

Dans le premier chapitre, les auteurs s'intéressent à la sémantique de « l'expatriation » et avancent une définition fondée sur la durée du séjour à l'étranger. Ils présentent les causes de ce phénomène ainsi que les accords de protection conclus par la France avec divers pays. Le chapitre suivant porte sur l'histoire de l'expatriation, une constante de l'expérience française depuis le Moyen Âge. Il traite en particulier de la colonisation de l'Amérique et des réfugiés de la période révolutionnaire et de l'épisode napoléonien. Plusieurs pages sont consacrées à l'Afrique subsaharienne, à l'Algérie et au continent asiatique. Le chapitre se termine par une discussion des répercussions de la décolonisation sur le statut des expatriés.

Dans le troisième chapitre, Alain Vivien et Mireille Raunet tracent le portrait contemporain du 1 700 000 Français de l'étranger en faisant faire au lecteur un tour du monde qui le mène de l'Europe occidentale à l'Amérique latine, en passant par l'Océanie. Ils font aussi l'esquisse socioprofessionnelle des expatriés et décrivent la gestion administrative de ces Français hors France. Les auteurs consacrent le chapitre suivant à la représentation politique de cette catégorie de citoyens au sein des institutions nationales et des diverses associations.

Le chapitre V, le plus long du livre (43 p.), porte sur les conditions de l'expatriation, notamment en ce qui a trait à la couverture sociale, à l'éducation, à la fiscalité et à la sécurité. Dans le dernier chapitre, Vivien et Raunet s'interrogent sur l'avenir de l'expatriation à l'aube du XXI^e siècle. L'avènement de l'Union européenne, avec ses différents types d'accords, et la mondialisation, associée à « l'emprise américaine », posent de nouveaux défis à la culture et à la technique françaises. Alors que cette nouvelle donne amènera un plus grand nombre d'expatriés, il faudra envisager de préparer les jeunes Français à cette réalité.

Les Français de l'étranger fourmille de renseignements intéressants, succinctement présentés dans le texte même et dans les treize tableaux et figures qui l'émaillent. L'analyse est pratiquement absente du livre, mais on ne s'attend pas à autre chose dans un « Que sais-je? ». En le parcourant, le lecteur suit les expatriés à travers le temps et l'espace, notamment les anciennes colonies. À cet égard, relevons une erreur : en 1754, les Français du Canada sont au nombre de 55 000 et non de 550 000 (p. 23)! Dans les chapitres sur la représentation politique et sur les conditions de l'expatriation, le lecteur accompagne les Français de l'étranger dans le labyrinthe de l'administration publique française, une administration fort lourde, ce qui explique sans doute la lourdeur des chapitres eux-mêmes, tant dans le contenu que dans la forme.

En un mot, *Les Français de l'étranger* est un livre utile qui laisse entrevoir un champ de recherche fertile pour l'historien, le politologue et le sociologue.

Yves Frenette
Collège Glendon, Université York

Michel Winock — *Nationalism, Antisemitism, and Fascism in France* (translated by Jane Marie Todd). Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998. Pp. 351.

This volume draws together 24 essays written in the 1980s by one of the leading historians of contemporary France. By and large, they were written for the educated but

not specialized public. Some are short opinion pieces; others are rather more substantial efforts, six of them drawn from Michel Winock's 1982 volume, *Édouard Drumont et Cie*. All are erudite, elegantly crafted, and well written. In his discussion of French nationalism, Winock observes that there are in fact two nationalist traditions in France. One, "open nationalism", is progressive and emancipatory, and it draws on the best traditions of the French Revolution. The other, "closed nationalism", is xenophobic and reactionary. In the 1830s *Le National* seemed an appropriate title for the newspaper of the moderate republican opposition to the July Monarchy. A century later the same title was adopted by the house organ of the *Jeu-nesses Patriotes*, the virulent right-wing opponents of the democratic republic.

Comparable complexities exist in the history of French anti-Semitism. In the France of Jean-Marie Le Pen it is tempting to identify anti-Semitism exclusively with the far Right. Winock reminds us that this was not always so. For much of the nineteenth century anti-Semitism was often part of the discourse of the Left, even, perhaps especially, the socialist Left. By the mid-1890s, as French socialism adopted a higher degree of doctrinal rigour, anti-Semitism became far less prominent. Nonetheless, as he notes in a particularly stimulating essay, anti-Semitism has never been entirely absent from critical segments of the French Left in the twentieth century. The very idea of a "Jewish specificity" offended the "singularist ...ethno-culturocentrism of the Right" but also, albeit to a lesser degree, the "universalist ethno-culturocentrism of the Left". He might have added that the shared anti-Semitism of some elements of the Right and Left in the 1930s had less to do with "ethno-culturocentrism" than with a common fear that French Jews might push France into war against Hitler.

