C321 Commerce emerges

✓

Refs 1. Kennedy, Taxation in Eng from 1660-1800

2. Eng Pmty. Inquiry, 1902-10, gives full hist. of land taxation, In rpt. of comm'r of internal rev.

Might be cited by Kennedy.

Schalkenbach

Landmarks

Early Stuarts, ~~1600~~ 1630-1640, rapid xtion.

Cromwell taxed commerce heavily.

Funfeld

Also Cl. Long. ni Ed Ref.
& ask Fisher if any index to land prices.

Perry wants quote on workers worse off in 19th.

Trevelyan 942 Tr
Mantoux
Veitch

Mantoux – p. 174-75
p. 443-ff.

Heaton p. 432

Reid.

✓ p. 302 Walpole from 1720 or so tried to replace land taxes, by Ag customs etc.

c. 1800, Pitt introduced income tax.

Land tax had been made redeemable by lump sum payment.

p. 301 By 1821 was still some land tax, but very small part of total rev. Maybe was not put on urban land.

Trevelyan, Eng. Social Hist. p. 274-75, non-committal.

Daniel Fusfeld. Sending MS on 15th-16th cents.

✓ Tax of 1689 was primarily on urban land. Rural landholders dominating. It was a way of tapping the new commercial wealth.

It never was a large revenue-producer, however. Indirect taxes predominated.

It has never completely disappeared, lingers on at negligible rate.

Enclosures of 16th cent. produced unemployment. Shift to grazing.

Enclosures of 18th c. didn't produce unemployment, rather it was destruction of cottage industry (that doesn't follow tho, bcs if shift from cottage to factory were all that was involved, labor shd. benefit)

✓ After 1815, long depressions, labor suffered badly. (One could say effects of enclosure were offset by war, then became manifest)

Th. Rogers data not gnrlly accepted. But there was a definite decline in 16th. Also after 1815. (That seems pretty definite.) And in spite of growth of industrial opps. in both eras.

✓ Rapid change from land to indirect taxes came in 1600-1640, esp. 1630-40. Bcs. Chas. lost support of rural landholders & ∴ couldn't tax them so heavily. (more)

So he turned to tax commerce, thereby lost burgher support.

But Cromwell did not repeal these taxes, rather stuck by them.

Interesting qn., then, Why came indl. revn in Eng?

Fusfeld

ED 5-1211

1. Send MS
2. Tax of 1689 – on urban land heavily in its adm.
   a. Why begun — Not a large part of total.
   b. When ended
3. When did first Parliament meet?
4. Did kings ally w. burghers & peasants vs. landlords?
5. If 16th c. enclosures were inconsequential, as often alleged, why did wages fall? Or did they?
   Why sturdy beggars?

Emergence of Commercial Agriculture in Western Europe.

The transition from

→ ✓ Heaton, H. Ec. Hist. of Eur. Chaps 18-20

Basic ✓ Oppenheimer, F. The State ~~Chap. 5 pts c;~~ Chap 6 pts a & c

~~Trevelyan, G.M. History of England~~

✓ Gras, N.S.B. Hist. of Ag Ch. 1 "The Enclosures" ~~Part II~~

→ ✓ Ashley, W.J. Ec. Organ of Eng. Chaps 3, ~~X~~, 6
Ch 3: "The Beginnings of Modern Eng; the Breakup of the Manor."
Ch. 6: "Ag. Estates & Eng. self-govt."

Collateral Prothero, E. English Eng Chaps 3, 10, 12

→ Trevelyan, G.M. Hist. of Eng 942/T124h. Vol ? Paperback??
Bk 2, Chap 6 100 yrs' war
Chap. 1 Black Death

Eng Hist. in 19th Cent. pp. 142-52, summarizes enclosures.

✓ Mantoux, P. Indl Rev Chap 1, Cottage Industry
Pt I, Chap. 3 Enclosures
Pt II, Chap. 1, Con replaces wool

→ Sinclair, H.M. Preface to Ec. Hists Chaps 6, 7, 10

~~De Tocqueville, A. Old Regime & French Rev.~~

✓ See, H. Ec & Social Condns in France During the 18th cent.
~~(Chaps 1-5 = over)~~ Ch. 4. "The Nobility." Ch 1-5 Optnl.

✓ Lefebvre, The Coming of the French Rev Pt IV, The Peasant Rev, pp. 113-32 paperback.

→ Clapham? Ec. Devmt of G.B. Nonesuch? Try Concise Ec. Hist. of Britain from earliest times to 1750. 330.942 C53c
J.H. Ec Devmt of Fr & Eng. Ch. 1, 2, on reforms in France, Eng. – 330.944 C53 Ch 1, 8, 2, 9

Seé

Ch. 4, "The Nobility" Repeats many glib fallacies, make optional.

ch. 2 "The Peasants & Agriculture." (Metayage has been misrendered as "cooperative farming.")

✓ → (p 25 & p. 18, points out disprop $ rents & l.v., last 20 yrs of ancien régime.

p. 25, simul, lords attempted enclosure. led to revolution.

p 21, Parish notables had to pay taxes for others who defaulted – royal taxes i.e. Cf. Rome.

Emergence of Commercial Agric., 2

Collateral Griswold. pp. ~~91~~ 91 – 106, Fr. revn. / only fair. Give as suggested collateral rdg only. Ng on England.

Macartney?

Gerschenkron?

Need less on Eng & Fr., more on Gy, Italy, Austria, Spain, small N. Sea countries. Clapham (on Gy.), Klein, Macartney, Gerschenkron, Jensen, Pirenne?

Need organizing theme(s): size of farm; market orientation; technique; political fn. & position of fmrs; tax position.

Try Trevelyan, English Social History. p. 469

333.0942 J63 Johnson, A.H. The Disappearance of the Small Landowner. Oxford, 1909
Not readable, for assignment, but good for ideas.

Gershoy, Leo. The French Revn & Nap. 944.04 G323f & fr — L 940.22 G323f

Collateral. Pirenne, H. Ec & Soc. Hist. Part V "The Ec. Changes of the 14th & 15th cents." Part VI, Urban Economy, I "The Provisioning of the Towns," pp. 172-76 of paperback.

Collateral De Tocqueville. Old Regime
Part Two, Sections:
1. Why feudalism ...
9. How, this in many respects ...
10. How the suppression ...
12. How, despite the progress ...

Try Henderson, Wm. O. The State & the Industrial Revn in Prussia.

1740 - 1870. 338
H 384s

Greenlaw, Ralph W. Ec. Origins of the French Revn.

330.944
G84e

Agricultural Economics 321, Spring, 1959

Reading list #4, Week of March 9. The emergence of commercial agriculture.

GENERAL WORKS AND TEXTS

See, Henri. ESQUISSE D'UNE HISTOIRE DU REGIME AGRAIRE EN EUROPE AUX 18e et 19e SIECLES. 333.094 Se3le. Good source for brushing up on your French -- very straightforward and readable.

Sombart, Werner. DER MODERNE KAPITALISMUS. 331 So 5m. Vol. 2, 2d Half-volume, Chapters 38-43.

Schlatter, Richard. PRIVATE PROPERTY. 333.3 Sch36p. Chapters 5-10. Primarily a history of the idea of property, gives a good overview of how legal concepts have had to change with changing commercial and technological conditions. Easy reading, but contains more detail than you will want to bother with, so skip discriminately.

Heaton, Herbert. ECONOMIC HISTORY OF EUROPE. 330.94 H352e 1948. Chapters 18-20.

Knight, M. M., Barnes, H. E., and Flugel. ECONOMIC HISTORY OF EUROPE, Part II, Chapters 5-7. (The text by Knight alone does not contain this material).

Barnes, H. E. ECONOMIC HISTORY OF THE WESTERN WORLD, 330.9 B262e, pp. 247-53.

Bowden, Witt, Karpovich, Michael, and Usher, A. P. AN ECONOMIC HISTORY OF EUROPE SINCE 1750. Chapter 13, "Agrarian Reforms in Europe, 1789-1870." In general this text is as poorly written as any in print, but this one chapter is tolerable and especially informative. Note how different were the French and the Prussian developments.

Bizzell, Wm. B. THE GREEN RISING. 630.1 B55 Agri. Chapter 2 "Agrarian Revolutions of the Past." A quick spin through many centuries with a former college president.

Oppenheimer, Franz. THE STATE. 320.1 Op5. Chapter 5, part c; Chapter 6, parts a and c. On the decline of feudal power with the growth of central states.

Gras, N. S. B. A HISTORY OF AGRICULTURE IN EUROPE AND AMERICA. 630.09 G76 Agri. Part II (or selected parts thereof).

WORKS ON ENGLAND

R - Ashley, W. J. THE ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION OF ENGLAND. 330.942 As3e. Chapters 3, 5 and 6. Don't get this confused with Ashley's Introduction to English Economic History and Theory, which is much less concise and interesting. However, if you are a glutton for punishment try it: 330.942 As3i4, Sections 3-6, 47-52.

Ag.- R Prothero, E. (Lord Ernle). ENGLISH FARMING, PAST AND PRESENT. 630.0942 Er6e3. Chapters 3, 10, 12. Prothero is more sympathetic than most students of English agricultural history with the landed gentry.

Tawney, R. H. RELIGION AND THE RISE OF CAPITALISM. 261 T19, and paperback. pp. 62-72, "The Economic Revolution; pp. 116-28, "The Land Question." For much more detail, see Tawney's exhaustive (and exhausting) Agrarian Problem of the 16th Century, 630.09 T19. Tawney tends to be carried away by the exuberance of his own verbosity, but if you restrict yourself to a few relevant sections you should come out all right.

Goldsmith, Oliver. "The Deserted Village." The classic poetic outburst against enclosures (fencing) in England. Found in most anthologies, or Goldsmith's works, such as 828 G57po, 821.08 C349 Vol. 16, etc.

Trevelyan, G. M. HISTORY OF ENGLAND. 942.T724h. Book 2, Chapter 6, "The Hundred Years' War;" Chapter 7, "The Black Death." England's imperialistic historian sings the virtues of yeomen as bowmen.

R - Mantoux, Paul. THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN THE 18th CENTURY. 330.942 M31. Part I, Chapter 3, "Redistribution of the Land," pp. 140-86. As readable and balanced an account as may be found.

Veitch, George S. THE GENESIS OF PARLIAMENTARY REFORM. Chapter 1, "The Need for Reform." Unfortunately not yet in Missouri Library. Best description of the system of rotten and pocket boroughs via which the landed gentry ruled England.

Taylor, Henry C. THE DECLINE OF LANDOWNING FARMERS IN ENGLAND. 305 W75b, Volume 1, 1904-06. This is one in a series of bulletins from the University of Wisconsin, and there is a numbering mix-up. Watch out that you don't get the wrong Volume 1. Taylor's work is in the second Volume 1 on the shelf.

Rogers, Thorold. SIX CENTURIES OF WORK AND WAGES. 331 R63 Chapters 16, 17. Rogers lacked a good editor, so it is up to the reader to separate the wheat from the chaff. When he seems boring or trivial, skim on to the next interesting paragraph. His insights, when you finally reach them, are worth the trouble.

----- THE ECONOMIC INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY. 330.9 R63. Chapter 1, pp. 8-10, on the political position of England's wool. Chapter 2, on wage-fixing in agriculture.

Hasbach, W. A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH AGRICULTURAL LABORER. 630.09 H27. Chapter 2, "Development of an Agricultural proletariat." Rather heavy going.

Hammond, John L. and Barbara. THE VILLAGE LABORER. 331.8 H18v Wordy and frankly propagandistic, emphasizes the hardships and injustices suffered by the poor and defenseless. But if you think this is overdrawn, look at Briffault's book on the Decline and Fall of the British Empire.

Ashton, T. S. ECONOMIC HISTORY OF ENGLAND: THE 18th CENTURY. 330.942 As39e. Chapter 2, "Agriculture and its Products." A wealth of detail, with more emphasis on technological than social factors. Ashton is at the opposite pole from the Hammonds -- recall his recent essay on The Treatment of Capitalism by Historians.

Habbakkuk, H. J. "English Landownership, 1680-1740." ECONOMIC HISTORY REVIEW. Volume X, pp. 1-17. In room 116. The divorce of ownership from operation.

Marshall, T. H. "Jethro Tull and the New Husbandry." ECONOMIC HISTORY REVIEW, 1929, p 41. ff. In room 116.

Curtler, W. H. A SHORT HISTORY OF ENGLISH AGRICULTURE. 630.094[illegible] C94. Agri. Chapters 5-18. Not very readable.

Seebohm, M. E. THE EVOLUTION OF THE ENGLISH FARM. 630.0942 C463e. Chapters 8-11. More detail than almost anyone will want, except for special research projects.

