National Brands and Global Markets

An Historical Perspective

Edited by
Nikolas Glover and David M. Higgins

First published 2023

ISBN: 978-0-367-75497-6 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-0-367-76268-1 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-1-003-16618-4 (ebk)

7

Made in France and Made in Paris

Luxury branding in the *longue durée*[1]

Véronique Pouillard and Audrey Millet

(CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003166184-7

The funder for this chapter is University of Oslo

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

7 Made in France and Made in Paris

Luxury branding in the *longue durée*[1]

Véronique Pouillard and Audrey Millet

Introduction

This chapter explores the history of branding the city of origin, and country of origin, in French consumer goods, especially luxury goods such as ceramics and haute couture. We consider how important Made in France was in relation to indications of regional origin, and other forms of intellectual property, especially industrial designs, and copyright. Particular importance is attached to informal mechanisms, for example, the entente of entrepreneurs that created and maintained standards of production.

Previous studies examined the symbiotic relationship between the image of France and the products of its terroir, especially champagne, foodstuffs, and wines,[2] and documented the important contribution that business lobbies and trade associations made to legislation governing trade marks and appellations. This chapter focuses on the French luxury goods industry, and the ways in which its composite firms created specific national images and labels that associated their products with France, and French quality. The identity of this industry developed symbiotically with French national and urban landscapes.

This chapter contextualizes the evolution of this identity within the history of French protectionism from the late seventeenth century. Indeed, Made in France was intimately linked to the centralization of the French state under absolute monarchs. The last years of the Ancien Régime were a crucial period during which French taste, and the reputation of its products, were formed. The second territorialization of French taste emerged during the eighteenth century, and this was associated with Made in Paris. These dual applications of 'Made in' were supported by economic policies oriented towards the arts, specific manufactures, and the training of craftsmen. The latest phase in the evolution of Made in France began in the late nineteenth century and concluded with the offshoring of production. This relocation attracted official interest during President Hollande's government, which created the Ministry of Productive Recovery (Ministère du Redressement Productif) led by Arnaud Montebourg. These recent discourses are viewed from a long-term perspective to demonstrate that support for 'French' manufacturing has a considerable lineage underpinned by civil servants, entrepreneurs, and politicians on both sides of the political spectrum.

DOI: 10.4324/9781003166184-7

This chapter proceeds as follows. The next section explains how France became renowned for manufacturing excellence in the 'luxury' industries. This is followed by sections on how Alexandre Brongniart sought to protect the reputation that Sèvres had established in the production of porcelain, and the growth of haute couture from the mid-nineteenth century. The penultimate section discusses how the temptation to offshore production threatened France's reputation in luxury products before conclusions are presented.

From Made in France to Made in Paris

Debates on French supremacy in luxury products can be traced to the eighteenth century. Contemporaries lauded the eminently artistic character of French manufactures, which captured the aura of the high arts and represented '*French genius*'.[3] This favourable image was imposed via French culture and language, and, to varying degrees, technological superiority, notably in the decoration applied to products.

In 1765, the British mercer, Ashburner, gave evidence before the London Select Silk Committee, and claimed that English brocades failed to incorporate the new designs inspired from France, or 'à la française'.[4] British manufacturers tended to distinguish themselves by evoking their relation to France. For example, Irishman Édouard Duras settled in Bordeaux. Initially, Duras designated his wallpaper designs as 'London', but subsequently emphasized their Parisian origins:[5]

> The ambition to earn the title of the French manufacture (Manufacture Française), has determined the latter (the manufacturer) to only execute French drawings, and to apply to give them the grace and elegance that characterize all the French works.[6]

An indication of French manufacture practically became a label of quality. With the important concentration of manufacturers in Paris and Lyon, the two cities quickly distinguished themselves from other manufacturing regions. The aura of the French court, and the success of Rose Bertin (1747–1813), hatmaker (*modiste*) to Marie-Antoinette, helped create a narrative on the unparalleled quality of French manufacture.[7] During the nineteenth century, products made in Paris were known as 'la Fabrique de Paris', and following in the footsteps of Bertin, its manufacturers became renowned for the diverse range of fashion accessories they supplied: Umbrellas, fans, pins, shawls, and gloves were offered for sale at every conceivable price.[8] During the seventeenth century, Paris gradually became the capital of the French luxury goods industry. A skilled artisanal workforce was readily available to serve a demanding clientele.[9] Consequently, around 1800, Made in France essentially denoted Made in Paris.