One of the thorniest problems for historians of contemporary France is fascism. Was there a serious fascism in France? If so, did it owe more to the Right or the Left? In the early 1980s the Israeli historian Zeev Sternhell outraged French scholarly opinion by disputing the conventional wisdom that France was by and large "allergic" to fascism. According to Sternhell, not only was fascist ideology more or less a French invention, but in the interwar years fascist ideas were omnipresent in France. Winock's essay on this topic was one of the more balanced and judicious to have appeared at the time. He makes the very sensible point that, even were one to accept (and many would not) that all of the thinkers examined by Sternhell were in fact fascist, it would still be the case that their ideas (unlike those of their counterparts in Germany and Italy) had remarkably little impact on the politics of Third Republic France. He also effectively demolishes the arguments of right-wing intellectuals who, taking a distant cue from Sternhell, argued for the fundamental similarity of fascism and socialism. He dryly remarks that, by comparing carefully selected and decontextualized quotations, it is possible to demonstrate almost anything, but this is a clever parlour game, not serious history.

By and large this is a stimulating and valuable volume, but it is flawed in two respects. The book is seriously dated. The most recent of the essays is more than a decade old and most date from the early 1980s. In the intervening period a great deal has been written on Winock's subject by scholars in France and elsewhere. Far more is now known, new perspectives have been introduced, and old debates have taken on new dimensions. It is a pity that Stanford University Press did not prevail upon

the author to write a sustained introduction giving his views about the historiographical developments of the last dozen years. Moreover, at times, the book has a mildly parochial quality. Presumably because he was usually writing for a broader public, Winock rarely cites the work of non-French scholars. To be sure, he does make reference to Roger L. Williams's *Henri Rochefort: Prince of the Gutter Press* (1966), only to dwell at length on its many egregious errors of fact. He is not wrong about the book, but it all seems a bit much for a work of popular history manifestly not intended for a scholarly audience. One would be far more interested in his thoughts about a book he never mentions, namely Steven Wilson's very substantial *Ideology and Experience: Anti-Semitism in France at the Time of the Dreyfus Affair* (1982). Scoring points on Williams for mistakenly believing that Maurice Barrès belonged to the *Action Française* is good sport, but there are serious North American scholars — one thinks of Robert Soucy (*Fascism in France: The Case of Maurice Barrès*, 1972) or Stewart Doty (*From Cultural Rebellion to Counterrevolution: The Politics of Maurice Barrès*, 1976) — who have provided us with far more scholarly interpretations of Barrès. These books had been published long before Winock wrote his articles, and his thoughts about their (very different) interpretations would have been welcome. In spite of these defects, however, there is a great deal to be learned from this book.

William D. Irvine
York University

Nancy Wood — *Vectors of Memory: Legacies of Trauma in Postwar Europe*.
Oxford: Berg, 1999. Pp. 204.

As Nancy Wood reminds us in the opening sentence of her book, “Memory is decidedly in fashion.” Indeed, there has been considerable recent discussion of collective memory, especially in European societies, where the memory of painful episodes has been hotly contested in the 1980s and 1990s. In France and Germany, for example, debates over memory have become central to political culture and have involved politicians, jurists, artists, journalists, Holocaust survivors, museum curators, and historians. To be sure, historians have often played prominent roles in discussions of memory. They have theorized about the construction, function, and meaning of historical memory, and they have examined both the varying ways in which particular episodes have been remembered and commemorated and the political considerations involved in the construction of memory — and in the determination to forget. Some historians have served as expert witnesses during war crimes trials, while others have analysed historical interventions and highlighted the often conflicting demands of law, memory, and historical scholarship. From an historical standpoint, then, the issue of memory in contemporary Europe is certainly not unexplored terrain.

Wood brings a somewhat different perspective to the study of European memory. A professor of media studies in Britain, she approaches the study of memory from an interdisciplinary perspective, and she is determined to bring a conceptual rigour