Lipson, E. THE ECONOMIC HISTORY OF ENGLAND. 330.942 L669 Volume 2, Chapter 3, "Agriculture." Pretty stuffy.

✓ Unwin, George. STUDIES IN ECONOMIC HISTORY. 330.942 Un9 Agri. pp. 186-203, "The Merchant Adventurers and the Cloth Industry." The loss of independance by rural craftsmen. cf. contract farming today.

Adams, Brooks. THE LAW OF CIVILIZATION AND DECAY. 901 Ad121 and paperback. Chapter 9, "Eviction of the Yeomen."

Ag.- R Sinclair, H. M. A PREFACE TO ECONOMIC HISTORY. 330.9 Si62p Agri. Chapters 6, 7 and 10. Although a secondary source, this is fairly original and very readable. Discusses soil exhaustion as a cause of change in agriculture.

The large number of excellent works on agriculture in this period gives some idea of how important it has seemed to historians and economists.

Marx, Karl. CAPITAL. Part 8, Chapter 27, 28.

WORKS ON FRANCE.

De Tocqueville, Alexis. THE OLD REGIME AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION. 944.04 T56aEb, and paperback.

See, Henri. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONDITIONS IN FRANCE DURING THE 18th CENTURY. 330.944 Se3, Chapters 1 - 5.

See, Henri. CLASSES RURALES ET LE REGIME DOMANIAL EN FRANCE AU MOYEN AGE. 333.0944 Se3. Livres IV, "Les Transformations du Regime Domanial dans les Derniers Siecles du Moyen Age."

WORKS ON CENTRAL EUROPE

Jensen, Einar. DANISH AGRICULTURE. 630.09489 J453d. Chapter 1.

Ford, Guy S. STEIN AND THE ERA OF REFORM IN PRUSSIA, 1807-15. 943.06 St34Xf7

Morier, R. B. D. "The Agrarian Legislation of Prussia." Chapter 5 in Cobden Club, SYSTEMS OF LAND TENURE, 347.2 C63 General and Agri.

OTHER COUNTRIES

Rountree, Seebohm. LAND AND LABOR IN BELGIUM. Not in Mo. library.

Klein, Julius. THE MESTA. 338.6 K67 Chapters 16, 17. Sheepman vs. Plowman in Spain. A classic struggle, beautifully reported which in many ways anticipated the battle over fencing of American rangelands. Our toughest cattlemen's associations had nothing on the Mesta.

THE RELATIONSHIPS OF FARMS WITH TOWNS.

Schmoller, Gustav. THE MERCANTILE SYSTEM. 330.1 Sch 5. In Room 116. pp. 1-47 at least, and it wouldn't hurt anyone to read the rest of this classic essay. City slickers have been gunning for unorganized farmers since time immemorial.

Hekscher, Eli. MERCANTILISM.Volume II, Part III, Chapter 4, pp. 80-111, on the policy of provision.

R - Pirenne, Henri. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY OF MEDIEVAL EUROPE. 330.902 P665e, and paperback. "Six, Urban Economy". I. "The Provisioning of the Towns, pp. 172-76 of the paperback.

Dobb, Maurice. CAPITALIST ENTERPRISE AND SOCIAL PROGRESS. Chapters 13, 14, on the struggle for market control, and town monopolies. Unfortunately not in Missouri library. Brings out the suicidal results of over-exploited town monopolies, and their influence on the evolution of trade and industry.

R - Ashley, W. J. ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION OF ENGLAND. 3301942 As3e. Chapter 6, "Agricultural Estates and English Self-government." Now it is the farm interests exploiting the cities through their control of Parliament.

------ INTRODUCTION TO ENGLISH ECONOMIC HISTORY AND THEORY. Sections 20, 21, 25, 27.

Smith, Adam. WEALTH OF NATIONS. 330 Sm5i. Book I, Chapter 3, "The Division of Labor is Limited by the Extent of the Market." Book III, Chapter 4, "How the Commerce of Towns Contributed to the Improvement of the Country." Characteristically, Smith emphasizes the mutual benefits of town and country, and the stimulation of agriculture by commerce.

Ag. -R Mantoux, Paul, THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN THE 18th CENTURY. 330.942 M31, Part I, Chapter 1, "The Old Type of Industry and its Evolution." Sections I-V, on cottage industry: a classic description. For another one, relax some evening with the novel SILAS MARNER.

Baldwin, S. BUSINESS IN THE MIDDLE AGES. 330.902 B193b. pp. 59-63, Town Policy. Largely paraphrases Pirenne (q.v.)

Day, Clive. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN EUROPE. 330.94 D33e 1942 Chapter 3, "Development of Manor and of Town." A text.

Rorig, Fritz. DIE EUROPAISCHE STADT IM MITTELALTER. Chapter 3, "Stadt und Staat."

M. E. Levasseur. Les Prix. Aperçu de l'Hist. Et. De la Valeur et du Revenu de la Terre en France, 13th - 18th inclusive. 1892. Extrait des Memoires de la société Nationale d'Agriculture de France. Tome 135, 1893. Paris: Typographie Chamerot et Renouard, 1893

le froment: wheat

le blé: wheat; corn; grain. le blé noir: buckwheat

p19 13th, pop grows, seigneurs create new towns, free.

la taille - also an Eng. word pronounced tāl. - a feudal land tax origly. (similar to English tallage), levied by king on seigneurs, & by them on vassals. (later became g.p.t. on visible wealth) 15th, Fr. king took over, became a personal tax from which many were exempt (lords & clergy). Not clear from Webster's if remained a land tax - may have become a poll tax. (a g.p.t. on visible assets)

décupler - increase tenfold

le denier - penny weight; money, funds. Used on p. 27 as inverse of i.t.
denier is from denarius (like dinar & dinero) which was 10 asses.

vaguer - to ramble

vague - empty

la moisson - harvest

enchevêtrer - to put on a halter

vénal - venal, mercenary; (of lands) rental when leased; or price when sold, "valeur vénale"

la semence - seed

la crue - growth

le fermage - rent (farm) - cash

Levasseur, 2

p 8 He draws mainly from 2 recent researches, soon to be published, of d'Avenel, M. le vicomte & Zalla, (Daniel).

p 9 d'Avenel concludes prices more from 5 & d, fixing fails. Kings cdn't enforce max wage in "middle ages" nor 16th; democrats cdn't enforce min. wage in 19th.

p 13 Many express value of $ in ℔ of wheat. (But wheat will become dearer relative to other products as country evolves from wheat exporter to importer. Thus studies of Th. Rogers & d'Avenel *infra* showing workers cd. buy more wheat in 15th than 19th are not conclusive)

la disette - scarcity

p. 15 d'Avenel's price index:

1200 - 1390 Rising
1376 - 1415 Falling
1415 - 1500 Stationary
1500 - 1600 Rising, very fast
1600 - c. 1640 Stationary
c. 1640 - c. 1660 Rising
c. 1660 - c. 1680 ~~Falling~~ Stationary
c. 1680 - c. 1740 Falling (no wonder they welcomed J. Law? (d'Avenel thought Law's machinations had little overall effect (but this may have been his prejudice))
c. 1740 - 1770 Rising
c. 1770 - 1790 Stationary
1790 - 1890 Rising (But cf. idea of falling prices in 19th. Maybe entire rise was before 1815 or 1819 anyway)

Levasseur, 3

9.r. falling from 16th cent., as mobile capital became commoner.

l'escompte (m) – discount.

14th & 15th, big movement to free serfs; but some remained in 1789.
(So France was/is as centrally dominated as Russia!)

le pré – meadow, pasture-ground
la prairie – meadow, prairie

p19-22/13th, popn ↓d, seigneurs create new free towns. Defrichen new lands formerly empty. Price of wheat falls, 1200-50, as reclamation outspeeds ↓ popn; 1250-1300, opposite. So says d'Avenel. Levasseur s'en doute mildly, so is in doubt. – & surely L. follows d'A.

But 1326-1475, land price falls, from c. 250 fr/ha to c. 50. – i.e. to 1/5.

1300-50 land price fell much, wheat & rye (le seigle), price a little, wages rose. Again, d'Avenel says ~~etc~~ recl. outstripped popn.

1351-75, wheat price climbs, land falls. Due to war & Jacquerie.

1376-1400, land price rises a bit, wheat back down. ?f. restoration of Chas. V & some order & hope. (1364-80)

1451-75, land down to low of 50 francs/ha. France was exhausted & depopulated by 100-yrs war (ended 1453)

In Orleanais, ?f. deliverance of Orleans, ha. rose from 16 to 92 francs.

1450-1500, many lands lay w/o claimants, much country a desert.

Levasseur. 4

p 22 7f. peace, reclaimed lands again from forests that had invaded them, post ravishing of war & revn. So later 15th was time of ~~pioneer~~ expansion, land reclamation, again.

This reclamation stopped land prices from rising very much (So altho France may have bn all reclaimed by 14th, it had to be done all over in late 15th, was new frontier)

Prices in general fell, as T & constant M.

l'orfèvre - goldsmith
le foin - hay, grass
p 23 1515-1600, average ha. up to 317 francs, largely due to new world gold.

Population: Grew, 13th & late 15th.
Fell, 14th & 15th (100 yrs War)
Fell, during religious wars ~~(16th?)~~ late 16th

p 23 15th to 19th, land price rose more than other things.
1451-1500, money worth 6 times 1884; land worth $\frac{1}{22}$ times 1884.
1884, mean price ha. = 1600 francs "d'après l'enquête du ministère des Finances".
1451-1500, = c. 72 fr. (& was down to low of 48 once)

Same period, rent has risen, but less than l.v. Rent rose c. 10x, cf. l.v. 22 times.

Different kinds lands have changed relationship. too. In 15th, woods were very ~~cmn~~ cheap bcs widespread; pasture cost more; & hay-land most of all, bcs. there were no "prairies artificielles" ... meaning?

Levasseur, 5

p 25 1621 Royal Edict forbids new building around Paris. Motive unclear. Failed.

p. 27 Over centuries, land prices have risen, esp. in cities, real values. "C'est elle (la propriété foncière) qui ... a le plus profité de l'accroissement général de la richesse nationale."

p 28 Right of chase, before 16th, was an obligation, not a sport — to protect from dangerous animals, predators on man & probly more so on beast.

By revn, many rentals were nominal token quitrents, due to inflation over centuries. (But did not this system destroy mobility, xferability?)

✓ Revn destroyed these tokens. But simul injured many peasants, in many a parish, who lost rights of usage & even common goods.

le bail, pl. baux, — lease; deed of conveyance

le cens — (census); payment due to estate owner in recognition of his title. Perhaps customary. Spanish censo.

amodier — to let out on lease

p 28 17th & 18th, "les baux à cens" replaced by "bail à ferme", more flexibility, reduced morcellement. At least in great plains like Beauce.

(Since "fermage" is cash rent, probly bail à ferme is too. Baux à cens wd. be perpetual leasehold)

p 29 d'Avenel concludes peasant's lot declined in 16th, & didn't recover until 19th. Levasseur concurs. Loss of old rights of use, & vaine pâture

Under Richelieu perhaps, suppression of vaine pâture in Provence?

(17th)

p 30 17th, use of artificial prairies begins (this must mean sown pastures, permanent stands.) Owners had to keep off other animals to do this of course,

Levasseur, 6

p30 1769, droit de parcours / easement for traversing abolished in Roussillon, bec too many tenants w. too many hungry animals were using it, destroying pastures.

1889, parcours finally abolished in France. (About same time as in Oklahoma!!)

Rents, & l.v. fell toward 1700; rose toward 1789

1651-75, prosperity. Louis XIV. But then he began futile wars, & Louis XV didn't help much at first. But then peace, 18th, long rise. clearing, ↓ pop'n, hi price land.

Revolution slowed ↓ l.v. But 1830 recommenced, & after 1850 was as rapid as after 1750.

Fleury, French cardinal & statesman, d. 1743.

p34 Middle ages, many serving men had hereditary right to certain job — & got paid for it. 16th, many props. bought this "fief" back.

Laborers got no more in 1890 than middle ages, esp. when consider many more holidays then.

p41 15th c. was tops for labor. 16th, position worsened as American gold poured in. Not clear just why. But enclosures were in process. & turning lands to flocks.

p44. Daniel Zolla, unlike A. Smith, says rent / gross product diminishes over time Calso unlike d'Avenel, supra. What is Zolla's evidence?)

p46 1596-1615, real rent rises, until 1630. Then falls during 2d half of reign of Louis XIII, due to Richelieu's costly policies. 1630-40.

1640-50 slight rise; 1650-75 rapid rise, to peak.

1675 – drop. – in real terms. Bec land less productive for 3 ~~centuries~~:

p48 Henri IV & Sully, economical

Richelieu costly. Lorraine esp. exhausted, in 50 years land price there fell 3/5.