Jean Zuber, a wallpaper manufacturer in Rixheim, in the region of Alsace, often referenced Paris in his letters: 'What new are we undertaking in the

Paris manufactures? Don't you have a person who can instruct you about what happens & give us samples of the novelties from the main manufacturers, there is an absolute need that you find a way to realize this'.[10] In his journal, Henri Lebert (1792–1864), a draughtsman from Colmar, in Alsace, described the feminine elegance of Madame Jurienne, a bourgeois woman used to the Parisian social evenings:

> Beautiful, graceful and spirited, doing the honors as a Sylph, she possessed to the highest degree the so Parisian art to trace her own circle of admirers that made as many people happy as guests were. If you remember a description of Mad. de Staël on the Parisian society, read it again, to complete my opinion.[11]

By the early nineteenth century, the superiority of Parisian elegance was established. Honoré de Balzac stated in 1830: 'The person that does not come often to Paris will never be elegant'.[12] For this reason, Zuber hired Parisian draughtsmen, such as Darmancourt, or, Saint Georges, 'in the capital 2 or 3 months to get his ideas shaped a bit'.[13] The brands *Made in France,* and *Made in Paris* were becoming embossed on products originating from these areas.

The premier position of Paris in the production of luxury goods affected the training of French craftsmen and influenced the education of artisans in other European capitals and French cities. The ascent of Paris began in the seventeenth century, under the guidance of Jean-Baptiste Colbert, First Minister of State between 1661 and 1683.[14] The French government concentrated on leading artisans' workshops, such as the Gobelins Manufactory, in Paris, to facilitate the dissemination of technical knowledge – which underpinned the excellence of luxury goods made in this city. This geographical density was complemented by support for 'modern' education in drawing. To improve talent, artisans were educated in the 'French taste'.[15] State-funded communal courses in drawing ensured French mastery in this skill continued for many generations. Such drawing schools were the ancestors of the great Paris schools of the nineteenth century, such as the Arts décoratifs de Paris. Moreover, craftsmen were sent to other towns and cities to improve their drawing and technical skills in particular manufactures, for example Aubusson, or Felletin, (tapestry), Amiens, or Rouen (porcelain and embroidery), Lyon (silk textiles), and Mulhouse (printed fabrics). Considerable effort was devoted to the identification of the most competent teachers. In many private workshops, education in the crafts became an obsession.[16] The fundamental aim of this training was to produce outstanding results from the marriage of art and industry.

It is apparent, therefore, that during the seventeenth century, the benefits of commercial drawing became increasingly recognized and valued. The growth of this type of drawing demonstrated a growing interchange of ideas between art schools, the world of business, and the state – all of which shared common concerns. Drawing helped determine the boundaries of good taste and this

made it imperative that the best workers were trained to become exceptionally proficient. The artistic and technical capabilities of French craftsmen were crucial to the emergence of a culture which valued Made in France.

Draughtsmen were at the centre of a production network. Their drawings defined the design, shape, technical characteristics, and decoration of products. Subsequently, the ability of artisans to anticipate changes to drawings also contributed to the prestige of Made in France. The evolution of artistic and technical conventions, understood by workers with diverse skills, developed in performative activities such as formatting, assembling, and surfacing.[17] Consequently, in addition to the skills learned by craftsmen during their training, Made in France was also shaped by technical 'sub-consciousness'. The beauty of the object – its colours and motifs – and its intrinsic quality, were essential to attract customers who wished to purchase items of good taste.

Art might be represented by unique objects of unassailable quality, which commanded high prices that only the elite could afford. Conversely, mass-produced articles, of lower quality, were attractive to poorer consumers. Nonetheless, Made in France was defined by the marriage between art and industry; it was this complementarity that enhanced the French reputation.[18] Indeed, by 1800, the brands Made in France, and Made in Paris, were universally adopted by French craftsmen.

Protecting the origin of products during the long nineteenth century

During the nineteenth century, the defence of high-quality French products became a political issue. The government was subjected to intense lobbying from producers' associations who wanted state protection against misrepresentation, and other forms of unfair competition that were being practiced in domestic and export markets.[19] In Europe, and especially France, protection of geographical indications (hereafter, GIs) has a long history, and they continue to be fiercely defended.[20] Recognition of the importance of terroir was fundamental to GIs in foodstuffs and wines. For these products, wine growers, merchants, and politicians collaborated to secure national, and then international recognition of this form of intellectual property. Nonetheless, other sectors of the French economy – l porcelain, luxury leather goods, and haute couture – were also subject to similar campaigns for protection.

