
A MARXIST APPROACH TO
OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION

by

Ronald Aminzade
The University of Michigan
June 1976

CRSO Working Paper #132

Copies available through:
Center for Research on
Social Organizations
The University of Michigan
330 Packard Room 214C
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

A MARXIST APPROACH TO
OCCUPATIONAL CLASSIFICATION

Ronald Aminzade
June 1976

Introduction

This paper was originally written as an appendix to my doctoral dissertation, Class Struggles and Political Conflicts in Toulouse, France, 1830-1872. The text does not stand on its own; it forms a small part of a very complicated argument concerning the relationship between class structure and political behavior. I have attempted to explicate what I consider to be a Marxist solution to the problem of classifying occupational titles. The categories one uses to analyze an event or social structure often determine the conclusions one ends up with. With this in mind, I have taken great pains to carefully define the social class terminology used in my thesis.

The social class vocabulary of historians is often ill-defined and vague. Part of the problem, no doubt, arises from the relational, and hence changing, meanings of particular class categories. Since class terminology refers to historically variable social relationships (of production), social classes don't have fixed meanings and components. Social class, as E.P. Thompson reminds us, is a relationship, not a thing.² Classes are not fixed entities, but social processes. I have relegated the following discussion of occupational categorization to an appendix in my thesis because the main focus of my work is upon the social relationships which provided the dynamic for these processes, rather than upon the important but nonetheless secondary problem of defining and categorizing the components in the process.

Social Class and Social Stratification

Social class and social stratification analysis concern different aspects of the problem of social inequality. Stratification analysis attempts to describe how socially valued attributes or scarce resources, such as income, prestige, or power, are unequally distributed to social strata. Social strata consist of aggregates of individuals who receive similar amounts of these

scarce rewards. The focus is upon the distributive, rather than the relational, aspects of the productive system. Class analysis attempts to analyze how social relations and institutional arrangements arising from the prevailing mode of production generate social conflict and large-scale structural changes.³ Class is an analytic tool for studying the sources of social change, not simply a descriptive category. It refers to differential property relations to the means of production, rather than to the differential allocation of scarce rewards. Classes are social realities, not statistical categories of persons sharing common traits.

Stratification analysis focuses attention upon changes in the process and pattern of distribution of persons into various occupational slots and the unequal rewards which accrue to such slots. Class analysis focuses instead upon the social relations existing between members of different classes. For example, whereas stratification analysis is concerned with the unequal distribution of wealth among people, class analysis focuses instead upon how the wealthy (i.e. owners of capital) relate to the propertyless (i.e. wage laborers).

A scheme which categorizes occupational groups into social classes on the basis of their relationship to the means of production must be based upon an intimate knowledge of the changes taking place in these relationships. Property relations are by no means static. In the case of nineteenth century Toulouse, they were transformed by a historical process involving the increasing concentration and centralization of private capital and the increasing loss of control by wage laborers over the product and process of their work. The close link between social classes and social change makes questionable any rigid ahistorical scheme for classifying particular occupational groups into social class categories. The following scheme was designed for a study of class relationships in a nineteenth century French

city. The general Marxist perspective, however, has an applicability which transcends the particularities of a given time and space, and thus offers a valuable tool for the study of social relationships in general.

The term "means of production" refers to the labor power⁴ and capital (e.g. tools, buildings, technology, raw materials, etc.) necessary to produce a particular good or service. The basic idea of class analysis is that the social relationships which accompany the bringing together of these resources into coordinated productive activity are shaped by the division between those who own and those who don't own the means of production. Occupational titles were classified into social class categories according to the social relationship to the means of production which the exercise of the occupation involved. A person's social relationship to the means of production refers to whether he or she: 1) owned or controlled capital 2) purchased or controlled the labor power of others; and 3) sold his or her labor power to an employer.

Stratification analysis usually classifies all persons sharing the same occupation together. Several American sociologists⁵, for example, have made an effort to rank all occupations on a hierarchical prestige scale. Marxist class analysis does not group together all those sharing the same occupation; rather it distinguishes among those sharing the same occupation on the basis of their relationship to the means of production. Using a Marxist approach, one would often have to know more than an occupational title. The procedure elaborated below makes use of the occupational modifiers frequently listed alongside occupational titles and of supplementary data about occupational groups from sources other than the manuscript censuses. This supplementary information enabled me to determine, for the occupational titles listed in the census manuscripts, whether a person listing a particular occupational title was self-employed, employed by someone else, or purchasing or controlling the labor power of others.

Occupational titles alone often designate a person's trade, but give no indication of the class position of the title holder. Since the division of labor within certain occupations was rather advanced, and the occupational titles not always specific enough, a title without an accompanying modifier was sometimes rather inconclusive. Someone listed as a printer (imprimeur), for example, may have been a skilled laborer in a print shop, the owner of that shop, a salesman of the products, or an apprentice performing menial tasks such as cleaning up around the shop. Fortunately, an occupational modifier often accompanied the titles of those occupations in which the division of labor made such distinctions important. A print shop owner using such a modifier would be designated as a master printer (maitre imprimeur), a journeyman as an ouvrier or compagnon printer, an apprentice as an apprenti printer, and a salesman for printed materials as a marchand-imprimeur or libraire. Eight percent (528/6,515) of all persons with occupational titles listed in the 1872 census sample had modifiers accompanying these titles.

The extent to which the sharing of a similar social relationship to the means of production also involved the sharing of similar experiences, lifestyles, beliefs, and values is a matter for historical investigation. Class was not defined in cultural terms, although the sharing of a common culture was crucial in providing force and meaning to class boundaries and distinctions.

Control over capital and labor power was reflected in various other dimensions of social inequality, such as wealth, income, and prestige. These dimensions of inequality did correspond to social class distinctions (See Tables III & IV on pages 36 and 37) but the term social class refers to the social relationships of production, not to wealth, status, or other aspects of consumption. A social class usually consists of a diverse group of persons whose short-term

interests, wealth, prestige, and social situations are by no means identical. Social classes are usually not homogeneous groupings with regard to the life situations they embody. The homogeneity or heterogeneity of social classes with regard to wealth, prestige, or life styles is a historical question regarding the existence of social strata within social classes.