Louis XIV began economically, for 12 yrs, then entered Dutch war, 1672 & later costly wars.

Colbert took measures vs. the exportation & free circulation of grains.

c. 1700, price of wheat fell, Fr. & Eng.

p49 Like d'Avenel, Zolla finds selling price (valeur vénale) & rent of land falling to c. 1740, then rising, & esp. after 1763.

Hectolitre = 2.84 bushels = 100 litres = $\frac{1}{10}$ m^3

p51 Innovations in 18th. Artificial meadows (meaning seeded? guess) / This probly means growing fodder crops, which wd. have ben a true innovation. Irrgd. pastures wd. hold.

Potatoes.

The minister Bertin gave free circulation to grains internally, & even allowed export for a time

Taxes rose too; but not as much as cash rents.

Later 18th, prices rose, wages not. So rents rose dly more than prices.

Levasseur, 8

p. 103 There was an influx of gold etc., c. 1750-1800, which raised prices(!??) Comparably to 16th(!!!???)

p103 Influence of legislation on price of wheat was most marked under Louis XIV, & 1st half reign Louis XV. Forbade grain export, from country, & from certain favored areas. Prices were low.

1750 - ---, allowed export. Prices higher.

1820 - 51, sliding scale tariff.

1853 - free import & export. Prices rise to 1880.

Before 1880, "famine" really meant Hell. Constant threat. Inadequate storage. Poor transport. Obstacles - largely to export. (by local seigneurs) Certain privileged towns had monopsony of certain areas, e.g. Lyons had Burgundy. Paris had widest area, & was always esp. well provisioned.

Some other areas ∴ suffered terrible famines - risk not shared optimally (good analogy re water systems)

wk p105 Many seigneurs forbade wheat export when famine looked imminent. (another analogy to Calif. water). Or taxed wheat in transit.

wk p106 In wars, big army requisitioning wheat was a local catastrophe. Louis XIV esp.

p. 107-40, annals of famines, 981 - 1878, including most affecting details. They were many & frequent, until 1880.

a remarkable study.

C. E. Labrousse. "The Crisis in the French Ec. at the End of the Old Regime."
pp 59 - 72 of Greenlaw, Ralph W (ed) The Ec. Origins of the French Revn
Boston: Heath & Co, 1958. (Not readable)

p. 64 Long term ΔP, 18th up to 1770.

Esp. after 1763, 1763-70, boom, exceptional advance.

c. 1770, ~~disaster~~ distress sets in, with Louis Seize. By 1778, decline in full force.

(One deals w. land on long term contracts – buying, or long term leasing. Biggest risk, ~~was~~ Biggest lag of contracts behind current conditions. Greatest instl. obsolescence.)

By 1781, wine price cut in ½, remained low for 7 yrs. Hit small fmrs.

Grain price fell, 1770-80, remained low to 1781. But not serious until 1776, & never as bad as wine.

Grain area was n-n France, Lorraine-Normandy & Flanders-Orleans. Tnt fmrs.

Expansion, devnt of new lands ceases.

Up to 1770-75, rents had lagged Δ gross income, 9 yr leases. Now landlords were getting revenge, & optimistic tnts were willing to pay, full of confidence – even as grnd prices were cresting c. 1775. (a 9-yr lease is like buying land, at least c. ½ interest – & much more turnover, so hi % of ~~g~~ propn. affected. Thus look for distress & social revolt in A, areas of hi tnty; B, areas of recent buying & reclamation)

Labrousse, 2

Rents continued to rise, 1775 - 90.

Fr. sales fell off, except colonies. There was a big re-export trade, colonial sugar & coffee brought to Bordeaux & Nantes. These pad the aggregates, but export of French proper fm products was falling. (And no doubt one reason was use of fr purch. pwr for colonial products. Thus confirming my hypothesis — they developed more land than mkt cd. absrb products of, priced it too high)

(These new lands were farmed by slaves. Ecly, like animals or machines — got products to mkt w. min. of French labor)

Unemployment in France, severe.

~~1781, brief recovery then. 1784, another setback.~~

1781 another setback starts, crisis came in 1819

1788 bad harvest, due to hailstorms — paging E. Huntington!! sharp rise of grain prices, thru 1789 - 90.

Rise was about 50%. There had been sharper rises, (in 1710), and were again later, (1812, 1817). But this one fell on explosive background. Triggered Revolution.

p 68 Poor had to pay more for bread, had nothing left for clothes, so cloth production halved, ~~1780~~ 1781-89. (Were clothes then a relatively durable good?) Was general collapse of construction & industrial production.

1785, had been a "severe forage crisis."

1777-83, heavy taxes for Am. War.

Labrousse, 3

p 69 Since 1781, govt unable to ask for more major consumption levies.

Taille fixed since 1780

a 2d vingtième imposed in 1782–87.

Govt. called Estates bcs. of bankruptcy – deficit & collapse of credit.
Cdn't impose new taxes – cdn't even collect old ones, e.g. on grain output, which became very burdensome as base fell, 20% net profit fell 100%.

p 71 Tendency of revn: to reduce excise, salt, & consumption taxes – temporarily.
to suppress tithes & feudal obligations. – this change was permanent.

There had been prohibitions vs. planting new vines, earlier. But not revived by Ancien Regime. Cahiers protested they should have.
Govt had forbidden grain export.

Seigneurs collected their rent in grain, often, thus became grain execs, thus were scapegoats in latter capacity.

Seigneurs didn't even collect rent themselves, no hire new to do it, but farmed out the right to bidders. Many of these were pinched, too, in depression.

p 72 His general point: revolution arose out of misery, & not as Jaurès & Mathiez say.

DÉPARTEMENT DE L'YONNE.

(1808 – 1842)

Size	NO.	% of Total NO.	Area (ha.)	% of Total Area	Ave. Hectares per Farm
		%		%	(ha.)
Below 1 ha.	106,553	55.91	36,169	5.10	.34
1 – 2	26,646	13.98	38,338	5.41	1.44
2 – 4	23,294	12.22	66,376	9.37	2.85
4 – 6	11,175	5.86	54,774	7.73	4.90
6 – 10	10,454	5.49	80,250	11.32	7.68
10 – 20	7,496	3.93	102,876	14.52	13.72
20 – 50	3,337	1.75	99,443	14.03	29.80
50 – 100	899	.47	61,967	8.74	68.93
over 100	739	.39	167,871	23.69	227.16
TOTAL	190,593	100.00	708,664	100.00	

(1863)

Size	NO.	% of Total NO.	Area (ha.)	% of Total Area	Ave. Hectares per Farm
		%		%	(ha.)
Below 1 ha.	145,735	61.10	45,633	6.42	.31
1 – 2	30,997	13.00	44,386	6.25	1.43
2 – 4	26,702	11.20	75,961	10.69	2.84
4 – 6	12,258	5.14	59,943	8.44	4.89
6 – 10	10,988	4.61	84,303	11.86	7.67
10 – 20	7,310	3.06	100,070	14.08	13.69
20 – 50	2,968	1.24	87,482	12.31	29.48
50 – 100	846	.35	59,030	8.31	69.78
over 100	701	.29	153,761	21.64	219.35
TOTAL	238,505	100.00	710,569	100.00	

DÉPARTEMENT DE GERS.

(1808 – 1842)

Size	NO.	% of Total NO.	Area (ha.)	% of Total Area	Ave. Hectares per Farm
		%		%	(ha.)
Below 1 ha.	44,853	42.96	16,925	2.77	.38
1 – 2	15,933	15.26	22,933	3.76	1.44
2 – 4	14,328	13.72	40,160	6.58	2.80
4 – 6	7,320	7.01	36,234	5.94	4.95
6 – 10	7,895	7.56	61,406	10.06	7.81
10 – 20	7,483	7.17	104,998	17.20	14.03
20 – 50	4,762	4.56	146,172	23.95	30.70
50 – 100	1,250	1.20	84,792	13.89	67.83
over 100	581	.56	96,765	15.85	166.55
TOTAL	104,405	100.00	610,384	100.00	

(1857)

Size	NO.	% of Total NO.	Area (ha.)	% of Total Area	Ave. Hectares per Farm.
		%		%	(ha.)
Below 1 ha.	58,567	46.70	21,862	3.59	.37
1 – 2	20,489	16.34	29,881	4.90	1.46
2 – 4	16,214	12.93	45,878	7.52	2.83
4 – 6	7,951	6.34	39,319	6.45	4.95
6 – 10	8,284	6.61	64,401	10.56	7.77
10 – 20	7,644	6.09	107,252	17.59	14.03
20 – 50	4,631	3.69	140,862	23.10	30.42
50 – 100	1,135	.90	76,607	12.57	67.50
over 100	502	.40	83,611	13.71	166.56
TOTAL	125,417	100.00	609,673	100.00	

Source: M. Gimel, 1868, pp. 584-85.

Département De L'yonne
A (1808–1842)

Size	f No	x Average Ha. per farm	$(x - \bar{x})$	x^2	fx^2
0–1	106,553	.34	−3.38	11.4	1214,704.00
1–2	26,646	1.44	−2.28	5.2	138,559
2–4	23,294	2.85	−.86	.7	16,306
4–6	11,175	4.90	1.18	1.4	15,645
6–10	10,454	7.68	3.96	15.7	164,128
10–20	7,496	13.72	10.00	100.00	749,600
20–50	3,337	29.80	26.08	680.2	2269,827
50–100	899	68.93	65.21	4252.3	3822,818
ous 100	739	227.16	223.44	49925.4	36894,871
Total	N= 190,593			$\Sigma x^2 = 54992$	$\Sigma fx^2 = 45,286,458$

$N = 190,593 \qquad \Sigma X = 708,664$

$$\bar{X} = \frac{708,664}{N} = \frac{708,664}{190,593} = \boxed{3.72}\ \text{hab.}\ (3.7182)$$

$\bar{X} = 3.72$
$\Sigma x^2 = 54992.00$
$\Sigma fx^2 = 45286,458.$

$$\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{45286.458}{190,593}} = \sqrt{238.3}$$

15.4

$\bar{X} = 3.72$
$\alpha = 15.4$
$\frac{\alpha}{\bar{X}} = 4.1$

.34
−3.72
2

3.72
34

10
−100
−90

−90

15
15
75
15
225

16
16
96
16
256

155
15.5
775
155
2392.5

Departement De Lyonne.

(B) 1863

f	X	x	x^2	fx^2
145,735	.31	− 2.66	7.07	1030,346
30,997	1.43	− 1.54	2.37	73,462
26,702	2.84	− .13	0.02	534
12,258	4.89	+1.92	3.69	45,232
10,988	7.67	4.70	22.10	242,835
7,310	13.69	10.72	114.92	840,065
2,968	29.48	26.51	702.78	2085,851
846	69.78	66.81	4463.58	3776,189
701	219.35	216.38	46820.30	32821,030.

$\Sigma x^2 = 52,137$ $\Sigma fx^2 = 40,915,644$

$N = 238,505$

$\Sigma X = 710,569$

$$\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma fx^2}{N}}$$

$$\bar{X} = \frac{710.569}{238.505} = \boxed{2.97}$$

$$\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{40,915,644}{238,505}} = \sqrt{171.55} = 13.14$$

2.97
1.43
1.54

13.69
2.97
10.72

4.89
2.97
1.92

29.48
2.97
26.51

7.67
2.97
4.70

69.78
2.97
66.81

219.35
- 2.97
216.38

13.14.

4.3
43
129
172
11.49

170

70.
2.
50.

