source of information is archival material, especially company reports. There is an admitted paucity of memoirs by directors and others connected with the company on the grounds, as Grant says, that these men of business were too heavily engaged in their work to write about their activities.

On several issues, Grant finds that a detailed study of the Putilov works challenges widespread assumptions about business in pre-Revolution Russia. The Leninist view that banks took over private business and established increasingly monopolistic control over sectors of the economy does not stand up to scrutiny. The Russo-Asiatic Bank increasingly bought stock in Putilov, provided financing, and placed a representative on the board of directors without ever exerting control over the company. As for whether the tsarist government exercised pre-1916 control, this common assumption is refuted by the continuing independent policy-making role of the board of directors.

Putilov lost its independence and was sequestered only in 1916, when, in the midst of waging World War I, the Russian government concluded that the production of munitions, especially artillery shells, and armaments could be speeded up by state control. Aside from the consequences of war, Putilov conducted itself almost identically to other large heavy industrial concerns in the West, and Grant convincingly parallels its practices with those of Krupp in Germany, Creusot in France, Vickers in England, and Carnegie in the United States. Strategic planning, financing, and other practices were so similar in all of these companies that Putilov entered into the technology transfer that went on among them, supporting Grant’s conclusion that these particular large manufacturing concerns behaved similarly.

Charles A. Ruud
University of Western Ontario


The Michelin Company is today an international corporation manufacturing tires; it has an established reputation for good quality, innovative products (the company