The historical reality of socio-economic relations in Toulouse during the period from 1830 to 1872 defined social strata within social classes. The social strata which exist within social classes are not fixed ahistorical categories; they are grounded in the concrete social and political relationships of a particular time and place. The term social strata refers to a category of persons who share similar life chances on the market place.⁶ Different social classes had different market power resources which differentiated the life chances and life situations of class members and created uneven distributions of wealth, status, and power among them. Within the working class, it was primarily skill which differentiated class members according to the type of labor power they could offer for sale on the marketplace. Within the bourgeoisie, it was the type of capital owned (e.g. commercial, industrial) which differentiated members of the same class. The following discussion examines the property relations which characterized each social class as well as the nature and character of the social strata which existed within each class.

Social Class Categories

All occupational titles listed in the Toulousain census manuscripts of 1830 and 1872 and in the marriage records of 1830, 1848, and 1872 were classified according to this scheme. The following list of categories outlines the classification scheme which is discussed in detail below. A complete listing of the social class categorization of all 1,410 occupational titles can be found in my thesis.

I. Bourgeoisie

- A) Industry & Finance - major industrialists, bankers, and financiers
- B) Commerce - wholesale merchants
- C) Administration and Government Service - high government officials, high level administrators, military commissioned officers
- D) Liberal Professions & Intellectuals - professor, writer, journalist, doctor, lawyer, architect, engineer
- E) Miscellaneous - rentier, bourgeois

II. Petite Bourgeoisie

- A) Commerce - innkeepers, shopkeepers, small proprietors
- B) Vendors & Small Independent Services - fruit vendor, knife sharpener
- C) Industry & Transport - small independent producers and manufacturers

III. Working Class

- A) Mental - "white collar" employees, minor administrators, clerical & sales workers
- B) Manual-Highly Skilled - skilled artisans in handicraft & factory production; shoemaker, tailor, printer, joiner

- C) Manual-Unskilled & Semi-skilled, Industry & Transportation - carter
hauler, tobacco worker, cotton print worker
- D) Manual-Unskilled & Semi-Skilled, Services - domestic servants, waiters,
guards
- E) Manual- Miscellaneous - ouvrier
- IV. Lumpenproletariat - criminal, vagabond, beggar
- V. Agriculture - farmer, gardener, cultivator
- VI. Property Owner (Proprietaire)
- VII. Not Classifiable - non-members of labor force, students, children, dependents

Bourgeoisie

During the Old Regime, the term bourgeoisie denoted a segment of the urban population which shared a certain legal status. In the nineteenth century, the term was generally used to refer to persons of independent means. The Toulousain police used the term rather vaguely to refer to the city's commercial, financial, industrial, and legal elite. The term was not, however, in its common everyday usage, applied to everyone who possessed above a certain amount of wealth. The French historian, Jules Michelet, writing in 1845, noted that: "Many an artisan who earns five francs a day says without hesitation 'my bourgeois' to the famishing rentier, who may receive an income of 300 francs a year and walks around in an old black suit coat in the middle of January."⁷ In the minds of nineteenth century Frenchmen, a certain economic independence, more so than a certain level of wealth, distinguished the bourgeoisie from those who sold their labor power to an employer to earn their daily bread.

In the following scheme, the category bourgeoisie refers to a) those who owned or controlled large-scale capital and b) administrators who held a high-ranking position involving directive control over a large-scale organization which employed the labor power of other individuals. The four strata which existed within the bourgeoisie were: 1) businessmen engaged in wholesale commerce; 2) industrial and financial businessmen; 3) high-level administrators and officials; and 4) professionals and intellectuals.

Businessmen engaged in large-scale industrial, financial, and commercial activities were classified as bourgeoisie because they owned large-scale capital and employed the labor power of others. As owners of capital, they derived their incomes from interest, rent and profit, rather than from wages.

Large-scale commercial capital and the commercial activities it supported provided a livelihood for an important segment

of the city's bourgeoisie. Large-scale merchants constituted the wealthiest, as well as the most numerous, strata of the Toulousain bourgeoisie. Although in 1826, only 4.5% of those Toulousains who left behind inheritance records were merchants (négociants), this group owned 24.3% of the wealth documented in these records. By 1869, they still controlled a substantial share of the city's wealth, owning 32.8% of the wealth but constituting only 6.4% of the total number of those listed in local inheritance records.⁸ (See Table IV on page 38).

Large-scale financial and industrial activities in Toulouse were quite limited in scope. Much of the wealth of the city's elite was invested in land and commerce, and very little of it was devoted to financial or speculative purposes. Until the arrival of Parisian banking firms during the Second Empire, banking and financial capital remained very limited. During the 1830's, the city's industrial capital remained relatively small in scale and largely in the hands of small artisans and merchants. The introduction of large-scale factory industry during the period from 1830 to 1872 considerably altered the situation. The increasing concentration of industrial capital marked the slow rise of the city's nascent industrial bourgeoisie, which, though small in number, gradually gained increasing control over the means of industrial production.

High-level administrators were also classified as members of the bourgeoisie. Although they didn't own the means of production, they exercised directive control over large-scale institutions employing the labor power of others. The president of a university, the archbishop of the Catholic Church, a general in the army, or a prefect would all qualify as holding positions entailing directive control over a large-scale institution. High-level administrative, government, church, and judicial positions involved the formulation or interpretation of institutional policies or laws. They all involved important decision-making or high-level direction or management of

large-scale institutions or enterprises. High-level administrators were "themselves part of the class that personifies capital and employs labor."⁹ Although they did receive a salary from employers, as Harry Braverman remarks, "their formal attribute of being part of the same payroll as the production workers, clerks, and porters...no more robs them of the power of decision and command over the others in the enterprise than does the fact that the general, like the private, wears the military uniform, or the pope and cardinal pronounce the same liturgy as the parish priest."¹⁰

Occupations, such as chief clerk or police sergeant, which involved low or middle-level supervision but little or no control over the formulation or interpretation of important decisions did not entail the exercise of directive control over an organization. Most organizations involve a continuous rather than a dichotomous division of authority relationships into a graded hierarchy. It is not simply authority divisions between dominants and subordinates which determined the social class of the holder of a particular occupational title. Foreman and chief clerks both exercised supervisory authority over other individuals performing similar work, but they were not classified as bourgeoisie because their roles did not involve directive control over the means of production. That is to say, they did not have the power to reallocate or dispose of capital and labor power.