In 1800, Alexandre Brongniart (1770–1847) became the administrator of porcelain manufacture in Sèvres. Brongniart founded his artistic-economic policy on the principle of creating 'a trade mark per trade mark' (d'une marque par la marque). In this context, 'Made in Sèvres' was part of the evolution of Made in France. Brongniart sought to affirm the reputation of Sèvres by making its products remarkable and, therefore, attractive to consumers. Imitation was a key component of this policy. For Brongiart, Sèvres had a duty to ensure that existing artistic designs ('modèles') were made freely

available to private manufacturers. Consequently, he gave private manufacturers the right to make overcasts of older designs and drawings. Over time, the brand Made in Sèvres had a dual function: it indicated the geographical origin of the product, and that it was made according to the 'French' manner.[21] Eleven signs placed on a piece of porcelain were necessary to assert the superiority of 'Sèvres' manufacture. Two of the marks indicated that the product was finished: one mark was the manufacturing trade mark in chrome green, while the other was for the setting of the background (pose de fonds'). The other marks belonged to the spinner, draughtsman, outliner ('décalqueuse'), calibrator, cutter, and enameller. Taken together, these marks created the 'Sèvres' brand.

To extend the appeal of the Sèvres brand, Brongniart promoted the manufacture of cheaper porcelain which was produced to less exacting artistic and technical standards compared to the porcelain that had made the reputation Sèvres.[22] Effectively, Brongniart was 'extending' the brand from the luxury category into the realm of common use ('choses banales').[23] The cheaper products were copies of the Sèvres luxury artefacts and were also embossed with the traditional Sèvres brand. However, cheaper porcelain was sometimes produced in independent Parisian workshops which specialized in decoration. Simultaneously, Brongniart increased the number of sales depots and shops selling Sèvres porcelain. For example, a new shop was opened at Lignereux in 1808, and a new warehouse on the count de St. Didier, 23 boulevard des Italiens, in 1818.[24]

Brongniart's management policy is reminiscent of the *Good luxuries* or *English luxury* as described by the anglophile, Montesquieu.[25] According to Montesquieu, the variety, novelty, and pleasure of 'physical forms' and their creative 'imitation' bring taste and distinction to a large group of consumers. Imitation was viewed as indispensable to innovation. Despite legislation to protect copyright, imitation of books and other literature persisted during the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, because such practices signalled creativity.[26] Nonetheless, such imitations were always inaccessible to the majority of the population; replication did not result in demi-luxe or *populuxe*, manufacturers – quite the contrary.[27] Even though reproduction porcelain was not manufactured to the onerous standards traditionally associated with Sèvres, it nonetheless helped to enhance the visibility of Sèvres as a brand and, thereby, the general reputation of French manufacture.[28] Indeed, in the short term, the process of decalcomania became much less expensive than hand decoration, and it facilitated the diffusion of styles and brands associated with Sèvres. Brongniart's policies were designed, first, to increase the geographical significance attached to French products , and, second, to disseminate in overseas markets the repute attached to products marked Made in France.

Brongniart's ambition was to make Sèvres the archetype of European taste. For example, the Caron and Lefebvre factories hired decorators from Sèvres to imitate this style to perfection. These factories employed Jacques François Swebach, a Sèvres-based manufacturer between 1803 and 1813, to imitate

the style of Sèvres by representing on a vase the passage through Mont-Saint-Bernard.[29] Under Brongniart's direction, imitations of Sèvres porcelain became prolific as it assumed its role as a champion of French taste.[30] The administration never filed a complaint: imitation meant dissemination.[31] The diffusion of the Sèvres style acted as an advertisement and reinforced the primacy of the manufacturer's taste.

Country-of-origins and World Fairs

During the later nineteenth century, World Fairs and exhibitions organized by commercial associations and colonial governments showcased inventions and new products that were attributed to 'national genius'. Competition between a diverse range of manufacturers accentuated international economic rivalry. Exhibitions were a means of demonstrating national artistic and technical ingenuity, and revealing national know-how by way of patented inventions that were oftendisplayed for the first time at such events. This tension was best exemplified by the French clothing and garment firms that attended exhibitions.[32]

From the mid-nineteenth century, French firms that informed the development of style in the clothing and textile industries became known as *haute couture*.[33] It is plausible that some of the fashion trends emerged from a broader group of firms, including textile manufacturers, negociants, and artisans that produced many types of fabric.[34] Nonetheless, haute couture established domination in this field of manufacture and contributed to the development of a strong brand, first as Made in Paris, and, following *Unis France* in the early twentieth century, Made in France. Haute couture, therefore, became synonymous with French expertise.[35]

