
Review by Stephen L. Harp, University of Akron.

This volume brings together a team of international scholars to consider what editors Hubert Bonin and Paul Thomes call the three stages of paternalism. As the title suggests, each forms roughly a third of the book. Although the essays do not collectively make an argument, they have a certain thematic coherence as all examine, in very different ways, employers’ paternalism in the workplace and in communities since the nineteenth century.

“Old Paternalism” is the subject of the first set of contributions. They begin in eastern France with Michel Hau’s carefully researched essay on textile manufacturers’ paternalism in early nineteenth-century Alsace. There Protestant industrialists taken with a vague Saint-Simonianism gathered together in the Société Industrielle de Mulhouse to undertake wide-ranging reforms including free health services and affordable lodging for workers. Manufacturers also championed national legislation to limit children’s work. On the basis of the evidence presented here, not all readers will agree with Hau’s conclusion that Alsatian industrialists did much for workers because they realized that there was more to workers’ well-being than salaries. Lower salaries in Alsace, as compared to the Nord, could lead some to the opposite conclusion; Alsatian employers attempted to use paternalist measures to avoid salary increases in the recruitment and maintenance of a stable workforce. In any case, Hau’s scrupulous documentation sets a standard for the essays that follow.

Georges Ribeill shifts the focus to French railway companies, beginning with the various private ones in the nineteenth century and concluding with the SNCF in the present. Ribeill successfully illustrates the ways that private initiatives on behalf of “railwaymen” formed the basis for the generous benefits cheminots still enjoy. It is a pattern that emerges in other chapters. Paternalist measures often emerged first in the private sector and then became the norm in state-owned enterprises or the subject of broad national legislation during the twentieth century.

Hubert Bonin’s essays trace the notions of paternalism and its more recent variant, corporate social responsibility, over the *longue durée* of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In the first of these chapters, he tries to answer “why did paternalism fail [sic] in France?” (p. 61). Bonin argues that revolutionary “dechristianization” reduced the role of religiously-inspired paternalism, that French centralization got in the way, that the anarcho-syndicalism of trade unions worked against paternalism, that state action as early as the Belle Epoque created a more nationally uniform welfare state, and that nationalizations after World War II reduced the role of private, paternalistic employers. The chapter is a good overview.

Essays then take up paternalism outside France. Considering the region of Aachen, Paul Thomes extends the volume’s focus to the German Rhineland from 1825-1925. He establishes just how comprehensive social welfare measures were, long before Bismarck’s better-known legislation designed
to undercut support for socialists in the 1880s. Reformist to the core (including even support for the Revolution of 1848), Aachen employers offered a subsidized savings bank, early kindergartens, girls’ schools, hospitals, and a technical university. In a separate essay, Alexander Fernandez examines mining communities and Christian socialism in the Asturias and Biscay in Spain from 1880 to 1919.

Essays in the second part of the book consider what Bonin and Thomes dub the “new paternalism” or what is often called in English the “company welfare” of huge industrial firms in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Here Boris Shpotov argues that Henry Ford’s famous five-dollar day was not a simple effort to reduce worker turnover and increase consumption as contemporaries and some historians have portrayed it. Rather, by focusing specifically on the extensive files of Ford’s Sociological Department, Shpotov’s emphasizes the importance of Ford’s “Americanisation” of an overwhelmingly foreign-born workforce (from some fifty-eight different countries). The five-dollar day clearly included a certain social control. “Letting out a part of lodgings, stuffy and dirty rooms, working wives, absence of certificate of marriage, of bank account, drinking and gambling” could lead to reprimand and the loss of the five-dollar daily wage (p. 165). Shpotov includes here some of the Sociological Department’s statistical data on employees’ savings, debt, real estate, living conditions, and various habits. In a second essay on the automobile sector, in this case the tire industry, Valerio Varini describes Pirelli’s company welfare, which included health services, training schools, workers’ housing, sports, and leisure activities. Interesting essays by Irina Potkina, Alain Cortat, Pierre-Yves Donzé and Laurence Marti track comparable examples in Russia and Switzerland.

The third part of the book carries the title “Post-Paternalism.” As in an earlier essay in the second part of the book, here Jean-Marc Figuet and Bernard Sionneau present excellent reflections on the development and decline of the “moral contract,” particularly in the United States. With considerable clarity, Figuet and Sionneau lay out the implicit agreement between workers and corporations in the U.S. during and after World War II. They begin by describing the “stakeholder” model of corporate governance from the 1940s to the 1970s, which was characterized not only by health care and pensions for employees but also by good corporate citizenship in communities. By the 1970s, a “shareholder” model emerged, which increasingly focused on quarterly profits for shareholders, financial machinations in the form of leveraged buyouts and ultimately hedge funds, and outsized stock options for corporate executives. In her complementary essay concentrating on Europe, Isabelle Daugareilh describes the talk of corporate social responsibility within Europe, a project that, in her words, “stalled.” Hubert Bonin ends this section with a broader reflection on links between nineteenth-century paternalism, the “new paternalism” of company welfare schemes in the early twentieth century, and corporate social responsibility today. Bonin questions whether current notions of corporate responsibility are a contemporary form of paternalism designed to assist employees and communities—or simply a “fad,” a window-dressing on corporate websites devoid of substance.

