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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In *Peasants Into Frenchmen*, his brilliant study of the modernization of rural France in the 19th century, Eugen Weber noted that "... we have no rigorous analysis of court records to give us a view of rural crime in its specific detail." Moreover, no study exists of a rural département in the nineteenth century which tells whether or not patterns of crime changed during this period, and, if they did why they changed. I propose to fill this gap in the history of rural France and the study of crime by analyzing the court records and statistics for the Morbihan, a rural département in Brittany. I shall examine patterns of rural crime and determine when and why they changed in the first century during which national crime statistics were recorded in France, 1825 to 1925. My findings will enable me to construct a "moral portrait" of the Morbihan from the available evidence and also demonstrate how it changed between 1825 and 1925.

Before beginning a discussion of patterns of crime in

the Morbihan, however, it is necessary to know the types of crime patterns discerned by historians of crime for this period, and why they think these patterns change. Historians of crime have discerned three patterns of crime: traditional, modern, and transitional. A higher rate of crimes against persons than of property crimes marks traditional crime patterns, while modern crime patterns reveal a higher rate of property crimes than of crimes against persons. This phenomena is the result of the decline in the rate of crimes against persons in modern crime patterns. Transitional crime patterns also show higher rates of property crimes than of crimes against persons but the rate of crimes against persons continues


Historians of crime expressed the relationship between the development of society and changing patterns of crime in several works; however they usually limited their studies to areas that experienced the rapid changes of urbanization and industrialization. Two important examples are Howard Zehr's \textit{Crime and the Development of Modern Society} and Louise Shelley's \textit{Crime and Modernization}. 

Modernization.

In *Crime and the Development of Modern Society*, Zehr seeks to discover the impact of modernization on patterns of crime in France and Germany in the nineteenth century in order to test various theories of criminal behavior. The crime, population, and economic statistics he employs are drawn from French and German statistical annuals published in the nineteenth century. He uses the population and economic data to create indices which he then tries to correlate with the crime statistics using multiple regression and correlation analyses. Though Zehr concludes that the entire modernization process causes changes in patterns of crime, he singles out urbanization as having the most affect.

Unlike Zehr, Shelley does not employ statistics in her work. *Crime and Modernization* is a summary of the recent literature on the impact of modernization on several nations in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. She uses capitalist, communist, and socialist nations as examples to show that it is mainly urbanization and industrialization which cause changes in patterns of crime by bringing about drastic alterations to society.

Other works that limit their studies to those areas which experienced rapid socioeconomic change are "Urbanization, Industrialization, and Crime in Imperial Germany," by Vincent E. McHale and Eric A. Johnson, Denis

The reason why the authors named above limited their studies on patterns of crime to areas that rapidly urbanized and industrialized is because the traditional, modern, and transitional stages in the development of society are clearly distinguished in such places. Regions that remained unchanged or changed gradually, such as the Morbihan, either are ignored or considered only briefly. These areas have been overlooked because historians of crime perceive such slowly developing societies as also having negligible changes in patterns of crime since they do not exhibit the disruption of society associated with rapid industrialization and urbanization. Societal development, however, took place in areas such as the Morbihan and, as a consequence, society was disrupted despite the absence of large cities and an industrial economy. As a result of the disruption caused by the agencies of change—schools, roads, and
railroads, patterns of crime in gradually developing areas changed also.

Historians of crime employ certain statistical indices of modernity to explain the relationship between patterns of crime and modernization. Urbanization is the most used index, while prices for staple food items, the business cycle, and changes in occupation reflect the shift in the economy from agrarian to industrial. Other indices such as alcohol consumption and the divorce rate are used to show the disruption of society caused by urbanization and industrialization. Using multiple regression and correlation analyses, historians of crime discovered that, except for urbanization, the indices did not explain the relationship between changes in patterns of crime and modernization over more than fifty years. When historians of crime used shorter periods of time in their studies, the relationship between changes in

\[\text{Zehr, Ibid. 45-46, 60, 70, 81, 98-99; Cohen and Johnson, Ibid., 482; Desert, Ibid., 243, 270.}\]

\[\text{Prices of staple food items and the business cycle are associated with the industrialization process. The fluctuation in real wages, especially during the early stages of industrialization, makes the price of staple food items an important index when determining the extent of want in a society and the effect of want on patterns of crime. The business cycle is used to ascertain the effect of the frequent periods of boom and bust in industrializing societies on patterns of crime.}\]
patterns of crime and modernization was clearer. For example, Zehr found a positive correlation between the theft rate, real wages and real wheat prices in France before 1870, but not afterwards.

Since there is limited success in relying solely on statistics to explain the relationship between patterns of crime and modernization over a long period, my study of the Morbihan will use a combination of quantitative and qualitative evidence to explain it. The indices for which I will use quantitative evidence are the demography of the département, primarily changes in population density and the sex and age of the population and the shift from a subsistence to a market economy in agriculture. Those indices using qualitative and quantitative evidence are the development of enclavist industry, the maintenance of tradition in the political and religious life of the people, the advance in literacy, and the connection of the département to the rest of France through an improved communication and transportation network.

The following questions will be considered to express

---


³Zehr, Ibid., 46.

⁴Enclavist industry is industrial development that is limited to a specific area in a larger region.
the relationship between the development of society and changes in patterns of crime: Do changes in patterns of crime precede or follow changes in society? Can the three types of patterns of crime—traditional, modern, and transitional—be distinguished in the Morbihan? Are there similarities between changes in patterns of crime in the Morbihan and in a rapidly developing département? The answers to these questions reveal that a definite link exists between society's development and patterns of crime, even in a slowly developing area such as the Morbihan. Moreover, patterns of crime change in a gradually developing area in the same manner as in rapidly developing ones.

To establish these conclusions, this thesis has been organized as follows: a description of a gradual change in rural society is essential to depict the relationship between such a society's development and its patterns of crime. Once the stages of the society's development are discerned the next focus is on the patterns of crime. Then, the stages of the development of the society are correlated to the patterns of crime. On the completion of this task, the "moral portrait" emerges and is explored as a way to "give us a view of rural crime in its specific detail."

Any understanding of patterns of crime would be imperfect without a knowledge of the French criminal
Justice system in the nineteenth century and the difficulties involved in the use of crime statistics. The French criminal justice system between 1825 and 1925 was organized on three levels—the Cours d'Assises, the Tribunaux correctionnels, and the Tribunaux de simple police. The Cours d'Assises, found in the capital of the département, sat for specified periods during the year. This court tried felonies such as rape, murder, or grand theft. Juries determined the sentences of those brought before it. Located in the capital of each arrondissement, the Tribunaux correctionnels heard misdemeanors such as unintentional homicide, disturbing the peace, assault and battery, or petty theft. Three judges determined the sentences of the accused brought before the Tribunaux. A justice of the peace presided over the Tribunaux de simple police and heard cases that concerned the contraventions de simple police, minor infractions that were not classified as misdemeanors.¹¹

The statistical sources I used to determine patterns of crime are the record compiled by the Garde des Sceaux from court records and published annually in the Compte

The statistical breakdown of the Compte générale reflects the three major divisions of the French criminal justice system. There are statistics for the Cours d'Assises, the Tribunaux correctionnels, and the Tribunaux de simple police.¹²

The statistics provided by the Compte générale will be supplemented by data gathered from the jugements minutes of the four Tribunaux correctionnels of the Morbihan. The jugements minutes contain the name (by which it is possible to determine sex), age, birthplace, residence, occupation, offense and sentence of the accused. Moreover, the jugements minutes indicate if the accused used a lawyer and if a Breton interpreter was needed to translate for those morbihannais who could not speak French. In cases of theft, the type of goods stolen was often recorded, while in cases of assault and battery the sex and relationship of the victim to the accused was given. Periodically, a court clerk would editorialize

¹²The Compte générale is considered one of the oldest official crime publications. It began in 1825 and is not only a source for information on crime, but also offenders and suicide. More information of the Compte générale is found in Alphonse Guerry, Essai sur la statistique morale de la France. (Paris, 1833), 5 and Désert, "Aspects," 223-225.

¹³The records of the Tribunaux de simple police are too extensive in the departmental archives in Series U (Justice), and not broken down by département in the Compte générale. They will not, therefore, be considered.
about offenders and, if applicable, about the victim. In the more sensational cases, detailed information about the trial was provided. The Jugements minutes yielded quantitative and qualitative evidence which, when added to the statistical data of the Compte générale, shows when and how crime patterns changed.

Though the statistics of the Cours d'Assises are an important index of crime, relying solely on them gives a misleading portrait. This is because several crimes were lowered from the category of felony to that of misdemeanor, especially in the latter half of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth, in a process known as correctionalisation.¹⁴ Therefore, a combination of the statistics of the Tribunaux correctionnels and the Cours d'Assises gives a better approximation of the actual number of crimes committed.

Because of the tremendous amount of statistical material available from the Compte générale, I chose to sample homicide, assault and battery, and theft rates every decade between 1825 and 1925 from the statistics for the Cours d'Assises and the Tribunaux correctionnels. Many types of felonies and misdemeanors were heard by the Cours d'Assises and the Tribunaux correctionnels.

therefore, it is necessary to limit inquiry to those crimes which will probably be best reported. Those categories are homicide, assault and battery, and theft. These are usually the best reported because they require the intervention of the State and may involve a third party.¹⁵

There are also other constraints caused by the changing method of collecting and reporting statistics in the Compte général. Until the 1880's, the number of accused, acquitted, cases tried, and condemned were always given. After that date, only the number of accused was reported for the individual crimes and misdemeanors. In addition, the statistics for individual misdemeanors are no longer broken down for the Tribunaux after 1904. To overcome the first problem, I used the number of accused instead of the number of condemned. To solve the second problem, I used data from the jugements minutes to replace the statistics of individual misdemeanors.

The Compte général also provides information on offenders at the Cours d'Assises level. This information includes age, sex, marital status, occupation, and educational level. There is nothing similar for offenders at the Tribunaux level in the Compte. As a result, data for those offenders was compiled from the information

¹⁵Zehr, Crime and Development, 15-16, 85.
contained in the _jugements minutes_.

When using crime statistics in general, it is necessary to remember that no source is totally reliable. In other words, not every crime is reported so the statistics only record those that are. The result is what sociologists and criminologists refer to as the "dark figure" of crime, or the unreported cases. It is usually estimated above the number given in the statistical annuals. In addition, bias in recording the number of crimes is possible because of variations in police efficiency. That is, urban areas may have higher rates of crime than rural areas because there are more police who are more efficient in urban areas than in rural ones.

With this survey of the French criminal justice system completed, it is now time to consider how the Morbihan's society evolved between 1825 and 1925 and how that evolution affected patterns of crime. A description of the Morbihan's society is needed to determine the stages of its development. This is done in Chapter II by reconstructing the society of the Morbihan between 1825 and 1925 through a discussion of its population statistics, the living and working conditions of the majority of its population, the economy, and the political and religious beliefs of the population. A consideration

---

^For an extensive discussion of problems using crime statistics see Zehr, _Crime and Development_, 14-19.
of the agencies of change in rural France—the schools, roads, and railroads—and their effect on the Morbihan follows in Chapter III. In brief, these chapters reveal a society slowly developing in response to the agencies of change.

The population statistics of the Morbihan show that most of the people were peasants who lived on isolated farms or in small villages. This characteristic of the Morbihan makes it similar to many other départements in France. The major exceptions to this pattern of population distribution were the urban centers of Vannes, the capital of the Morbihan, and Lorient, the site of the naval arsenal and shipyards and industry. Both Vannes and Lorient are on the Atlantic coast and located between them were most of the small towns of the Morbihan. The population, accorded to the censuses, remained overwhelmingly rural between 1825 and 1925, with approximately 85 percent of the population classified as rural in 1825 and 75 percent in 1925. Unlike rural départements in France that suffered from depopulation in the nineteenth century, the Morbihan’s urban and rural population grew. The population finally peaked in the early twentieth century and then fell as the rural exodus began. The population census of 1921 reflected for the first time the decline in the rural and urban populations.

A study of the living and working conditions of most
of the morbihannais, the peasantry, especially those residing in the interior of the département, reveals that they changed very little between 1825 and 1925. The general poverty of the region and a form of land tenure, the domaine congeable, widespread in the Breton-speaking part of the département explains this situation. There were no financial resources for improvement and any improvements made on a farm held as a domaine congeable only made the rent higher. Beginning in the 1880's and continuing beyond the First World War, peasant hopes developed with the gradual spread of new agricultural methods and the increase in wealth brought about by the new methods and the end of a peasant subsistence economy.

The economy of the Morbihan was based on agriculture with coastal residents supplementing their income by combining farming with fishing. A fishing industry eventually developed and aided in the establishment of canneries along the Morbihan's coast which used the products of the local iron and steel industry centered in Lorient and its environs. The iron and steel industry, however, did not become a vital part of the Morbihan's economy: agriculture remained the dominant sector.

The political and religious beliefs of the population remained conservative between 1825 and 1925. In general, the population supported royalist candidates for political office and the Church retained an enduring influence, best
illustrated by the riots that occurred when the population resisted the closing of the congregational schools.

The four characteristics of the Morbihan outlined above make it appear static, except for some movement in the economy. However, the Morbihan was not static because the agencies of change—schools, roads and railroads—altered its society. Eugen Weber in *Peasants into Frenchmen* and Roger Thabault in *Mon village* described the effect of the agencies of change on nineteenth-century rural France. Weber’s work concentrates on the period from 1870-1914, the era that he perceives as the one where rural France ceased to be isolated from the culture of Paris. He examines peasant life before the coming of the agencies of change and how that life changed because of them. In *Mon village*, Thabault discusses how the roads, railroads, and especially the schools ended the isolation of his village, Mazières-en-Gâtine, from France. The end of isolation, however, meant that the village’s children

---

17 Schools, roads, and railroads as agencies of change are the subject of Weber’s *Peasants into Frenchmen* and Thabault’s *Mon village* translated as *Education and Change in a Village Community* (New York, 1971). Railroads and roads as agencies of change are further emphasized in Roger Price’s *the Modernization of Rural France* (New York, 1983). It concentrates on the end of the peasant subsistence economy and its replacement by a national market economy because of more and better roads and the expansion of the railroads throughout France. The use of education and better transportation and communication networks as ways to spread ideas which then caused change is noted in Shmuel Eisenstadt’s *Modernization: Protest and Change* (New York, 1966), 2, 4-5.
wanted to improve their lives and, as a result, left Mazieres-en-Gatine to seek permanent employment elsewhere.

As in many départements, in France, the Morbihan’s major difficulty in bringing education to its population was a lack of money with which to build schools, hire teachers, and build roads that would have enabled students to get to schools. Based on the statistics found in the army recruitment records, illiteracy was widespread in the Morbihan throughout most of the nineteenth century. This changed, however in the 1880’s. After the introduction and implementation of the Ferry Laws in that decade, the illiteracy rate in the Morbihan declined rapidly as it did in much of France.

The building of roads and railroads faced the same difficulty as the schools—lack of money. The length of the major roads—the routes nationales and the routes départementales remained unchanged throughout the nineteenth century. These roads, however, did not encourage local development, nor were they meant to encourage it. They were the main highways that crossed the Morbihan, but they only connected the capitals of the arrondissements—Vannes, Lorient, Pontivy and Ploërmel—with other major Breton and French towns. This situation changed in the 1860’s and after as more of the tertiary rads, the chemins vicinaux, were built in the Morbihan. By 1900, the Morbihan had a network of roads to
connect the isolated farms and small villages with market towns, the rest of the département, and the nation.

The railroad arrived in the Morbihan in 1869 as the line running from Nantes to Brest opened its stop in Lorient. Throughout the 1870's and 1880's a series of shorter lines were built from the main one to connect the capitals of the four arrondissements. The stops on these lines included the market towns of the interior and the coast. The connection of the Morbihan's farms and villages to each other and the outside world brought about the shift from the subsistence economy to a market one. Schools, both public and private, were also more accessible.

The agencies of change, then, altered the lives of the morbihannais by changing the focus of their agricultural economy and ending illiteracy. These changes, in turn, modified their living and working conditions. For example, by 1914 more houses had slate roofs instead of thatched ones and more wheat rather than rye or buckwheat was grown.

How did patterns of crime change as the Morbihan's society gradually altered under the impact of such forces of modernization as roads and schools? The patterns of crime discussed in Chapter IV reveal that the rates of crimes against persons and property increased between 1825 and 1925 in the Morbihan. The evolution of these patterns
of crime can be divided into three periods. The first period was from 1825 to 1855, the second from 1865 to 1885, and the third from 1895 to 1925. The first period, 1825-1855, falls into the category of traditional patterns of crime. The second and third periods belong to the transitional category. Modern patterns of crime were only beginning to emerge in 1925.

To give perspective, patterns of crime in the Morbihan are compared to national ones and those of a rapidly developing département, the Seine-Inférieure. This comparison reveals that changes in patterns of crime in the Morbihan were not similar to national ones. Yet, changes in patterns of crime in the Morbihan and the Seine-Inférieure were the same.