Haute couture firms emerged in the mid-nineteenth century as a cosmopolitan trade, in which many workers, entrepreneurs, and clients had international backgrounds. Although the luxury industries are symbolic of France, they have always been characterized by an openness to international networks and migrants.[36] This industry was characterized by small to medium-sized firms that produced exclusive garments for women in very small quantities. Innovative in cut, colour, and materials, haute couture garments often set the tone for fashionable clothes produced by large-scale manufacturers. From 1868, haute couture firms were represented by a professional syndicate, the Chambre Syndicale de la Haute Couture, which organized the trade and lobbied the government for better trading conditions.[37] Couturiers assembled in the Chambre Syndicale to determine rules for the trade, and to decide which firms were worthy of membership. Subsequently, members of the Chambre Syndicale agreed to supply two types of client: the private customers, and foreign corporate buyers, who were admitted to the seasonal haute couture shows. Foreign buyers paid 30 or 50% more than private customers for each garment purchased. This premium was considered to be the fee for authorized reproduction in overseas markets.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century, however, concerns emerged about the marketing of haute couture. The problem was the growth in counterfeiting, and imitation, which became a source of nationalist discourse. According to the contemporary sociologist, Gabriel Tarde, French luxury products were relying upon imitation because consumers wished to adopt the new trends launched by the elites.[38] New lines were communicated via the press, though it is doubtful whether the drawings and descriptions therein were always of French origin.[39] Numerous studies in art, and art history, document that some who worked in haute couture felt that their Paris shops were being undermined by competition from other fashion cities, especially Vienna and New York.[40] French entrepreneurs and journalists had misgivings about imitators working in Berlin, Brussels, Vienna, New York, and other cities. Sometimes, this discourse became nationalistic, as for example, towards Austrian and German manufacturers during the First World War.[41] Such nationalistic overtones were not only directed to Germanic producers: research has revealed that the couturier Paul Poiret, was equally antagonistic towards US imitators.[42]

After 1918, haute couture firms sought greater international exposure for their products, even though they did not have the capacity to manufacture their designs on a substantial scale. Indeed, only a few haute couture firms had foreign retail outlets before the First World War, and this number dwindled during the interwar era.[43] For example, Marcel Rochas, who was not a member of the Chambre Syndicale, opened a New York branch in 1937. Rochas produced dresses in Paris that were sold in New York, but he encountered difficulties with US Customs and eventually closed the American branch.[44] In any event, during this period, the Chambre Syndicale developed a policy that haute couture should only be produced in Paris. The justification for this initiative was that everything had to be made within the haute couture house located in Paris, in order to provide employment to workers in the city. In practice, complementary products – perfumes, boxes, and wrappings –were often made elsewhere in France. And, for the majority of consumers, textiles were sourced in France, though researchers have recently demonstrated that this declined during the post-1945 era.[45]

Some of those involved in the trade, and in local politics, embraced the defence of haute couture. In the late 1920s, Yves Georges Prade, head of redaction at *L'Officiel de la Couture et de la Mode*, a luxury magazine that represented haute couture on domestic and international markets, started campaigning for the safeguarding of French industries. Prade was a staunch advocate of the French luxury business, and a pen for *L'Officiel*. A connoisseur of fine wine, and automobiles, Prade thought that haute couture was a product of terroir to be preserved and protected from copying. However, the simplification of designs by firms not engaged in haute couture was a source of concern to Prade. This journalist campaigned for the French automobile industry in *L'Officiel*: 'that standard taste of Detroit is not the norm in Paris',[46] and alerted the public to the threat posed to French automobile brands by the craze for American cars. Prade expressed similar sentiments for haute couture.

In June 1929, Prade, who was a Conservative, had almost attained the age of political majority (25 years), which allowed him to be elected. Prade campaigned in the fourteenth arrondissement, and became the youngest *conseiller municipal* in France, when he was elected *conseiller municipal* of Paris, and *conseiller général* of the Department of the Seine. The couture profession welcomed his election as a significant step in the defence of luxury industries because it expected Prade to be a major propagandist.[47] Prade encouraged domestic citizens to buy French cars[48]and fostered the development of glittering competitions at which famous Parisians and international socialites displayed their motor cars while wearing the latest designs in haute couture, and millinery. In November 1929, Prade published a flattering portrait of entrepreneur, Louis Renault, which saluted his, 'admirable offensive' towards US automobile production. Prade also urged the female readership of *L'Officiel* to resist the appeal of mass-produced motorcars: to be consistent in their preferences, such readers, who preferred their shoes to be made-to-measure, should buy personalized French automobiles.[49] In 1933, *L'Officiel* created the *Coupe des Dames* (Ladies Cup), for the Monte Carlo rally, which gathered the elite of the European and American automobile industries.[50]

During the Great Depression, Prade recognized the importance of invisible exports and called for the rescue of tourism in France.[51] Prade also worked on initiatives such as the *Grande Semaine* of Paris, a week in June dedicated to various festivities, which attracted an international crowd of socialites to horse races, motorcar shows, and elegance competitions.[52] In the summer of 1930, Prade visited the US with trips to Niagara Falls, Detroit, Chicago, Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, and New York. He had recently read books by Paul Morand, enthusiast Americanophile, and future biographer of Chanel, and Georges Duhamel, author of *Scènes de la vie future*, an essay that became one of the first anti-American manifestos. For Prade, Duhamel, 'enjoyed himself suffering like a French genius whose habits have been overturned.'[53] Prade was won over by America, especially New York, but did not mention the Depression. Citing figures at length to demonstrate American gigantism to his French readership, he added that 'presently America has three masters: Costes, Maurice Chevalier, and the Chic Parisien'.[54] Prade claimed that Americans were discovering individual creativity, taste, virtuosity, and artistic and aesthetic sense in France, and that Made in Paris was admired as a brand. Throughout the US, he argued that couture and millinery were unmistakably identified as French.