To an even greater extent than in most edited volumes, these essays are uneven. Several are well-researched and nicely argued. Others are based exclusively on secondary sources; Fernandez’ essay on Spain begins, for example, by noting that “we shall base ourselves mainly on the remarkable study of José Sierra Álvarez” (p. 144). France and the United States are better represented than other countries. Most essays focus on business, economics and finance, not the cultural assumptions embedded in notions of paternalism. However there are two notable exceptions, and each of them suggests approaches for future research, even if the authors do not explicitly say so.

In a volume that generally assumes male workers as well as male company owners and male managers, Corinne Belliard’s chapter on women’s philanthropy in nineteenth-century Britain and France is interesting. Belliard describes women’s charitable work under the category of “paternalism,” a classification that seems fitting given her findings. Despite some differences, in both the Charity Organisation Society in London and the Office Central des Oeuvres de Bienfaisance in Paris, Belliard notes that even the most prominent women were subject to the men in charge. Other scholars and
students will want to take her focus on women and extend it to gender. Did paternalism infantilize or even feminize working-class men? How might those efforts have been tied to notions of middle-class male constraint as masculine in the mid-nineteenth century? How did paternalism reinforce traditional gender roles? Was it designed to avert the seeming reversal of gender roles among workers that horrified some critics of early industrialization? Belliard’s essay reminds us that the study of paternalism begs for more attention to gender. Near the end of the volume, Bonin cites Pierre-Yves Gomez in suggesting that Steve Jobs “designed ‘maternalism,’ the corporation giving priority to the ‘care’ of its customers, in satisfying their needs and expectations” (p. 364).[1] Since this particular construction implicitly reprises the nineteenth-century notion of separate spheres of male production (and thus paternalism) and female consumption and “care” (“maternalism” as used here), the volume’s lack of analysis of the fundamental gendering of “paternalism” seems like a missed opportunity.

Similarly, the single essay about paternalism in the empire suggests other potential perspectives for future work. Jean-Louis Moreau’s essay on the Union Minière du Haut-Katanga’s social policies in the Belgian Congo in the 1920s is fascinating. Relying (heavily) on a single, unpublished memoir by N. N. Genoncexaux and the files of the Union Minière, Moreau succeeds in laying out company welfare policies for “laborers,” or “natives,” as opposed to “employees,” who were Europeans. Moreau thus does for mining in the Belgian Congo what Shakila Yacob did for U.S. Rubber’s plantations in Southeast Asia.[2] Although I am not yet convinced that these imperial forms of company welfare did much besides increase the productivity of contract laborers in the Congo and Southeast Asia (certainly the European employees fared much better than did indigenous and “coolie” laborers), the inclusion of Moreau’s essay here suggests an important question for the future of European business history: How might we rethink paternalism within Europe after learning more about its implementation in mines and on plantations in the empire?

This is a large and varied volume. Overall, it suggests the need for an analysis of paternalism and advertising. In his closing essay, Bonin is rightly skeptical of today’s corporate websites for proclaiming the social values of fair treatment of workers and good environmental practices—regardless of what the companies actually do. He also includes images of a couple of advertisements in order to illustrate the point. What if we apply that same skepticism to earlier periods? I know the case of Michelin best, but that company was in no way alone in publicizing its early twentieth-century “œuvres sociales” as a means of enhancing its reputation and selling its products. Ford himself was a master of the media, and publicity for the five-dollar day did much to sell his cars. Are today’s ads proclaiming corporate responsibility really new, except in the technology delivering them? Didn’t the nineteenth-century pictures, postcards, or trade cards of factories and their workforces that adorn this volume have a similar use in showing well-treated workers, veritable “families” overseen by the fatherly employer, to potential customers? In short, future work might interrogate the extant sources of paternalism, concentrating on how and why employers publicized their efforts to “reform” and “improve” workers’ lives.

The likely readers are fellow scholars who will probably focus on one or two of the essays closest to their own research. Such readers will not be concerned about the lack of a general argument that might have pulled together the volume. Reading narrowly for content, they might also be able to overlook the egregious grammatical and typographical errors that riddle this book. It is somewhat easier to understand some of the errors of translation, especially if one mentally translates back into the original language. So that when one reads here that “they could not rely on the concourse of social-Christian trade unions” (p. 72) or “potential workers needed to be seduced” (p. 191), or that there is a “famous adage, help yourself and the heavens will help you,” (p. 50) it is useful simply to go back to the original French. Other errors could easily have been caught by a copyeditor; “collective bargains” (p. 159) are not the same as collective bargaining, and I doubt one of the authors intended to write “coloured people” (p. 239) to describe people of color. Given the profound strengths of several of these essays and the fact that authors are not native speakers of English, it is a shame that the publisher does not seem to have provided any copyediting. The contributors deserved better.
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