landscape. For example, Emmanuel Mounier, who had been an important intellectual influence at Uriage, emerged at the head of a relaunched *Esprit*, while Uriage's director of studies, Hubert Beuve-Méry, became the head of the new *Le Monde*, arguably France's most important postwar newspaper.

That these men were able to position themselves so successfully in postwar France depended, at least in part, on their ability to reconstruct their wartime pasts. At the end of the book, Hellman gives a fascinating account of the process by which these prominent men managed the memory of their past. He describes, for instance, how Mounier rewrote the history of both *Esprit* and the associated philosophy of personalism in a way that situated them on the political left and laid claim to excellent Resistance credentials. This set the stage, Hellman argues, for further "memory management" regarding both *Esprit* and the Uriage experiment more broadly. Through such actions as careful control over access to archival material, encouragement of sympathetic historical treatments, and denunciation of those with opposing views, the men associated with Uriage helped construct a past that downplayed certain aspects of their ideas, erased their central involvement with Vichy, and exaggerated their Resistance credentials. For Hellman, this effort to "manage" history is less understandable — and less forgivable — than the men's own wartime actions.

Were the history of the "knight-monks" of Uriage merely one isolated example it would be interesting enough, but what makes Hellman's study all the more important is that this group's intellectual and political journey and subsequent memory management represent a path taken by many other Catholics of this generation, including François Mitterand. As Hellman points out in the second edition, we now know that Mitterand's trajectory — from right-wing student activism in the 1930s, to support for Pétain's National Revolution in the early 1940s, to engagement in the Resistance, to subsequent postwar political prominence — paralleled that of the men of Uriage. By tracing the knight-monks' history, Hellman thus provides an important contribution to ongoing debates about the complicated relationship many French people had to the events of 1940–1945. As his study suggests, there were few Catholics in France who wholeheartedly supported either Vichy or the Resistance, and it was often only careful memory management that made it appear so in retrospect. By highlighting these complexities and by unmasking the politics of postwar memory and forgetfulness, Hellman makes a significant contribution to questions of central interest to historians of contemporary France.

Susan B. Whitney
*Carleton University*

Keith Lindley — *Popular Politics and Religion in Civil War London*. Aldershot, England: Scholar Press, 1997. Pp. xiii, 413.

London in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries has attracted the attention of many able scholars in the past 30 to 40 years. Ian Archer and E. S. Rappoport have

examined its political and social structure and have debated the extent of popular participation in London's governance, as well as the degree of immiseration of the lower classes. In a recent pioneering work Paul Griffiths has analysed the clashes of youth and authority in the pre-revolutionary metropolis. Robert Ashton and Valerie Pearl have debated the extent to which the City's elite were alienated from royal policies before the meeting of the Long Parliament. Pearl, in her classic study, has also shown the crucial importance of the municipal elections of 1641 in delivering the city into the parliamentary camp. Robert Brenner, author of a massive study of the London merchant class, has demonstrated that the bulk of merchants who backed Parliament had been excluded from the established great trading companies. They had accordingly turned to overseas trade and to Ireland, where they had developed a considerable stake in the overthrow of Catholicism and the dispossession of the native landowning class.

With the exception of Griffiths, whose book appeared too recently to have been included, Keith Lindley has built upon and extended the work of these other historians of London. His debt to Pearl and Brenner is particularly heavy, but he has done a prodigious amount of his own primary research in municipal and national archives, as well as in the huge printed Thomason collection of pamphlets and newsbooks in the British Library. The product is a densely detailed study of the involvement of the London populace in the revolution up to the summer of 1646. A second volume is apparently planned to carry the story into the 1650s.

Lindley confirms what students of the English Revolution have long suspected: that London in the 1640s was a deeply divided city. While radical parliamentarians succeeded in capturing control of Common Council at the end of 1641, they did so in the teeth of a powerful conservative minority. A capital in friendly hands could be tapped for manpower, finances, materiel, and shipping. In the summer of 1642, for example, Parliament's radical friends were able to muster 8,000 volunteers for the new army under the Earl of Essex. Yet the spectre of trade depression, unemployment, the flight of gold, and the relentless shedding of blood combined to produce widespread disenchantment with the war as early as the beginning of 1643. Conservatives and royalists combined to exploit this disenchantment by promoting a seemingly non-partisan peace movement, spearheaded by both women and men. The size and vehemence of this movement frightened revolutionary leaders such as John Pym and Isaac Penington.

A chief strength of Lindley's book is his exploration of the social basis of the revolution in the early 1640s.

> Parliamentarianism drew its principal support from the ranks of prosperous merchants and tradesmen in the heart of the City, some with colonial trading interests and many more with strong commitments to the Irish adventurers, who were outside the City's inner circle of government and privilege before 1642. It could also attract allegiance from the generality of shopkeepers and artisans throughout London, the brewers, mariners and artisans of the eastern suburbs and their equivalents on the south bank, the capital's young men and apprentices and men and women of relatively humble status. (p. 236)

He also shows in fascinating detail the degree to which political radicalism was rooted in the religious experiences of the 1630s. Men who had sharpened their teeth in the struggle against the oppression of bishops and in the quest for the liberty to create their own separatist churches were ready to take on popery in the form of "superstitious" images, books, altars, and vestments at the beginning of the 1640s. Their absorption of radical protestant ideas had given them a practical belief in liberty and human equality. This belief, combined with the organizational experience that they now had under their belts, prepared them to wage war against royal tyranny and on behalf of radical democracy.

Thus Lindley shows that the Leveller movement grew from the Independent and separatist congregations of London — above all the Baptists. Future Leveller activists such as John Lilburne, William Walwyn, Edmund Chillenden, William Larner, Giles Calvert, Clement Wrighter, Thomas Prince, and Nicholas Tew threw themselves with boundless enthusiasm into the war against the king in 1642 and 1643. The Salters Hall subcommittee to raise volunteers for the war effort was a special focus of their activities. The early commitment of men such as William Walwyn to organizing and fighting the war should serve as a corrective to any lingering idea that the Levellers comprised a movement that somehow eschewed violence.

If there is a criticism to be made of this richly detailed study, it is that too much space is allocated to investigating the social basis of parliamentary radicalism and not enough to the political struggles that shook the capital during the epochal decade of the 1640s. To give but one example: William Walwyn and other future Levellers were heavily involved, with republican MP Henry Marten, in the effort to organize a "general rising" in the summer of 1643. The aim was to put together a volunteer force of 10,000 men in London and place it at the disposal of Sir William Waller, who was the great hope of all who were disillusioned by the lacklustre military leadership of the Earl of Essex. In the event the movement for a general rising was a dismal flop: according to Sir Simonds D'Ewes, the committee was not able to raise 400 men. Lindley briefly describes this episode in revolutionary politics but refrains from commenting on its larger significance.

We may hope that Lindley has the stamina to give us a sequel to this substantial volume, for the London of the later 1640s and 1650s still awaits its historian. This gap in our understanding of the revolutionary years badly needs filling.

Ian Gentles
*Glendon College, York University*

Brian Jenkins and Spyros A. Sofos, eds. — *Nation and Identity in Contemporary Europe*. New York: Routledge, 1996. Pp. ix, 286.

*Nation and Identity in Contemporary Europe* is a thought-provoking collection of essays addressing the vexatious problem of nationalism in Europe. The first part of the book provides the theoretical framework for the subsequent essays, which are