While in the US, Prade witnessed the effects of counterfeiting and imitation, and commented:

> this advertisement which, the day before my departure, was announcing in a popular store, *the success dress of Augustabernard for 30 dollars, the famous Agnès beret for 8,5 dollars*. Such prices … show well that the most modest customer also demands a little bit of the French taste. As his purchasing power is important, one seeks to give him satisfaction, sometimes even

> in cheating him, and I have seen designs audaciously baptized with the name of our major brands, which would make our Parisian masters ebullient with indignation.[55]

According to Prade, 'Paris' dresses were everywhere in New York, and they included cheap, knock-off garments in lower-end department stores, in addition to high-end, quality designs, legally imported from France by luxury enterprises which included Saks-Fifth Avenue.

After this outburst, Prade became more critical of counterfeiting. In February 1931, he commented on the successful protection of the French automobile industry from American competition, which followed an initiative by Louis Renault. Prade feared that US manufacturers might overtake the French fashion industry: the former were becoming more independent of Paris, and they had launched a systematic propaganda campaign against French prestige. Essentially, US companies were using Paris haute couture as a creative office; they purchased designs for reproduction on a mass scale and reaped the fruits of French creativity. According to Prade, the consequences of this American activity were that the brands belonging to haute couture houses were tarnished, and there was a general decline in French creativity. The solution to this problem was to respond to the manner in which US manufacturers conducted their business.[56]

Labels of origins: towards a clearer policy in the 1940s

During the 1920s, the majority of cases heard in the Paris small crimes court concerning authenticity involved alcoholic beverages. Additionally, there were a number of lawsuits for counterfeiting in the fashion industry, especially the lawsuits waged by members of the Chambre Syndicale de la Couture Parisienne, to which could be added the occasional non-member, such as Chanel.[57] However, the protection of Made in France or Made in Paris did not feature in these cases. Nonetheless, examination of these small crimes court cases shows that entrepreneurs in all industries sought to protect their intellectual property against substitute products. It was during this decade that defending authenticity became more prominent in French society.[58]

Most couturiers continued to produce only in Paris. In 1943, decisive legislation was introduced by the Vichy regime to protect the term *haute couture* from unauthorized use. This staute also prohibited the use of associated symbols, or similar brand names, such as representations of the Eiffel tower, or *Paris couture*, respectively. Potentially, this legislation was important to the French haute couture profession. However, the archives of the Chambre Syndicale are inconclusive as to why this legislation – which became effective only in 1947 – was introduced during this decade. It is also debatable whether this legislation was enforceable. From a different perspective, French protection of its haute couture needs to be considered in a broader context: this industry was isolated from the international market during the German

occupation of France. As far as we can determine from the archives, the 1943 legislation was used to protect the French haute couture trade.[59]

After 1945, the production of luxury goods was revitalized. There was increased recognition that French manufacture of these products was characterized by tacit knowledge which generated artefacts of substantial value, and benefitted employment, both of which were important in the reconstruction period. This belief was very old: it echoed the defence of luxury goods proposed in eighteenth-century writings, including that of Bernard Mandeville in *Fable of the bees*, a satire describing the social goods that vices bring somehow inadvertently to society, notably by way of the luxuries in which criminals may indulge. France had to endure considerable hardship during the immediate post-1945 era. Nonetheless, as Claude Rouzaud argued, craftsmanship allowed France to add high value to its limited raw materials; this, in turn, would accelerate French growth in subsequent decades.[60]

De-localization and re-localization

France continued to develop its high reputation in the manufacture of luxury goods in the postwar era. A pertinent question that arose was the extent to which Made in France, or equivalent indicia mattered to the strategies of firms in this industry. As previously discussed, during the interwar period, the majority of French entrepreneurs believed that the production of luxury goods had to remain in France. But how did this belief change in the post-1970 era – the last phase of globalization? Would the association between quality and France remain intact if there was a partial or complete relocation of production to another country?[61]

For wines and many foodstuffs, the strict enforcement of appellations d'origine contrôlée, means that relocation of production is impossible. For some foods, though, such as Gruyère cheese, origin remains contested.[62] The answer to the previous question is far less certain for perfumes, couture garments, couture designer ready-to-wear, and accessories. For the latter products, two interrelated issues need to be considered. First, large luxury firms have invested considerable sums overseas in the training of craftsmen who are becoming increasingly adept in the production of high-quality products. This investment, complemented by growing international technology transfer, meant that the benefits from relocation were likely to grow. Second, as the international demand for French luxury goods increased, it was expected that production would relocate to satisfy such markets. Rarity would still play a role in the definition of luxury, but the precise origins of this characteristic could change. In a milestone study on luxury, management experts, Vincent Bastien and Jean-Noël Kapferer, suggested that a product was no longer a luxury product if its production was relocated. Instead, such a product should be classified as a 'simple premium product'.[63]

The legend 'Made in' has struggled to reconcile the competing demands of national prestige and the increased complexity of global value chains.