40.
10.
16.00

$\bar{X} = 2.97$

$\alpha = 13.14$

$V = \frac{\alpha}{\bar{X}} = 4.4$

Département De Ters
(A)

1808—1842

f	X	$x = X - \bar{X}$	x^2	fx^2	
44, 853	.38	− 5.47	29.92	1342001.76	1342,002
15, 933	1.44	− 4.41	19.45	309896.85	309,899
14, 328	2.80	− 3.05	9.30	133250.40	133,250
7, 320	4.95	− .90	.81	5529.20	5529
7, 895	7.81	+ 1.96	3.84	30316.80	30,317
7, 483	14.03	+ 8.18	66.91	500687.53	500,689
4, 762	30.70	+ 24.85	617.52	2940630.24	2940,630
1, 250	67.83	+ 61.98	3841.52	4801900.00	4801,900
581	166.55	+ 160.70	25824.49	15004028.70	15004,029

$\Sigma x^2 = 30413.76$

$\Sigma fx^2 = 25068,242$

$N = 104,405$

$$\bar{X} = \frac{610,384}{104,405} = 5.85$$

$$\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{25068,242}{104,405}} = \sqrt{240.1} = 15.5$$

$\bar{X} = 5.85$

$\alpha = 15.50$

$\frac{\alpha}{\bar{X}} = 2.65$

Département De Gers

(B)

(857)

f	X	x (X − X̄)	x²	fx²
58, 567	.37	− 4.48	20.07	1175, 440.00
20, 489	1.46	− 3.39	11.50	235, 624
16, 214	2.83	− 2.02	4.08	66, 153
7, 951	4.95	+ .10	.01	79
8, 284	7.77	2.92	8.53	70, 663
7, 644	14.03	9.18	84.27	644, 160
4, 631	30.42	25.57	653.82	3027, 840
1, 135	67.50	62.65	3925.02	4454, 898
502	166.56	161.71	26150.12	13127, 360

$N = 125,417$

$\Sigma X = 609,673$

$\Sigma fx^2 = 22802,217$

$$\bar{X} = \frac{609,673}{123,417} = \boxed{4.85}$$

$$\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{22802,217}{125,417}} = \sqrt{182} = 13.5$$

$\bar{X} = 4.85$

$\alpha = 13.50$

$\frac{\alpha}{\bar{X}} = 2.78$

Departement De Lyonne

1808–1849

check products	size	(b) % of Farm	% land	(h) cumulative % of Land	products
353.9	0 – 1	55.91	5.1	5.1	285.1
269.9	1 – 2	13.5	5.4	10.5	210.6
360.2	2 – 4	12.2	9.4	19.9	370.9
314.6	4 – 6	5.9	7.7	27.6	280.3
365.7	6 – 10	5.5	11.3	38.9	365.8
304.4	10 – 20	3.9	14.5	53.4	360.0
155	20 – 50	1.8	14.0	67.4	217.4
68.5	50 – 100	.5	8.7	76.1	71.8
39.9	100 over	.4	23.7	99.8	70.4

$\Sigma = 2232.1$

$\Sigma = 2232.3$

checking products
2,232.1

products
$\Sigma = 2,232.3$

$$C.R. = 1 - \frac{T}{10,000}$$

$1 - .2232 = .7768$

Departement de l'Yonne

1863

Check Products	size	(b) % of Farm	% of Land	(h) cumulative % of Land	Products
474.2	0 — 1	61.1	6.4	6.4	391
307.3	1 — 2	13	6.3	12.7	248.3
281.4	2 — 4	11.2	10.7	23.4	404.3
308.3	4 — 6	5.1	8.4	31.8	281.5
336.5	6 — 10	4.6	11.9	43.7	347.3
248.5	10 — 20	3.1	14.1	57.8	314.7
112.2	20 — 50	1.2	12.3	70.1	133.5
54.9	50 — 100	.4	8.3	78.4	59.4
30.0	over 100	.3	21.6	100.0	53.5
$\Sigma = 2,253.5$					$\Sigma = 2,253.5$

C.R. = 1 − .2254 = .7746

Département De Ters

1808 – 1842

check Products	Size	(b) % of Farm	% of Land	(h) Cumulative % of Land	Products
163.2	0 — 1	43.0	2.8	2.8	120.4
191.4	1 — 2	15.3	3.8	6.6	143.8
273.2	2 — 4	13.7	6.6	13.2	271.3
278.9	4 — 6	7.	5.9	19.1	226.1
432.2	6 — 10	7.6	10.1	29.2	367.1
547.5	10 — 20	7.2	17.2	46.4	544.3
408.3	20 — 50	4.6	24	70.4	537.3
151.7	50 — 100	1.2	13.9	84.3	185.6
60.1	over 100	.6	15.9	100.2	110.7

$\Sigma = 2506.5$ $\Sigma = 2,506.6$

C.R. = 1 − .2507

C.R. = .7493

Département De Gers

1857

Check Products	Size	(b) % a Farm	% a Land	(h) Cumulative % a Land	Products
226.8	0 — 1	46.7	3.6	3.6	168.1
248.2	1 — 2	16.3	4.9	8.5	197.2
307.2	2 — 4	12.9	7.5	16.0	316.1
290.3	4 — 6	6.3	6.5	22.5	242.6
420.4	6 — 10	6.6	10.6	33.1	367
496.9	10 — 20	6.1	17.6	50.7	511.2
339.5	20 — 50	3.7	23.1	73.8	460.7
112.3	50 — 100	.9	12.6	86.4	144.2
40	Over 100	.4	13.7	100.1	74.6

$\Sigma = 2,481.6$ $\Sigma = 2,481.7$

C.R. = 1 − .2482

C.R. = .7518

Departement de L'Yonne

Size Class	a l'origine (1808-42) No.	% of total no.	Area (ha.)	% of total area	ave. hectares per farm	1863 No.	%	Area (ha.)	%	ave. hectares per farm
Below 1 ha.										
1-2										
2-4										
4-6										
6-10										
10-20										
20-50										
50-100										
Over 100										

Département de Gers

	a l'Origine (1808-42) No.	%	Area	%	1857 No	%	Area	%
Below 1 ha.								
over 100								

Source: M. Gimel, 1868, pp. 584-85 (v. notes in C 321 file)

Hwang

Put the data onto tabulating paper in scheme as shown.

Then compute standard deviations and coefficients of variation ($\frac{\sigma}{\bar{x}}$)

Département De Lyonne

(A)

1808 — 1842

Size	f	X	(X−x) x	x^2	fx^2
0 – 1	106,553	.34	− 3.38	11.4	1214,704
1 – 2	26,646	1.44	− 2.28	5.2	138,559
2 – 4	23,294	2.85	− .86	.7	16,306
4 – 6	11,175	4.90	1.18	1.4	15.645
6 – 10	10,454	7.68	3.96	15.7	164,128
10 – 20	7.496	13.72	10.00	100.00	749,600
20 – 50	3.337	29.80	26.08	680.20	2269,827
50 – 100	899	68.93	65.21	4252.30	3822,818
Over 100	739	227.16	223.44	49925.40	36894.871
	Σf=190.593				Σfx² = 45,286,458

$\begin{cases} f = \text{No.} \\ X = \text{Average ha. per farm.} \\ x = \cancel{X} \quad x - X \end{cases}$

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\Sigma X}{N}$$

$$\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma f x^2}{N}}$$

$N = 190,593$

$\bar{X} = \frac{708,664}{190,593} = \underline{3.72}$ (ha.)

$\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{45286.458}{190,593}} = \sqrt{238.3} = \underline{15.4}$

$\frac{\alpha}{\bar{X}} = \underline{4.1}$

(B)

1863

Size	f	X	x	x^2	fx^2
0 – 1	145.735	.31	− 2.66	7.07	1030,346
1 – 2	30,997	1.43	− 1.54	2.37	73,462
2 – 4	26,702	2.84	− .13	.02	534
4 – 6	12,258	4.89	+ 1.92	3.69	45,232
6 – 10	10,988	7.67	+ 4.70	22.10	242,835
10 – 20	7,310	13.69	+ 10.72	114.92	840,065
20 – 50	2,968	29.48	+ 26.51	702.78	2085,851
50 – 100	846	69.78	+ 66.81	4463.58	3776,189
Over 100	701	219.35	+ 216.38	46820.30	32821,030
	Σ = 238,505				

$N = 238,505$

$\Sigma X = 710,569$

$\bar{X} = 2.97$

$\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{40,915,644}{238,505}} = \sqrt{171.6} = 13.14$

$\frac{\alpha}{\bar{X}} = \frac{13.14}{2.97} = \underline{4.4}$

Département De Gers

(A)
1808 – 1842

Size	f	X	x	x^2	fx^2
0 – 1	44,853	.38	– 5.47	29.92	1342,002
1 – 2	15,933	1.44	– 4.41	19.45	309,837
2 – 4	14,328	2.80	– 3.05	9.30	133,250
4 – 6	7,320	4.95	– .90	.81	5,529
6 – 10	7,895	7.81	+ 1.96	3.84	30,317
10 – 20	7,483	14.03	8.18	66.91	500,688
20 – 50	4,762	30.70	24.85	617.52	2940,630
50 – 100	1,250	67.83	61.98	3841.52	4801,900
ouv 100	581	166.55	160.70	25824.49	15004,029

$\Sigma fx^2 = 25068,242$

$N = 104,405$

$\Sigma X = 610,384$

$\bar{X} = 5.85$

$\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{25068,242}{104,405}} = \sqrt{240.1} = 15.5$

$\frac{\alpha}{X} = 2.65$

(B)
1857

Size	f	X	x	x^2	fx^2
0 – 1	58,567	.37	– 4.48	20.07	1175,440
1 – 2	20,489	1.46	– 3.39	11.50	235,624
2 – 4	16,214	2.83	– 2.02	4.08	66,153
4 – 6	7,951	4.95	+ .10	.01	79
6 – 10	8,284	7.77	2.92	8.53	70,663
10 – 20	7,644	14.03	9.18	84.27	644,160
20 – 50	4,631	30.42	25.57	653.82	3027,840
50 – 100	1,135	67.50	62.65	3925.02	4454,898
ouv 100	502	166.56	161.71	26150.12	13127,360

$\Sigma fx^2 = 22802,217$

$N = 125,417$

$\Sigma X = 609,623$

$\bar{X} = 4.85$

$\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{22802,217}{125,417}} = \sqrt{182} = 13.5$

$\frac{\alpha}{X} = 2.78$

IX

MOYENNES GÉNÉRALES DES SALAIRES AGRICOLES ET DES SALAIRES DE MAÇONS, CHARPENTIERS, PEINTRES, ETC.

PÉRIODES.	JOURNALIERS OUVRIERS AGRICOLES par Jour.		VIGNERONS PAR JOUR	
	Nourris.	non Nourris.	Nourris.	non Nourris.
		1° De 1201	à 1600	
1201 — 1225	" "	" "	" "	" "
1226 — 1250	" "	0. 65	" "	" "
1251 — 1275	0. 20	0. 60	" "	" "
1276 — 1300	0. 26	0. 60	" "	" "
1301 — 1325	0. 30	0. 67	0. 47	" "
1326 — 1350	0. 37	0. 80	" "	1. 04
1351 — 1375	0. 45	0. 90	" "	
1376 — 1400	0. 35	0. 73	" "	
1401 — 1425	0. 40	0. 70	0. 35	0. 75
1426 — 1450	0. 37	0. 65	0. 46	0. 87
1451 — 1475	0. 32	0. 60	0. 52	0. 90
1476 — 1500	0. 30	0. 58	0. 47	
1501 — 1525	0. 30	0. 60	" "	
1526 — 1550	0. 29	0. 70	0. 50	0. 96
1551 — 1575	0. 33	0. 75	0. 42	0. 86
1576 — 1600	0. 36	0. 78	0. 38	0. 91
		2° De 1601	à 1790	
1601 — 1625	0. 32	0. 76	" "	0. 98
1626 — 1650	" "	0. 74	" "	1. 25
1651 — 1675	0. 39	0. 80	0. 53	1. 07
1676 — 1700	0. 43	0. 80	" "	0. 89
1701 — 1725	0. 35	0. 70	" "	0. 90
1726 — 1750	0. 34	0. 68	0. 40	0. 80
1751 — 1775	0. 37	0. 75	0. 42	0. 86
1776 — 1790	0. 45	0. 82	0. 50	1. 01
1890	1. 50	2. 50	" "	" "

XII

SALAIRE DE LA JOURNÉE DU MANŒUVRE, NON NOURRI, EXPRIMÉ EN MARCHANDISES DIVERSES

PÉRIODES.	EN LITRES de blé.	EN LITRES de seigle.	EN KILOGS. de boeuf.	EN KILOGS. de porc.	EN LITRES de vin.
		1° de 1201 à 1600			
1201 — 1225	14. 20	28 "	1. 930	1. 720	6. 20
1226 — 1250	12. 10	13. 30	1. 780	1. 610	12. 10
1251 — 1275	8. 60	10 "	1. 780	1. 610	9. 70
1276 — 1300	9. 20	9. 60	2. 100	2. 180	2. 80
1301 — 1325	7. 72	11. 10	2. 400	2. 120	2. 62
1326 — 1350	12 "	16 "	2. 580	1. 400	4. 80
1351 — 1375	10 "	18 "	3. 330	2. 360	4. 30
1376 — 1400	16. 80	26 "	3. 470	1. 480	5. 30
1401 — 1425	9. 70	20 "	2. 590	1. 450	5. 40
1426 — 1450	9. 60	14 "	2. 000	1. 620	4. 20
1451 — 1475	18. 40	26 "	4. 270	2. 850	5. 70
1476 — 1500	14. 50	19 "	3. 220	2. 410	6. 20
1501 — 1525	14. 60	18 "	2. 720	1. 870	8. 20
1526 — 1550	10 "	17. 50	2. 690	1. 400	3. 10
1551 — 1575	6. 25	8. 30	2. 500	1. 250	6. 10
1576 — 1600	3. 90	5 "	1. 850	1. 140	4 "
		2° de 1601 à 1790			
1601 — 1625	5. 30	7. 60	2. 050	1. 520	4. 40
1626 — 1650	3. 80	5. 60	1. 600	1. 430	3. 30
1651 — 1675	5 "	9. 60	1. 660	1. 480	8. 00
1676 — 1700	5. 90	8. 80	2. 000	1. 900	4 "
1701 — 1725	4. 50	7. 70	1. 620	1. 570	3 "
1726 — 1750	6. 10	10. 10	1. 780	1. 740	4. 80
1751 — 1775	6. 10	7. 10	1. 560	1. 340	4. 40
1776 — 1790	5. 70	7. 80	1. 240	1. 150	4. 10
1890	12. 50	20. 80	1. 560	1. 660	6. 20

É. LEVASSEUR.