Directive control does not refer to the clerical tasks of record keeping or to the managerial tasks of supervising workers, scheduling production, or marketing products; it refers to basic decisions concerning where, how, and in what quantities capital will be allocated in order to acquire profits. In early large-scale commercial and industrial establishments, these basic decisions remained the prerogatives of the owners of capital. These owners, often assisted by the chief clerks and commercial travellers they employed, themselves made the decisions concerning the allocation of capital, the acquisition and

extension of credit, and the investment of profits. There was little separation of the ownership and control of capital in private industry in Toulouse during this period. Although foremen were given supervisory functions at the workplace, the owners of capital themselves ran their businesses rather than delegate directive control of their enterprises to a staff of trained managers and administrators. None of those persons listed in the 1830 and 1872 census samples who were classified as high-level administrators were directors of private enterprises; they were all government officials directing public institutions. The thirty-five high-ranking government officials listed in the 1830 census sample included 24 military officers, 5 judges, 5 high-level government administrators, and one police official. By 1872, the world of government officialdom was still numerically dominated by the military, but government administration had considerably expanded its numbers. Of the forty-four high-level officials listed in the 1872 census sample, there were 23 military officers, 5 judges, 8 high-level public administrators, one police commissioner, and 7 directors of educational and charitable institutions.

The next group which was classified as bourgeoisie included intellectuals and professionals. Intellectuals made their living through the creative production or manipulation of cultural symbols, rather than the production of goods or services. This group includes artists, writers, philosophers, musicians, university professors, and journalists. Professionals were mental laborers with high educational qualifications, specialized training, and, most often with some sort of government or professional certification. The liberal professions in Toulouse were dominated by men of law. In the 1830 census sample, 39 persons had occupational titles that were classified as professionals. This included 19 lawyers, attorneys, and notaries, 13 doctors, dentists, and pharmacists, 4 engineers, 2 architects, and one geometer. In the 1872 census sample, of the 72 persons with occupational titles that were

classified as professionals, there were 37 lawyers, attorneys, and notaries, 18 doctors, dentists, and pharmacists, 12 engineers, 3 architects, and 2 chemists. Some professionals had their own private practices and sold their services to a diverse clientele; others drew the bulk of their income from the services they provided to particular employers, especially government institutions.

Professionals and intellectuals were classified as bourgeoisie because they owned and controlled the means of production in the sense that the basic means of production of their occupations was a cultural, or human, capital. The exercise of their occupations required a university education; that is, a lengthy investment of several years of educational training. Professionals and intellectuals were not the only ones whose occupational activities required human capital. Skilled workers also required training to exercise their occupations and clerical workers required at least enough education to read and write; but unlike professionals and intellectuals, this training and education alone was not the major capital necessary for the creation of the goods and services they produced. Unlike workers, professionals and intellectuals required little physical capital (i.e. few tools or raw materials) to produce their services; the main thing that they required was extensive education and training, that was usually the product of long years of schooling.

It is difficult to decide whether to classify professionals as bourgeoisie or petite bourgeoisie. Although it is hard to calculate the exact cost of acquiring a professional license, and impossible to estimate the cost of the cultural capital of intellectuals, it was a good deal more costly to acquire this sort of capital than to set up a small business. The possession of cultural capital provided professionals and intellectuals with a degree of independence and security unknown to most petite bourgeoisies. In the 1830 manuscript census, only 5% of those whose occupations were classified as

professionals were observed by census takers to be living in poverty; 40% of them were described as moderately well-off, and the majority of the group (55%) were categorized by census takers as wealthy. According to the same 1830 manuscript census, 24.5% of the petite bourgeoisie were living in poverty, 46.5% were moderately well-off, and 32.9% were wealthy. (See Table III on page 37). In death, as well as in life, Toulousain professionals resembled the bourgeoisie more closely than they did the petite bourgeoisie. Inheritance records, for 1826, 1846, and 1869, reveal that the wealth left behind by professionals far surpassed the meager inheritances which the owners of small-scale capital (i.e. the petite bourgeoisie) had accumulated over their life-times. Given the initial investment that the possession of this cultural capital required and the returns that it eventually brought, it appears more reasonable to classify professionals and intellectuals as bourgeoisie (owners of large-scale capital) than as petite bourgeoisie (owners of small-scale capital).

The miscellaneous bourgeoisie category, including 13 persons in 1830 and 230 persons in 1872, consisted almost entirely of those who gave their occupations as rentiers (rentier). There were 12 such individuals in the 1830 census sample, as well as one persons whose occupation was listed simply as bourgeois. In the 1872 census sample, 230 persons gave their occupations as rentier. These individuals gained their incomes from interest, rent, profits, or pensions, but failed to specify whether the source of that income was from commercial, industrial, or financial activities. A majority of those who listed their occupation as rentier were women (84.7% in 1830, 65.7% in 1872). A sizeable percentage of Toulousain rentiers were old people; in 1830, 15% were over 60 years of age, and in 1872, 38% were over 60. These figures suggest that many rentiers were old or retired people living off of pensions or inheritances.

Petite Bourgeoisie

The term petite bourgeoisie refers to those who owned a small-scale enterprise, sold a product rather than their labor power on the marketplace, and employed few if any other persons. The three strata distinguished within the petite bourgeoisie were a) shopkeepers and small proprietors; b) vendors and small independent service people; and c) small independent producers.

Shopkeepers and small proprietors often owned small family run businesses which they operated with very limited capital. The owner usually worked alongside family members or hired a few employees. These small businessmen dealt directly with consumers, and were thus dependent upon different types of clientele, according to the social composition of their neighborhoods.

The category petite bourgeoisie also included vendors and small independent service people who were self-employed persons rather than wage laborers. These persons did not sell their labor power to an employer. They owned very minimal amounts of capital with which to purchase the products they sold on the street or the tools they used to provide unskilled or semi-skilled manual services such as knife sharpening or chimney sweeping.

Shopkeepers differed from street vendors not only in their superior social status and standard of living, but in their demographic composition as well. The petite bourgeois shopkeeper category consisted primarily of male-headed family run-enterprises, with males constituting 65% of this group in 1830 and 59% in 1872. The petite bourgeoisie vendors & small independent services category was composed primarily of women, who constituted 74% of this group in 1830 and 72% in 1872. Many of these women were seeking to supplement their husbands' or fathers' below subsistence level incomes with their meager earnings.