Consequently, 'Made in' has fragmented to indicate either, place of production, or place of design, or source of raw material. Made in France indicates that products received their last substantial transformation in France. This legend continues to be important to French producers of luxury goods: the organization Comité Colbert, which was established in 1954, promotes luxury products, and its members export 80% of their production.[64]

In recent decades, the government was preoccupied with the current state, and likely future of Made in France. In the 1990s, Dominique Taddéi and Benjamin Coriat provided an analysis of Made in France within the context of global competition. Their research was funded by the French government which sought to define and measure the impact of *Made in France* on the French economy.[65] According to Taddei and Coriat, the aftermath of the 1970s oil shock, the advent of the last phase of globalization, and the challenge of remaining competitive justified the need to assess the importance of Made in France. Taddei and Coriat reiterated current debates on competition: the world had become dangerous ("*le monde est devenu dangereux*"), in the authors' italics.[66] Ultimately, the objective of improved competitiveness was to maintain high levels of employment.[67] Consumer demand for high-quality products was another factor advanced by the authors to justify the use of country-of-origin labels.[68]

Currently, debates on Made in France share common features with debates in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Rather than buying imports which results in an outflow of currency, contemporary debates emphasize the benefits of relocating manufacturing to France to foster reindustrialization. During the 1990s and 2000s, improved transportation and access to a cheaper overseas workforce led to offshoring by many French firms.[69] The Covid-19 pandemic has partly offset this trend: fear of shortages attracted the attention of consumers, industrialists, and the government. Since the 1980s, regions in the East and North of France have not benefitted from plans to reignite the economy. Imported counterfeit articles and substitutes of poorer quality have been the subject of considerable critical commentary.[70] The tendency to retract the provenance of such products has been influenced by nationalism fuelled by the economic and social crisis that has been endemic since the late 1970s. Within the framework of the last phase of globalization, there have been growing demands for a redefinition of Made in France.[71]

The above trends have resulted in subterfuge: labelling a product 'designed in France' may mislead consumers by creating the impression that the article was manufactured entirely in France. To address such problems, new labels have been developed. Thus, the logo *France terre textile* provides several guarantees: at least 75% of the manufacturing occurs in the five 'cradles' of the French textile industry. Certified firms may use the mark 'Berceaux Textiles Français' (AGR), This logo also certifies a high level of quality, and that production is environmentally friendly. Products with this label are subject to random inspection, and they must be declared on the platform of traceability *EColTex-TerreTextile*.[72]

Similarly, the certification trade mark, Origine France Garantie, was created in 2010 following a report by Yves Jégo on the brand 'France'.[73] This trade mark differs from similar marks, such as Made in France, 'conçu en France', and 'Fabriqué en France', because the latter are self-declared by the producer. Origine France Garantie certifies the French origin of a product. It may be applied to any product, and the right to use this mark is subject to independent verification. To obtain certification, applicants must satisfy two cumulative criteria. First, no less than 50% of the unit production price must occur within France. One consequence of this requirement is that Made in France became synonymous with re-territorialization. The second criterion is to determine whether workers with specific know-how will be available and, if so, if they will accept work in the certified factory. Funding schools to provide education in handwork and the new technologies is essential to this phase; but it is also challenging considering that the division of labour can suffer from a negative cultural image.[74]

Conclusion

This chapter has argued that France's image did not depend solely on Made in France. The protection of country-of-origins in France appears to be an on-going which sometimes generates heated political and economic debates. Numerous economists, politicians, and groups of entrepreneurs have for a long time advocated a reinforcement of 'Made in France', especially for exported products.

The only French products that have been effectively and continuously protected are appellations, for which it is not possible to de-couple product and place. In France, the terroir, or the regional denomination of origin appears as a protective mechanism that also had the effect of reinforcing the identity and presence of the nation on international markets. Yet, the growth of licensing arrangements enabled numerous luxury products, including haute couture, to be successfully off-shored, which also contributed, indirectly, to the prosperity of the French economy.

