an ambiguous status in Old Regime society and were often despised both by their masters and by the lower classes, who saw them as pawns of the propertied. Therefore, Fairchilds goes on to show, servants were not the agents of cultural transmission between the elite and those below them that some historians have postulated. The tension implicit in this situation eased during the latter half of the eighteenth century as servitude changed from an état to a métier, and as the spread of a market economy brought increased wages and rising social ambitions, which encouraged new tensions.

The second half of the book studies the relations between masters and servants. Fairchilds argues that attitudes toward the lower classes were formed in "the household which may have been . . . a school in which noble, officeholder, and rich bourgeois learned the attitudes and techniques of social dominance" (p. 150). "Patriarchal theory," which implied reciprocity, "was generally little more than an ideological veil drawn over the naked reality of a relationship based solely on power" (pp. 168-69).

Fairchilds balances structural analysis of servant life with a study of the evolution of the role of the domestic in the family. This is all done with impressive style and academic rigor. However, a critic may ask if a study of different cities, or a choice of different time periods, might show that the statistical shifts are less significant than she argues. Some readers may be put off by the speculative, impressionistic aspects of this work. Questions concerning the psychology of illiterate servants must be answered impressionistically, and although Fairchilds shows an ability to recreate the historical milieu, she does slip once. The chapter on sexual relations is overly speculative, lacks documentation, and is riddled with irrelevant remarks about male sexuality. These are, nonetheless, only minor flaws in an otherwise impressive and valuable addition to the social history of Old Regime France.

Mark Scholz
University of Washington


Although acknowledged as one of the largest and most influential Communist parties in Latin America, little has been written about the Chilean Communist Party (CCP). This lack of attention is due primarily to
its overshadowing ally, the Chilean Socialist Party (CSP), whose leader, Salvador Allende, dominates the scholarship on the Chilean Left. Although often overlooked by the attention paid to the venerable Allende, in many ways the CCP was more important than the CSP. In The Chilean Communist Party and the Road to Socialism Carmelo Furci, an Italian Marxist, corrects this relative inattention to the Communists. In doing so he makes a valuable contribution to our understanding of Latin American Communism.

Originally written as a doctoral dissertation in political science for the London School of Economics, this work covers the CCP from 1912 to 1983, but focuses on the crucial 1948-1973 period when the CCP followed the strategy of the “Peaceful Road to Socialism.” Adopted in a period in which the CCP was outlawed, this strategy was similar to the “Popular Front” of the 1930s. During its “Peaceful Road” period, the CCP was cognizant of the risks of armed struggle with the military and of the possibilities of electoral victory in coalition with leftist and progressive forces. The strategy led to the Popular Action Front (FRAP), the near election of Allende in 1958, and finally the victory of the Popular Unity movement in 1970.

Although united in their desire for a socialist society and the candidacy of Allende, the CCP and CSP disagreed on strategy, tactics, and foreign policy. By comparing the programs of the two parties with that adopted by the coalition, Furci concluded that the CCP dominated the coalition. This was due primarily to the internal divisions of the CSP and the discipline of the CCP. Thus while outnumbered and with virtually no support in the agrarian and middle-class sectors, the CCP controlled the alliance.

Upon achieving power, the Popular Unity coalition began to disintegrate, and the “Peaceful Road” strategy collapsed with the Pinochet coup of 1973. While acknowledging the efforts of the U.S. in overthrowing Allende, Furci is more critical of the actions taken by the CSP and other leftist organizations in precipitating the crisis by attempting to ally with such moderate groups as the Christian Democrats. In both cases, the CCP proved more moderate and realistic by advocating a cautious “legal” revolution in alliance with the Christian Democrats.

Furci is also critical of the CCP’s naiveté and unrealistic expectations. Furci stresses the mistaken CCP belief that the Chilean armed forces would remain politically neutral and accept socialism. He points out the Left’s dilemma with regard to the military: to create an alternative force (people’s army) would precipitate an immediate crisis, but in not doing so the government was defenseless and easily swept away. The Chilean experience would seem to indicate a peaceful or electoral strategy without an alternative military force to counter a U.S.-trained and equipped professional force is an impossibility. Furci also criticizes the CCP for its
complete subservience to the Soviet Union which limited its popularity and flexibility. This criticism is not surprising, given that Furci’s own organization—the Italian Communist Party—has broken with the Soviet Union. Yet, with the realistic (except toward the military) strategy and popular support of the CCP (17% in the 1973 elections), Furci’s criticism may be politically motivated.

Although the Pinochet regime destroyed most of the records concerning the Chilean Left, Furci was able to piece together a reliable history through extensive interviews of exiled Chileans and a small archive in the Soviet Union. Furci’s work is at times repetitive, but a solid piece of scholarship recommended for students of both Chilean history and Latin American revolutionary movements.

W. Michael Weis
Ohio State University


In recent years historians, archaeologists, and combinations of the two have analyzed relics to understand the American past and cultural patterns better. Most notable is Ivor Noel Hume’s study of Carter’s Grove, Virginia, *Martin’s Hundred*. Hume’s colleague on the project, William Kelso, simultaneously happened on seven adjacent planation sites nearby, collectively known today as Kingsmill Plantation. Twelve years later, with the help of the Virginia Historic Landmarks Commission and the properties’ owner, Anheuser-Busch, Kelso proves equal to Hume’s task of portraying rural colonial Virginia. He traces the contours of the society from the “grand” style of the aristocracy to the lives, “something less,” of tenants and slaves, and he sets forth archeological documentation of artifacts discovered during excavation. On both counts he succeeds admirably in treating his subject with compendious grace and making insightful inferences by transcending the “fine line” between the two disciplines and integrating the thought of both.

Kelso begins by describing the context of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Virginia. Drawing on Bernard Bailyn’s and especially Edmund Morgan’s ideas, he paints the toil, disease, and death of the fledgling colony, the viable community rooted in tobacco, the fighting amongst the homegrown planters, incoming elite, freedmen, and government, and the