The changes in patterns of crime are also related to the development of society in the Morbihan. Many events began to alter society at the same time: the arrival of the schools, roads, and railroads occurs approximately between 1865 and 1885. A certain amount of time elapses before these changes are reflected in the patterns of crime. Therefore, three periods of crime exist, all reflecting society's development. During the first period, the society of the Morbihan remained relatively isolated from the outside world. The second period, 1865-1885, finds the Morbihan becoming a part of France because of the agencies of change. The patterns of crime
are no longer traditional, but transitional. The third period, 1895 to 1925, is a continuation of the transitional category. The agencies of change are an integral part of the Morbihan's society and continue to alter the entire society, but the process is not finished until after World War I.
CHAPTER II

THE MORBIHAN AND THE MORBIHANNAIS

In their article on French criminality, David Cohen and Eric A. Johnson remarked that "more needs to be known about the way individual societies in different periods reacted to socioeconomic and political development and change before we will ever understand such a complex issue as crime." Such knowledge is necessary because the alteration of society by social, economic, and political change, also known as the process of modernization, causes changes in patterns of crime. A knowledge of how the Morbihan's society "reacted to socioeconomic and political development and change" is integral to understanding the relationship between modernization and changes in patterns of crime between 1825 and 1925. To demonstrate Morbihannais society's reactions to socioeconomic and political change it is necessary to measure the modernization process by examining the following indices: population data to determine the


2 The term "modernization" is considered to be synonymous with the term "progress" and progress is defined as improvement. As a result, we have been trained to perceive modernization as good and failure to modernize as bad. I believe that modernization is simply the alteration of a society by certain internal or external economic, social, cultural, and political events which can have either a positive or negative effect on that society.
extent of urbanization and changes in composition by age and sex; the living conditions of the majority of the *morbihannais* to assess the role of tradition in their lives; the economy to discover if industrialization occurred or agricultural methods changed; and the people's religious and political beliefs to ascertain if they eroded or remained intact.

What does each index reveal about the impact of societal change on the evolution of crime patterns in the Morbihan? What is the Morbihan's place in the broader context of the modernization of France in the nineteenth century and its impact on patterns of crime?

The indices of modernization disclose three stages of social evolution—traditional, transitional, and modern—which, according to historians of crime, correspond to similar stages in the evolution of patterns of crime. Each stage has specific characteristics which distinguish it from the other. A traditional society is characterized as rural with the population living in villages or on isolated farms raising enough food for themselves. In traditional societies, religion and conservative politics are important factors shaping the lives of the people. A modern society is defined as urban and industrial where values such as religion and strong family bonds have eroded and are replaced by normlessness or anomie. The transitional society contains characteristics of modern
In the evolution of patterns of crime, the three stages are characterized by the rates of particular crimes. Traditional patterns of crime have higher rates of violent crime than of property crime, while modern patterns of crime have higher rates of property crime than violent ones. Transitional patterns of crime have rising rates of violent and property crime with the latter increasing more rapidly than the former.

To study the Morbihan’s society and its development in the context of these ideal types, we must begin with a description of the area to indicate the geographic factors that influenced society’s development. One of the five départements created from the province of Brittany in 1790, the Morbihan received its name from the Breton words

---

To find a common base from which to work, historians of crime concentrate on the simple definition of rural society as agrarian and sparsely populated and modern society as urban and industrial. Transitional society has both modern and pre-modern (traditional) characteristics. Historians of crime do take into consideration that "complex social changes" accompany urbanization and industrialization and these other changes contribute to "observable patterns of criminal behavior." (Shelley, Crime, xvi) The variables Shelley lists are the "geographic mobility of the population, changes in social and familial structure, and the economic organization of society." (Ibid) In Modernization: Protest and Change (New York, 1966) (2-6), Shmuel Eisenstadt defines a traditional society and then explains the processes by which it becomes a modern one. Though he does not specifically use the term "transitional" society for the period of change from traditional to modern that is what he describes.
for "little sea," the Golfe du Morbihan. The département comprised the former diocese of Vannes with some parishes of the old diocese of St-Brieuc added to it. The Morbihan was divided into four arrondissements—Lorient, Vannes, Ploërmel, and Pontivy—containing 37 cantons and 249 communes. Vannes was the capital of the département and the seat of a new diocese.* These Revolutionary political divisions were somewhat artificial, cutting across the major natural and cultural divisions that shaped the ways in which people lived, worked, and communicated throughout the nineteenth century. The maps illustrate both the political and cultural divisions.

The major natural division was between the interior and the coast. The coastal section, known in Breton as Ar-mor, was a strip, ten kilometers wide, that ran across the base of the arrondissements of Lorient and Vannes. The interior, or Ar-goat, embraced the rest of the arrondissements of Lorient and Vannes, as well as all of the arrondissements of Pontivy and Ploërmel. Ar-mor was more densely populated than Ar-goat. It also had more towns and villages and, therefore, a larger urban population. For example, according to the census of 1901,

*Enquête agricole, 2e série, 3e circonscription, 1862, (Paris, 1867), 15.

of the fourteen towns listed as having populations over 2,000, ten were located in the coastal strip. Two of these towns were the large urban areas of Lorient and Vannes. Only four were located in the interior and two of them were Pontivy and Ploërmel, the capitals of their respective arrondissements. The limited urbanization of the Morbihan was centered in the arrondissements of Lorient and Vannes, an occurrence which affected the evolution of patterns of crime in those arrondissements.

The line between Upper and Lower Brittany, cutting across the département, constituted the major cultural division. Upper Brittany included the eastern half of the Morbihan, i.e. the arrondissements of Vannes and Ploërmel. Lower Brittany was the western half of the département—the arrondissements of Lorient and Pontivy. The division between Upper and Lower Brittany was a cultural one because it represented the furthest advance of French influence in the medieval and early modern period with Upper Brittany being the most francised. The cultural division between Upper and Lower Brittany is best seen in the language differences. The population of Upper Brittany spoke French and called their area the pays gallo. In Lower Brittany, the pays breton, most of the population spoke Breton, a Celtic tongue. There were some exceptions to the linguistic dichotomy in the border cantons: in and around the towns of Lorient and Vannes the
population spoke French. The vernacular spoken on each side of the language line was a patois of Breton and French. The variations sometimes made residents even of neighboring cantons unable to understand each other. The linguistic division did not affect the evolution of patterns of crime but areas where Breton was widespread were the ones where traditional society survived the longest as did traditional crime patterns. The linguistic difference also meant that the courts had to provide Breton interpreters during trials for those morbihannais who did not understand French. This phenomena occurred primarily in the arrondissement of Pontivy where the largest number of Breton speakers lived. As the nineteenth century ended and the twentieth began cases requiring these interpreters decreased so that by 1925 there were none.

To what extent was the society of this geographically remote and divided region affected by the general nineteenth century phenomena of rural exodus and

---


8The jugements minutes of the Tribunal of Pontivy indicated when a Breton interpreter was used. Unfortunately, the person, or persons, who required an interpreter was not recorded.
Figure 1 France

Figure 2 The Morbihan
urbanization? How did the composition by sex and age of its population evolve? More importantly, how did rural exodus, urbanization, and the sex and age of the population affect patterns of crime?

Table 1
Population of the Morbihan, 1821-1926*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>461,224</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>490,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>427,453</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>506,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>433,522</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>521,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>449,743</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>535,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>447,898</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>544,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>472,773</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>552,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>478,172</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>563,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>473,932</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>573,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>486,504</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>578,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>501,084</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>546,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>543,175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All population data from the Statistique de la France, the Annuaire Statistique, and the Recensement de la population for 1846, 1856, 1906, and 1921.

Table 1 shows that the population of the Morbihan increased 17.8 percent from 1821 until 1921, when it began to decline. The small number of emigrants from the Morbihan and the high birthrate account for the increase in its
population until 1921. The decline shown by the censuses of 1921 and 1926 stemmed from the losses sustained in the First World War and greater postwar emigration. The birthrate of the Morbihan also declined after 1911.

In Table 2, the percentage of the urban\rural population is given. The table reveals that the percentage of people classified as urban increased between 1846 and 1911 as the percentage of people classified as rural declined, though the Morbihan remained much more "rural" than most other French départements. When compared to

The fecundity of the Morbihan was commented on as late as the census of 1906. It was third on the list of départements that had the highest birthrate between January 1, 1905 and March 4, 1906. (Recensement de la population de 1906, Tome II, 30)

This fact makes the Morbihan different from other rural départements in France that lost population in the nineteenth century because of the rural exodus and the drastic decline in the birthrate. The Morbihan fits the theory presented by Etienne Van de Walle in The Female Populations of France in the Nineteenth Century (Princeton N.J. 1974) that states that the poorer the département, the higher the birthrate. As the general standard of living rose in the Morbihan the birthrate declined. The losses of World War I and increased mobility caused by the improved transportation network lowered the population even more. For more on transportation's role in the rural exodus see Weber, Peasants into Frenchmen, 282 and Philippe Ariès, Les populations de la France et leurs attitudes devant la vie et le mort depuis le XVIIIe siècle. (Paris, 1948), 46. For the general lack of a rural exodus in nineteenth century Brittany see Histoire de la France rurale, Tome III, (Paris, 1976), 77.

The terms "urban" and "rural" are based on the official French statistical definition of urban as an area with a population of 2,000 inhabitants aggloméré. "Rural" is any area with less than 2,000 inhabitants aggloméré.
the national percentages of urban and rural population, the Morbihan is well behind the trend towards urbanization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban/Rural Population, 1846-1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in percentage)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Morbihan</th>
<th>1846</th>
<th>1872</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1921</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>urban</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>France</th>
<th>1846</th>
<th>1872</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1921</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>urban</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the population by arrondissement. The most populous arrondissement was Lorient, while Vannes was the second most populous. The other two less populated arrondissements, Pontivy and Ploërmel, are located in the interior of the département. Of those two, Ploermel had the smallest population.

Table 4 shows the population density by arrondissement. Lorient continued to increase in density as did Pontivy. On the other hand, Vannes decreased in
**Table 3**

Population by Arrondissement, 1821-1921

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lorient</th>
<th>Vannes</th>
<th>Ploërmel</th>
<th>Pontivy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>123,466</td>
<td>117,893</td>
<td>83,600</td>
<td>91,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>138,013</td>
<td>124,451</td>
<td>86,283</td>
<td>99,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>161,816</td>
<td>131,632</td>
<td>91,589</td>
<td>101,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>180,780</td>
<td>141,980</td>
<td>93,270</td>
<td>105,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>203,468</td>
<td>145,393</td>
<td>94,830</td>
<td>115,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>213,608</td>
<td>146,805</td>
<td>94,101</td>
<td>118,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>208,428</td>
<td>133,634</td>
<td>84,942</td>
<td>119,043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

density, while Ploërmel remained stable. Vannes, Pontivy, and Ploërmel were below the departemental average density, while Lorient was considerably above it. The departemental average density was consistently higher than the average density for France. Therefore, the Morbihan suffered from rural overcrowding in the nineteenth century. The rural exodus drained the excess population from many other départements but not the Morbihan.

The belief that population density was a possible cause of crime began in the nineteenth century and was based on the popular idea that cities bred crime, especially in the crowded poorer sections. Criminologists and sociologists decided that the overcrowding of a city's poorer inhabitants heightened interpersonal tensions and made theft easier because of easier access to goods.
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arrondissement</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1921</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lorient</td>
<td></td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>122.7</td>
<td>131.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vannes</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ploërmel</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontivy</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morbihan</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This concept was expanded to include any densely populated area, urban or rural. For this reason, it is necessary to examine population density to see whether or not it affected the evolution of crimes against property and crimes against persons.  

A reason for the higher population density in the

---

12 Clive Emsley, Crime and Society in England 1750-1900, (London, 1987), 83. Emsley discusses how eighteenth and nineteenth century commentators viewed towns and cities as dangerous especially where the poor lived in overcrowded conditions. In "French Criminality," Cohen and Johnson tested urbanization and population density separately to determine their effect on crime patterns. They claimed that there were sociologists and criminologists who failed to distinguish between population density and urbanization thing thus leading to confusion over how each affected patterns of crime. (490)
arrondissements of Lorient and Vannes was the presence of the two largest towns in the Morbihan, and the fact that there were more market towns, as well as fishing villages, in the coastal arrondissements. These towns and villages continued to grow in the nineteenth century as did the cities of Lorient and Vannes. In brief, urbanization occurred in the Morbihan though not to the extent of other départements. In addition, urbanization was concentrated in the arrondissements of Lorient and Vannes. Urbanization affected patterns of crime in the Morbihan as the higher theft rates in these two arrondissements illustrate. In the arrondissements of Vannes and Lorient, rates of theft and interpersonal crime continued to rise as those areas urbanized. These trends uphold the general hypothesis of historians of crime that the process of urbanization causes both theft and interpersonal crime rates to rise as a result of disorganization. The disorganization comes when the rural population migrating to cities and towns has not yet revised its value structure
to correspond to its new environment.¹²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population by Age, 1851-1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Sexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in percent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Age Cohort</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1872</th>
<th>1891</th>
<th>1901</th>
<th>1921</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-14 years</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24 years</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 years</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 years</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59 years</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and above</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding.

The population by age is illustrated in Table 5 and Figure 3. Table 5 shows the percentage of population in each age cohort between 1851 and 1921, while Figure 3

¹²For the impact of urbanization on rates of theft and interpersonal crime see Zehr, Crime and Development, 82-83, 134-135; Shelley, Crime, 37; Gurr, "Development and Decay," 36-38; and Cohen and Johnson, "French Criminality," 492. Gurr cautions that the apparent higher rates of theft and interpersonal crimes in cities could also be the result of better policing and the higher visibility of crimes in urban areas ("Development and Decay," 38). Zehr warns against overemphasizing urbanization as the cause of social disruption because recent sociological studies indicate that the differences between urban and rural are not as great as once supposed (Crime and Development, 22).
contains a breakdown of age cohorts according to sex in 1851, 1872, 1891, and 1921.

Table 5 reveals that the percentage of the age cohort 60 and above steadily increased. This means that life expectancy increased in the Morbihan; the increase that occurred after 1890 may have been due to an improved diet and medical care available to a better educated populace. The two age cohorts that experienced the steadiest absolute decline in percentage of total population, 25-34 years and 35-44 years, were those groups which left to find work outside the département and suffered most from the losses of the First World War. The percentage of the age cohort of 15-24 years, considered by criminologists to be the group most likely to commit crimes, remains constant. Therefore crime rates should not rise rapidly in the Morbihan, but they do. Why? The average age of the offender in the Morbihan rose from 27 in 1835 to 37 by 1925. As a result, rates for all types of crimes increased because the offender population was drawn from all age cohorts.

Figure 3 shows age cohorts according to sex. Children under 14 make up the largest segment of the population, while those over 60 are the smallest proportion. The age cohorts 25-34, 35-44, and 45-59 remain constant with women making up more of that population by 1 percent. Figure 3, like Table 5, also shows that the age cohort of 15-24 years
Figure 3 Population by Age and Sex, 1851-1921
Figure 3. (continued)

1901
Percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>0-14</th>
<th>15-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-59</th>
<th>60 and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1921
Percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>0-14</th>
<th>15-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-59</th>
<th>60 and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M=male  F=female
constitutes the second largest segment of the population. The males in this age cohort are considered by criminologists as those most likely to commit crime. The percentage of males in the 15-24 cohort declines, however, between 1851 and 1921. Yet crime rates continue to rise because offenders come from all age cohorts.

Population data alone do not reveal how the "morbihanais" lived. By exploring the environment and diet of the majority of the "morbihanais", the peasantry, it is possible to perceive change in the Morbihan, the role of tradition in the lives of the people, and how tradition could affect the evolution of patterns of crime.

A prefect's report written in 1819 contains a section on living conditions during the traditional stage of development. He notes that most peasants of the interior, whether Breton or French-speaking, lived in low-roofed dwellings made of stone. Others lived in wooden houses, or ones made of clay and bricks of straw. Some peasants lived in huts. All of the dwellings had few openings because of the tax on doors and windows. Moreover, existing openings were as small as possible. Inside the dwelling a visitor would see a large room divided into living quarters and a stable for livestock. An upper floor was reached by a small ladder. Beds were arranged along the wall, with storage chests in front of each bed. The stable contained the animals and their straw which was
rarely changed. According to the report, the combination of animal filth, unchanged straw, and the humid climate created an environment "that bred sickness besides smelling badly."  

Peasants who lived on the coast had somewhat different housing. There, better material such as stone or slate was more easily obtained for housing and the houses had more and wider openings. The houses remained, however, one large room divided into living quarters and a stable area.  

By the time of the Second Empire, as the Morbihan entered its transitional stage of evolution, living conditions had improved little. The Enquête Agricole (1862) stated that the older farmhouses, both in the interior and on the coast, showed no changes. A reason for the general lack of improvement in the older farmhouses was a Breton form of land tenure called the domaine congeable. In it the tenant, or domainier, leased the land from a larger landowner. The rent was paid either in kind or in money. A standard clause in the agreement, however,  

14AD (Morbihan), 6M957, Essai statistique sur le département du Morbihan, 1819. For a description of similar housing conditions in other parts of France see Histoire de la France rurale, 277-78, and Weber, Peasants, 155-59.  

15AD (Mor) 6M957, "Essai."  

declared that improvements in housing or livestock raised the *domainier's* rent. Moreover, any repairs to or restorations of the house or the barn had to use the same materials and retain the style of the original. Because it limited improvement, the *domaine congeable* perpetuated a lifestyle that could not be improved.

On the other hand, the *Enquête agricole* reported that more of the newer farmhouses had slate roofs instead of thatched ones and more windows and doors. However, the new ones continued to have one large room divided into living quarters and a stable area. The living quarters of the newer ones contained more furnishings such as beds, chests, and tables; the cooking area was better separated from the living area; and provisions were strung from the ceiling and stored on shelves. Obviously, those people who could afford the newer farmhouses also had the means to better furnish them. Yet dirt floors continued to predominate in both the coastal and interior farmhouses.

Housing continued to improve in the late nineteenth century, the period when the transitional stage of development accelerated in the Morbihan. Yet in several cantons, notably in the interior *arrondissements* of Pontivy

---


and Ploërmel, the one-room model continued to prevail. In other parts of the département, slate or wooden floors began to replace dirt ones. Interior walls were painted white, and the walls then decorated with religious objects or "grossières gravures religieuses d'Epinal." Coastal inhabitants might add English pottery as decoration for their homes. Other signs of improvement included more slate roofs and fewer thatched ones, and more rooms within the farmhouse. Many farmhouses still had only one door and window because the tax on them was still collected. Generally, living conditions in the farmhouses remained unhealthy because of the traditional practice of keeping dung-heaps close to the house and wells, which caused contamination of the water supply.