IV

PRIX ET REVENUS DES TERRES (L'HECTARE) ET DES MAISONS DÉDUITS

PÉRIODES.	TERRES LABOURABLES.		PRÉS.		VIGNES.		BOIS.		MAISONS A PARIS.		MAISONS DE VILLES DE PROVINCE.		MAISONS DE VILLAGES	
	Prix.	Revenu.	Prix.	Revenu.	Prix.	Revenu.	Prix.	Revenu.	Prix.	Revenu.	Prix.	Revenu.	Prix.	Revenu.
	P/R						1° De	1200	á 1600.	P/R				
1290 — 1225	10 135	13.50	428	42	387	38	63	6	1356	12.1112	500	41	174	14
1226 — 1250	232	23.50	354	35	600	60	70	7	1596	12 133	1614	136	188	15
1251 — 1275	10 206	20.60	790	79	340	34	96	9	2510	12.208	1885	160	235	19
1276 — 1300	10 261	26.00	376	37	721	72	100	10	2600	216	513	42	143	12
1301 — 1325	10 222	22.00	616	61	636	63	104	10	2045	170	346	29	111	9
1326 — 1350	10 108	10.80	236	23	463	46	52	5	3787	315	237	19	170	14
1351 — 1375	10 83	8.30	337	33	140	14	84	8	1100	91	473	39	162	13
1376 — 1400	10 98	9.80	484	48	420	42	53	4	1560	130	1000	80	46	4
1401 — 1425	10 89	8.90	136	13	376	37	60	5	2067	172	332	26	87	7
1426 — 1450	10 68	6.80	139	13	218	21	15	1.50	804	67	705	58	149	12
1451 — 1475	10 48	4.80	218	21	127	12	»	»	696	58	750	62	146	12
1476 — 1500	12 97	8.10	123	10	228	19	55	4	951	80	1227	102	123	10
1501 — 1525	11.9 95	8 »	268	22	191	16	70	5	2060	147	1700	121	207	14
1526 — 1550	12 132	11 »	237	19	378	31	90	7	5133	366	1470	105	137	10
1551 — 1575	14 241	17.20	524	37	705	50	130	8	3485	249	1407	100	182	13
1576 — 1600	16 317	19.80	448	28	518	32	200	14	7016	16.1437	1856	116	263	16
							2° De	1601	á 1790.					
1601 1625	19.8277	14 »	693	34	600	30	190	9.50	~~11800~~	20 590	2320	116	425	21
1626 1650	20 308	15.40	675	33	580	29	280	14	34280	1769	4526	226	393	19
1651 1675	25.1481	19.20	970	48	860	43	190	8	40500	2250	3878	193	490	21
1676 1700	20 375	18.75	910	45	750	37	275	13	32000	20 1600	6075	303	413	20
1701 1725	23.2 265	11.40	670	27	575	23	118	5	22740	1137	5830	296	395	19
1726 1750	25. 344	13.75	885	35	1125	45	238	9	29600	20 1480	3225	160	390	19
1751 1775	30.3 545	18 »	1000	35	1380	50	350	12	33300	20 1665	5465	278	600	30
1776 1799	29.4764	26 »	1244	44	1312	47	400	14	73560	20 3678	5775	288	635	32
									260000	14300	13759	588		91
									dans les arrondiss. anciens.					moyenne des communes de 5000 hab. et au-dessus.
1890	61.1600	26 »	2600	86	2600	115	900	30 »					2129	
									130000	7000	67000	4460	~~2129~~	71
									dans l'ensemble de la capitale		Ancienne	Banlieue annexée		moyenne des communes de 2000 hab. et au-dessus.

Two corrections.

LES PRIX.

IV

DES MOYENNES COMBINÉES DE LEUR VALEUR EN CAPITAL ET INTÉRÊTS.

V

Moyennes provinciales du prix et du revenu de la terre labourable déduites de la valeur en capital et intérêts.

Périodes.	Ile de France.		Normandie.		Champagne		France-comté.		Languedoc.		Saintonge. Aunis. Angoumois.		Bourgogne.		Berry.		Orléanais.		Guyenne Roussillon.		Comtat venaissin.		Flandre.		Limousin Auvergne.		Dauphiné.		Picardie Artois.		Maine.		Alasce-Lorraine.	
	Prix.	Revenu. Redevance.	Prix.	Revenu. Redevance.	Prix.	Revenu.	Prix	Revenu.	Prix	Revenu.	Prix.	Revenu.	Prix.	Revenu.	Prix.	Revenu.	Prix.	Revenu.	Prix.	Revenu.	Prix.	Revenu.	Prix.	Revenu.	Prix.	Revenu.	Prix.	Revenu.	Prix.	Revenu.	Prix.	Revenu.	Prix.	Revenu.
													1° de		1200		à 1600																
1220-1225	190	19	130	13	98	9.80	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1226-1250	288	28	136	13	464	46	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	51	5	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1251-1275	250	25	204	20	317	31	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1276-1300	360	36	290	29	263	26	42	4	198	19	133	13	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	87	7	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	46	4
1301-1325	243	24	364	36	226	23	109	10	"	"	57	6	20	2	31	3	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1326-1350	157	15	128	12	82	8	20	2	"	"	"	"	13	1.30	67	6	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1351-1375	69	6	180	18	53	5	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	92	9	43	4	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1376-1400	116	11	110	11	62	6	18	2	"	"	"	"	"	"	142	14	16	1.6	"	"	261	26	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	120	12
1401-1425	115	11	86	8	78	7	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	45	4	18	1.8	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	105	10
1426-1450	45	4	23	2	75	7	"	"	"	"	"	"	99	9	110	11	92	9	75	7	11	1	24	2	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1451-1475	54	5	33	5	22	2	"	"	"	"	16	1.60	99	9	19	2	37	3	55	5	161	16	"	"	39	4	10	1	"	"	"	"	"	"
1476-1500	136	11	48	4	67	5	"	"	"	"	36	3	46	4	80	6	122	10	"	"	84	7	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
1501-1525	90	7	96	8	101	8	120	10	24	2	40	3	24	2	68	5	66	5	"	"	"	"	"	"	94	8	48	4	"	"	"	"	"	"
1526-1550	244	20	109	9	78	6	"	"	"	"	36	3	49	4	85	7	126	10	"	"	222	18	303	25	60	5	"	"	127	10	"	"	"	"
1551-1575	426	30	288	20	192	13	"	"	168	12	247	17	167	12	77	5	175	12	"	"	370	26	308	22	244	17	61	4	117	8	325	23	"	"
1576-1600	371	23	495	30	389	24	"	"	580	36	247	15	158	10	191	13	210	15	"	"	340	24	176	11	196	17	140	8	168	10	257	16	430	26
													2° de		1601		à 1790																
1601-1625	400	20	383	19	313	15	"	"	"	"	395	19	180	9	154	7	308	15	"	"	463	23	"	"	333	16	79	4	"	"	168	8	297	14
1626-1650	380	19	295	14	412	20	"	"	"	"	200	10	"	"	226	11	302	15	"	"	700	35	"	"	353	17	169	8	331	16	327	16	300	15
1651-1675	537	21	520	20	500	20	"	"	"	"	"	"	437	17	261	10	335	14	"	"	658	26	847	34	"	"	325	13	434	17	504	20	400	16
1676-1700	395	19	340	17	478	23	"	"	"	"	180	9	220	11	262	13	399	19	380	19	736	36	453	22	"	"	394	19	460	23	339	16	360	18
1701-1725	309	12	329	13	323	13	"	"	"	"	173	7	175	7	277	11	275	11	250	10	650	26	"	"	"	"	240	10	193	8	247	10	150	6
1726-1750	494	20	461	18	402	16	"	"	"	"	237	9	230	9	225	9	"	"	"	"	"	"	494	20	"	"	240	9	335	13	"	"	327	13
1751-1775	630	22	600	21	585	20	"	"	450	16	325	12	510	18	360	13	580	20	"	"	610	21	1069	37	"	"	"	"	530	19	540	19	440	15
1776-1790	1.092	38	853	30	784	27	"	"	669	23	770	27	630	22	527	19	630	22	"	"	1090	38	1244	43	"	"	526	19	745	26	630	22	460	16
1890	2400	80	2626	87	1145	38	1130	37	1285	42	1267	42	1446	48	1080	36	1500	50	850	28	1400	46	4800	160	1144	38	1240	41	2800	93	1900	63	1350	45

3 - 12, p4

5. Prussia

Frontier area, 13th - 16th, freer men. Drang nach Osten. Flaemisches Recht

Reaction, 16th:

Strong Slavs, stop expansion, close frontier. Roman law.

19th, after Nap, remove servitudes, but also benefits, bad deal, create Junkers.

Burdet, M. Étude sur une question touchant à l'Histoire locale de la Province de Dauphiné pp. 55-66, removed from some journal, & bound in U Mo. lib. with Levasseur, Prix de la terre etc. 330.944 L57p

In France generally it was custom to distinguish lands of nobles & commoners (roturiers), former tax exempt.

Dauphiné (contains Briançon) (left bank Rhone, between Savoy & Provence), not so, all lands taxed. This dates from Saracen occupation.

Saracens did tax native landholders heavier than Moslems.

p58 Dauphiné is the only province where the cadastre comprehended all lands. Romans had a cadastre, but by individuals, hence not all inclusive. Wide lands were reserved by Roman fisc & then distributed to the powerful at Rome, never got on tax rolls.

10th cent., Saracen occupation. Large irr. canals in the Briançonnais, including tunnels thru rock & other feats of engineering.

p64 Water law goes back to Saracens, customs very foreign to France, more like Spain & southern countries whence came Saracens. Notably the "right of aqueduct", as defined in 1845 law of France called loi d'Angeville.

p65 When Saracens conquered, they took lands of powerful, of church, & distributed them among their people, subject to tax. Native peasants kept their lands. Only difference was heavier tax rate on native peasants.

Peasants found this regime more tolerable than their own

Extractive resources

JEH 1951 Winter, p.5 .. 19th Eng landowners renting mineral rights, charged annual 'certain rent', to make sure it was used; & severance rent besides.

10 As cities grew, much farm area became suburban, great \$ value. Rural & urban landowners not separate groups, anchor streets, but same people. (But wd still be some with heavier interests in one than another, basis for conflict)

Local monops.

10 Many lords owned monops of public mkts in certain areas, which became very valuable (& restrictive)

14 Old rural families much indebted going out. -- & new rich coming in.

(Some old story. A generation of wealth, develop expensive tastes, forget to produce, down you go)

Cap. fmtn. ✓

a fixed charge ✓

Fabulous accounts of extravagant consumption, financed by borrowing on land -- & losing it often.

Also, current holders of entailed estate obliged to send much support money to relatives (cf. Chinese family). Matter of family prestige to keep them in 'gentility'.

17 Immense social pressure for mists not to sell, as it was public & degrading. -- be shown letters.

(I suppose as long as can borrow at low i.r., don't sell, but when, to renew, must pay high, because have exhausted easy credit, tough. When you own much, can borrow cheap, must come as blow when all is mortgaged & you are asked for rich rates.)

Many were saved in this era, from what I suppose is a normal evolution, by ↓ rents.

(Other hand, many doubtless hurt by ↓ i.r & repeal of Corn Laws.

~~Ask Wentrup for help on this.~~

Curtler

~~Orwin, The Open Fields, Oxford, 1938. Detailed study of Laxton, Eng, living survival of open fields.~~

Curtler, W. H. R., The enclosure & redistribution of our land, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1920

Breakup of small freehold, copyhold, leasehold small holdings (which were created on breakup of manorialism) speeded by loss of supplementary income. Over

As big farmers perfected organization, they got the land.

65% Eng holdings 'today' ∠50 acres, can get on w/o supplemental income, tho many do have city work, & get on better.

Ever. small holders successful when have 'industrial crops': flax, hops, colza, tobacco, vines, fruit, vegetables, beets, hemp 'Ordinary rotation farming' takes bigger. Eng. mostly adapted to other kinds of farming. - i.e requiring large scale.