Currently, *official* promotion of Made in France is illegal under European Union trade rules. In contrast, GIs for food and alcoholic beverages have been accepted for over 100 years.[75] But such indications are founded on the region, not the nation. This distinction is particularly apposite for France: ever since Napoleon Bonaparte, French history was characterized by the centralization of institutions, government, and power in Paris, and, therefore, the erasure of regional languages and dialects in favour of a unified version of the French language. While dialects and regional languages were forbidden in the Nation's schools, terroir became the legal basis for the defence of French wines and foods throughout the world.

Can consumers realistically pay for products marked Made in France? The relocation of some luxury goods production to Southeast Asia led to a decline in retail prices. Moreover, social and environmental laws in Western Europe

are much more demanding than those in developing countries. In the current economic crisis, few consumers can afford an increase in price. Moreover, if the supply of products labelled Made in France did not increase, it might signal a new divergence between the rich and poor. Some economists, inspired by David Ricardo and Milton Friedman, believe that the solution is to lower employers' charges and free up labour.[76] However, it has been widely demonstrated during the numerous crises of the last 40 years, that free labour is linked to forced labour.

Notes

1 This chapter is part of two projects that have received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme: Creative IPR: The History of Intellectual Property Rights in the Creative Industries, ERC CoG Grant agreement No. 818523, and MISS: Made In SweatShops, Marie Skłodowska-Curie Grant agreement No. 101024003.
2 Guy, *When Champagne*; Vabre, *Le sacre du Roquefort*; Stanziani, *Rules*.
3 Joubert de l'Hiberderie, *Le dessinateur pour les fabriques*. Leroudier, 'Les dessinateurs', 1908, pp. 13–31 and *Les Cahiers d'Étienne Benoit*, 1930.
4 Miller, 'Designers', p. 1.
5 Blanc-Subes, 'Le marché', p. 16.
6 *Mercure de France*, 1 January, 1775, p. 204.
7 In 1770, Bertin opened her first hats shop under the brand "Le Grand Mogol", in the rue du Faubourg-Saint-Honoré, in Paris. Her creativity and her sense of business helped her develop the firm very fast, soon employing 30 people and working with 120 suppliers. Her clientele was solely aristocratic. Sapori, *Rose Bertin*, pp. 112–127.
8 Sougy, 'La Fabrique'. Another popular cliché still alive influences the studies: some believe that Paris, capital of luxury and good taste, was born at the end of the nineteenth century, and more precisely with the installation in 1858, rue de la Paix, Charles Frederick Worth (1825–1895), English, "inventor of haute couture. Fashion historians make it the date of the birth of haute-couture. What is the difference between the milliner and the designer? The first would not be a force of proposal, while the second would impose his style, the right tone, the good taste to his customers. It is hard to believe in this opposition which minimizes the work of the milliner and transforms the couturier into a dictator. Krick, 'Charles Frederick Worth', http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/wrth/hd_wrth.html; Cole, 'Patrimoine'; Zajtmann, "L'organisation'.
9 Jacqué, *De la manufacture*, p. 68.
10 Musée du Papier Peint, Rixheim, France, Zuber, Z 108, 28 prairial an VIII (17 juin 1800); 14 vendémiaire an VIII (6 Octobre 1799); Jacqué, *De la manufacture*, pp. 66, 69.
11 Bibliothèque Municipale de Colmar, France, Henri Lebert, Journal, vol. 2, 13 avril 1813 et vol. 4, 10 novembre 1818; Millet, *Vie et destin*.
12 Balzac, *Traité de la vie élégante*, p. 56.
13 Musée du Papier Peint, Rixheim, France, Zuber, Z 108, 4 complémentaire an VIII (21 septembre 1800); Jacqué, *De la manufacture*, p. 69.
14 P. Minard, *La fortune du colbertisme: état et industrie dans la France des Lumières*.
15 Millet, 'La manufacture'.
16 Millet, 'Transmettre', pp. 273–284.