Diet also changed slowly. In 1819, the principal foods were rye, buckwheat, oats, and millet. Potatoes had just made their appearance and were not widely cultivated. Bread was limited to towns and some coastal villages. In its place the peasant ate galettes, a type of unleavened buckwheat pancake, or a porridge of buckwheat, oats, or

---

1° Paul Joanne, Dictionnaire géographique et administrative, (Paris, 1898), 2831.

2° Vallaux, Basse-Bretagne, 134-137. The general improvement in housing and decoration for the home suggests that the Morbihan by 1900 was experiencing a transition from a traditional to a modern society. The improvements imply a higher standard of living and a desire to acquire material goods. (Zehr, Crime and Development, 62).
millet with water and salt. Lard or butter provided fat. Coastal residents supplemented their diet with fish and shellfish. Practically all the morbihannais drank cider. Wine consumption was limited to towns. Peasants also consumed apple brandy. As Alphonse d'Angeville noted in his *Essai sur la statistique de la population française*, the diet of the morbihannais was very bad.

By the 1890's, potatoes were a larger part of the peasants' diet, but oats, buckwheat, and millet remained its core as a porridge or galettes. Meat appeared on special occasions such as weddings, wakes, first communions, and christenings. Coastal residents continued to have an abundance of fish and shellfish to eat. Townspeople were able to obtain eggs, butter, milk, bread, and wine. This diet was similar to the rest of rural France in the latter part of the nineteenth century. In short, both in the Morbihan and elsewhere in rural France in the late nineteenth century, peasants were able to expand and vary their diet as their incomes in general

---

*AD (Morbihan) 6M957.*

*Alphonse d'Angeville, Essai sur la statistique de la population française*, (Paris, 1832), 245. D'Angeville wrote his description of the French population based on the information provided in the statistical annuals, such as the *Compte général*, that began appearing in the 1820's as a result of the new found passion of French politicians and intellectuals to explain the world around them in numbers.

*Joanne, Dictionnaire*, 2831.
rose when they became part of the national market economy. The continuation of porridge and *galettes* as the chief ingredients of the peasants' diet in the Morbihan illustrates a national phenomenon of peasants having access to an improved diet for themselves, but choosing instead to sell their better animals and crops and eat a traditional diet.\(^2\)

Throughout the period 1825 to 1925, the economy of the Morbihan remained overwhelmingly agricultural. Agricultural statistics from the 1830's to the 1920's reveal that some improvement in agricultural methods occurred. The increase in agricultural production meant better living conditions as incomes rose and poverty eased.

The departmental administration was enthusiastic about improving agriculture in the 1830's and 1840's, years which fall into the traditional stage of development. The peasants during those years, however, remained dubious about trying new ways to farm. Administrative complaints about their traditional farming methods were common. In 1842 for example, in the commune of Caro, the inhabitants "lose half their crop because of bad practice and

In the canton of Malestroit, arrondissement of Ploërmel that same year, the peasant continued to farm with a small plow drawn by two oxen and alternated the cultivation of buckwheat and oats. Fertilizer was used but always too late in the growing cycle to make any difference in crop yield. Such complaints by notables were common throughout France in the first half of the nineteenth century as the peasant was attacked for ignorance and refusing to change. In the Morbihan, such attacks on peasant ignorance were justified, but at the same time not much time nor money was spent on re-educating the peasants. Moreover, why should the peasant worry about feeding others when his aim was to feed his family. He could not get his crops to market because the roads were either bad or non-existent during this period; they had to be consumed at home.


26 Ibid.

27 For an extensive discussion of peasant attitudes as seen by government officials, the notables, and outsiders in general see Weber, Peasants, 3-22.

28 The Morbihan fits Roger Price's description of the ancien régime économique. The ancien régime économique was characterized by "the predominance of agriculture, artisanal forms of industry, and slow and expensive modes of transport." As Price further stated, "the hallmarks of this society were isolation and localism." (Price, Rural France, 45).
Agricultural improvement came slowly to the Morbihan and usually began in areas closest to towns and on the coast. Because of their proximity to roads and waterways, the people in these places had contact with others who brought new equipment and new ideas on farming. In the interior, however, the general lack of improvement in agricultural methods may be ascribed to the pernicious domaine congoeable and the continued division of the land.

Continued division into smaller and smaller holdings was also responsible for slow change in agriculture. How bad was land division in the Morbihan? On the coast the land was divided into so many small plots that farming was difficult. The plots were too small to grow enough crops for a family. Some households resisted land division by giving the eldest son the land and indemnifying the others. However, if the eldest died, ten heirs might pass along the land collaterally. The same situation occurred with the domaine congoeable because the domainier could divide the land as he wished.29

A glance at the Statistique agricole indicates how far land division progressed in the second half of the nineteenth century. In 1852, 36% of the exploitations rurales were five hectares or less. By 1892, that figure had risen to 61%. In 1852, 31% of the exploitations were

29Enquête agricole, 1862.
five to ten hectares, while in 1892 only 18% of the exploitations rurales were in this category. Landholdings of 10 to 20 hectares made up 26% of exploitations rurales in 1852 and 13% in 1892. The trend toward small landholdings thus hindered agricultural progress.\textsuperscript{20}

This trend was not unique to the Morbihan. Such a development characterized the French nation though it remained more typical of the south and west than the north.\textsuperscript{21} But were there economic considerations that made land division desirable for the peasants or was this another tradition that refused to die? It was a custom that had its roots in the value placed by the peasant mentality upon landholding. Therefore, each male family member should have his own plot on which to grow crops and support his family. As a result, the land was increasingly divided as the population grew. The law of 1791 that outlawed primogeniture also aided in promoting land division.

Economically land division was not sound because it meant that, eventually, there would not be enough land on which to grow a sufficient amount of food or even graze livestock.\textsuperscript{22} Land division also affected the crime rate

\textsuperscript{20}Statistique agricole, 1892, (Paris, 1897)
\textsuperscript{21}Price, Rural France, 350, 352.
\textsuperscript{22}For more information on the reasons for land division Weber, Peasants, 239-240 and Price, Rural France, 352.
because not every family suffered from it. Some peasants increased their landholdings by purchasing land being sold by landowners who sought to "transfer their capital from the land to apparently more profitable investments." Land division exacerbated tensions by creating a larger group of people whose holdings decreased in size and became less productive. Peasants who had larger landholdings were able to use the available technology to make their farms more productive. The increase in the theft rate in rural parts of the Morbihan as well as the changing types of goods stolen are examples of these tensions. For example, the number of farm implements stolen increased because there were more of them available.

The type and amount of crops cultivated also illustrate the slowness of agricultural change and the persistence of tradition. Table 6 shows the types of crops grown in the Morbihan between 1840 and 1929. Rye and buckwheat were the most cultivated cereal crops until 1929 when wheat surpassed them. Potatoes were not widely used until the end of the nineteenth century. Though not indicated in the table, the same was true of artificial

---


*Ibid. Price points out that the Statistique agricole of 1892 indicates that "holdings of over 40 hectares represented only 4 per cent of the total number (of landholdings), but covered almost one-half of the land farmed."
prairies (expanses of varieties of clover) grown to improve both the land and the livestock that grazed on them. According to Roger Price's *The Modernization of Rural France* and Hugh Clout's *Agriculture in France on the Eve of the Railway Age*, the persistence of rye and buckwheat as the major cereal crops and the lack of artificial meadows evinced traditions that could only be overcome by education in newer crops and farming methods. Moreover, the survival of such crops also indicated that the peasants who grew them were still part of a subsistence economy.38

---

Table 6
Crops Grown in the Morbihan, 1840-1929* (in hectares)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>1840</th>
<th>1852</th>
<th>1872</th>
<th>1892</th>
<th>1929</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>32,023</td>
<td>44,659</td>
<td>38,950</td>
<td>41,297</td>
<td>56,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rye</td>
<td>83,569</td>
<td>74,988</td>
<td>75,200</td>
<td>77,828</td>
<td>43,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>32,725</td>
<td>29,546</td>
<td>33,400</td>
<td>39,506</td>
<td>38,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buckwheat</td>
<td>57,666</td>
<td>59,363</td>
<td>64,700</td>
<td>60,744</td>
<td>37,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>9,050</td>
<td>4,237</td>
<td>12,900</td>
<td>18,617</td>
<td>42,288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aData from the *Statistique de la France. Agriculture, series 2: Annuaire statistique* for 1872, and the *Statistique agricole* for 1852, 1892, and 1929.

---

Morbihan, then, had a subsistence economy and, consequently, the peasants remained generally poor until the end of the nineteenth century.

The rest of France followed a similar pattern of development in the nineteenth century. Agricultural change varied from region to region: the result of soil types and access to markets. In addition was the reluctance on the part of the peasant to abandon methods "without which the economy of the household and community fell apart."34

To work the land the morbihannais used what tools they could afford. Farm machinery was little used. Small landholdings made the use of machinery unprofitable, especially since the machines were expensive. Only after World War I did farm machinery gain wider use as it became more affordable. By that time, land division was less of a problem as family members left the farm for towns.

How far had agriculture advanced in the Morbihan by the 1920's? In 1923 the prefect observed "on assiste à une transformation appréciable du système de culture et les assolements." This transformation appréciable was the result of higher prices for farm products and a labor

---

shortage that made wages higher for farm workers remaining in the Morbihan. Although less land was under cultivation, cultivated land had become more productive. Though greater production was now obtained with less labor, as a result of the use of machines and better care of plants and animals, most farmers still did not "attach much importance to rational conditions of production and the upkeep of animals by improving their stock."[37] The prefect's statement in 1923 echoes the comments of the notable of the 1830's, i.e. peasants in the Morbihan (and elsewhere in France) remained largely wedded to the practices of their ancestors. Agricultural development in the Morbihan, then remained in transition as late as 1923.

Fishing and heavy industry were other sectors of the Morbihan's economy which affected the socioeconomic evolution of specific cantons and thus the evolution of patterns of crime in the arrondissements where they were located. Fishing and the related industry of ship-building was important for the economies of the coastal towns and villages in the arrondissements of Vannes and Lorient. Peasants along the coast supplemented their income from farming with fishing also. The introduction of canneries in the 1830's resulted in the

[37]AN, F11111 1130 (Rapport du préfet au Ministère de l'Intérieure, octobre 1923).
establishment of large-scale sardine fishing.  

Though periodic crises affected the industry between 1825 to 1925, it generally provided employment for many fishermen and small shipbuilders. As a result, several of the smaller fishing ports remained prosperous. The prefect reported in 1835 that "sardine fishing was the most important commerce of the Morbihan coast from Belle-Ile to Port-Louis."  

In that year, 500 boats manned by 2500 sailors went out. By the 1870's, the number of persons employed by fishing reached four thousand. Furthermore, there were 71 canneries employing 3,000 workers to process the catch brought in by the fishermen.  

In the 1920's fishing remained a vital industry and included oyster farming. The advantages of the fishing industry were, however, limited to the coast. Therefore, it could never replace agriculture as the most important sector of the economy.

Industrial development began with attempts to establish large-scale textile manufacturing in the Morbihan. Textile manufacture in the 1830's was a

---


31AD, (Morbihan), 6M958 (Rapport, 27 novembre 1835).

32AD, (Morbihan), 6M958 (Rapport 1871).

33Hachette, Le Morbihan, Paris, 1925. 12.
cottage-based industry centered in the towns of Josselin, Malestroit, and Vannes. It employed about 1,000 workers of both sexes and all ages, a small fraction of the approximately 450,000 people living in the Morbihan.\(^2\)

The textile industry in the Morbihan never grew beyond the cottage industry stage and it finally disappeared because it could not compete with the large textile manufacturers of the Midi who sent cheaper cloth of a superior grade all over France.\(^3\) By 1846 the remaining textile industry supplemented the incomes of a population (the size was not recorded) of journaliers and petits paysans. The depression of 1846-1848 finally killed textile production in the Morbihan. Afterwards, cloth was produced only for home consumption.\(^4\)

Textile manufacturing was not the only early nineteenth century effort at industrialization in the Morbihan. The notables who wished to see textile manufacturing established in the Morbihan also wanted to turn the département into a center for heavy industry by promoting the development of an iron industry. The 1830's


\(^3\)AD, (Morbihan), 6M958 (Rapport, novembre 1835)

witnessed the development of five small factories making iron products. Each worked at full capacity, but all production was consumed within the Morbihan.\textsuperscript{45}

The prefect provided an enthusiastic assessment of the future of the iron industry. In a report to the Minister of Commerce in November, 1835, he listed four large blast furnaces in operation in the département that employed 105 workers, though this was a very small number when compared to the agricultural sector of the economy.\textsuperscript{46}

Efforts to establish the iron industry throughout the département failed. Instead, the iron industry by 1870 was concentrated in and around the city of Lorient, the site of the naval arsenal, shipyards, and a merchant fleet.\textsuperscript{47} The rest of the département had nothing comparable. By 1890, the only large industrial establishment in the Morbihan was the Forges d'Hennebont, the largest private concentration of iron and steel production and manufacture in Lower Brittany. Two iron mills, one at Kerglaw and the other at Lochrist, made up the Forges. The primary material for both mills was shipped up the Blavet River.

\textsuperscript{45}Cayot-Delandre, "Industrie morbihannaise," in the Annuaire statistique, historique, et politique du Morbihan (Vannes, 1836), 51, 53.

\textsuperscript{46}AD, (Morbihan), 6M958 (Rapport du préfet au Ministère du Commerce, 27 novembre 1835).

\textsuperscript{47}AD, (Morbihan), 6M958 (Rapport du sous-préfet au préfet Lorient, 1871).
from other parts of France and England. Brittany did not have the necessary raw materials: a major reason for the lack of large-scale industry in the Morbihan.**

The two establishments of Kerglaw and Lochrist sent goods all over France and reached their peak production between 1892 and 1900. By 1903, Kerglaw employed 1,400 workers of both sexes and all ages while Lochrist employed 300 male workers. The workforce drew its numbers from the peasants of the neighboring communes.** This industrialization, however, was limited to a small area and never challenged agriculture as the most important sector of the département's economy. Because industrialization was limited to one area in the arrondissement of Lorient, it had a limited effect on the crime rate in the département. It did, however, affect patterns of crime in the city and arrondissement of Lorient.

The lack of widespread industrialization means that the Morbihan did not experience the severe changes in demography, society, and the economy that characterized rapidly industrializing areas such as the Nord, Pas-de-Calais, and the Seine-Inférieure. Changes in diet, housing, and agriculture were more gradual in the Morbihan

**Vallaux, Basse-Bretagne, 215.

**Ibid, 216-217.
than in those départements that experienced industrialization. Tradition was not disrupted. How strong it remained in the Morbihan is suggested by the religious and political beliefs of the morbihannais.

The religious beliefs and the political life of the Morbihan remained inextricably linked. In religion, the vast majority of the morbihannais were "white" Catholics; in politics, the voters supported Legitimist candidates who supported policies favorable to the Church. The preservation of this intimate connection between conservative Catholicism and conservative politics illustrates the role tradition played in the Morbihan.

How did tradition affect patterns of crime in the Morbihan? Both theft and violent crime rates rose between 1825 and 1925, but not as dramatically as in the urban/industrial départements where the great economic and social changes disrupted tradition.

The fervor with which the morbihannais embraced

---

50 During the Third Republic, "white" Catholics were those who supported Legitimist candidates and regarded the Revolution as anti-clerical. There was another group known as "blue" Catholics who defended republicanism and voted on the Left, but they remained in the minority in the political life of the Morbihan. See Guy Devailly, editor, Histoire religieuse de la Bretagne, (Chambray, 1980), 301-302. For a more detailed observation of the connection between religion and politics in the Morbihan during the Third Republic see Andre Siegfried, Tableau politique de la France de l'Ouest, (Paris, 1913) 112-118; 151-154.

51 For more on the relationship between tradition and patterns of crime see Shelley, Modernization, 61, 142.
Catholicism was typical of the entire province of Brittany. The works of Anatole Le Braz, a Breton writer of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, abound with stories of pardons, or religious festivals. Two geographers sent out from Paris in the 1840's described such a pardon. They wrote that one should

\[
\text{go to the villages on Sundays or feastdays when it is time for Mass. A long procession makes its way towards the church. Nearly every time the courtyard is too small for such a large crowd. Therefore, a portion remains outside.}
\]

The crowd was immobile, kneeling, "the men on one side and the women on the other," in a devotion so palpable that "one senses that there is true piety here, a sincere faith."\(^5\)

There were, however, instances of impiety. Disrupting the Mass was a misdemeanor and the records of the Tribunaux correctionnels contain examples of individuals, male and female, who did. These people disrupted the service and even stopped it with obscenities, personal remarks about the priest, or bothering other worshipers by pulling their hair. The loyalty of the morbihannais to the Church and their faith also did not blind them to the fact that priests and other religious were human. For example, in the Tribunal of Ploermel a teaching brother in the Frères

de l'instruction chrétienne was accused of homosexual relations with his male students. The brother, Yves Sable, was cleared of this charge, but was defrocked and ultimately found guilty of the excessive beating of his students.³³

The authority of the Church remained essentially unchallenged in the Morbihan until Republican governments in Paris between 1901 and 1906 made concerted efforts to break up what they perceived as anti-republican strongholds. The violent protests by many morbihannais and the voting record of their deputies against the anti-clerical legislation provide a good index of the continuing vitality of conservative Catholicism. The first major anti-clerical legislation passed in the wake of the Dreyfus Affair decreed the closing of unapproved congregational schools. Those morbihannais opposed to these closings, mainly peasants and the population of small towns supported the teaching brothers and sisters in their efforts to resist losing their schools. They even rioted in one town, Lanouée, to prevent the police from carrying out the closings.³⁴

Another piece of anti-clerical legislation that can

³³U351, Tribunal de Ploërmel, 1845-46.