Those persons listing their occupations as marchand de....were engaged

in the retail, not wholesale, merchandizing of products. Wholesalers were either clearly designated by the adjective "en gros" or were listed as a "negociant" or "representant de commerce" for a particular product. Sometimes two different titles were used to distinguish the way in which a product was retail merchandized, either by a street vendor (e.g. marchand de bonbons, marchand de café au lait) or a storekeeper (e.g. marchand confiseur, cafetier). In many cases, however, the distinction between hawkers and street vendors on the one hand and storekeepers on the other was not always evident from the occupational title alone. Certain occupational titles, such as marchand d'allumettes (match vendor), marchand de choux (cabbage vendor), or marchand sur la place (open air vendor) obviously referred to street vendors not storekeepers. In most cases, vendors sold a particular item of very low cost, usually food, whereas storekeepers tended to be less specialized in the products they sold, or, if they did specialize in only one item, it was usually of much greater value (e.g. marchand d'instruments de musique). In questionable cases, occupational titles beginning with the words marchand de...were classified as shopkeepers if they were listed along with store addresses in the city directories of 1840 or 1872 or if they were listed in the electoral eligibility lists of 1845. Those titles not listed were classified under the street vendor-hawker category. This procedure was later verified by a study of how often the modifier proprietaire (property owner) accompanied the occupational title in the census listings of 1830 and 1872, as well as by an analysis of the observations of wealth attributed to holders of the occupational title in the 1830 manuscript census. Those persons listed as retailers under the title revendeuse de...were almost always women

engaged in the sale of low cost items. Although the title may have occasionally applied to storekeepers, it appears to have been rather consistently used to designate street vendors. The same procedure was used to classify these titles.

The third group included in the category petite bourgeoisie was small independent producers. It was difficult to distinguish between small master artisans and journeymen when occupational modifiers providing this distinction were absent. Only 4 of the 1,574 artisans listed in the 1872 manuscript census sample designated themselves as masters. 51 designated themselves as apprentices, and 188 as journeymen. The absence of occupational modifiers to distinguish between masters and journeymen in artisanal trades was not necessarily the result of poor work by census takers. In those trades in which a distinction was not made between journeymen and masters, such a distinction was probably not very important, and a person was likely to respond to the census takers' inquiry by simply stating his occupational title without any accompanying modifier.¹¹ Artisanal owners who, in responding to the census taker, failed to identify themselves as masters (maitres) probably considered themselves skilled workers rather than capitalist employers. They probably worked alongside the journeymen they hired, rather than simply directing or supervising them.

In the absence of a modifier, an artisanal occupational title was classified as a journeyman rather than a master for purposes of class categorization. The relative absence of the occupational modifier master (maitre) suggests that, at least in the minds of many artisanal employers, the distinction between themselves and the few workers they hired was relatively unimportant. This was especially the case in those industries, such as the building trades, where the ratio of workers to employers was very low. In

such cases, the amount of capital needed to set up shop was quite small. The basic difference between the small-scale masters in these industries, many of whom were themselves former wage laborers, and the few workers they employed was the former's ability to acquire a small capital investment.

Master craftsmen resembled small shopkeepers more closely than they did either large-scale capitalists or wage laborers. They owned and controlled the (small-scale) means of production, catered to clients rather than to an employer, employed several laborers, and sometimes pursued activities more commercial than productive in character. Many small masters engaged in retail trade, with their shops serving as retail outlets for goods produced on the same premises. Small artisanal masters were often very dependent upon the bourgeoisie of the city, especially the group of large merchants, for credit and contracts.

It was difficult to classify certain occupational titles as either bourgeoisie or petite bourgeoisie because the scale of capital was not always evident. For example, the term fabricant de....(manufacturer of....) could have referred to a master craftsman who owned a small shop employing few workers or to a large industrialist. The nature of the product provides a clue, but it isn't always evident from the title alone whether manufacture of the product specified involved large-scale industrial production or small independent craftsmen. Other sources had to be used to find this out: the Statistique de France: Industries Manufacturière: Commune de Toulouse, 1840 (Archives Municipales: Secretariat Generale 137), and Edmond de Planet's Statistique Industrielle du Département de l'Haute Garonne, 1865, (B.N.: Vp 4943). The former source lists establishments in Toulouse which employed over 20 workers in 1840, along with detailed information about each firm. The latter source gives the number of firms and the number of workers for the nine-

ty principal industries of Toulouse in 1865. This information was used to classify titles beginning with the words fabricant de..... If the manufacture of the product involved primarily small craft production (an average of less than 20 workers per shop), the title was classified under the "petite bourgeoisie, small independent producers" category. If it involved primarily either large-scale production (an average of greater than 20 workers per shop) or factory production by unskilled manual laborers, the title was classified under the "bourgeoisie, industry" category.

Working Class

The term working class refers to non-agricultural wage laborers who placed their labor on the market place for purchase by contract and did not own or control the means of production.¹² A majority of the city's labor force, 69% in 1830 and 67% in 1872, fit this description. Strata within the working class were identified on the basis of skill levels and economic sector. The term skill refers to both whether the occupation involved manual or mental labor as well as to whether educational qualifications or technical training and expertise were required to exercise the occupation. Technical skills and educational qualifications were important market power resources which differentiated individuals within the working class. Occupational titles for which the performance of the job task required a lengthy period of training or apprenticeship to acquire the necessary proficiency were classified as highly skilled.

The four social strata identified within the working class were: a) employees engaged in mental labor; b) highly skilled workers engaged in industrial manual labor; c) semi-skilled and unskilled manual laborers engaged in industry and transportation; d) semi-skilled and unskilled manual laborers engaged in the provision of private and public services..

Toulouse was an administrative and commercial center for the entire southwest of France. A large segment of the city's population was engaged in the purchase and resale rather than the production of goods. Commerce not only generated many manual jobs in transport and warehousing, but many clerical and sales jobs as well. Rather than define this group of clerical & sales workers negatively, as nonmanual labor, or use the vague term "white collar" workers, I have used the term mental laborers.