Recently, greatest turnover of land since Normans. Roses, Tudors, Commonwealth, shifted some (& enclosures?), This ~~the~~ greater than all those. (Tudor time monasteries said to own ⅙ Eng, but this included land to which they just had tithes, actually they owned less 'freehold') Estate breakup, due to: taxes (what kind?), Δ since war; upkeep expense: Δ i.r. (?); State interference in estate management; threat of further taxation.

13 m acres, or ⅓ cultiv. area Eng & Wales, changed hands, 1909-19. Tenants buy most, & city businessmen. He doesn't mention lower grain price, which is probable cause.

18-19th process reversed.

Since 1908 Ag. Holdings Act, tenants not under many restrictions. (now thru case of selling?)

Institutions becoming largest owners - Eccl. Commission, Ch. of Eng, Charity Commission, Educ. & municip. bodies.

Ch. ~~13~~ 17

Great change, 18th. Before, north had been poor, south rich and progressive. Unenclosed lands practically uninhabited, & extensive. Great owners, squires, yeomen, poor holders, grade into one another. And small freeholders, usually with shpplemental income, as farm labor, artisans, ~~etc~~, indep. or dependent. Copyholders less sure tenure than freeholders, then tenants.

In next centuries, farms tended to get bigger, but not a colossal change.

Large landless class even then--c. 1700.

18th, techn. ag. advance. Plowing, new crops, stock breeding, communication, bus. org. of large tenants and landowners.

Large units became more efficient, they were agglomerated. High corn price encouraged it, too, esp. in Nap wars, & it took big holdings. About this time Eng. stopped exporting corn,

i.e., units formed by redistribution of rights in enclosures were not
ec., the small ones -- perhaps they would have been had commons
still been there.

Cartler, 2

feared loss of sea control, encouraged it at home.
Demand for meat & dairy products diminished as wheat price rose, it taking income of poor, so pasture converted to corn.
Pop: 1788, 5½m; 1800, 9m; 1821, 12m.
Some enclosure by parliamentary act, some by private arrangement.

Chap 14
6½m acres enclosed by Act, 1700-1880, more without Act.
1801, General Enclosure Act passed, opposition to it had prevented it for years, from lawyers etc.

Ch. 16
At time of enclosures, complementary use of commons for stock raising had diminished, harm done to small holders not so much. Dubious. Were worn out with centuries of overgrazing. This sounds reasonable. cf. Wantrup.

17.
1st half 18th, small farmers sold meat, eggs, fruit, butter, poultry. Wives marketed. Then large wheat farmers grew, after 1765, price rising. (so it was as simple as that)
By enclosure, land could be put to its best use, instead of all land to same use.
Farms brought into one piece. (no wonder it increased efficiency)
Long strips gotten rid of.
Good farmer rid of incubus of bad farmer. Individual got benefit of own acts, i.e., & I guess was freed from some old restrictions. Trespassing on commons ended. Security of improvements. Drainage could be undertaken. In common fields, one bad drainer could clog up others.
Common fields, after harvest, were trampled on by everyone's stock. With enclosed fields could grow crops that had to stand thru winter, like clover & turnips, hence rotate.
Now individual stock could be segregated, & breed improved, & individual herds kept healthy.
1760-1865, the large wheat farm the ideal, dominant.
The small owners were not usually kicked out, but bought out. Double incentive: could sell at higher price; could get higher wages in town; their hand labor products were cheaper. etc.
1795 Speenhamland Act subsidized labor, large farmers who hired labor were thereby benefited, small farmers who did not had to pay the taxes for it, got no benefit, as did own labor. Thus welfarism for hired labor is subsidy to big orgs -- of California
Taxes on land rose in French war, made many small ones sell to big, who offered higher prices. Present as v. future cases?
When enclosures were anticipated, farmers mined land, knowing they would get other land in reallotment.
Many small holders sold, to get capital to become large tenants., did well.
Those using common land only got allotments if they could prove a good title. Doubtless many were excluded.
Credit conditions poor for small farmers in Eng, even in pretty modern times. Abroad, Raffaisen credit banks have helped.

Cutler, 3

Small leaseholds did not die out as much as small holdings. Why?

Tendency was, of enclosure, to have fewer workers/acre on rich land, more on poor, than before.

Many lost rights, or usages, without compensation.

18.

1801 Act did little to make enclosure cheaper.

19.

Seems to think some success resulted from giving "allotments" of small amounts of land to laborers, etc. I don't think Eng. was ever famous for this.

Schnapper. Bernard

Les Rentes au XVIe Siècle.

Lib.

Gimel, M. "De la division de la Propriété Foncière" pp. 589-89 of some unidentified publication. Bound in U. Mo. lib. with Delapalud et al., Cadastre Regime Foncière, 333/037

Handwritten on flyleaf: "1868 (Lectures faits a la Sorbonne)"

Evidently there was a nationwide land tax (cote foncier) from which départements & communes took a share, varying with local wishes.

This tax was initiated early 19th. The cadastre, or "arpentage (survey) parcellaire (detailed)", was begun in 1808 & finished 1840-42 !!

He studied two Départements in detail: l'Yonne & Gers.

He found the number & aggregate acreage of small holdings increased, while large ones decreased, from time ~~of~~ when survey first complete (which time ranged from 1808 – 1842) to time of his study: 1863 for l'Yonne, 1857 for Gers.

(Compute LCR, tho. It looks to me as tho the smallest class, altho increasing its acreage, did not do so in proportion to ↓ of its numbers. Thus you have paradox of ↓g no. of landowners but higher LCR. This might not happen if counted whole popn of country in smallest class! Consider adjusting all LCR trend figures for this factor.)

He doesn't say if there are ownerships or "exploitations"

Finch 2

p. 587 Some have deplored morcellement as taking up much of good land. But he points out it has hardly touched large farms; the great increase in numbers has been in smallest sizes

For one little commune, Crolles in l'Isère, he split into 4 parts the farms under 1 ha., & found trend continued, i.e. ~~greater~~ the smaller the category the greater the Δ of nos., & the more the mean fell toward bottom.

Jacotte, Pierre "A Poor State in a Rich Country." Greenlaw.

p. 45 "The <u>taille</u>, which was the most important of the royal imposts, was an income-tax roughly assessed on the basis of the external evidence of wealth..."

Louis IX, St. Louis, 1226-70

Louis XI, 1461-83

XII, 1498-1515 — Henry IV, 1589-1610 Religious wars, 1562-98

XIII 1610-43

XIV 1643-1715

XV 1715-74

XVI 1774-93

Religious overtum of 16th, aspects: French wars, 1562-98

Gm war, 1618-48

Netherlands revolt, 1565 - c. 1600

Spanish-English war -1588

English confiscations, 16th

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC SERVICE
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

June 14, 1960

Dear Dr. Gaffney,

Enclosed is a copy of my paper for the Lindholm book. It does not contain the final revisions, but the argument is the same as the one that will be published.

You may find the bibliography helpful.

The reference to English land tax history that I mentioned is in one of the annual reports of the Internal Revenue Commissioner —— I couldn't find the exact reference. They will be found in the House of Commons Sessional Papers series. The 1909 Parliamentary Commission report ("Taxation of Land") was a study of land taxes in all countries of the world. You probably would not find it very useful. Sorry to be so indefinite, but we are moving soon and all my notes are packed up.

Sincerely yours,

Daniel R. Fusfeld

In Eng. they changed land system, but opened nobility & oppys gradly.

In Fr. they kept old system, let peasants get vested interests in it. and closed nobility, relatively at least.

Review notes, 3

Reasons for smaller French farms.

1. Land never completely commercialized, small manorial units remained.
2. Less urban & industrial growth, source of capital (hence highest bidder for land) continued to be small peasant or bourgeois. & small peasant got much rent long ago, hence had much of cap.
3. Lower wages, less urban labor opportunities, hence increased desire for rural farm as residence, willingness to offer labor for less to be a farmowner, making smallowners higher bidders.
4. More beautiful countryside, more residential desirability; pleasanter rural land insitutions.
5. Inheritance customs: no primogeniture; ~~perhaps~~ it was even obligatory to split farms up
6. Credit Foncier
7. Crop types of smaller optsize. Where beets or wheat, bigger farms, in Fr. too.

French & Prussian land reforms differed both in respect to what they had before, and what afterward. Prussians started out with archaic feudal system, caste system, personalized relations, inflexible system, communal cultivation, taxes paid by peasants only, peasants owing labor to lords, lords owing military service -- but welshing, after Rr Fred. Great. And from this created the most commercialized, impersonalized land system in Europe, outdid English, no primogeniture nor entail even. Real disciples of A. Smith. French started with individualized holdings, subject to various personalized obligations. They confiscated & sold church lands; they abolished a few feudal vestiges; they made it nec. to subdivide on death; but didn't make many changes really.

Cobden Club book suggests land was easier to transfer in France than in Eng., morcellement from other causes than enforced subdivision & inflexibility. But weight of authority is other way, tho all is vague.

Gurr, W.S.B.

Ch. 5, Peasant revolts.

Discuss several. In all cases it was peasants who were relatively well off, relatively free — & near centers of commerce, touched by commerce. Allied with merchants, often.

West Frisia, 1254-88. Sandy, wild. Put down by Count of Holland.

West Flanders, 1323-28. Defeated at Cassel, forced to pay tribute thereafter, perpetual higher rent. Aided by Bruges, while Ghent sided w. nobles, as did Count of Flanders & his feudal chief, King of France.

Jacquerie, near Paris, 1358. Nobles humiliated by English, 2d Poitiers, 1356. Brigands warring everywhere. Peasants rose too, under Wm. Cales, & started looting nobles, just as nobles had been looting them. Merchants of Paris allied, under Etienne Marcel, a draper trading w. Flanders.

Social Revolt, Eng, 1381. As Eng. was losing war. Wanted to pay money rents instead of service, a main grievance — commutation proceeds too slowly.

Some objected to low wages, esp. in Kent, where money wages were the rule, but held down. Some objected to towns restrictions on mktg. A general complaint. There was also a pure communist fringe, followers of Wyclif and land communists, who said nobility lost right of stewardship bec. they goofed.

Ger revolt, 1524-25

Like others, complex mélange of malcontents. Attacked Cath. Church, but Luther disowned. Münzer wanted communist theocracy.

Gras ch. 5, 2

Gm. peasants rose while nobles away fighting French in Italy. (Francis I?) Unhappily for them French lost, & Gm. nobles came home Pavia, 1525 to wreak vengeance.

Some 100,000 rebels slain. Nobles were united under emperor, peasants divided.

Cause of outbreak was reversal of improvement in peasants' condition. Due to ...? Nat. unity under Emperor? Roman law introduced, favoring lords over tenants, as vs. local custom. There was some enclosure.

(Thus while nat. unity created common mkt & benefits, it also strengthened strong vs. weak???)

Peasant revolts succeeded where? France & Russia, where power had been most centralized, nobles were reduced to parasites, & central power had crumbled from other blows.

Russia, only strong peasant revolt was under Pugachev — from SW.? Was a Cossack. Captured Kazan.

Religious element strong in all peasant revolts. Common property aspirations.

English peasants submitted to enclosure bcs they had alternatives.

French had none, hence resisted.

(Gm peasants fought back too, — but lost?)

✓ 1694 or so, Eng. instituted land tax, 4s/£ or so. Farm land only.

Italy, no strong State, towns took over completely. Bitter fights w each other.

Drang nach Osten involved drainage, in which lowlanders were experts. This was real frontiering, land taken from nomads, marshes & lakes left by ice sheet. Ironic. This did not nec. create free men. Gm. Marks

So again, coop. ag. effort basis of society — this time drainage.

Law of ~~state~~ scarcity breeds subsn — maybe labor overdid it in 15th, encouraging subsetn & reaction in 16th.

? ✓ Convertible husbandry developed — plow up pasture every few yrs for grain, then hay, then pasture again. Whittlesey attributes decline of fallows to this, probly wrong.

Probly was case of stimulus & lagging responses. 1349 etc. made labor scarce & dear. finally brought enclosures, beat wages back down.

Yet Tawney & c. agree they were mild.

Th. Rogers, Ec Int-n of Hist., says:

Eng. had monpy of wool for centuries bes required strong central govt to stop sheep rustling, & only Eng had that. (Mesta?)

Used export duties, fully added to price, inelastic demand. Flanders depended on Eng as fully as Eng of 19th on U.S.

Eng. Kings used as weapon to control Flanders, thru which they invaded France.

Misc. sources.

Eng. longbow won Crecy, Poitiers, Agincourt. Yeomen practiced from early youth. Kings forbade other sports.