³⁴Devaillly, Histoire, 358. Other towns where the local population rallied to the defense of the congregations were Ste-Meen and Pleudaniel.
be viewed as an attempt to change tradition was the law passed in 1902 that forbade the catechism and sermons in any language but French. This measure affected schools and churches in the pays breton, where, technically, priests would be preaching in a language incomprehensible to their parishioners. The result was a written protest sent by the maires and conseillers to Premier Emile Combes and verbal protests by deputies from the Morbihan in the Chamber. Priests who refused to comply with the law were fined. In some places associations were formed to pay the fines.==

Priests were attacked in speeches and the press by local republicans in the Morbihan during the early twentieth century. One of them, Abbé Laurent Breurec, the vicar of Melrand, arrondissement of Pontivy, sued a public schoolmaster in Melrand for defamation and 500F damages. The schoolmaster, Le Bourhis, spoke at a meeting in the public school and accused the vicar of kissing the young female parishoners. Le Bourhis said of all priests that "le vice sort par tous les pores de leur peau." The vicar won his suit and the schoolmaster paid a 50F fine and 500F damages to the vicar.==

The conservative brand of Catholicism practiced in

==Ibid., 358-360.

==U4600, Tribunal de Pontivy, 1904-06.
the Morbihan was reflected in its conservative politics. The only exceptions were the cities of Lorient and Pontivy, both bastions of republicanism. Generally, the morbihannais voted on the right, i.e. for Legitimists.57

Andre Siegfried in his monumental study, Tableau politique de la France de l'Ouest, stated that the reason for the continued conservatism of the Morbihan in particular and of Brittany in general was the strong influence of priests who were feared rather than loved. Local nobles also influenced the political beliefs of the peasants. This influence extended to the population in the small towns, such as storekeepers who feared boycotts, notaries who feared losing clients, or small landowners who feared alienating possible protectors. Political independence, therefore, was nonexistent and fear, of noble and priest, reigned everywhere.58

Siegfried wrote his study in the early twentieth century, based partly on contemporary observations, though he described conditions that had prevailed since the Ancien Regime. Despite the Revolution, the succession of governments in Paris, and the introduction of universal manhood suffrage in 1848, little had changed in the


58Siegfried, Tableau, 113-114.
Morbihan. What the influence of noble and priest also meant was a persistence of tradition. These two groups ran affairs in the Morbihan and it appears that this situation was accepted by peasants and the population of small towns.59

How long had such political conservatism existed? The sub-prefect of Pontivy in a report to the prefect in March 1819 said that in the arrondissement the people rarely occupied themselves with political matters and "those in the countryside have no ideas" about politics. This observation could either mean that the peasants were apolitical or that they followed the advice of their betters. In any case, their involvement in politics was considered unimportant because few peasants could vote in 1819. The sub-prefect noted the influence of the priest and noble, saying that the conduct of the peasants "was almost always subordinated to them, the curés and maires having almost absolute power." A successful fonctionnaire needed the support of these two groups in order to carry out his work.60

59 The political life of the Morbihan in the late 19th century differs from that of Mazières-en-Gâtine in the Deux-Sevres during the same period. There, the people rejected the domination of noble and priest by electing a republican mayor and representative. (Thabault, Education and Change in a Village Community, 112-113).

60 AD, (Morbihan), 6M958, (Rapport du sous-préfet a Pontivy au préfet, Mars 1819).
There were cases, however, brought before the Tribunaux correctionnels that showed that there were those among the people who were not satisfied with the accession of Charles X in 1825. Such cases of cris séditieux were rare. Some of those who shouted them also shouted "Vive l'empereur" and turned out to be veterans of the Grande Armée. The rest were listed by the court clerk as being drunk. In other words, they did not know what they were doing.\textsuperscript{41}

As long as the government in Paris pleased the priests and nobles of the Morbihan, the morbihannais remained loyal to it. The July Monarchy did not please the priests, nobles, or the morbihannais. The sub-prefect of Pontivy reported to the prefect in October 1830 that he could not find enough literate people to take the oath of allegiance and become new notables. All of the old ones had resigned and refused to take the oath. The priests were saying that the new regime wished to destroy all morals and Catholicism. In their opinion, the new regime failed to show to the morbihannais that it was a firm supporter of Catholicism. The peasants and villagers believed the priests because the people were "ignorant and credulous." The priests propagated the "falsest principles and

\textsuperscript{41}Seven cases of cris séditieux were brought before the Tribunaux correctionnels in 1825. Of the seven, three proclaimed their attachment to "the usurper."
deceived" the public by telling them about a "disastrous future which will come" as the consequence of the new regime.\(^{\text{42}}\)

A report from the Procureur-général to the Minister of Justice shows that the political situation for the entire département was similar to the situation in Pontivy in 1830. A large portion of mayors, deputy-mayors, and municipal councillors resigned after the July revolution. Replacements were difficult to find because likely candidates feared becoming victims of popular sentiment. Besides the difficulties with the notables, nine-tenths of the peasants were opposed to the new regime. Moreover, the clergy, "very ignorant in general," inflamed further an already discontented population. The Procureur-général surmised that the clergy wanted civil war, an occurrence that appeared possible because of the active presence of former chouan leaders, among them the Cadoudal brothers, in the Morbihan. The Cadoudal brothers led the National Guard unit in Auray and exercised great influence in the area around the town. The Procureur-général suggested that troops be sent and garrisoned in Vannes with smaller garrisons in other towns (and in the capitals of each

\(^{\text{42}}\)AD, (Morbihan), 2M121 (Letter from the sub-prefect at Pontivy to the prefect, 8 October 1830). The role of the clergy in pre-1850 rural France in general is noted in Histoire de la France rurale, 144-145.
canton) in order to prevent the possibility of an uprising.\footnote{AN, BB\textsuperscript{10} 1320 A\textsuperscript{7}, (Procureur-général to the Minister of Justice, 29 October 1830, on state of affairs in Brittany).}

Though the morbihannais eventually reconciled themselves to the July Monarchy, the Second Empire proved even less popular. In the first elections to Corps législatif the Legitimists prevailed. In the elections of 1856, however, the Legitimist opposition faded because they decided not to oppose the Imperial candidates. Once Napoleon III decided to allow other parties to submit candidates, the Legitimists were usually returned to their seats in the Corps législatif.\footnote{Theodore Zeldin, The Political System of Napoleon III, (London, 1958), 4.}

During the Third Republic, the morbihannais continued to vote for Legitimist candidates. For example, in the elections of 1876, of the five deputies elected from the Morbihan, four were Legitimists and one was republican, the representative from Lorient, the only site of urban/industrial culture in the Morbihan where the bonds of political and religious tradition were loosening. All of the senators were center-right. Even the Seize mai crisis did not shake the confidence of the morbihannais in continuing to vote for the right. During those elections one republican, one Orleanist, and three Legitimists
The alliance between priest and noble to maintain the status quo is illustrated by the invalidated election of Comte Albert de Mun in 1876. The Chamber of Deputies held an inquiry into election irregularities in his district and discovered that the vicomte de Kergariou had circulated a letter to his fermiers and his family stating that "all must vote for M. de Mun, and the landlords know how to execute this order." Furthermore, the archbishop of Vannes sent his priests a letter recommending de Mun for a seat in the Chamber. The priests, obedient to the episcopal prompting, "indulged in a very fervent" propaganda campaign for M. de Mun. Some incidents remained unverifiable, such as denying the Sacrament to "electeurs réfractaires" or their wives. De Mun won re-election in August 1876 by defeating a Bonapartist in Pontivy.

A later example of the dual influence of priest and noble is illustrated by the vote on the Law of Separation in June 1905. At this point, there were eight deputies from the Morbihan. Seven voted against the Law and one for it, the republican deputy from Lorient.

By the 1920's, the population of the Morbihan accepted

\"Daniel, Année politique, 1876, 209-210, 260-261.
\"Daniel, Année politique, 1905, 650.
the Third Republic and its policies. With the disputes caused by the anti-clerical legislation past them, there appeared new threats to public order: in the form of the Socialist party and the new Communist party, both based in Lorient. The prefect wrote the Minister of the Interior in March 1923 to say that only the Socialists of Lorient, the workers, objected to French troops occupying the Ruhr factoriles. The supporters of the move held banquets and parties to demonstrate their agreement with the government's actions. The prefect continued, "the population is passionately attached to the ideas of order and respect for authority..." The population also approved of arresting Communists and "other extremists" for passing out leaflets protesting the occupation of the Ruhr because their actions threatened the region's peace." The appeal of the priest and noble as preservers of tradition, i.e. authority, was now joined to the idea that the Republic would protect the population against extremists. Right-wing politics, or the preservation of the status quo and public order, continued to retain much appeal for the morbihannais from the 1820's to post-World War I. As a result, in 1925 there were arrests of Communists passing out leaflets to military personnel protesting the involvement of French troops in a campaign to subdue

**AN, F1=III 1130, Esprit publique, 1918-1929, (Prefect to Minister of the Interior, 20 mars 1923).**
Between 1825 and 1925, the Morbihan evolved from a traditional rural society to a modern one as it tried to maintain tradition, especially in religion and politics. The Morbihan's evolution makes it similar to several rural départements in France in the 19th and early 20th centuries including its northern and western neighbors, the Côtes-du-Nord and the Finistère. Each of these départements were part of traditional rural France, or what Roger Price has called the ancien régime économique. In it, the population lived in small villages or on isolated farms, clinging to farming methods that grew only enough food for themselves and the local market. Moreover, the inhabitants continued to speak in dialects and perpetuate myths that explained a world most found mysterious and intimidating.

The evolution of the Morbihan in particular and of rural France in general was the result of a new national economic and social structure created by industrialization and urbanization. Though départements such as the Morbihan experienced little urbanization and industrialization they were affected by them. For example, their populations were able to obtain mass-produced goods ranging from farm implements to clothes. The exodus from the rural
départements swelled the population of many French cities thus accelerating the process of urbanization. As a result of industrialization and urbanization, the ancien régime économique disappeared by the 1890’s in the Morbihan and in rural France in general as those areas increased their participation in the national market economy. The evolution away from a traditional society to a modern one meant an increase in crime rates in general.

How does the discussion of the indices of modernization clarify the three stages of societal evolution in the Morbihan? A closer look at the département’s evolution as the ancien régime économique, or traditional rural society, eroded reveals that the general standard of living rose after 1865. Further, the population tended to move from the less populous interior to the more populous coast, especially to the industrial center of Lorient also after 1865. After 1911, segments of the population left the Morbihan entirely for other French cities. In both cases, people searched for work as agricultural improvement meant fewer people were needed to work the land. There was even a shift in values, however slight, with the successful reduction of those bastions of tradition, the Catholic religion and royalism, by national legislation in the early twentieth century.

Economic integration helped lead to cultural homogenization according to Weber in *Peasants*, 493.
In conclusion, the slow transformation from a traditional society to a modern one was bound to effect dramatic changes in the profile of crime patterns in the Morbihan. Certain agencies of change—roads, railroads, and schools—also affected the evolution of crime patterns in the Morbihan because they brought social change as well. It is to the agencies of change and their effect upon the Morbihan's society and patterns of crime that I will now turn.
CHAPTER III
THE AGENCIES OF CHANGE

Between 1825 and 1925 the Morbihan in particular and rural France in general evolved from a traditional society to a modern one. Certain agencies of change—the schools, roads, and railroads—promoted this evolution. A discussion of the agencies of change reveals how they affected the Morbihan's society, and further clarifies the three stages of societal evolution—traditional, transitional, and modern—which exhibit different patterns of crime. How did the agencies of change affect the Morbihan's society? Was their effect on the Morbihan similar to their impact on the rest of rural France?

How schools, roads, and railroads functioned as agencies that changed nineteenth century rural France is described in Mon village (published in English as Education and change in a Village Community) by Roger Thabault and Eugen Weber's Peasants into Frenchmen. In Mon village, Roger Thabault examines how the three agencies of change affected his birthplace, Mazères-en-Gâtine, and the surrounding countryside. In the first half of the nineteenth century, Mazières-en-Gâtine, located in the Deux-Sevres, was an isolated area where illiterate peasants lived at subsistence level. The village changed, however, in the late nineteenth century because schools, roads, and
railroads connected it physically and psychologically with the rest of France. The connection altered the outlook of the citizens and brought them increased wealth. The result of the change was that the village’s children wanted better lives for themselves and left Mazières-en-Gâtine. Though Thabault, an educator, believed the schools of the Third Republic brought much of the change, he did not ignore the importance of roads and railroads in fostering economic improvement.

Thabault’s work inspired Eugen Weber’s *Peasants into Frenchmen*, a monumental study of the impact of the agencies of change on rural France between 1870 and 1914. His theme is similar: rural France became part of the nation as roads, railroads, and schools ended its separation from the culture of Paris. Weber describes life in rural France before the introduction of the agencies of change and how it changed after their appearance. In some regions the change was more pronounced than in others, but change occurred however slow.¹

The Morbihan, like the rest of rural France, was changed by the coming of the roads, railroads, and schools. In the isolated society of 1825, the *morbihanais* lived in

¹ Other studies of the agencies of change in rural France are *L’histoire de la France rurale*, tome III, and Roger Price’s *The Modernization of Rural France*. The latter emphasizes the role played by roads and railroads in initiating economic change.
bad housing and ate a monotonous diet. Moreover, approximately one-half of the morbihannais did not speak French. Throughout most of the period 1825-1870 the peasants grew the same crops and farmed in the same way as their ancestors. There was little reason for the morbihannais to alter their working and living conditions as long as the Morbihan remained geographically isolated.

The society of the Morbihan, however, was altered in the late nineteenth century by the same agencies of change that altered Mazières-en-Gâtine and the nation itself—the schools, roads, and railroads. When did the agencies of change arrive in the Morbihan? What was their effect on the département? How did the agencies of change affect the Morbihan’s evolution?

It is difficult to decide which agency of change is the most important because all three are inextricably linked. For example, without better roads the children could not get to the schools.² I will, therefore, first discuss the roads and railroads which established an improved communication and transportation network in the Morbihan. The roads and railroads brought new ideas and the national market economy into the Morbihan and thus changed the attitudes and aspirations of the morbihannais.

²Weber states that school inspectors also had difficulty reaching their schools whether they went on horseback or on foot because the roads were in a deplorable condition. (Weber, Peasants, 200)
An early attempt to improve transportation and communication in the Morbihan came with the waterways. Because the Morbihan possessed an extensive coastline and rivers, it was included in the plans for a national canal system that was first proposed in the Year XII. The canal system finally crossed the Morbihan in 1838 when the Canal Nantes à Brest opened to link the area to other parts of Brittany and France. Named after the cities it linked, the canal followed a diagonal path across the Morbihan and was connected to the département's major river, the Blavet, by another canal named the Canal du Blavet.

The purpose of the Canal Nantes à Brest was to facilitate the transport of provisions to the naval arsenals at Brest and Lorient. Despite its intended purpose, the chief engineer pointed out to the prefect of the Morbihan in 1828 that the population along the Canal believed it would expedite trade. The Canal would bring in wines, resins, coal, and fertilizer and take out rye, hides (tanned and untanned), honey, firewood, and a variety of iron products. The Canal succeeded in connecting by water towns that were already connected by roads—Pontivy,

Ploermel, Vannes, Hennebont, and Lorient. A few more villages were involved, but the hope that the Canal would become a trade route through the Morbihan's interior was never realized.

The rest of rural France faced similar difficulties with the canal system. As in the Morbihan, the canals connected major towns and market centers already connected by roads. The system did not cause economic or social change in France, as many canals continued to bypass small settlements and farms. As Hugh Clout notes in *Agriculture in France on the Eve of the Railway Age*, "...waterways directly served only a small part of France..."4

Canals did not overcome the problems in transportation and communication faced by nineteenth century France. Roads could connect France more effectively. A roadbuilding effort involved not only building new ones but also improving those already in existence. In 1825, there were three types of roads in France—the *routes nationales*, the *routes départementales* and the *chemins vicinaux*. All needed to be expanded and improved. The *routes nationales* (also known as *routes royales* or *routes impériales* depending on what government was in power in Paris) were

4For a description of the problems that plagued the canal system see Clout, *Agriculture in France*, 51-56.
the major highways. The *routes départementales* and the *chemins vicinaux* were, respectively, the secondary and tertiary roads.®

In France, roads built before the Revolution connected major commercial and administrative centers and bypassed the majority of the population. After 1789 many of these roads became the *routes nationales*. This proved to be the case in the Morbihan. The *routes nationales* connected the *chef-lieux d'arrondissements* to Vannes and major towns outside the Morbihan. There were only seven of these roads and they did not provide a means to end the economic and psychological isolation of the majority of the *morbihannais*.

The intentions of the governments of the Revolution, First Empire, and Restoration to extend and improve the road network in France were not fulfilled because of the expense of the wars and their aftermath. The July Monarchy was more aware of the economic significance of roads. Yet progress remained slow because of the lack of funds to build new roads and maintain old ones.®

Under the July Monarchy there were efforts made to

®The *chemins vicinaux* were divided into two categories--the *chemins vicinaux d'intérêt general* and the *chemins vicinaux d'intérêt commun*.

®Price, *Modernization*, 40. Price also adds to his list of the reasons for slow progress a shortage of engineers and wasted money because of "imperfect administration."
force communes to cooperate in the building of roads, especially the chemins vicinaux. The law of 21 May 1836 and the circular of 24 June 1836 were major efforts by the July Monarchy in the campaign to expand the length of the chemins vicinaux. The latter laid down specifications developed by government engineers for the tertiary roads. The government gave prefects the power to supervise and coerce the communes into assisting financially with the roads if they displayed indifference or inertia. The legislation of May and June 1836 was the beginning of the slow process of expanding and improving the roads of rural France.