Workers performing mental rather than manual labor possessed certain educational qualifications and skills, such as reading or writing, that were usually a requirement for their jobs. Most nineteenth century Toulousain mental workers were propertyless wage laborers rather than independent or quasi-professional employees. Their jobs, in clerical, sales, and low-level administrative positions, involved the routine operations of an organization, such as record-keeping and message handling. These job tasks entailed routinized alienating labor demanding little if any room for initiative or creativity. Unlike manual laborers, their jobs didn't require physical exertion and their working conditions often included a relatively relaxed pace and discipline, a certain degree of job security, and the prospect of promotion.¹³

In terms of their job tasks, employment conditions, social status, and job security, mental laborers stood apart from manual workers and formed a separate strata within the working class. At a time when many Toulousain workers were living on the margin of subsistence and faced with yearly crises of seasonal unemployment, mental laborers had a job security which guaranteed them a living. Inheritance records for 1869 suggest that mental laborers were a good deal wealthier than skilled or unskilled manual workers. (See Table IV on page 38). The 1830 census manuscript reveals that, although a sizeable proportion of mental laborers were living in poverty,

the majority were either wealthy (50%) or moderately well-off (23.7%); overall, their economic situation was superior to that of other strata of the working class (See Table III on page 37).

Primary and secondary school teachers were classified as mental workers rather than as professionals or intellectuals. They sold their labor power to employers and exercised very little control over the labor process. They were often as involved in administration as in the exercise of creative talents and, unlike the "men of ideas" who constituted the intelligensia, their jobs involved the teaching of "authorized" knowledge in church and government run institutions.

A distinction was made within the category of manual wage laborers between highly skilled workers and semi and unskilled workers. Highly skilled manual wage laborers were better paid than semi and unskilled workers. They usually exercised some control over the work process, often over the pace of their work, and performed a wider range of tasks than did semi and unskilled workers. Unskilled and semi-skilled manual wage laborers performed repetitive tasks involving little or no training or technical expertise and exercised very little control over the work process.

A distinction was also made within the group of semi and unskilled workers between those employed in industry and transport and those employed in services. Manual service workers were primarily women, especially single women, and a majority of manual service workers were domestic servants. Manual laborers engaged in industry and transport were by and large day laborers or factory hands. Unlike manual workers in industry and transport, domestic servants received room and board from their employers, which meant a certain degree of economic security as well as a paternalistic

dependence upon those who employed them. Since their life situations differed substantially from that of manual workers in industry and transport, manual service workers were classified as a separate strata within the working class.

Lumpenproletariat

The term lumpenproletariat refers to unattached laborers cut off from the means of production and not performing wage labor for an employer. This group of "down and outs" and undesirables is not equivalent to the reserve army of the unemployed. The lumpenproletariat were marginal men and women earning their living through dubious or illegal means and either incapable or unwilling to participate in legitimate productive activities on a regular basis. Members of what Marx called the reserve army were temporarily unemployed workers. Unlike the lumpenproletariat, the surplus population of the reserve army was readily mobilizable for capitalist production as wage laborers and formed an available reservoir of labor power. Although not equivalent, these two groups were very closely related. An unemployed worker who gives up seeking employment to engage in theft, begging, and vagrancy leaves the reserve army to join the ranks of the lumpenproletariat.

It was quite difficult to determine from a listing of occupational titles the group of individuals categorized as lumpenproletariat. Karl Marx defined this category as "decayed rouses with dubious means of subsistence and of dubious origin, alongside ruined and adventurous offshoots of the bourgeoisie" and his listing of those within it includes "vagabonds, discharged soldiers, discharged jailbirds, escaped galley slaves, swindlers, mountebanks, pickpockets, tricksters, gamblers, brothel keepers, literati, organ-grinders, ragpickers, knife grinders, tinkers, beggars."¹⁴ In the manuscript census, however, few people described themselves with these disreputable titles.

It is difficult to determine how those living on the margins of society and cut off from the means of production, most of whom probably escaped the census enumerators' enquiries, would have in fact listed their occupations if questioned by a census taker. The police commissioner's reports on the "classes dangereux" of the city provide a clue. According to the police commissioner's report of June, 1866, many of those engaged in the transport of goods (e.g. portefaix), the sale of inexpensive items on the streets of the city (e.g. marchand d'allumettes), and the provision of menial services on the streets (e.g. decrotteurs) were in fact beggars and vagrants. According to local police, most of them were recent rural migrants who were "for the most part vagrants, lacking any means of subsistence, sometimes ex-criminals."¹⁵ The police commissioner recommended to the Préfet that those claiming to exercise the occupations of dockers (portefaix) haulers (commissionnaires) hotel touts (pisteurs) and boot cleaners (decrotteurs) be placed under close police surveillance, that their activities be carefully regulated, and that their right to exercise the occupation be licensed by authorities. This licensing and surveillance, the police thought, would prevent begging and vagrancy by eliminating those occupations under which such activities hid. The police commissioner also strongly recommended that match vendors (marchand d'allumettes) be altogether prohibited from the city as they were in Paris.

It would be incorrect to classify all those listing their occupations as dock workers (portefaix) as lumpenproletariat, since many of those exercising this occupation were honest but unskilled wage laborers. Although they lacked control over access to their trade, they did in fact organize mutual benefit societies and display a degree of corporate consciousness unknown to the lumpenproletariat. Since these workers were in fact less likely to escape detection by the census taker than those unskilled migrants and vagrants who had recently flooded their trade in search of a livelihood that would ensure their subsistence, I classified

those listed as dockers (portefaix) under the category of unskilled manual laborers, not lumpenproletariat, well aware that some of their numbers may have fit the latter category. Raggickers, itinerant singers, match vendors, and boot cleaners were all classified as lumpenproletariat, since these occupational groupings consisted not of wage laborers but largely of unskilled propertyless itinerant men and women struggling to survive often through illegal means. They spent most of their time as beggars and vagrants and lacked any sense of corporate consciousness or any history of trade organization. Marx also included within the category of lumpenproletariat the occupation of knife grinder, which suggests that he was thinking in terms of a life-style definition of the lumpenproletariat, with a particular subculture in mind, rather than carefully following the implications of his more theoretical writings on social class. I have categorized those exercising occupations involving the provision of menial services (knife sharpeners, chimney sweepers, etc.) alongside street vendors as "petite bourgeoisie-vendors and small independent services." Unlike the dock workers, they did possess some capital, the tools that they worked with, and did not perform wage labor for an employer. The economic insecurity and itinerancy of many of those exercising these occupations is undeniable, but they were neither wage laborers working for employers nor were they destitute vagabonds completely lacking a trade; living on the margin of subsistence, some of them undoubtedly took to begging to supplement their incomes during hard times, but they were not entirely cut off from productive activities and therefore were not classified as lumpenproletariat.