But best as defense weapon. When French brightened up & learned not to charge, lost no more. Exhausted Eng – good at cannonry, punched holes in their castles, 15th.

15th, golden age of Eng labor, agreed, despite wars, plagues.

Ironic that Tudors & nat. unity should accompany retrogression. And the few enclosures of 16th seem too few to account for it. What does? 'Conspiracy' of Th. Rogers? Tudor tyranny? Confiscations?

Eng. yeomen higher status than French peasant, military fn.

16th, Kings & Pmt discouraged enclosures; 18th, Pmt aided.

U.S., fencing was by small vs large, & from pasture to arable; Eng, v.v.

Franklin 1666, Eng law to help dying wool trade. all must be buried in it.

Flemish & Italian looms used Eng. wool; Eng. undercut them later by prohib'g export.

Sheep everywhere, but only on commons & wastes, foraged for selves.

14th – 1410, wool demand & exports declined, then revived 16th.

(Taxed hard in 100 yrs war, one cause, 1337 – 1453.) Inclosures commence – take over arable for sheep, & commons. 1549, cowardly peasants protest by killing sheep – as tho they were to blame. Cf. Luddites, saboteurs, Jim Crow.

Franklin says enclosures nec. bec 3-course rotation inadequate to maintain fertility of open fields. Sheep yielded more cash.

1510, corn price rose again, & land, after 100 yrs rest & manure, higher yields. After that, periodic pasture permitted, yields permanently higher.

Late 19th, Landlords finally had to lower rents.

Curtler 14th, depopulation. 15th, Rogers calls golden age, real wages hi. Curtler attributes to more depopn, due to recurrent plagues.

p 70 Rogers denounces lords for legislating to keep up rents, but Cunningham says is good, to A tax base. & Curtler agrees. (Better stick to Rogers.)

Ashley, Ec. Orgn

Lecture 6. Farm popn falls, 18th. Landlord Pat in saddle. Admitted depopn. Cf. Prussia, Fred. Great &c. 18th cent. Kings muted peasants. For rev. & army. (But how come Eng landl lex hi? Lower than before?)

Cf, Royal or Princely & church estates let tnts stay, bcs less enterprising. Bavaria, where church lands remained, so did peasants. Also, churches subsidized rulers, so not dependent on squirearchy.

1720-85, rapid Δ LCR, largely by purchase, from gains of "trade." Urban rich joined landed, & found no obstacles on abroad.

p125. "Family settlements" replace entail, which now illegal. De Donis, 1285, required entail. Evaded by common recovery suits, courts allowed in 1472, Taltarum's case. King wished that when grantee's line died out, land escheat to him; likewise larger lords who had granted to smaller. But smaller lords too strong.

17th, law sets self to opposite goal, & wins again. "Family settlement," means of effecting primogen. & entail, be outside law. Originated in Civil Wars, to prevent confiscation somehow. German Fidei commiss* orig'd in similar pd., 30 yrs war. But 2/3 Eng under settlements, cf. 6% Prussia, 15% Silesia, etc. Recent big Δ Prussia, 1895 etc., from urban fortunes, wanting to found landed families

Ashley, Eu. Orgn, 2

Eng, desire for landed estate stronger than U.S. bec made him J.P., power, local admin. As vs. France, Eng. rural had local self-govt. under J.P. Also votes in Pmt, & patronage to put younger sons in public offices.

Ashley, Lecture 6

	ag Pop.	Σ pop
p 119 ~~1688 - 1769, ag pop~~ 1688	4½ m	5½
1769	3	8

Knapp showed persistence of Gm peasants due to "paternal" policies Fred. Gt. & other Gm 18th c. princes: "peasant protection" = for revenue (Kameralism) & army. Pmt overweighed Kings' Council, no longer possible in Eng.

Also, Eng crown lands ~~s~~passed to pvt hands before I during Revn. But on Gm. crown lands, "more conservatively mnged", customary tenures survived. & Bavaria, church estates, counter-reform-n triumphed.

Bishops less enterprising (& more humane?) let tnts remain.

p132-4 Eng 18th, copyholds, which were hereditary at fixed rent, changed to leaseholds, which expired after so many yrs – evidently on payment of some consideration. Then developed short tm leases. (they at will)

So tnt equity gone. (Reverse of inflationary process) Probly disparity of bnd power a factor, growing due to commerce.

p134-5, Attributes agglom-n to interest in ag science. 9 question.

No state had combined political with commercial virtues until Eng —

hence her great strength.

Notes from Clapham, J H.

Even Clapham commits folly of cfg nations by output/acre, re effic.

Favorite sport of ag. ecsts. Or output/man, worse. Utterly invalid.

Small farms persist – & lend great variety & charm to French agric.

Dairying a specialty – cheeses etc.

Phylloxera big setback to vines 1813 & seq. 20 yrs to recover.

Growing demand for wheat, instead of rye, buckwheat, barley, etc.

Turn land to wheat & wine. 1855-75. English mkt.

Slow changes – fallow gradually gives way

Sheep go out, 19th, or down. Import

Weber points out, re mir, Stolypin let peasants withdraw, so richer ones did.

Thus split peasants into 2 antagonistic groups.

1881 France prohibits Am. pork

✓ Nap. succession law widely blamed for low b.r. – was only way to avoid further morcellement

achieved virtual self-sufficiency, 1900.

R+s changed much, gave many lands mkt access for first time.

To 1910, only France of great nations remained predominately rural.

Large landholdgs, recostd 1815, persist. As elsewhere they change hands, to urban rich. Large ones for sport. But little change.

Very poor stat – worst in Eur. Too much in dark

Sharecropping gave way to contract cash rents, is major change.

Clapham, 2

p167. Communal lands remain, largely woodlands.

Contrasts of Eur. devmt:

1. Eng - enclosures. Hammonds. Webbs? Goldsmith Arthur Young.
   Hasbach. Corn law repeal, results. Rigid controls today. Mantoux ch. 3
2. France - Revolution, ~~restoration~~, security.
3. Ry - East vs. West.
4. Italy - extreme concen. Spain too.
5. Denmk
6. Russia. Karpovitch?

~~Interpretation of~~ historical evidence. The bathtub hoax. Bergen Evans. ~~Emperor's clothes.~~

~~Rural electrifn, roads urban subsidy?~~

In Eng, nobles continued to pay taxes, 17th-18th, also kept voice there Part in how much pay. France, nobles relinquished discretion to King, on condition of their own immunity. - de Tocqueville p 98-9.

So Eng. nobles paid taxes — some, at least — & devoted lives to public service. French nobles did neither, vegetated parasitically. Tax-exemption was a device to keep them quiet, leave power to king

---

Urban centralization & country life — what happens if landlords move to town, — or sell to town-dwellers & then move off?

Assignments in de Tocqueville, & what to look for:

How French evolution resembled English: nobility threw off burdens while keeping income, shifting to indirect taxes

How French evolution differed from Eng: nobility become utter drones, estranged from all; taille replaces noble obligations entirely; Catholicism — clergy identified with drone classes; anti-clericalism of radical kind strongest in Eur. State modeled on Church hierarchy, says de Toc., p. 151, anti-clerics conceived must break one to break other. Evils that de T. describes in France, centralized hierarchy, might I suppose indeed be traced to failure of reformation in Fr.

assignments, de Tocqueville

Pt. I.

Ch. 1 – Seeks to ~~secure~~ distinguish true religion from abuses that led to Revolutionists' anti-Clericalism, & reconcile his Democracy & his Piety.

In which the historian seeks to reconcile his piety & his democracy, thus revealing ~~his~~ ~~his view~~ the viewpoint from which he interprets history.

Pt. II

Ch. 1 Why feudalism was more hated in France.

Not because French peasants were more abused than ~~in~~ others.

Because nobility had cast off obligations, kept income: lands, monies, taxes. Became pure drones, a privileged class w/o a fn.

Ch. 8. How France was where men were most alike

Decay of ~~vitability~~ & impoverishment of French nobility. ~~hand in hand with their~~ accompanies their ~~drone metamorphosis~~ ~~loss of function~~, & closing of the caste & its loss of fn.

Ch. 9 How French were divided

aristos a closed caste, unlike Eng. ~~Ger~~ ~~French~~ In France, privileges attached to persons; in Eng. to lands. "Each group was differentiated from the rest by its right to petty privileges of one kind or another." – basis of prestige as well as income. Kings encouraged division, the better to rule; also sold privileges (tax exemptions, monies, local autonomy) for revenue.

Ch. 10. More of same

How French nobles traded their ~~power for~~ authority for tax exemption.

How Kings created privileges & sold them for revenue. ~~Thus~~ Even sold public offices, thus ruined bureaucracy.

Re T.

Pt II

Ch. 12 How French peasants sometimes worse off in 18th than 13th.

Nobles abandoned them; richer moved to town, poorer remained but as strangers.

Spiritual estrangement; impersonalization of relationships.

Kings' divisive policies, centraliz-n, left peasants uncared for.

Taille collected thru village (like Mir), unprotected peasant was chief source of taxes.

Languedoc & other exceptions.

Pt III ch. 2. ~~How~~ anti-clericalism, 18th c. Framers.

De T. – comment.

de T. is rather wordy, poor in specific facts but rich in interpretation. ~~based on fact~~ ~~ideas~~, ~~with a co~~ a conservative ~~clerical~~ ~~Restrained~~ idealist, ~~with a sense of justice coupled with realism & even a certain cynicism~~. A remarkably balanced ~~man~~ historian; his idealism is touched w. cynicism; his sense of justice with realism; his Catholicism with ~~Anglophobia~~. outspoken support of Anglo-saxon decentralization.

Bowden, Karp, & Usher on French agric. (also some on English)

By 1700, were "completely enclosed" fields in a few regions:

1. Lowlands
2. Brittany, Normandy, & Poitou (obviously not due to commerce)
3. Brianconnais (Dauphiné)
4. Auvergne etc -- large patch.
5. Around Bayonne & into Spain. -- Basque Country?

Elsewhere "open fields" predominated. "Open" meant no fences or posting around individual plots, tho separated by balks of turf. Also, fence around entire arable field possible.

2 types of open fields: long acres & irregular parcels.

Long acres, literally c. 1 acre each, 10×1 ratio length/width, centered on Fr, up to Denmk, down to Istria. A triangle, broad in east, wedge in west thrust to Normandy. Forms broad belt across N-n Fr., drops s. to include Jura also in Eng a belt running from Yorkshire sw to Western downs (almost Cornwall)

Hypoth: non-commercial enclosed areas were like Mormons: turned to pvt propty to preserve vs. invasion, sharing common things w. invaders.

Irreg. acres form huge crescent from Spain to Italy thru s-n Fr. Also include most of Eng, all Ireland.

Long acres assoc. w. wheeled plow, deep plowing, heavier soils & n-n agric. — hence Teuton tribes. Assoc. w. village agric., communal opns.

Square acres assoc. w. unwheeled shallow plow; 2-field alternation; common pasture after harvest, but gnrly less village control of opns. (Assoc. w. Celts?) And diff. crops: Medit. wheat, vine, olive

Bowden, Karp, & Usher, 2

alleux more common in S.

Tenants who negotiated perpetual leases in money. In Fr. censives; Eng. copyholders.

Ragged boundary between types puzzles many re origins; but easy to imagine combo of factors carrying methods: tribes, soils, politics, climate, all intermingled.

Open fields, & little integration of livestock & arable. Arable grew bread & beer --- wheat & barley. Stock grazed pastures. No fodder grown!! (how did they survive winter? Cattle in Montana wrestled for selves, 19th)

Square fields, individs managed their parcels w/o "explicit" interference from village officers. Latter mngd pastures.

(So cannot explain stagnation of agric. by tyranny of village custom, in s-w France, Spain & Italy.

Lords were first to get individ. control of their lands. Removed from village regimen by consolidating, then cd fence control. 16th Eng

---

Square fields on map resemble enclosed fields. Operationally, individual managed his own lands, subject only to common pasture, & not that if in vines. Arable was subject, also, however, to "some form of bare fallowing" (p. 54)

Sometimes even flocks were individually mngd.

So why was agric. stagnant in large areas outside tyranny of village custom? Must be other explanations. Fragmentation (parcellement)?; inalienability of perpetual leaseholds?; water supply?; conc-n (nobles had higher % in S); tax exemption?; predatory taille collection? Serfdom?

Bowden, K&U, 3

Seems clear permanent crops — vines, lucerne, orchards — wd. be outside possibilities of open field system. But whence, then, vineyards of Rhine?

Enclosed areas differed much among selves, pp 55-56. Were all gradations from fully enclosed to fully open.

Since we cannot blame stagnation of ag. technique on village custom alone, it follows that individual tenure has serious faults too, else it wd. have pulled way ahead in technique. Tendency to look to something spectacular & obvious for answers, has led historians astray, overemphasizing enclosures.