The chemins vicinaux were maintained through a 5 percent tax called the prestation. The head of a family or enterprise owed three days labor, or the cash equivalent (prestation), on a road per year for himself and every male between the ages of 18 and 60 whether a family member or servant in his household or enterprise. He also owed three days labor (or the equivalent) for each cart or draft animal he owned. Introduced in the 1830's, prestation continued throughout the nineteenth century and was deeply resented and criticized. In the Morbihan, for example, peasants living in the commune of Elven,

---

7 Price, Modernization, 40; Clout, Agriculture in France, 52.

9 Clout, Agriculture in France, 53.
arrondissement of Vannes. In 1870 considered it the equivalent of the Ancien Régime's corvée. Another major criticism of the prestation was that some peasants suspected that it was used to improve the roads leading to important individuals' property rather than to improve the roads of the commune.9

The chemins vicinaux in the Morbihan during the July Monarchy remained in terrible condition despite the legislation passed in 1836. In one case, the notables of La Roche-Bernard sent a petition to the prefect in March 1843 describing the "deplorable state" of their chemins vicinaux and how the disrepair hurt local industry. Their second petition in a year stated that the notables assumed that the lack of response to their previous petition was the result of the opposition of certain "maires qui ont craint l'emploi de quelques centimes additionnels." The prefect could end the conflict by appointing a commission to verify what the notables had written about their roads.10

In the early 1830's, as the result of the uprisings

9Price, Modernization, 264-265.

10"Les transports intérieures," no. 16, "Les notables du canton de la Roche-Bernard (Morbihan) signalent l'état deplorable de leurs chemins vicinaux (1843). A centime additionnel is an additional tax for needed projects such as road construction.
in the West in 1832, Louis-Philippe and the Chamber of Deputies mandated the construction of *routes stratégiques* in the West to prevent further disturbances that could threaten the government in Paris. The Morbihan, however, was not on the list of *départements* that received *routes stratégiques*.¹¹ Not being on the list proved unimportant for these roads did not provide a transportation and communication network, but a more efficient way to move troops to troubled areas.

Determined efforts were made under the Second Empire to build roads. Beginning in the 1850's, the Ministry of Public Works established priorities for road construction based on estimates of the importance of roads to a commune's economy. The result was an increase in subsidies for local roads in those areas too poor to finance improvements themselves. This financial assistance was needed because the resources provided by the legislation of 1836 had become inadequate. A decree in August 1861 and the law of 11 July 1868 provided the much needed subsidies. The subsidies to local roads were also used to counter complaints that all available funds for public works were being spent on Baron Haussmann's improvements of Paris while the rest of France was being neglected. The roads built with the subsidies helped reduce the isolation of rural

communes elsewhere in France, but not in the Morbihan. The Third Republic continued and expanded road construction and improvement by providing more funds for such purposes than previous governments had. A major part of the historic Freycinet Plan of 1881 was to improve the *chemins vicinaux* in the rural areas by allotting them most of the funds set aside for road construction and improvement. As a result, more *chemins vicinaux* were built under the Freycinet Plan than previously and existing ones were better maintained.

The Morbihan languished in isolation like other rural départements in the nineteenth century despite the efforts of the July Monarchy and the Second Empire. The Third Republic's Freycinet Plan was the turning point for the Morbihan as it was for much of rural France because it accelerated the construction of the *chemins vicinaux*, the most important roads in the Morbihan.

Table 7 shows the progress of road construction in the Morbihan between 1834 and 1925. The table is also a barometer indicating the stages of societal evolution in the Morbihan. The length of the *routes nationales* in the

---


2^Weber, *Peasants*, 209-210. In this section Weber also notes that the Freycinet Plan was a way to "buoy up" the French economy and that its effect of creating cultural change was not considered.
Morbihan remained static between 1834 and 1925, while in France their length increased slightly. For example, nationwide in the 1850's, the length of the routes nationales was 35,700 kilometers and increased to 38,300 kilometers by 1914.\(^4\)

Table 7

Roads in the Morbihan, 1834-1925\(^a\)

(finished and under construction, in kilometers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Routes nationales</th>
<th>Routes départementales(^b)</th>
<th>Chemins vicinaux(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>3.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>4.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>5.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>5.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>5.810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Data from the Statistique de la France, 1ere and 2e series and the Annuaire statistique.

\(^b\)Data for the chemins vicinaux for 1834 and for the routes départementales for 1925 were unavailable.

The length of the routes départementales that crossed the Morbihan did not increase significantly either. In the rest of France, however, the length of the routes

\(^4\)Price, Modernization, 260-261.
départementales increased. In 1851, there were 42,300 kilometers of routes départementales in France. In 1876, there were 47,700 kilometers, but after that the length declined slightly from 47,300 kilometers in 1888 to 46,700 kilometers in 1913.  

In contrast to the insignificant increase in the length of the routes nationales and routes départementales, Table 7 reveals that the length of the chemins vicinaux in the Morbihan grew by approximately 30 percent between 1854 and 1874 and by another 30 percent between 1874 and 1897. This increase was the outcome of the efforts of the Second Empire and, above all, the Third Republic to expand the length of local roads by making more subsidies available to communes. The increase after 1876 was the result of the Freycinet Plan. Changes in the types of crops grown by the morbihannais reflects the consequence of the increase in the length of the chemins vicinaux. The morbihannais grew crops, such as wheat and potatoes, that would sell at markets made more accessible by the new chemins vicinaux. For example, the number of hectares of wheat increased from 38,950 in 1872, to 41,297 in 1892 and then to 56,425 in 1929. The number of hectares of potatoes under cultivation grew from 12,900 in 1872 to 18,617 in 1892 and to 42,288 in

---

1=Price, Modernization, 262.
In short, the construction of these roads aided in the erosion of the *ancien régime économique*.

Table 7 illustrates that between 1854 and 1876, the Morbihan entered the transitional stage of development. This observation is based on the increased length of *chemins vicinaux* which during those years. From 1876 to 1897 the development of the Morbihan accelerated as the length of the *chemins vicinaux* continued to increase. Fewer of the tertiary roads were built between 1897 and 1925 (approximately 41 kilometers) perhaps indicating that the Morbihan had enough of them to meet its needs and, therefore, was leaving the transitional stage for the modern.

Though roads finally connected the farthest corners of the Morbihan, greater and more rapid changes came with the railroad. The plan for the railway network was prepared in the 1830's by the *Corps de Ponts et Chaussées* but was not formally adopted until 1842 and then only after long debate in the Chamber because of its cost.\(^\text{17}\)

The railway network would radiate from Paris and link the provinces with the capital. Topography and the flow of goods determined where the railroad went. Because of

---

\(^1\) *Annuaire Statistique* for 1872 (Paris, 1876); *Statistique agricole* 1892 (Paris, 1894); *Statistique agricole*, 1929 (Paris, 1930).

\(^{17}\) Ibid, 208.
these factors, priority was given to major commercial centers with active populations. Such places, of course, were already on well-maintained major roads.\footnote{Ibid.}

The railroad first appeared in Brittany in the 1850's and the Morbihan in the late 1860's. Plans to connect the southern part of Brittany with the rest of France had existed since the 1850's. The railroad reached Nantes in 1851 and Rennes in 1857, thus linking Brittany with France. The rest of the Breton peninsula, however, was still not part of the growing network of rail travel. Finally the line running from Nantes to Brest was built in the 1860's and the first station in the Morbihan opened in Lorient in 1867 amid great acclaim.\footnote{The description of the celebration is found in "Les transports interieures", no. 49 "Les fêtes de l'inauguration à Lorient." Such a grand celebration further illustrates the importance of the railroad for the city of Lorient, its environs, and the département.} The station at Vannes opened in 1871.

During the rest of the 1870's and into the 1880's other railroad lines were added to the main one running from Nantes to Brest (as shown on the map). These lines branched first from Lorient through Pontivy to St-Brieuc, then from Vannes and Rennes to Ploërmel. The villages along these lines opened stations so that the railroad could better
Completed
Proposed by law of 4 June 1878
Proposed, but not mandated for construction

Map taken from "Les transports interieures."

Figure 4 Completed and Proposed Railway Lines in Brittany, 1878
serve their population.20

Railroads were classified in two categories—chemins de fer d'intérêt général and the chemins de fer d'intérêt local. The latter connected the smaller towns and villages. Like the chemins vicinaux, the construction of the chemins de fer d'intérêt local in the Morbihan and other rural départements waited until the Third Republic. This program was also part of the Freycinet Plan.

A comparison of the length of the chemins de fer d'intérêt local with the chemins de fer d'intérêt général reveals that there were more of the latter than the former. For example, in the Morbihan in 1878 there were 241.7 kilometers of chemins de fer d'intérêt général and none of chemins de fer d'intérêt local. By 1892 there were still no chemins de fer d'intérêt local but 292.4 kilometers of the chemins de fer d'intérêt général. In 1910, however, there were 313.6 kilometers of chemin de fer d'intérêt général and 342.3 kilometers of Intérêt local.21 In brief, most of the local railroads appeared in the 1890’s and the first decade of the twentieth century.

20 Ministère des Travaux Publics, Tome IV, Juillet-Decembre 1881, 168-169 contains an announcement of the scheduled opening of a line from Questembert to Ploërmel for 1 May 1881 and from Auray to Quiberon for 1 January 1882 which shows that the lines listed as en projet in 1878 were actually being constructed and used.

21 Annuaire Statistique, (Paris, 1881); Annuaire Statistique, (Paris, 1894); Annuaire Statistique, (Paris, 1912).
In terms of density, there were 9.743 square myriameters \((10,000\text{m}^2)\) of railroads in the Morbihan in 1913 when the national average was 11.585 square myriameters per département. Though the morbihannais had access to the railroad, the département still had less than the national average. The result was that some sections of the population remained isolated.\(^{22}\)

The expansion of the national railroad network into the Morbihan caused difficulties for some morbihannais. For example, failure to keep animals off the right of way was a misdemeanor as was travelling without a ticket or buying a third or second class ticket and sitting in first class.

In the Morbihan, there were several incidents involving either the failure to buy a ticket or sitting in the wrong class. There were also cases of farm animals on the right of way. Peasants once used to letting their animals graze anywhere suddenly found themselves arrested and ordered to pay a standard fine of 16F. This practice persisted into the twentieth century, but occurred infrequently. For example, three cases of farm animals on the right of way appeared before the Tribunal of Ploërmel in 1925. None were recorded as appearing before the other three Tribunals.\(^{23}\)

The improved transportation and communication network

\(^{22}\)Price, Modernization, 212: 222-223 and Weber, Peasants, 204.

\(^{23}\)U391 1924-26, Tribunal de Ploërmel.
linked the Morbihan to the national market economy. As stated above, changes in agricultural products grown in the département reflected the fact that it was now easier to get products to market. In short, the roads and railways eroded the ancien régime économique in the Morbihan as they did in the rest of rural France by making transportation cheaper and more efficient. The expansion of roads, the introduction and spread of railroads, and economic improvement also indicate the transitional stage of development (1865-1925). That is, these two agencies of change by bringing agricultural change to the Morbihan caused it to have a less static economy.

The discussion of roads and railroads shows they brought tangible alterations to the Morbihan's society in the nineteenth century. At the same time another change was taking place in the Morbihan as a result of the extension of schools. What problems did the schools confront in spreading education? Did literacy rates improve? What role did the Breton language play in the spread of education in the Morbihan? Does the advance of education aid in clarifying the three stages of societal evolution?

Education in the Morbihan, as in the rest of early nineteenth century France was for those people who could afford it. Most of the morbihannais were peasants who could

---

24 Price, Modernization, 45.
not afford to send their children to school; neither did they have the inclination. As in most agricultural societies, the children were needed to help on the farm. Moreover, the variations in language within the Morbihan made education difficult. For example, in Breton-speaking areas a teacher needed to know the local dialect. A brief glance at the history of education in the Morbihan illustrates the obstacles faced in educating the general population and how they were overcome.

In the 1820's, most education in the Morbihan was provided by the Church. More financial assistance, however, was needed to bring education to more people. To that end the sub-prefect in Pontivy demanded help from Paris in educating the populace saying that the arrondissement of Pontivy was a place where "the language, the customs, and the practices belong more to a province of Siberia than a département of the kingdom."

Educating the populace of Pontivy and the rest of the Morbihan was difficult because of the lack of financial resources. In Pontivy, a large market town and the chef-lieu d'arrondissement, those who had the money sent their sons to the collège royal. Education for the masses was a different matter entirely. Though the Legislative Assembly had decreed in 1791 that every commune should have

2 AD (Mor) 6M958 (Rapport du sous-préfet au préfet, Pontivy 1819).
a primary school. the exigencies of revolution, counter-revolution, and war had made the implementation of that decree impossible. When peace returned, the Restoration government decided to continue Napoleon I's policy of educating an elite instead of everyone, so money from Paris was still not forthcoming.

The sub-prefect and mayor of Pontivy decided to alleviate the situation in their town by establishing an école mutuelle to educate 50 male students, 30 of whom would be clothed by the city. Efforts to open a girl's school were also started. A nun was hired to teach the girls the Three R's as well as knitting and sewing so the "poorest would be kept from beggary."  

This laudable effort was not enough. Moreover, it was undertaken not by the State but by a group of concerned citizens in Pontivy led by the sub-prefect and the mayor. It is significant that a nun, not a schoolmistress, taught the girls. The Church was still the place to turn to in order to find teachers.

The Church continued to control what primary education there was in the Morbihan in the nineteenth century through the Frères de l'instruction chrétienne, the Lazarists, and

---

Ibid.
the Jesuits. The Lazarists proved unable to recruit enough teachers and by 1838 disappeared from the département. The Jesuits devoted themselves to their petit-seminaire at Ste-Anne d'Auray which proved successful in attracting future priests from the Morbihan. The Frères de l'instruction chrétienne, however, established primary schools across the Morbihan including areas where there had never been one. The Church, therefore, filled the void in primary education left by the State because it had the money to provide schools and schoolteachers that the local and national governments either did not have or refused to allocate. The Guizot Law (1833) was an attempt to change the situation. It required communes with more than 500 people to maintain a primary school and provide the teacher with a salary of 200F per year as well as a house. The Guizot Law had little impact in the Morbihan

27The Frères de l'instruction chrétienne, established at Ploermel under the direction of Jean-Marie de Lamennais in 1821, combatted the introduction of écoles mutuelles into the Morbihan because they were viewed as "too liberal" and used a teaching method the order saw as inefficient. (Devalily, Histoire, 293, 297, 323.) The order taught students individually while the écoles mutuelles used monitors to assist teachers in teaching large groups of students. In addition the écoles mutuelles taught reading and writing simultaneously, while the Frères still taught them separately. (Furet, Reading, 133-134)

28Devalily, Histoire, 293.

27Ibid.

because many of the communes were too poor to afford the schools.

There was little change in this situation throughout much of the nineteenth century. As late as 1889, out of 251 communes with more than 500 inhabitants there were 52 (approximately 21 percent) that did not have the two primary schools required by the Ferry laws. In addition, expenditures in 1889 on education amounted to 1F38 per student; the national average was 2F96.\(^3\)

How does education in the Morbihan in the early nineteenth century compare with the rest of rural France? The other rural départements also suffered from the lack of funds to educate their population. Despite the intentions of the Guizot Law, the Church continued to fill this void either openly or with clandestine religious schools.\(^2\)

Whether clergy or lay, schoolmasters and schoolmistresses faced the same obstacles in spreading primary education in the Morbihan. They contended with the lack of money and the attitudes of peasant and notable regarding education. To overcome a shortage of funds in the arrondissement of Vannes, for example, a proposal was made to use maîtres ambulants in communal schools. The council dismissed the proposal citing evidence showing that maître

\(^3\)Joanne, *Dictionnaire géographique*, 2832.

ambulants were also "peddlars of scandal and immorality."\textsuperscript{33} The belief that the morality of schoolmasters in general was suspect was reinforced by incidents such as the case of an instituteur, Julien-Marie Bellamy, who appeared before the Tribunal of Pontivy in 1875. He was charged with attentat aux moeurs by habitually exciting, favoring, or facilitating the corruption of his male students. At the trial, held behind closed doors because of the danger to public morals, Bellamy was found guilty, sentenced to three years in jail and a 300F fine.\textsuperscript{34}

The problem of attitude was more difficult to overcome. Peasant and notable mistrusted primary education because the former distrusted all outsiders, while the latter mistrusted anything that would threaten their position. The peasants also needed the children to contribute to the family living. For that reason, peasant children were not in school during the harvest or the planting season.\textsuperscript{35}

The hostility of the notables is illustrated by an incident in 1833. At that point, of the 35 communes in the

\textsuperscript{33}Paul Lorain, Tableau de l'instruction primaire en France, (Paris, 1837), 309.

\textsuperscript{34}U4587, Tribunal de Pontivy, 1875.

\textsuperscript{35}Weber, Peasant, 318. In L'agriculture en France, Duchatellier makes the generalization that the Breton peasant was not inclined to get an education because it might be one more case of an outsider trying to fool him. (Duchatellier, L'agriculture en France, 191)
arrondissement of Ploermel, 26 did not have primary schools. Of these 26 school-less communes, 18 had haut-notables who ran local affairs. These families were asked to contribute that year to help establish and finance schools in their communes: only five agreed to do so.\(^\text{3}\text{4}\)

The notables were politically conservative and like their counterparts in the rest of France they believed that education would cause the peasant to become discontent. Their original objection was that the public schools would not give religious instruction. This objection was without foundation, however, as the curriculum proposed by Guizot in his law on education of 1833 provided for religious instruction. After 1833 the notables saw the schools as a way to discipline and moralize the masses.\(^\text{3}\text{5}\)

The Church was more active in educating the morbihannais yet it was not always enthusiastic about its assignment, a major problem where the clergy were very conservative. Like the notables, the clerics believed that the spread of primary education would seduce the peasant into leaving the countryside or trying to emancipate himself from the usual controlling forces of priest and noble. In the arrondissement of Ploermel, for example,

\(^\text{3}\text{4}\)Joel Bigorgne, "L'enseignement primaire dans l'arrondissement de Ploërmel, 1833-1914" D.E.A. (Rennes, 1982), 65. Haut-notables are families that compose the local aristocracy and upper middle classes.