In addition to the four major urban social classes discussed above, which accounted for 84% of the city's population in 1830 and 83% in 1872, two additional class categories were included. These two categories, property owners (proprietaires) and agriculture, include those who earned their income from the land.

Property Owners (Proprietaires)

The occupational title proprietaire (property owner) was difficult to classify. It was commonly used by the landed nobility residing in the city to provide an occupational title, but was also sometimes used by members of the bourgeoisie who earned their incomes through the profits of their property holdings. Land remained an important status symbol long past 1830, and many Toulousain urban bourgeoisie invested in land. Since their chief occupational activities and class interests were not, however, tied to the exploitation of landed property, they should be classified as bourgeois rentiers rather than alongside the landed nobility as proprietaires. Although a few members of the bourgeoisie probably used the term when questioned about their occupations, in most cases, it referred to large landholders, most of whom shared a common legal status, as the nobility, under the old regime. Although these large landowners usually maintained residences in both the city and the countryside, their economic interests and the main source of their incomes remained in agricultural areas outside the city.

Agriculture

This last category, which included only 4.2% of the city's labor force in 1830 and 3.4% in 1872 was reserved for those engaged in agricultural production within the city. It was composed of agricultural laborers who worked on plots of land in the outerlying areas of Toulouse but within city limits. This group could easily be further subdivided for a more detailed analysis of rural class relationships; but since this scheme was designed for the analysis of class relations in urban areas where few people are engaged in agriculture, a single category was sufficient.

Occupational Code Numbers

Each of the 1,410 occupational titles listed in the census manuscript

of 1830 and 1872 and in the marriage records of 1830, 1848, and 1872 was given a different code number. Four digits specify the occupational title. Code numbers were assigned to occupational titles according to the type of work performed. Occupational titles sharing similar characteristics were numbered near one another. Many occupational groups, such as hatters, contained various positions held by individual workers performing one of the possible tasks which the division of labor within that occupational role called for. Individuals engaged in the same occupation (i.e. participating in similar activities in the division of labor) but bearing different occupational titles because of differences in job tasks, levels of skill, stage of production, or other particularities of the work process were assigned different code numbers, but these numbers were assigned so as to group them near each other. The assignment of code numbers in such a manner facilitates the later consolidation of equivalent designations for the same occupational group. Servant and domestique, both titles referring to domestic servants, were given different occupational code numbers, but placed next to one another in the code scheme in order to facilitate the later grouping of equivalent occupational titles into the same occupational groups. The same occupations often show up under several different titles simply because of various degrees of specificity in the designation of the occupation.

Persons listed under different occupational titles but considered to belong to the same occupational group: a) performed similar or related tasks oriented to the production of the same or similar goods or services; and b) considered themselves to belong to the same occupational group, as was reflected in their organizational efforts, or were considered by others to belong to the same occupational group. Bootmakers, shoemakers, and cobblers, even though they used different words to designate their occupations, were considered to belong to the same occupational group, as were tailors

(tailleurs d'habits), shirt tailors (tailleurs de chemises), and dress tailors (tailleurs de robes).

Women and children and aged persons who exercised no occupation were listed in the census manuscript under a variety of titles. These titles usually specified their relationship to the household head, rather than an occupational group. Listings such as son (fils), daughter (fille), wife (femme), child (enfant), grandmother (grand-mere), etc. were all coded as family members (famille) to designate non-participation in the labor market.

Occupational Modifiers

Tasks and wage levels differed within occupations. The allocation of tasks and rewards within occupations was based largely upon skill qualifications and occupational seniority, both of which were closely related to the stage in the job cycle and age of the worker. Younger workers learning a trade typically earned less, performed the more menial and unpleasant tasks, and, during periods of economic downturn, were often the first to lose their jobs. Information about the stage of the job cycle and the age ranges that each stage included for different occupations will be used to study the patterns of intra-generational mobility within occupations, as well as the structure of inequalities within occupations.

Adjectives such as foreman (contre-maitre), apprentice (apprenti), merchant (marchand), etc. were considered to be occupational modifiers because they were used to describe a workers' status in his occupation rather than a specific occupation. A working proprietor exercising a craft was given the occupational code number of the craft in which he was engaged, and the occupational modifier variable retained the information, in machine readable form, concerning his ownership or non-ownership of the means of production, as did the social class code. A foreman (contre-maitre), who in most cases participated in the work done by the team under his day-to-day supervision, was

given the same occupational code number as those workers he supervised and the information concerning his supervisory status was retained in the occupational modifier variable.

Occupational modifiers were coded as follows:

- 01) apprentice - apprenti, garcon, eleve, aspirant
- 02) journeyman - ouvrier, compagnon
- 03) foreman - contre-maitre
- 04) master - maitre
- 05) retired - ex, retraite, en retraite, en non-activite
- 06) merchant - marchand (used as an adjective)
- 07) and property owner - et proprietaire
- 08) and door-keeper - et concierge or et portier
- 09) merchant (used as an adjective) and property owner - marchand and et proprietaire
- 10) merchant (used as an adjective) and door-keeper - marchand and et concierge or et portier
- 11) two occupations - code the first one given, unless the two titles are listed under one code number (e.g. ebenistemenuisier) as well as separately
- 12) retired and property owner - ex, retraite, etc. and et proprietaire
- 99) no occupational modifier

Industrial Classification Scheme

Goods

- 01) Agriculture, Forestry, & Fishing
- 02) Mining & Extractive Industries
- 03) Construction
- 04) Woods & Furniture (non-construction)
- 05) Stone & Earthenware Products (excluding construction)
- 06) Glass Products
- 07) Chemical Products
- 08) Food, Drink, & Tobacco
- 09) Paper Products & Printing
- 10) Leather Goods
- 11) Clothing (excluding leather & wooden items) & Textiles
- 12) Metals (including precious metals & jewellery), Tools, Machinery, and Precision Instruments

Services

- 13) Transportation
- 14) Communications
- 15) Finance(Banking & Credit), Insurance, & Real Estate
- 16) Domestic & Personal Services
- 17) Medical, Welfare, & Sanitary Services; Utilities - Gas, Water Fire Protection
- 18) Public Administration & Legal Services
- 19) Education & Science

- 20) Religion
- 21) Military, Police, and Prisons
- 22) Entertainment, Art & Recreation; Public Accommodations
- 23) Miscellaneous: dependents, unemployed, independent property owners,
and social outcasts
- 24) Commerce-Goods or Services Unspecified
- 25) Industry- Goods Unspecified
- 26) Administration- Services Unspecified
- 27) Classification not possible- no occupational title; illegible title

Industrial Classifications

This is a classification of industries, not sectors. There is no independent classification for commercial activities. A wine merchant (negociant en vin) would be classified in the food industry category, a shoe merchant in the leather goods category, and a merchant with no other specification in the non-classifiable category (i.e. Commerce-Goods or Services Unspecified). Sector designations (i.e. industry, commerce, administration, agriculture) are included in the social class scheme. The broad distinction is made between the provision of goods and the provision of services. A clerk in a leather goods store, engaged in the merchandizing of a product, was coded into the Leather Goods industrial category, since he is engaged in the provision of goods not of services. A clerk in a tax bureau, however, was coded under the Public Administration category. A ship's captain would be classified under the Transportation category, while a ship's carpenter would be placed into the Wood and Furniture category.