Must have been other source of drive to progress. How about ∆ land tax,

✓ in Eng from 1694; in France, 19th.

England

Technique of great reforms: subst. for fallow 2 kinds forage, ~~one to~~

Fallowing had 2 fns: 1, Accumulate nitrates; 2, Clear off weeds.

clover, a lucerne, gave nitrates; turnips, planted in rows, allowed cultivation simul. w. growing fodder.

Sounds to me like 3d function: supported cattle from fodder, ~~alt~~ took

✓ pressure off grazing lands, allowed more enclosure.

Legumes produced no ~~at~~ nitrates unless fertilized. Where fertilizer unavailable, ∴, fallowing persisted until 19th, except around stock raising districts. 19th, imports of guano (Chile nitrate) & bone meal helped.

(20th, exhaustion & starvation forecast, but Haber process came)

Bowden, K & U, 4

Enclosure involved $\frac{1}{3}$ the animal carrying capac. of lands. Why then hear of Wheat prodn as major aim? Probly bec fodder let bring animals off pasture, released that for corn.

There is something more signif. than enclosure, more universal: that is the conversion of nobles from functional agents to parasites. Become assertive of "property rts" as unilateral thing, w/o obligations, sure sign of decadence -- hit this hard. De Tocqueville useful here.

17th was when French nobles left for towns, lost fns, became pure parasites.

Englishmen = before law: contl. nobles held ~~petty~~ courts etc., e.g. ~~hung~~ for capital crimes committed on their estates.

Commutation meant villein tenures became perpetual leases, fixed rents -- censives. Tnt had right of succession. Copyhold; Erbzinspacht. So here was a colossal rent-control scheme -- no wonder agric. was stagnant.

S-n Eur., perpet. lease called emphyteutic. (Webster agrees, emphasizes long term or perpetual character, rather than early rent-free years. Civil Law) (Sometimes "alienable under certain conditions" - Webster) Whereas in n-n Eur., perpetual leases developed during commutation, in so. they, or at least the legal form, dated from Rome. Who knows, perhaps the leases themselves did? Probly emphyteusis is what held back South. Check J.S. Mill.

Note the enduring nature of land tenure arrangements, more permanent than governments, etc.

Bowden, K, & U, 5

In many areas, 18th, land reduced to individ control w/o fencing. p146 (French?)

England, 40% area subject only to common pasture on arable after hvst; otherwise individ. control, 1700. Reform simple. (Maybe this is why enclosure worked better in Eng.? Less change nec.?)

Lords had legal rt. to enclose "wasteland" to improve it, provided they left enough for village needs. From 1235 Statute of Merton. Manorial lords had mnpy of this. (No wonder it took so long!! Cf. M. Clawson's proposal to give devmt mnpy to Devmt Distrs.) This wd include reclamation of fens.

18th, mnpy broken; & developers zealous to enclose common pastures comprehensively. A historian of land devmt cycles could doubtless go over these enclosures & trace patterns similar to U.S. westward expansion.

But in all, 1721–1901, only 2.1m acres common pasture enclosed (in Eng. & perhaps elsewhere, not specified). Area of Eng = 51,356 mi^2 = 32,868,000 acres. $\frac{2.1m}{32.9m}$ = 6.4%. Hardly seems worth all the fuss of T. Neilsen et al. Probly like taking water from Owens Valley, great cause for negative types to waste breath on.

In Midlands, new type farming was cereal & stock combined. Grass, artificial; green crops; cereals, in new rotations. Grass, esp., occupied land for several years. Now one had to own & develop pasture, previously common. This wd. Δ size of arable area for each unit, but wd. reduce pasture share it required. & I wonder if latter factor were considered whether farms

really got bigger?

One economy of scale is hedging, clearly, where purpose is mainly to separate a plot from neighbors cattle.

Clue to whether Δ size was due to fund. or opg. reasons wd. be trend of trncy. Hint that many new large holdings were immedly split among tnts, p. 151. But trncy also common in old system, recall.

p151 At one stage required unanimous consent to break open-field arable customary servitudes. But Pmt changed, majority of propty ~~holders~~ - value - holders cd. do it.

p152 Encl. required special Act Pmt thru 19th.

Two tables of enclosure, relationship not made clear

I "Common pasture & waste" by Act of Pmt. p.149, from Slater

Period	No. of Yrs.	Acres Enclosed	Rate per yr. (computed)
1727-60	34	75,000	2,206
1761-92	32	478,000	14,931
1793-1801	9	274,000	30,444
1802-15	14	740,000	52,851
1816-45	30	199,000	6,633
1846-1907	62	335,000	5,403
1727-1907	181	2,101,000	11,608

II "Common arable, with some meadow & waste", by Act of Pmt, p.152, from Gentler

Period	No. of Yrs.	Acres Encl.	Rate/yr (Computed)
1700-60	61	238,000	3,902
1761-1801	41	2,429,000	59,244
1802-44	43	1,610,000	37,441
1845-1907	63	181,000	2,968
1700-1907	208	4,464,000	21,462

Evidently these are two diff series, not overlapping. Note that enclosure of "Common arable" was the larger movement. This figures, since much of Eng. had no common "waste" (or pasture).

p152 Combined area of 1, "waste" & 2, "open-field arable" enclosed, by Act of Pmt. 1700-1900, was c. 20% area of Eng. -- that wd. be sum of above 2, $\frac{6.6 \text{ m a}}{32.9 \text{ m a}} = 20.1\%$

Bowden, K, & H. p. 7

p. 152 But the unrecorded enclosure, w/o Act of Pmt., was wider spread. They think unrecorded enclosure was most common before 1790. (Note that recorded enclosure was fastest 1798-1815.) But no one knows. Therefore one cannot say just when most enclosure occurred. Just like land developments today, very poorly recorded.

p 153 By 1810 they est. 80% England was enclosed.

Back to France.

p153 Much of France, establishment of individualized control of land did not lead to enclosure. Too expensive. (probly wd. have Δd their tax).

Vaine pâture went first from Provence. (Clapham agrees). Was much wild pasture there anyway, so arable fields not badly needed for this purpose. Roman Law strong, emphasizing individualism. 1469 Provincial declaration vs vaine pâture, but not recognized by local authorities until later, 1500-1700. Fences not nec., just posting & driving stock off their land.

Normandy, right to enclose arable recognized from c. 1500. Also, cattle not allowed on any land ~~w. permanent crops~~ not yet hvsted — apple orchards widespread, hvst in Nov.

1743, might prohibit grazing on field if planted w. clover, Normandy. Or anywhere, if one had enough ~~cattle~~ sheep to graze his own

Above suggests that in France there was no central policy on these matters applied partout, but provincial autonomy; & within provinces, local autonomy. Strange contrast with centralization of functions in Paris.

Bowden KRH p. 8

1766-67 there was an inquiry. In South & West, was little common pasture of arable (vaine pâture). W. or w/o enclosure, rt. had been completely abolished in Flanders, Brittany, Normandy, Poitou; Languedoc, Provence, & Dauphiné. and partly in Saintonge, Guyenne, Berry, Bourbonnais. Held on in central & n.e provinces, "with little change."

✓ 12th-13th, occurred much improvement of waste land in France (perhaps this was comparable to Eng in 18th??) Lord cd. do it, w/o injuring villagers.

1685 revoked Edict of Nantes. Feud anti-comm. reaction?

1667 & '83, tried to stop further enclosures, recognized peasant rts, 1683 forbad alienation by villages of wastes, at least their share. Lord gently had rt to 1/3.

Late 18th, provincial ordinances authorized dividing wild pastures in n.e.

admin., both central & local, tried to protect peasants, urged distribution to all (contrast Eng. Pmt!!)

But movement proceeded slowly bec no class dominated. Govt withdrew its support bec cd'nt protect peasants.

Even after Revs., much wild pasture remained, to help poor. In east (where it had always been) & in South! (bec much pasture there by nature probly).

p. 159 Nobility held higher % of land in "South" than elsewhere.

"Feudal" reaction, late 18th, try collect old dues etc.

Emergence of Commercial Agric. in France

Most completely feudalized, never quite got away from it. Extremely slow evolution. Commercial revn weakest here.

Wide variety of conditions, from Medit. ag of Provence, 2 field system, square plots, wheat, vine, olive, & irrd meadows (innovation c. 17th?), Roman heritage; and Arabian, in Dauphiné to Flanders, commercial ag. of Rhine Lowlands, 11 course rotations, etc.

Clapham wrong? Block, p. 264

Surby, Loire - Burgundy line separates into halves. N. of there, villages, open fields, long strips, collective grazing rts over stubble, collective rotations. But p 227 Bloch gives over to Seigneurie also Eastern area from Catalonia to Rhine. Leaving SW as pioneer area. Nabholz p. 534 con. visitant

S. of line, square Roman fields, 2-course rotation. Here, origins from Roman villa, w/o Teutonic village. Coloni of late Rome, hutted on portions of estate.

Great mystery: Why did these individual holdings not lead way to new ag? Have we been misled to think communal ag. was debilitating factor? Maybe other factors? Water law?

Subinfeudation in NE France, 11th-13th, weakened lords vs. peasants.

✓ NW --- Normandy, Brittany, Poitou — peasants long temps stronger, pay land, low rents.

~~11th-13th, coming of Mer., lords weaker than Eng.~~ bcs had no staple export like wool.

✓ Isolated homestead assoc. w. larger use of land per cap.; bcs village agric. wd. put labor too far from fields if used much land.

Emergence of Commercial Agric.

Tues, March 10. Factual, by regions & countries.

~~Growth~~

Sequence of commercial primacy; framework of agric. markets.

1. N-n Italy. Byzantium, orient transit. Maritime city-states, held off Islam. Fattened on Crusades – urban cynicism vs rural enthusiasm. Competed vs each other, kept on toes. Stagnated after Turks closed routes, & bypassed to west.

~~Champ. Fl.~~

2. Champagne – Troyes. Developed by territorial prince, ruined by Philip the fair ~~successor~~ & Flanders fleet. Obvious natural hiway destroyed. Lyons later, but a forced growth, 15th, Louis XI. French never accepted commerce, free.

3. Flanders – Ypres. Bruges. Hanseatics. ~~Wool~~. English wool. Philip the Good?

4. So. Ger – simul with Flanders, thru Swiss passes, but limited possibilities, & stagnated with N. Italy.

5. Antwerp. Queen of 16th c. Replaced Bruges, grew restrictive. Open to new groups, replaced old. Spain destroys

6. Amsterdam, 17+l

7. London, 18+l.

3-10, p. 2.

Agric. devmt.

1. Italy - fell under towns. Dead end.

2. Lowlands - Rhine delta & environs

Commercialized early.

Drainage, coop. enterprise, fixed charges to meet, on land

~~The germinal center~~

Denser popn, + higher techniques, spread out. Birthplace of modern agric.

Canal xptn, like Venice, stimulates specializn. exchange.

✓ Cottage ind-y - ff. ~~guild~~ craft guild revolts, 14th. Bypass old centers like Bruges, for new like Antwerp. (Anticipates big Eng. devmt of 16th) Wool. Cf. contract farming. Cheaper to move wool to farm than food to city.

Fields remain small, peasant - but very productive. J.S. Mill.

3. France

Internal trade, never much internat orientation, tho some.

Canals. Colbert. Provincial tolls remain.

Dues commuted, + inflation, left small peasants, precarious tenures, fearing change. Parlement remains.

→ 100 yrs war ends défrichement

Nobility becomes purely parasitic. De Tocqueville. Cf. Eng. Loses military, & political fns. Louis XI & his standing army.

Gilds & state factories remain strong. little cottage ind-y.

Kings protect peasants from nobles - so can tax them themselves.

Sully e.g. under Henry IV. Royal taxes hit peasant most, nobles exempt. Leads to Revn. Physiocrats try to reform, no luck.

Like Russ. Narodniks, Chinese Sun Yat Sen

3, France, cont.

+turned tenants into owners.

Revolution destroyed gilds; residual feudal servitudes; confiscated church & runaway lands, sold for revenue; & State control of agric.

Afterwards not all this could be undone, but much was. Code Nap. & equal division.

4. England.

Norman system. Entail & primogen. imposed

Commutation, as elsewhere, first step.

→ 14th. Death, ↓ wages. War. Wool export.

15th War. Prosperity. Merry England — yet Eng lost wars, fell apart in Civil Wars.

16th Tudors. Robin Hood.
Enclosures for wool. Higher demand; soil exhaustion?
Confiscations. Cottage ind-y, Adventurers, bypassing gilds & staplers. Banned export of raw wool.

17th. Little change. Establish squirearchy

18th. Corn enclosures. Wool ind-y stagnant. Absolutely the end of landowning farm in Eng.