\(^\text{3}\text{5}\)Furet, Reading, 118-120.
this view led to the closing of the seven écoles mutuelles by 1855. The remaining two were run by the Frères de l'Instruction chrétienne.\(^{38}\)

Besides the lack of sufficient funds and indifferent, if not hostile, attitudes, primary education in the Morbihan was hampered by the lack of good roads. Without them getting to school was difficult. The Inspector of the Academy of Vannes said in 1835 that "the inhabitants (of the Morbihan) are widely dispersed in a large number of communes," so that those attending school "had to make a journey of four to four-and-one-half kilometers on very bad roads."\(^{39}\) This situation remained unchanged until roads improved in the last third of the nineteenth century.

Inspectors' reports were cited as proof of the advancement of education in the Morbihan but they were not always accurate. For example, the reports for 1836-1842 for Ploërmel used the same descriptions of classes and attendance. Between 1833 and 1855 attendance numbers were recopied and gave the illusion that the number of students attending school remained stable. These statistics not only perpetuated an inaccurate picture of attendance, but also made no distinctions between the type of teacher. As a result, the quality of primary education received by

\(^{38}\)Bigorgne, "Ploërmel," 64.

\(^{39}\)Lorain, Tableau, 214.
students remained unknown.40

In the rest of France, there were similar problems with attendance records. For example, in the 1860's attendance figures became more reliable because of changes in the methods of taking attendance. Yet, these figures resembled those of the 1840's when there was no reliable method of keeping attendance records. In short, according to these figures, the same number of students attended in the 1840's as in the 1860's. Moreover, girls were not included in the attendance figures at all.41

One way to measure the impact of schools on the Morbihan is to examine the advance of literacy. What was the level of literacy in the Morbihan in the nineteenth century? Did it rise? Did the various laws passed by successive governments in Paris aid in the increase of literacy in the Morbihan? Does measuring literacy levels aid in ascertaining societal evolution?

Henri Baudrillart in Les populations agricoles de la France said that primary education lagged more in the Morbihan than in the rest of Brittany. As he noted, "...of 100 conjoints, 60 were incapable of signing their names to

41Weber, Peasants, 308
marriage certificates" in 1880. How accurate was Baudrillart's assessment? Table 8 illustrates the advance of literacy in the Morbihan between 1831 and 1859 using army recruits as examples. It shows that illiteracy decreased among the recruits from 74.9 percent in 1831-33 to 62.4 percent by 1855-59, a decrease of 12.5 percent over approximately 25 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literacy among Army Recruits, 1831-1859</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to Read and Write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Illiterate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Henri Baudrillart, Les populations agricoles de la France Vol. I: La Normandie et la Bretagne, (Paris, 1885), 437. Conjointes are spouses. As part of the marriage ceremony, they had to sign their names to the marriage certificate. Whether or not they could sign their names was used as a way to measure illiteracy.*
Table 8 shows that the *morbihannais* were predominately illiterate as late as 1860 despite the Guizot and Falloux laws. Yet, the decrease in illiteracy also suggests that the Morbihan was moving away from a traditional rural society.

How do literacy rates in the Morbihan compare with the rest of rural France? The Morbihan was one of those départements that fell south of the infamous St-Malo-Geneva line.\(^4\) Départements below that line usually had high rates of illiteracy among their populations. For example, in 1881 20 percent or more of the recruits from sixteen of these départements were illiterate.\(^4\)

Baudrillard's work commenting on the illiteracy of the *morbihannais* was written before the implementation of the Ferry Laws, the great effort by the Third Republic to educate a population that now realized the benefits of

\(^4\)The Geneva-St-Malo line was first "discovered" by French statisticians in the 1820's and early 1830's. Adolphe d'Angeville was one of the first to use it to show that France was divided into two parts: a wealthy, literate France north of the line and a poor, illiterate France south of it.

\(^4\)Weber, *Peasants*, 309. Weber goes on to discuss the variations in what was perceived as literacy in the nineteenth century. He gives examples from inspectors' reports about these variations which range from the ability to write one's name to reading shop signs. Weber also cites reports that question the accuracy of measuring the literacy of army recruits. One report from the Haute-Loire stated that recruits crammed to pass their examinations or would feign illiteracy to escape their military service. (Weber, *Peasants*, 309-310)
education. As a result of the Ferry Laws and a change in attitude towards education among the peasants, the Morbihan's literacy rate increased. The Ferry Laws of 1881-1886 gave France free compulsory public primary education. Moreover, by the 1880's as the economic structure of France changed more peasants began to see that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1898</th>
<th>1908</th>
<th>1921-22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literate</td>
<td>4,527</td>
<td>4,669</td>
<td>4,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to Verify</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,696</td>
<td>5,568</td>
<td>5,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Illiterate</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data from the *Annuaire statistique* for 1898 (Paris, 1900), 1908 (Paris, 1912), and 1921-22 (Paris, 1923)

*This category combines the following: Read only, Read and Write, More Developed Primary Education, Brevet, Diploma, and Bachellers ées lettres, ées sciences, de l'enseignement.*
The Third Republic was also more successful because it made better facilities and teachers more accessible and school more meaningful and profitable than previous governments. Weber addresses the subject of changed attitudes and gives examples of how people began to perceive education as a way to improve themselves. As a result of this new attitude, education modified people's behavior by having them become less "peasant" and more "bourgeois" as well as more French and patriotic. (Weber, *Peasants*, 301. 326-338)
shows that the greatest gains in literacy rates were made between 1872 and 1906. Again, the Ferry Laws and the general change in attitude made the greatest difference in the advance of literacy in the Morbihan. The general decline in illiteracy also denotes the continuation of the transitional period of societal evolution that began under the Second Empire and accelerated under the Third Republic.

The data on illiteracy are similar to the rest of France in that the literacy rate among the general population is lower than those of the army recruits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10</th>
<th>Literacy in the Morbihan, 1866-1921*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literate*</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level</td>
<td>1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literate*</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aData from the *Statistique de la France*, 2e series, Population, 1866 and 1872; the *Renseignement statistique de la population française* for 1906 and 1921.

*"Read and write" and "Read only" combined.
A central reason for this phenomenon is that women are factored into the data as are men who have no exposure to schooling because of their age.\(^{6}\)

Education in the Morbihan concerned more than introducing more schools, teachers, and educational reforms. The Breton-speaking areas had a higher rate of illiteracy than the French-speaking areas. For example, between 1850 and 1890 the 16 Breton cantons had a higher illiteracy rate than the departemental average. In contrast, the literacy rate on the Breton/French border was higher than in the Breton interior. Moreover, French-speaking cantons had less illiteracy than the departemental average. These findings are based on the conscription lists of 1850 and 1890. More detailed information from the lists reveals that in 1850 only 7 percent of the recruits from Le Faouët and Plouay were literate. Both were Breton-speaking cantons deep in the interior of the arrondissement of Pontivy, the most traditional of the four arrondissements. On the other hand, recruits from the cantons of Mauron and Guer, French-speaking cantons in the arrondissement of Ploërmel, had a 44-47 percent literacy rate.\(^{7}\)

When broken down on the arrondissement level at

\(^{6}\)Weber, Peasants, 309.

\(^{7}\)Furet, Reading, 286-89.
mid-century the data reveal that of the four arrondissements, Pontivy consistently had literacy rates below the departemental average, while the other three arrondissements were always above it. Pontivy was the arrondissement where Breton was the dominant language until the late nineteenth century and the poorest of the arrondissements.\(^4\) Pontivy was also the arrondissement that remained at the traditional stage of development the longest, an occurrence that is reflected in the evolution of crime rates.

The illiteracy in the Breton-speaking communes was because there were fewer schools and longer distances between them than in the other communes in the Morbihan. The situation changed as more schools were subsidized by the Church and the Third Republic and the improved roads enabled children to get to school.\(^\text{49}\)

The battle between the Church and the Third Republic to educate the morbihannais also aided in the rise of literacy rates. The conflict centered around the introduction of free public primary education which the more conservative elements in the Breton-speaking communes feared would francize Breton speakers. These two groups perceived


\(^{49}\)Furet and Ozouf, *Reading*, 291.
Determined to preserve Breton, church educators organized groups to prevent the Republic's schools from becoming popular. The groups, claiming they were preserving their Breton heritage, assisted the local clergy in developing a private network of confessional schools to preserve Breton and to provide an alternative to the Republic's primary schools. The proliferation of the confessional schools brought education to people who previously had no access to it.51

Schoolchildren in Breton-speaking communes received a basic education from the confessional schools. The problem was that the subjects were taught in Breton and/or Latin, not French. When anyone attempted to change the curriculum to include French, the school was usually deserted.52

A school inspector observed a confessional school on a visit to St-Avé in 1881. It was a one-room school for girls run by a Béate (female religious), with 42-53 girls, ages 3 to 13, in attendance. Their subjects and readings were primarily religious ones and were taught in Breton. The Psalms, however, were read to them in Latin. There was no

50 Devailly, Histoire religieuse, 323.
51 Devailly, Histoire religieuse, 323 and Bigorgne, "Ploermel," 86.
52 Devailly, Histoire religieuse, 323.
instruction in writing, mathematics, and French.\textsuperscript{33}

The success of the Republic's primary schools varied all over the Morbihan, not just in the Breton areas. The arrondissement of Ploërmel provides a case study of the difficulties of establishing state-run public primary education. The town of Ploermel was the base of the Frères de l'Instruction chrétienne, yet the population of the arrondissement did not always use their schools. For example, in the commune of Radenac in 1888-1889 there were 94 students at the école privée de garçons and only 2 in the public school. At Reguiny, 112 students were enrolled in the private school and eight in the public one. The instituteur of the school in Reguiny was isolated by villagers, tradespeople, and shopkeepers.\textsuperscript{34}

In areas of the arrondissement of Ploërmel where there was a more equitable distribution between supporters and detractors of the Republic, the establishment of public primary schools went more smoothly. In places such as Ploërmel and Guer the conflict between confessional schools and public schools centered around the teachers. The outcome was a divided town where the priest and

\textsuperscript{33}Furet, Reading, 146. Béates belonged to the Congrégation des Soeurs de l'Instruction de Jesus. Their schools, known as assemblées, were generally in their native parish. The Béates were not nuns and their schools were also used as community centers for adults. (Furet, 109)

\textsuperscript{34}Bigorgne, "Ploërmel," 93-94.
schoolmaster tried to outdo each other. The only two places in the arrondissement of Ploërmel where public schools were totally successful were Lanouée and St-Brieuc de Mauron. The success of the schools was assisted by the fact that the municipal councils were totally republican.\textsuperscript{55}

Breton disappeared in the twentieth century as the Republic's schools succeeded in establishing themselves and confessional schools ceased teaching in it. What happened to Breton in the Morbihan was similar to the fate of other dialects in the rest of rural France. They were no longer useful and became the province of folklorists.\textsuperscript{56}

How did the three agencies of change affect patterns of crime? The improved transportation and communication network brought economic improvement to the Morbihan and increased wealth. The relationship between economic improvement, increased wealth and changes in patterns of crime was noted in the nineteenth century. In 1845 a contributor to the Journal des économistes stated that "the excesses of industrialization" caused people to be impatient to acquire more goods. This situation led to cupidity and more crime. Later in the century, criminologist Henri Joly averred that the increased wealth brought by

\textsuperscript{55}Ibid., 94-95.

\textsuperscript{56}From conversations with various Bretons, I found out that the only way one can learn the language is with a special class after school. The very old still remember a few words.
industrialization and the national market economy led to more cupidity and greed which led to more crime, especially violent ones as well as theft. He cautioned that easily acquired riches led to habits of "bien-être et les plaisirs grossières." Such warnings proved to be true in the case of the Morbihan. The improved transportation and communication network caused improvement in the major sector of the Morbihan's economy, agriculture. It forced those peasants who wished to compete in the national market economy to make changes in their agricultural methods. The consequences were increased wealth for those willing to take advantage of the economic connection to France and the entry of the Morbihan into the transitional stage of societal development. Because of the economic change brought by the easier availability of transport, theft and violent crime rates rose.57

How did the schools affect patterns of crime in the Morbihan? Early nineteenth century criminologists and social reformers believed that the spread of education would cause crime rates to fall. They arrived at this conclusion based on the literacy levels of offenders that came before the Cours d'assises and were reported in the Compte général. Most offenders were, of course,

illiterate. Education would cause crime to decrease because it would "morraliser" the masses. But first, education had to spread to the masses. A contributor to the *Journal des économistes* in 1844 said, "l'éducation morale, sociale, élevée, qui jetterait de bon germes dans les âmes, et qui ferait de l'élève un citoyen intelligent, cette education-là manque tout à fait." Education was necessary because "l'ignorance engendre le crime." In his *Essai* Alphonse Guerry stated "L'ignorance est la principe cause des crimes, et pour rendre les hommes meilleurs, et plus heureux, il suffit de leur donner de l'instruction."

By the latter part of the nineteenth century, however, education's relationship to crime no longer concerned how it would decrease crime but instead how the educational level determined what type of crime a person was more likely to commit. For example, a literate person would commit fraud or embezzlement while the illiterate person would be more inclined to commit crimes of violence. Offenders in the Morbihan, however, remained predominately illiterate

---


"Joly, *La France*, 369-370. Joly points out that the *Compte général* for 1880 reported that there was no correlation between education and better morals. What education did was to give the offender new ideas on how to commit crime. (Joly, 372, 388)
throughout the nineteenth century, though the literacy rate of the general population increased. The rate of cases of fraud and embezzlement remained constant at 1.5 per 100,000 inhabitants. In short, education by itself did not affect patterns of crime. Patterns of crime changed because the society in which they were committed changed and one way that society changed was to become more literate.

The agencies of change—schools, roads, and railroads—promoted the evolution of the Morbihan. These agencies of change arrived slowly. The first one to affect the Morbihan was the road, especially the *chemins vicinaux*, the tertiary roads, that connected villages and farms to the larger *routes départementales* and *routes nationales*. Increased construction of the *chemins vicinaux* began under the Second Empire and was accelerated under the Third Republic with the Freycinet Plan. The second agency of change to affect the Morbihan was the school. The decline in illiteracy began under the Second Empire and rapidly continued under the Third Republic after the implementation of the Ferry Laws. The third agency of change, the railroad, complemented what the roads began, the economic integration of the Morbihan into the national market economy followed by the cultural integration of the *département* with the nation. In brief, the three agencies of change ended the economic, geographic, and psychological isolation of the *morbihannais* by joining it to France.
How do the three agencies of change clarify the three stages of societal development? The traditional society was the era when the Morbihan lacked good roads and over 74 percent of the population was illiterate. The transitional period began with the increased construction of roads and railroads and a rise in the level of literacy. The roads and railroads brought economic improvement, while the schools changed how the morbihannais looked at the world. Modern society emerged after World War I when the railroads, roads and schools connected the Morbihan physically and psychologically with France. The evolution of the Morbihan, then, fits the typology of societies as set forth in Louise Shelley’s Crime and Modernization when she discusses the how societies evolve from the traditional to the modern.41

The discussion of the agencies of change completes the reaction of the Morbihan to socioeconomic and political development and change between 1825 and 1925. The Morbihan was a slowly evolving agricultural society that went through a long transitional period of development that lasted from the 1860's until after World War I. Now it remains to discuss how socioeconomic and political development and change altered patterns of crime in the Morbihan.

41 Shelley, Modernization, 17-37.
CHAPTER IV:

THE PATTERN OF CRIME

In his essay, "Development and Decay," the sociologist Ted R. Gurr asserts that "past and present patterns of crime and criminal justice are the products of powerful and fundamental socioeconomic and political processes." The evolution of patterns of crime in the Morbihan corroborate this statement. The changing profile of criminality in the Morbihan reflects the gradual socioeconomic and political evolution which the département underwent between the years 1825 and 1925, the first century of recorded national crime statistics. The Morbihan's societal evolution and its effect on patterns of crime may be seen by examining changes in three categories of crime—thief, assault and battery, and homicide—between 1825 and 1925 and by answering the following questions: How and when did the changes in patterns of crime occur in the Morbihan? What was the effect of the Morbihan's evolution on these patterns of crime? Do the Morbihan's patterns of crime correspond to national ones? Does the evolution of patterns of crime in the Morbihan fall into the three stages proposed by historians of crime?

\footnote{Gurr, "Development and Decay," 31.}
Before taking a closer look at patterns of crime in the Morbihan, it is necessary to recall how historians of crime define the three stages of the evolution of patterns of crime and how they correspond to the three stages of societal evolution. The three stages of the evolution of patterns of crime have characteristics based on the behavior of rates of crimes against persons and crimes against property. In the traditional stage, rates of crimes against persons are higher than crimes against property; the transitional stage is characterized by rising rates of both types of crime. In the modern stage, rates of crimes against persons are lower than rates of property crime.²

The Morbihan gradually evolved from a traditional society to a modern one between 1825 and 1925. Using Gurr’s contention that crime patterns are the result of societal evolution, traditional patterns of crime should prevail from 1825 to around 1865. From 1865 and until after World War I transitional patterns of crime should dominate and by 1925 modern patterns of crime should emerge.

To determine the evolution of patterns of crime in the Morbihan and how societal evolution affected it, I will examine the rates of three specific crimes—theft,}

assault and battery, and homicide—between 1825 and 1925. Historians of crime perceive these particular categories of crime to be those most reliably reported. These crimes also compose the largest percentage of personal and property crimes. The discussion of each crime includes the fixed rate (number of persons tried per 100,000 inhabitants) based on a combination of the statistics provided by the Cours d'Assises and the four Tribunaux correctionnels.