Many of the titles which ended up in the three unclassifiable, or unspecified, categories were persons engaged in retail or wholesale trade; they either dealt in many products or failed to designate the products involved. A fruit vendor (revendeuse de fruit) or bookstore clerk (clerc en librairie) could be classified, but someone listed simply as a clerc or revendeuse could not be. All military personnel, regardless of the jobs they performed, were coded under the Military category. A military surgeon, for example, was coded under the Military and not the Medical category. Civilian personnel working for the military, such as the workers employed at the arsenal's metal works, were coded under their appropriate industrial category, not under the Military category.

All students, since they were not yet engaged in the production of

goods or services, were classified under the Miscellaneous category as dependents, as not participating in the labor force except as clients for a particular service. Apprentices, trainees in a formal learning status but actively engaged in production, were classified with the workers in the occupation being learned.

FOOTNOTES

- 1) I am very grateful to Erik Olin Wright of the University of Wisconsin for the criticisms and suggestions he provided after reading an earlier version of the paper. Significant improvements in the text resulted from the insightful comments of Lynn Eden, Bruce Fireman, Mary Jo Maynes, and Charles Tilly.
- 2) E.P. Thompson, The Making of the English Working Class (N.Y., 1963), 9-11.
- 3) J. Stolzman and H. Gamberg, "Marxist Class Analysis Versus Stratification Analysis as General Approaches to Social Inequality", Berkeley Journal of Sociology, 8 (1973-74), 105-125.
- 4) For a discussion of the difference between labor and labor power, see Harry Braverman, Labor and Monopoly Capital (N.Y., 1974), 45-59.
- 5) For example, Donald Trieman, The Validity of the 'Standard International Occupational Prestige Scale' For Historical Data, paper prepared for the Conference on International Comparisons of Social Mobility in Past Societies, Institute for Advanced Studies, Princeton, N.Y., 15-17 June 1972.
- 6) Max Weber, "Class, Status, Party", From Max Weber (N.Y., 1946), H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds.), 180-195.
- 7) Jules Michelet, The People (Illinois, 1973), John McKay (translator), 83.
- 8) Adeline Daumard (ed.), Les Fortunes en France au XIX Siecle (Paris, 1973), 570-572.
- 9) Op. cit.; Braverman, 405.
- 10) Ibid., 405.
- 11) According to William H. Sewell, Jr., this was also the case for artisans in nineteenth century Marseille. William H. Sewell, Jr., The Structure of the Working Class of Marseille in the Middle of the Nineteenth Century (Berkeley, 1971), University of California Ph.D. thesis.
- 12) In this scheme, I have classified police and military personnel, as well as the clergy, by using the same criteria that were used to classify other occupations. High level official exercising directive control in the Church, army, or police were classified as bourgeoisie, and the remaining personnel as working class. One might question this classification, arguing that the police clergy, and military bore a special relationship to the social classes engaged in production, as agents of social control functioning to support and defend the interests of the bourgeoisie. In this scheme, however, occupations were classified according to the relationship to the means of production they involved, not according to whether the occupational activities pursued furthered the interests of a particular social class. In any case, very few military personnel showed up in the census, since they weren't counted unless they had their own private residence in the city outside of the military garrison. Police and military personnel constituted only .6% of the working class in both 1830 and 1872, while the clergy accounted for just over 2% of

this group in 1830 and 1872.

13) Arno Mayer, "The Lower Middle Class as a Historical Problem", Journal of Modern History, 4 (Sept., 1975), 409-436.

14) Karl Marx, "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte", Karl Marx and Frederick Engels: Selected Works, 1968.

15) Archives Départementales de l'Haute Garonne: 13M47.

TABLE I

1830: n = 2493 (labor force); 6,035 (total pop.)
 1872: n = 6515 (labor force); 11,000 (total pop.)

	1830 #	1830 % of Labor Force	1872 #	1872 % of Labor Force	CHANGE 1830-1872
I BOURGEOISIE	174	7.0%	530	8.1%	+1.1%
Industry & Finance	16	.6%	26	.4%	-.2%
Commerce	49	2.0%	109	1.7%	-.3%
Administra- tion	35	1.4%	44	.7%	-.7%
Professionals	43	1.7%	72	1.1%	-.6%
Intellectuals	18	.7%	49	.8%	+.1%
Miscellaneous (rentier)	13	.5%	230	3.5%	+3.0%
II PETITE BOURGEOISIE	211	8.5%	446	6.8%	-1.7%
Commerce	120	4.8%	317	4.9%	+.1%
Industry	22	.9%	33	.5%	-.4%
Vendors	69	2.8%	96	1.5%	-1.3%
III WORKING CLASS	1707	68.5%	4377	67.2%	-1.3%
Mental	156	6.3	577	8.9%	+2.6%
Manual Skilled	578	23.2%	1579	24.2%	+1.0%
Manual Semi. & Un- skilled Industry	512	20.5%	1298	19.9%	+.6%
Manual Semi & Un- skilled Services	457	18.3%	915	14.0%	-4.3%
Miscellaneous	4	.2%	8	.1%	-.1%
IV LUMPEN PROLETARIAT	7	.3%	43	.7%	+.4%
V AGRICULTURE	104	4.2%	219	3.4%	-.8%
VI PROPRIETAIRE	243	9.7%	320	4.9%	-4.8%
VII NOT CLASSIFIABLE (i.e. illegible, vague or no occupat: title)	47	1.9%	580	8.9%	+7.0%
VIII NOT CLASSIFIABLE (i.e. non-members of labor force)	2904	54.2% of total population	5060	46% of total population	-8.2%

Note: These figures are based upon a systematic sample of every tenth individual listed in the manuscript censuses of 1830 and 1872.