To put the Morbihan's crime rates in perspective, I will compare the evolution of its patterns of theft, assault and battery, and homicide with those of the Seine-Inférieure and the nation. The comparison with France will make it possible to see where the Morbihan

\[\text{Zehr, Crime and Development, 15-16, 37, 85.}\]

\[\text{4The data on crime in the Morbihan, the Seine-Inférieure, and France is based on decade by decade samples from statistics in the Compte générale de la justice criminelle for the years 1825, 1835, 1845, 1855, 1865, 1875, 1885, and 1895. Except where indicated the data are the combination of persons tried from both the Cours d'Assises and the Tribunaux correctionnels for those years. The Compte générale stopped giving categories of crime for the Tribunaux in 1904, though they were still available for the Cours d'Assises. In order to be able to continue to combine the data from both courts for the Morbihan, I used the jugements minutes of the Tribunaux for 1925 in Series U (Justice) in the Archives Départementales of the Morbihan and added them to data provided by the Compte générale for the Cours d'Assises. Unfortunately, the same could not be done for 1905 as the records for the first half of 1905 for the Tribunal de Lorient were destroyed in World War II thus leaving a gap in the data for 1905. As a result, 1905 is not included in the tables where the data for both courts is combined.}\]
stands in relation to the evolution of national rates of crime. The comparison with the Seine-Inférieure will show the similarities and differences between the evolution of patterns of crime in a rapidly industrializing and urbanizing département with those of the gradually evolving Morbihan.

The Seine-Inférieure, in Normandy, was one of France's leading commercial and urban centers because of its location. The Seine River traversed the département thus making it accessible to Paris by water. The roads followed the river's course adding another link between Paris and the Seine-Inférieure. In the 1840's the first railroad arrived in the département. The Seine-Inférieure contained the large port city of Le Havre where the Seine emptied into the English Channel. Its capital, Rouen, was France's fifth largest city for most of the period 1825 to 1925. The population of the département rose from 688,295 in 1826 to 880,671 in 1921, and it was one of the first départements where the percentage of urban population surpassed that of the rural population in the nineteenth century.  

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Seine-Inférieure was a major cloth manufacturing area. The textile industry was primarily based on home production  

centered in the villages of the département. In the 1830's and 1840's, however, textile production shifted to factories which caused an influx of people into Rouen seeking employment at the textile mills. The mills made the Seine-Inférieure the largest textile manufacturer in France. In addition, the département was the site of a flourishing iron industry before 1860. Agriculture did remain an important part of the economy in the Seine-Inférieure. In brief, the societal evolution of the Seine-Inférieure between 1825 and 1925 was characterized by rapid industrialization and urbanization. Its society was already in transition from traditional to modern as early as 1825. By 1900 the transition period was over and the Seine-Inférieure emerged as a modern society.

Table 11 indicates the evolution of patterns of theft in the Morbihan, the Seine-Inférieure, and France between 1825 and 1925. The societal evolution of the Morbihan is reflected in its patterns of crime. The traditional period of development witnessed lower theft rates than the transitional period. During the traditional period, where the Morbihan was isolated from the rest of the nation by the lack of good roads, where the population was predominately illiterate, and where the peasants

---

continued to use their ancestors' farming methods. Theft rates in the traditional period remained.

Table 11
Theft Rates in the Morbihan, the Seine-Inferieure and France, 1825-1925

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Morbihan</th>
<th>Seine-Inferieure</th>
<th>France</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>125.7</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>127.2</td>
<td>198.4</td>
<td>137.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>157.6</td>
<td>91.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>175.8</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>274.3</td>
<td>120.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>364.1</td>
<td>117.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>N/A(^b)</td>
<td>N/A(^b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Data from the Compte generale and the records of the Tribunaux correctionnels.
\(^b\)Data for 1925 for the Seine-Inferieure and France unavailable because the Compte general ceased to provide information on specific crimes at the Tribunaux level.

between 52.5 in 1835 and 58.5 in 1865 except for 1825 where the rate was 38.1 and the unusual year of 1855 where
rates soared to 127.2."

By 1865, the Morbihan was in the transitional stage of its development as indicated by the increased length of the chemins vicinaux. The transitional stage continued for the rest of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth. The coming of the railroad, especially the construction of the local lines, the continued building of the chemins vicinaux, the rise in literacy levels, and the changes in the types of crops grown show that there were alterations to the Morbihan's society. Theft rates reflect this stage in the département's evolution. Between 1865 and 1885 the theft rate increased from 58.5 in 1865 to 85.4 in 1885. Beginning in 1895, however, rates begin to decline and by 1925 dropped from 80.4 to 69.4, a decline of 16 percent. The rates throughout the transitional stage, despite the decline at the end, were higher than they were in the traditional stage of the development of the Morbihan, except for the unusually high theft rate of 1855.

Actual cases of theft also reflect the modernization process. In the traditional period, there were highway

"I do not have concrete evidence that tells why rates in 1855 were higher than at any other time in the century 1825-1925. I can only repeat the guess that Zehr made in Crime and Development when he notes the same phenomena of unusually high theft rates in 1855 in the three rural départements (Loir-et-Cher, Creuse, Vendée) that he studied. Zehr said that the unusually high theft rates could be attributed to the end of a decade of economic decline and political turmoil which upset "'normal' crime patterns and affected short run trends." (71)
robberies in the Morbihan, but by the 1870's they disappeared because of the arrival of the brigades de gendarmes sent to better police the rural areas.

An investigation of whether or not types of good stolen changed reveals that modernization introduced new items into the Morbihan's culture which people took. For example, in 1925 there were cases of bicycle thefts in the arrondissements of Lorient and Vannes. Bons de défense nationale provided another item for thieves to take. In 1925, twenty-year old Rene Thominaux, a garçon de café, was accused of stealing 3000F worth of the bonds and two watches. The Tribunal de Lorient sentenced him to one year.

A different attitude towards offender also shows how modernization penetrated the Morbihan. For example, in 1825 the Tribunal of Pontivy sentenced Josephe Mahé Kybral, a 40 year-old widowed washerwoman, to five years in prison for the theft of clothing. In another case in 1825, the Tribunal of Ploërmel sentenced a Rene Pinçon, age 48 and a tailor, to five years in prison and five years of surveillance for stealing a silver watch, knife, and a

---

*aU4309, Tribunal de Lorient, 1er semestre, 1925; U4310, Tribunal de Lorient, 2e semestre, 1925; U3910, Tribunal de Vannes, 1925.

*bU4310, Tribunal de Lorient, 2e semestre, 1925.

*cU1302, Repertoire des prevenues et condamnees 1811-1854, Tribunal de Pontivy.
It is possible that these recipients of sentences that recall the fate of Jean Valjean in *Les misérables* were repeat offenders but the records of the Tribunaux do not indicate if they were.

By the twentieth century, the views of officials on how to treat offenders differed from their predecessors of 1825 because of the influence of the new social sciences of psychology and sociology. Offenders in 1905 and 1925 received lighter sentences even though the actual monetary value of what a thief stole in those years might be more than what one stole in 1825. For example, in 1925 Émile Coquantif, a 26 year old farmer stole several tools, and received a sentence of four months from the Tribunal of Ploermel. Because it was his first offense, the sentence was suspended. In another case before the Tribunal of Pontivy in 1905, Corentin Jaouen, age 38, was sentenced to 4 months for the theft of a watch. Jaouen was a recidivist who had no permanent address. It would seem that the judges would mete out a harsher punishment to a repeat offender such as Jaouen even in 1905, but, as the sentence shows, they did not.

How does the evolution of theft rates in the Morbihan

---
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117U344, Tribunal de Ploërme, 1825.

127U391, Tribunal de Ploërme, 1924-1926.

137U4600, Tribunal de Pontivy, 1904-1906.
compare to the rest of France? Theft rates in France generally followed the same evolution as those of the Morbihan. They rose from a rate of 43.4 persons tried per 100,000 inhabitants in 1825 to a rate of 137.6 in 1855. Theft rates increased again from a rate of 91.6 in 1865 to 120.4 in 1885 then declined to a rate of 117.7 persons tried per 100,000 inhabitants in 1895. But national theft rates were not affected by the same phenomena that affected those of the Morbihan. Since national rates in general are taken from all the départements at all stages of development it is difficult to point to one aspect of modernization as the cause for changes in patterns of crime. The greatest increase in theft rates, from 1825 to 1855, occurred when France experienced an increase in the urbanization process as well as the first major efforts at industrialization. Yet, these two phenomena occurred in only a few départements. Moreover, the three stages of the evolution of the patterns of crime discerned by historians of crime are based on their belief that an entire nation went through the same societal evolution at the same time. Since the départements did not evolve at the same rate, the model advanced by historians of crime, especially Zehr, must be viewed with doubt.

Theft rates in the Seine-Inférieure were consistently higher than those of the Morbihan and France. They do not follow the same evolution of rates from 1825 to 1895.
Instead, theft rates in the Seine-Inférieure fell from 95.3 in 1825 to 79.0 in 1835. Theft rates rose, however, in 1845 to 125.7 then again in 1855 to 198.4. These years, 1825-1855, were those where the textile industry shifted from home production to mills which caused an increase in process of urbanization as people left their villages to work in the mills, many of which were located in Rouen. Historians of crime point out that the arrival of peasants in the city and their final acculturation to their new environment affects rates of property crime. The close proximity of the new inhabitants as they moved into the poorer sections of the cities as well as exposure to more items are cited as providing increased opportunities for theft.

The rates of 1865 declined to 157.6 but increased again to 175.8 in 1875, 274.4 in 1885, and 364.1 by 1895. These higher rates represent the period when the Seine-Inférieure was undergoing another period of industrialization and urbanization in the late nineteenth century. The lower theft rate of the 1860's could possibly have been affected by the crise cotonière that resulted in widespread unemployment among the workers in Rouen's

---

"Zehr, Crime and Development, 12, 28-29, 33-34; Gurr, "Development and Decay," 43-44, 48; Lodhi and Tilly, "Crime and Urbanization," 296."
The crisis ended and theft rates rose again as the economy recovered. In other words, the Seine-Inférieure first experienced a rapid transition from a traditional society between 1825 and 1855 and then a new surge in industrial development and population increase after the depression in the textile industry in the early 1860's. This rapid transition, according to historians of crime, caused disruption in the lives of its inhabitants as traditions eroded. The result was anomie, or normlessness which gave rise to delinquency as people searched for a meaning to their lives.\(^{15}\)

Since the Morbihan contains two cultures, one Breton-speaking and the other French, it is essential to consider their influence on the evolution of theft rates. Table 12 gives the theft rates by arrondissement. In the arrondissement of Pontivy, the most "Breton" of the four arrondissements, theft rates rose from 16.7 in 1825 to 60.1 in 1845. Theft rates remained constant until 1905, when they declined to 36.2. The theft rates of the arrondissement of Lorient, which contained more Breton than French-speaking communes, rates rose from 17.0 in

\(^{15}\)Desert, "Aspects," 251.

\(^{16}\)Durkheim formulated the idea of anomie to explain increased crime and suicide in France in Suicide. Criminal sociologists continue to use it as a theory of criminal behavior. Historians of crime use it for the same reason and try to correlate it with specific indices such as urbanization, the business cycle, and the divorce rate.
Table 12

Theft Rates by Arrondissement, 1825-1925a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Lorient</th>
<th>Vannes</th>
<th>Ploërmel</th>
<th>Pontivy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>N/Ab</td>
<td>N/Ab</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>112.6</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aData compiled from the jugements minutes of the Tribunaux correctionnels.
b'Records of the Tribunal of Lorient destroyed in World War II. 1845 for the Tribunal de Vannes was missing from the holdings of the Archives départementales.

1825 to 95.9 in 1925. The arrondissement of Vannes had more French-speaking communes than Breton ones. Its theft rates rose from 21.4 in 1825 to a peak of 112.6 in 1885. They then fell to 43.6 in 1905, but rose to 65.9 in 1925. Theft rates in the arrondissement of Ploërmel, the most French-speaking of the four arrondissements, rose from 31.3 in 1825 to 76.4 in 1845, then declined until 1905 when they began to rise.

The evolution in patterns of theft rates reveals that the socioeconomic evolution of these areas influenced the evolution of theft rates, not what the inhabitants
spoke. The Breton-speaking areas were those where change took the longest to penetrate. Theft rates were the highest in the Breton arrondissement of Pontivy during the traditional period of societal evolution, but they fell during the transitional period thus following the departemental trend of decreasing theft rates as conditions improved. Theft rates evolved in the same manner in the French-speaking arrondissement of Ploërmel. Yet, in 1885 they declined but in 1905 and 1925 they showed an increase.

Assault and battery is another type of crime that reveals the impact of societal evolution on patterns of crime. Table 13 contains assault and battery rates and the number of persons tried in the Morbihan, the Seine-Inférieure, and France.

Between 1825 and 1855 the Morbihan was in the traditional period of societal development characterized by low literacy rates, the continued isolation of much of the population as the result of the lack of roads, and the persistence of the ancien régime économique as illustrated by the predominance of such crops as rye and buckwheat. Assault and battery rates in this period fluctuated from 25.3 persons tried per 100,000 inhabitants in 1825 to 41.4 in 1835 to 30.0 in 1845 and 26.4 in 1855. The premise advanced by historians of crime that traditional rural areas are supposed to be violent is not borne out by these figures.
Table 13
Assault and Battery Rates in the Morbihan, the Seine-Inférieure, and France, 1825-1925a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Morbihan</th>
<th>Seine-Inférieure</th>
<th>France</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>114.3</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>120.3</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aData from the Compte générale and the records of the Tribunaux correctionnels. 1905 was unavailable due to the partial destruction of the records of the Tribunal de Lorient. bData for 1925 for the Seine-Inférieure and France unavailable because of changes in the Compte générale.

The transitional stage of societal development in the Morbihan witnesses a general improvement in the lives of the morbihannais with the joining of the département to the national market economy with the expanded transportation and communication network. Assault and battery rates generally increased, but not consistently. The rates rose again in 1865 to 51.9, fell in 1875 to 42.1 and then increased in 1885 to a rate of 67.4. The assault and battery rates of 1895 showed a slight decline to 63.4...
in 1895, then in 1925, the rate increased to 96.0. In general, assault and battery rates in the transitional stage of societal development were higher than those in the traditional stage. This fact does support the notion of historians of crime that assault and battery rates increase in the transitional period.

The societal evolution of the Morbihan affected individual cases of assault and battery as well. For example, there were cases of assault and battery that resulted from efforts to improve a locality or a tradition that suddenly went awry. In 1865 the Tribunal of Vannes heard several cases of assault and battery that were the result of one incident. The incident was a free for all at the sale of terrains communaux at the mairie designed to raise money for a communal schoolhouse and new cemetery.

The free for all occurred when a group, composed mainly of women, invaded the mairie and broke up the sale. The members of the group had heard a rumor that the sale would financially ruin some people in the commune. The injured included a few conseillers municipaux; the mayor had fled the room when the trouble began.¹⁷

¹⁷U1555, Tribunal de Vannes, 1865.
arrondissement of Pontivy. The ages of the offenders ranged from 15 to 52 and included both sexes. Their sentences were from one month to eight days. A Breton interpreter was required at their trial.¹

In general, assault and battery rates in the Seine-Inférieure evolved similarly to those of the Morbihan. In the first stage of transition to a modern society, assault and battery rates rose from 44.3 in 1825 to 54.9 in 1845, then fell to 26.0 in 1855. Assault and battery rates then increased tremendously from 46.8 in 1865 to 120.3 in 1895. The increase from 26.0 in 1855 to 46.8 in 1865 could be the result of the unemployment in the textile industry in the early 1860's. In short, just as the Morbihan's slow rise in assault and battery rates from 1865 to 1925 reflects its gradual evolution, so the precipitous increase in the same rates in the Seine-Inférieure reflects its two periods of rapid development.

The evolution of assault and battery rates for France was similar to those of the Morbihan between 1825 and 1895. In France, assault and battery rates increased gradually from a rate of 40.0 in 1825 to 50.9 in 1835 to 47.3 in 1845. In 1855 they dropped to a rate of 35.5 persons tried per 100,000 inhabitants. From 1865 to 1895,

¹U 4587, Tribunal de Pontivy, 1875.
assault and battery rates in France increased from 63.5 in 1865 to 85.3 in 1895.¹⁹ The first increase in national assault and battery rates (1825-1845) reflects the traditional stage of societal evolution. The second increase was the result of France’s transition to a modern society by 1900.²⁰

To determine the impact of the Breton/French division on rates of assault and battery it is necessary to turn to the rates provided by jugements minutes of the four Tribunaux correctionnels. Table 14 reveals that the assault and battery rates of the French-speaking arrondissement of Ploërmel rose from 24.4 in 1825 to 43.0 in 1865. The rates declined in 1885 to 38.0, but rose tremendously to 136.0 in 1905. They then declined to 82.4 in 1925, a rate that was higher than any of the nineteenth century. In the Breton arrondissement of Pontivy, assault and battery rates continually rose from 1825 to 1925. The period of greatest increase began in 1885. Assault and battery rates in the arrondissement of Vannes increased from 1825 to 1885 then declined in 1905 and rose again in 1925.

¹⁹Zehr, Crime and Development, 87, 89.
²⁰Ibid, 91.
Table 14
Assault and Battery Rates by Arrondissement, 1825-1925a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ploérmel</th>
<th>Pontivy</th>
<th>Vannes</th>
<th>Lorient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>N/Aa</td>
<td>N/A=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>113.3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>136.0</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>118.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aData from the jugements minutes of the Tribunaux correctionnels. b1845 missing from the jugements minutes of the Tribunal de Vannes. cThe records of the Tribunal de Lorient from 1845 to the second half of 1905 destroyed in World War II.

Homicide provides the last of the crimes to be investigated. Like theft and assault and battery it was among the most reliably reported and it completes the category of crimes against persons in the Morbihan.

Table 15 contains the homicide rates of the Morbihan, the Seine-Inférieure, and France from 1825 to 1925. The table shows that rates generally declined in the Morbihan between 1825 and 1925 despite a peak of 9.1 persons tried per 100,000 inhabitants in 1835. In addition, 1925 does show a slight increase to a rate of 3.1 persons tried per 100,000 inhabitants.
### Table 15
Homicide Rates in the Morbihan, the Seine-Inferieure, and France, 1825-1925*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Morbihan</th>
<th>Seine-Inferieure</th>
<th>France</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data from the Compte générale and the records of the Tribunaux.

*Data for 1925 for the Seine-Inferieure and France unavailable due to changes in the Compte générale.

Homicide rates in the Seine-Inferieure rose from 3.7 in 1825 to 4.8 in 1845 then fell slightly to 4.2 in 1855. From 1865 to 1895 they rose from 4.9 to 8.8. Again the rise in homicide rates in the Seine-Inferieure reflect the period in its development where there was the greatest socioeconomic change. When the homicide rates of the Seine-Inferieure are compared to those of the Morbihan, those of the Morbihan are higher between 1835 and 1875.

The evolution of national homicide rates has little in common with those of the Seine-Inferieure or the
Morbihan. Homicide rates began at 4.7 in 1825, then rose quickly to 6.1 in 1835. From 1835 to 1865 they remained constant, fluctuating between 6.1 and 6.9 by 1865. Homicide rates then decline by 1875 and decline again to 2.9 in 1895. The national homicide rates reveal that before 1870 rates were steady, and afterwards they dropped.

Homicide rates were not affected by the Morbihan's evolution as theft and assault and battery rates were. Except for 1835, rates of homicide were relatively low in the Morbihan. Perhaps the contention of Desert and Zehr that traditions of violence determine the homicide rate also explains the homicide rate in the Morbihan. When compared to the nation and a rapidly, urbanizing département, the morbihhanais were not an extremely violent people.

Certain cases of homicide do reflect some aspects of the modernization process. For example, the records of

---

Zehr, 114,115.

Desert noted that Corsica, the land of vendetta, had the highest homicide rate in France. (264). Zehr's data and his extensive statistical work using cross-sectional correlation analysis showed no correlation between homicide and degree of urbanization, alcohol consumption, or economic factors. However he did find that areas associated with traditions of violence did have higher homicide rates. Of the eight départements he concentrated on, the Bouches-de-Rhône, had the oldest tradition of violence and the highest homicide rates. (Zehr, Crime and Development, 117-119)
the Tribunaux indicate the various types of *homicide par imprudence* (manslaughter). No matter the arrondissement, most of such cases were negligence on the part of a coach driver in the nineteenth century or, by 1925, on the part of the driver of an automobile.

Considering homicide, assault and battery, and theft as separate entities does not, however, give any indication of the three stages of the evolution of patterns of crime. These three stages are only evident when comparing rates of crimes against persons and crimes against property. To reiterate, traditional patterns of crime have higher rates of personal crime than property crime and transitional patterns of crime witness increases in both types. Higher rates of property crime than rates of crimes against persons characterize modern patterns of crime.

Do the rates of crimes against persons and crimes against property fit the definitions for the three stages listed above? When relying only on the categories of assault and battery and theft, the data in Table 16 and Figure 7 reveal that from 1825 to 1925 theft rates in the Morbihan were always higher than those of assault and battery and homicide combined. The only year investigated where assault and battery and homicide rates were higher than theft was in 1925. In brief, using only these particular types of crimes, patterns of crime in the Morbihan do not meet the criteria of the three stages of
the evolution of patterns of crime. Instead, patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Assault and Battery</th>
<th>Theft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>127.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data from the Compte général and the records of the Tribunaux.

of crime in the Morbihan fall under the definition of the modern stage. Of course, the discussion of the Morbihan's societal evolution shows that it was in the traditional stage of development until the 1860's and then began a long transitional period. Even as late as 1925 it is not yet clear that the département is a modern society.

Other historians of crime find the same information when they deal with these three categories of crime. Zehr noted the same pattern of homicide, assault and battery, and theft rates in the five urban and three rural
Figure 5  Assault and Battery and Theft Rates in the Morbihan, 1825-1925*
départements he examined. The rates of homicide and assault and battery were lower than theft in the rural ones.\textsuperscript{23} When Gabriel Desert examined "Aspects de la crime et la criminalité en France et en Normandie" his graph showed the assault and battery and theft rates for France. The graph indicated that theft rates were consistently higher than those of assault and battery throughout the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{24}

Another way to view the evolution of patterns of crime is by using the Theft-Violence ratio, a formula developed and used by Zehr. A ratio above 50 indicates that personal crimes predominate, while one below 50 indicates that property crimes predominate.\textsuperscript{25} The TVR indicates that in the Morbihan property crimes generally predominated until 1925. Some years, however, the TVR was very close to 50. For example, in 1835 the TVR was 48.7 and in 1865 the TVR was 48.5. In short, crimes against persons did not always predominate in the Morbihan, but they constituted a significant part of its total crimes. Such a phenomenon was not unusual in other

\textsuperscript{23}Zehr, \textit{Crime and Development}, 68, 105.

\textsuperscript{24}Désert, "Aspects," 261.

\textsuperscript{25}Zehr, \textit{Crime and Development}, 120. The formula for the Theft-Violence Ratio is TVR= \( \frac{100 \times (\text{Homicide rate + Assault rate})}{(\text{Homicide rate + Assault rate + Theft})} \).
Table 17
Theft-Violence Ratio for the Morbihan, 1825-1925*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TVR</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TVR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1855</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data from Compte général and the records of the Tribunaux.

In other rural départements, Zehr noted that the TVRs of the three rural départements he examined (Loir-et-Cher, Creuse, Vendée) did not fit the hypothesis that the TVR should indicate higher rates of crimes against persons than property in the traditional stage of development. Instead, crimes against property were higher than those against persons. Using the TVR then reveals that definition of the traditional stage of the evolution of patterns of crime is not concrete.

Despite this finding, Zehr, as well as Desert, concludes that rural départements have more personal crime than property ones even though their evidence using specific categories of crime do not bear out this assumption. In order to verify this assumption, Desert

---

Zehr, Crime and Development, 127.
included rébellion, or resisting arrest, in his crimes against persons rather than homicide. Cases of rébellion at the national level continuously increased throughout the nineteenth century and were more numerous than those of assault and battery. Adding cases of rébellion to those of assault and battery cause rates of crimes against persons to be higher than theft rates even though assault and battery rates were lower than those of theft. Desert then maintains that society seemed to be getting increasingly violent in the last twenty years of the nineteenth century. He said that it was perhaps the result of the birth of a new society slowly engendered by urban-industrial civilization.  

Zehr did not include other categories choosing instead to discuss how rates of violent crime were actually higher than those recorded because of an urban-rural bias in court records. This bias was the result of rural communities, where all parties knew each other, tolerating "petty mischief." When compared with assault and battery rates, theft rates would appear higher because property crimes were considered "more serious and were given more attention by the police and public." Zehr did not produce

---

Percentage of total number of accuses


Figure 6 CRIMES AGAINST PERSONS, 1831-1880
any type of evidence to support his claim.\textsuperscript{20}

The maps indicate where the Morbihan falls in relation to all 82 départements and the nation when all types of crimes against persons are considered. The first map shows the percentage of total crimes of crimes against persons between 1831 to 1880. These years were those where the Morbihan began its transition from a traditional society. According to this map, 40 to 49 percent of people tried for felonies in the Morbihan had committed crimes against persons. The national rate was lower, 34.8 percent. In contrast, in the Seine-Inférieure only 30 percent of persons tried were tried for crimes against persons. The map, therefore, reveals that in the traditional stage of development, there were higher rates of crimes against persons than crimes against property in the Morbihan. Moreover, as transition began, the rates of crimes against persons increased.

The second map shows the rate of crimes against persons per 100,000 based on a combination of felonies and misdemeanors. The years covered in this map are 1878 to 1887, years when the Morbihan was well into the transitional stage of societal development. This map

\textsuperscript{20}Zehr, Crime and Development, 17. Arson is said to be an example of a crime "for which statistics are virtually worthless," because of the absence of a suspect. (16, 38) Yet, Zehr employs it as a category of property crime in order to use it as a correlate with theft rates. (34-36).
Figure 7  VIOLENCE: FELONIES AND MISDEMEANORS, 1878-1887

reveals that the rate of crimes against persons in the Morbihan was between 50 to 74 persons tried per 100,000 inhabitants, somewhat below the national rate of 73. The Seine-Inferieure, on the other hand, had a rate of 100-124 persons tried per 100,000 inhabitants. This rate was higher than that of the Morbihan and the nation.

Between 1825 and 1925, there was an evolution in patterns of theft, assault and battery and homicide. Theft rates, in general, rose from 1825 to 1895 when they began to decline. The decline continued through 1925. Despite the decline, theft rates remained higher than they had been before 1875. The only exception was 1855.

The comparison between the evolution of theft rates in the Morbihan and those of the rapidly urbanizing and industrializing Seine-Inferieure reveals that in general theft rates in the Seine-Inferieure increased at a higher rate than did those of the Morbihan. This situation was the result of the rapid development of the Seine-Inferieure. National theft rates evolve similarly to those of the Morbihan from 1825 to 1855, but not after 1865.

Assault and battery rates in the Morbihan fluctuate between 1825 and 1885. A general increase in assault and battery rates begins in 1885 and continues through 1925. This increase coincides with the period of accelerated societal evolution brought by the agencies of change.
The comparison between the Morbihan and France reveals that national assault and battery rates fluctuated between 1825 and 1855, then steadily increased. The fluctuations were not as wide as they were in the Morbihan at the same period, and the increase after 1865 was sooner than the increase occurred in the Morbihan. The assault and battery rates of the Seine-Inférieure, in contrast to France and the Morbihan, rose steadily from 1825 to 1845. They rise again beginning in 1865 and continue to increase for the rest of the nineteenth century. Thus they are similar to national rates, but not the Morbihan's.

Homicide rates in the Morbihan, and France generally declined in the nineteenth century while those of the Seine-Inférieure rose. The evolution of rates was not associated with socioeconomic change and must be attributed to traditions of violence. Désert's example of Corsica and Zehr's of the Bouches-du-Rhône were places where vendetta and murder were common (and even perhaps accepted) ways to settle disagreements. These traditions did not exist in either the Morbihan or the Seine-Inférieure.

The use of three categories of crime does not however, aid in discovering whether or not patterns of crime in the Morbihan fit the three stages in the evolution of patterns of crime set forth by historians of crime. When only the categories of theft, assault and battery are considered then the Morbihan does not fit the model...
considered then the Morbihan does not fit the model proposed by historians of crime such as Zehr and Shelley.

In conclusion, the evolution of patterns of crime in the Morbihan between 1825 and 1925 was the result of that department's gradual socioeconomic and political development and change. Because its evolution was gradual, the Morbihan was able to absorb any possible disruption to its society. Thus it avoided the higher rates of assault and battery and theft experienced by other departments such as the Seine-Inferieure where industrialization and urbanization caused rapid alteration to its society.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

In their article, "French Criminality," David Cohen and Eric A. Johnson adjured those who would study the evolution of the patterns of crime to first investigate the society's socioeconomic and political development and change.¹ Such an investigation is necessary because societal evolution causes changes in patterns of crime. I have attempted to follow the guidelines offered by Cohen and Johnson. I have traced the evolution of the Morbihan's socioeconomic and political development and change, then related it to the evolution of the patterns of crime. What conclusions can one draw about the Morbihan's societal evolution and its relationship to crime using this approach?

The investigation of the Morbihan's socioeconomic and political evolution revealed that the Morbihan was a traditional rural society where approximately one-half of the population spoke French and the other half spoke Breton. This society experienced gradual change between 1825 and 1925 in most, but not all categories. As a result, the Morbihan was still only in transition in 1925.²

¹Cohen and Johnson, "French Criminality," 490.
²A modern society is urban and industrial where religion and strong family bonds have eroded and are not replaced by a new value system so that normlessness results.
Agricultural methods, housing, and diet of the majority of the **morbihanais** changed most significantly. These alterations were the result of the linking of the **département** to France through the improved transportation and communication network, especially the expansion of the **chemins vicinaux**, as well as the schools. These agencies of change caused the **morbihanais** to modify their agricultural methods in the late nineteenth century in order to compete in the national market economy and brought general prosperity to an area once considered one of the more wretchedly poor ones of France. The schools of the Third Republic enabled communes that previously had either few or no schools to have them thus educating a population that had become more aware of the benefits of an education. These schools also taught the new farming methods the peasants needed and the benefits of better housing and diet.

The areas that remained the strongholds of tradition from 1825 to 1925 were religion and politics. In religion, the majority of the **morbihanais** were conservative Catholics while in political matters they followed the lead of the **notables** and clergy and hewed to a right-wing line. These groups never hindered the economic progress of the Morbihan, but they did try to hamper the efforts of the Third Republic to establish its schools in the **département**, efforts which they feared would erode their influence with the people.
Despite alterations to agriculture and lifestyle, despite the increase in literacy and the length of the chemins vicinaux, as well as the introduction of the railroads, the Morbihan between 1825 and 1925 did not complete the three stages—traditional, transitional, and modern—of societal evolution. Between 1825 to around 1865, the Morbihan was a traditional rural society. Then around the mid-1860's it entered an extended period of transition from a traditional to a modern society which continued beyond the dates of this study.

Why is it difficult to designate the Morbihan as a modern society by 1925? There were still parts of the département not reached by roads or schools, where the populations continued to practice traditional methods of agriculture and to live in housing and follow a diet unchanged since 1825. Moreover, Breton was still spoken in these area.

What was the relationship between the slow evolution of the Morbihan's society and its patterns of crime? The study of the three categories of crime—thief, assault and battery, and homicide—revealed that changes in their rates of commission followed alterations in society, but not according to the three stages of evolution proposed by historians of crime. Historians of crime such as Zehr and Shelley stated that in the traditional period rates of crimes against persons were higher than those of crimes
Assault and Battery ::::    Theft ***

*Data from the Compte général and the records of the Tribunaux.
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against property. In the Morbihan, however, rates of crimes against persons were lower than those of crimes against property in its traditional stage (1825-1865).

In the transitional stage, according to Zehr, rates of both personal and property crimes should increase. Assault and battery rates and theft rates rose in the Morbihan beginning in the 1860's, the period when the Morbihan entered its transitional stage of development as illustrated by the higher literacy levels, the arrival of the railroad, and the building of more chemins vicinaux.

Theft rates continued to rise until 1895 as did assault and battery rates. The evolution of these rates illustrate that the Morbihan was still in transition from a traditional to modern society. But theft rates begin to decline in 1895, while those of assault and battery continue to increase. The evolution of these two categories of crime at this point fit neither the definition of the transitional stage nor that of the modern stage where assault and battery rates should decline, while those of theft should rise. Therefore, when the evolution of patterns of crime between 1825 to 1925 is considered the Morbihan does not confirm the model proposed by historians of crime.

The evolution of patterns of crime in the Morbihan was similar to national trends in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. A comparison between the
Morbihan's patterns of theft, assault and battery, and homicide and those of a rapidly developing département, the Seine-Inférieure, reveals that changes in patterns of crime resembled each other during the transitional stage of societal development. In other words, rates of assault and battery and theft rose in both départements under the impact of the agencies of change.

A comparison of the evolution of patterns of assault and battery and theft rates in France and the Seine-Inférieure reveals that, as in the Morbihan, rates of theft were higher than those of assault and battery throughout the period 1825-1895. According to this discovery, the evolution of rates of assault and battery and theft in France and the Seine-Inférieure do not confirm the model proposed by historians of crime and elaborately described by Zehr. It could be said that the Seine-Inférieure was continually in transition. Since national rates were drawn from the statistics of départements at all stages of development, it would seem that from 1825 to 1845 the traditional stage would be in evidence as most départements were still in that stage in their development. For the rest of the century, rates of assault and battery and theft rose signifying that the nation was in the transitional stage of development and so were all of its départements by 1895.

The effort to correlate the three stages of the
evolution of patterns of crime and those of societal development according to the model developed by historians of crime and described by Zehr in Crime and the Development of Modern Society and Shelley in Crime and Modernization shows that the model is flawed. Zehr did not take into consideration that the départements were at different stages of development, a fact that has to be considered when interpreting national crime statistics. When he did try to break the data down into the departemental level, he quickly dismissed any revelations that did not correspond to the definitions of the three stages of crime. For example, when he discovered that theft rates were higher than those of assault and battery in the three rural départements he chose, he reiterated that violent crimes went unreported in rural areas, so their rates would always appear lower than those of theft. Shelley summarizes the recent literature on crime and society and she only repeats much of what Zehr says on the subject.

What is the importance of my study of the the relationship of societal evolution to changes in patterns of crime? It adds a dimension to the social and cultural history of France by considering the role of crime in a rural society in the nineteenth century. It also shows the use of crime as an index of modernization. Those who say that crime is a flawed index point to fluctuations along trend lines, the fact that not all crimes are
reported, and the biases in those that are. Despite such criticisms, I maintain that the study of the relationship of societal evolution to patterns of crime is one way of understanding how a society's evolution affects its population. My study also shows that the model of the evolution of patterns of crime does not take into consideration the fact that all societies develop differently and their evolution is influenced by a variety of factors.

The study of the Morbihan's societal evolution and its affect on patterns of crime shows that the two are related. In other words, the impact of societal development on patterns of crime altered the moral portrait of the morbihannais between 1825 and 1925. This alteration was especially clear in the evolution of assault and battery and theft rates from 1865 to 1895 when the agencies of change coupled with the population growth caused those rates to increase. Moreover, the evolution of patterns of crime in the Morbihan does not confirm the model set forth by historians of crime. Louise Shelley summarized what was

---

3In the introduction to *Crime and Development*, Zehr, summarizes the difficulties of relying too heavily on statistics. (9-30)

4Gabriel Desert also makes the same observation in "Aspects de la criminalité" when he states that "La criminalité dans son ensemble resul te d'une telle variété de facteurs que chaque département, pour ne pas dire chaque arrondissement ou groupe de cantons, mériterait une monographie." (244)
happening to the Morbihan when she stated in *Crime and Modernization* that increasing crime rates are "general indicators that the process of modernization has commenced."
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