TABLE II

SIZE OF SOCIAL STRATA

BOURGEOISIE

	<u>1830</u>		<u>1872</u>		<u>CHANGE %</u>
	#	% of Bourgeoisie	#	% of Bourgeoisie	1830-1872
INDUSTRY & FINANCE	16	9.2%	26	4.9%	-4.3%
COMMERCE	49	28.2%	109	20.6%	-7.6%
ADMINISTRATION	35	20.1%	44	8.3%	-11.8%
PROFESSIONALS	43	24.7%	72	13.6%	-11.1%
INTELLECTUALS	18	10.3%	49	9.2%	-1.1%
MISC. (e.g. rentiers)	13	7.5%	230	43.4%	+35.9

PETITE BOURGEOISIE

	<u>1830</u>		<u>1872</u>		<u>CHANGE %</u>
	#	% Petite Bourgeoisie	#	% of Petite Bourgeoisie	1830-1872
COMMERCE	120	56.6%	317	70.9%	+14.3%
INDUSTRY	23	10.8%	33	7.4%	-3.4%
VENDORS	69	32.5%	97	21.7%	-10.8%

TABLE II

SIZE OF SOCIAL STRATA (cont.)

WORKING CLASS

1830

1872

CHANGE %

	#	% of WORK- ING CLASS	#	% of WORK- ING CLASS	1830- 1872
MENTAL	156	9.1%	577	13.2%	+4.1%
MANUAL SKILLED	578	33.9%	1579	36.1%	+2.2%
MANUAL SEMI & UN- SKILLED INDUSTRY	512	30.0%	1298	29.7%	-.3%
MANUAL SEMI & UN- SKILLED SERVICES	457	26.8%	915	20.9%	-5.9%
MANUAL MISCELLANEOUS	4	.2%	8	.2%	0

TABLE III
DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH (1830)

	INDIGENCE & POVERTY (e.g. indigent pauvre)	MODERATELY WELL-OFF (e.g. mediocre aisance, un peu aisé)	WEALTHY (e.g. riche, aisé, opulent)	TOTAL # OF OBSERVATIONS	
I	BOURGEOISIE	2.9%(2)	32.4%(22)	64.7%(44)	68
	Industry & Finance	0	40%(2)	60%(3)	5
	Commerce	0	22.2%(6)	77.8%(21)	27
	Administration	0	0	100%(7)	7
	Professionals	5.0%(1)	40%(8)	55%(11)	20
	Intellectuals	0	80%(4)	20%(1)	5
	Miscellaneous	25.0%(1)	50%(2)	25%(1)	4
II	PETITE BOURGEOISIE	24.5%(23)	42.6%(40)	32.9%(31)	94
	Commerce	12.5%(7)	46.5%(26)	41.1%(23)	56
	Industry	0	50.0%(6)	50.0%(6)	12
	Vendors	61.6%(16)	30.7%(8)	7.7%(2)	26
III	WORKING CLASS	56.1%(323)	28.5%(164)	15.5%(89)	576
	Mental	26.3%(10)	23.7%(9)	50%(19)	38
	Manual Skilled	47.6%(127)	37.8%(101)	14.6%(39)	267
	Manual Semi & Un-Skilled Industry	70.3%(156)	19.4%(43)	10.4%(23)	222
	Manual Semi & Un-skilled Services	63%(29)	19.6%(9)	17.4%(8)	46
	Manual Misc.	33.3%(1)	66.7%(2)	0	3
IV	LUMPEN PROLETARIAT	100%(3)	0	0	3
V	AGRICULTURE	36.4%(12)	33.3%(11)	30.3%(10)	33
VI	PROPRIETAIRE	3.8%(4)	21.2%(22)	75.0%(78)	104
VII	NOT CLASSIFIABLE	45.7%(203)	23.2%(103)	31.1%(138)	444

n=1322

Note: The above figures are based upon observations made by census-takers in the 1830 manuscript census.

TABLE IV
DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH, TOULOUSE, 1826, 1846, 1869

	1826			1846			1869			
	% of Total Wealth	% of Total Inheritance Declarations	Distribution Measure	% of Total Wealth	% of Total Inheritance Declarations	Distribution Measure	% of Total Wealth	% of Total Inheritance Declarations	Distribution Measure	
I	BOURGEOISIE	56.1%	14.2%	3.95	59.3	14.2%	4.18	67.6%	18.1%	3.73
	Industry (Industriels)	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.0%	-	-
	Commerce (Negociants)	24.3%	4.5%	5.40	39.2%	4.0%	9.80	32.8%	6.4%	5.13
	Administration (fonctionnaires)	-	3.1%	-	10.8%	6.5%	1.66	11.0%	7.4%	1.49
	Professionals (Professions Liberales)	31.8%	6.6%	4.82	9.3%	3.7%	2.51	16.8%	4.3%	3.91
II	PETITE BOURGEOISIE	6.3%	9.0%	.70	3.2%	9.7%	.33	3.6%	6.0%	.60
	Commerce (Commerçants)	6.3%	9.0%	.70	3.2%	9.7%	.33	3.6%	6.0%	.60
III	WORKING CLASS	3.8%	36.0%	.11	3.4%	30.9%	.11	10.7%	26.9%	.40
	Mental (Employees)	-	-	-	-	1.4%	-	7.5%	3.0%	2.50
	Manual Skilled (Artisans)	3.2%	23.1%	.14	1.6%	16.8%	.10	2.0%	16.4%	.12
	Manual Semi and Un-Skilled (Ouvriers Brassiers)	.6%	12.9%	.05	1.8%	12.7%	.14	1.2%	7.5%	.16
IV	AGRICULTURE (RURAUX)	-	7.0%	-	1.5%	15.4%	.10	1.1%	12.4%	.09
V	PROPERTY OWNERS (Proprietaires)	33.8%	9.6%	3.52	32.5%	15.6%	2.08	17.1%	12.4%	1.38

Note: The above figures were calculated from data presented on pages 570-572 of Adeline Daumard (ed.), Les Fortunes en France au XIX^e Siecle, 1973. The distribution measures were arrived at by dividing the group's % of total wealth by its % of total inheritance declarations.