17 Becker, *Les mondes*, p. 49; Hilaire-Pérez, *La pièce et le geste*.
18 Celina Fox has shown that there was an attempt to separate the two distinct spheres from the seventeenth century onwards, but this was above all intellectual and corresponded to academic discourse that did not reveal much about practices. Fox, *The Arts*.
19 V. Pouillard, 'Intellectual property rights and country-of-origin labels', p. 403.
20 V. Pouillard, "Intellectual property rights and country-of-origin labels,", p. 403.
21 The imposition of the brand of the manufacture is imposed well before that of the designer. The artist or draftsman imposes his signature when the art market takes off. It was not until the end of the nineteenth century that drawings were systematically signed.
22 Such products, just as the ceramics manufactured by Josiah Wedgwood, however remained costly.
23 Millet, 'La manufacture'. Roche, *Histoire*.
24 Archives de la Manufacture de Sèvres, Sèvres, France, U 4, dépôts de vente, liasses 1–4 (Magasin de Paris rue Grammont, 1815; Pérès, Jamas, Irlande et Cie, 1816–1817; Dépôt rue Sainte Anne, 1817; Projet de dépôt au Bengale, 1827; Dépôt rue de Rivoli, Paris, 1828–1840; chez M. Bury, 1848–1849; Dépôt rue d'Enfer n°7, 1848–1853; Dépôt Sallandrouze à Londres, 1849–1853, n°2 rue Voltaire, Paris, 1853–1857.
25 de Montesquieu, *De l'esprit*, pp. 341–345; Berg and Eger, *Luxury*; Berg, *Luxury & Pleasure*.
26 Blanc and Beaumont, *Code General*.
27 J.-F. de Saint-Lambert, 'Luxe', in D. Diderot, J. Le Rond D'Alembert, *Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers*, 1751, t. IX, p. 763. Maxine Berg and Hélène Clifford have also shown that imitations were not demi-luxe replicas of the originals. Berg, 'New commodities', pp. 63–87.
28 Grenier, 'Une économie'; Millet, 'la manufacture'.
29 Archives de la Manufacture de Sèvres, Sèvres, France, Vase en forme fuseau, cartel peint par Swebach : Passage du Mont Saint Bernard, fond brun, décor camaïeu d'or, Swebach Jacques François Joseph (1769–1823), 1806, porcelaine, manufacture Caron et Lefebvre (1806–1812). AMS, Oa 1, 1800–1815, État des personnes attachées à la manufacture nationale de Porcelaine de Sèvres ou employées momentanément en l'an X, en l'an XII, en l'an XI, en 1806, en 1810.
30 Slitine, *Samson*.
31 Guillerme and Sebestik, *Les commencements*, pp. 92–93; Vérin, 'La technologie', pp.137–139; Beckman, *Entwurf ;* Dieterich, cited in Hilaire-Pérez, *La* pièce, p. 12.
32 Pouillard, *Paris*, pp. 22–42.
33 Simon, *Monographie*; Grumbach, *Histoires*.
34 Maillet, *Histoire*; Blaczszyk and Wubs, *The Fashion*.
35 For a recent discussion of the *UNIS* trade mark, see Higgins, *Brands*, pp. 49–52.
36 This topic was addressed in Saillard, *Mode d'Ici*.
37 Grumbach, *Histoires*.
38 de Tarde, *Les lois*.
39 Schweitzer, 'American fashion', pp. 130–149.
40 Troy, *Couture Culture*.
41 Pouillard, *Paris*, pp. 33–40.
42 Troy, *Couture Culture*.
43 Grumbach, *Histoires*; Green, *Ready-to-Wear*; Pouillard, 'Managing fashion'.
44 Pouillard, *Paris*, pp. 110–112.
45 Dubé-Sénécal, *La mode francaise*, pp. 249–261.
46 *L'Officiel*, 87, 15 November 1928, p. 9.
47 *L'Officiel*, 94, 15 June 1929, p. 13; 15 November 1928, p. 9.

48 *L'Officiel*, 95, 15 July 1929, pp. 11–15.
49 *L'Officiel*, 99, 15 November 1929, p. 17.
50 *L'Officiel*, 142, 15 June 1933, pp. 19–20.
51 *L'Officiel*, 105, 15 May 1930, pp. 13–15.
52 *L'Officiel*, 108, 15 August 1930, p. 11.
53 *L'Officiel*, 110, 15 October 1930, pp. 11–12.
54 *L'Officiel*, 110, 15 October 1930, pp. 11–12.
55 *L'Officiel*, 110, 15 October 1930, pp. 11–12.
56 *L'Officiel*, 114, 15 February 1931, p. 15.
57 Pouillard, *Paris*, pp. 49–57.
58 Green, *Ready-to-Wear*; Green, *The Limits*; Pouillard, *Paris*, chapter 2.
59 Chambre Syndicale de la Couture Parisienne archives, Compte-rendu de la réunion du Comité de la Chambre Syndicale de la Couture Parisienne, 13 May 1945, p. 10; and General Assembly, report, year 1959, pp. 3–4. Also, see Pouillard, *Paris*, p. 186.
60 Rouzaud, *Un problème*; Mandeville, *La fable*.
61 Koromyslov, 'Le Made in France'.
62 Jenny Gross, 'Is Gruyère still Gruyère if it doesn't come from Gruyères?', *New York Times*, 12 January 2022, Is Gruyère Still Gruyère if It Doesn't Come From Gruyères? – *The New York Times* (nytimes.com). Accessed 15 January 2022.
63 Bastien and Kapferer, *Luxe Oblige*, p. 226.
64 Koromyslov, 'Le Made in France', p. 111; p. 119; 'Marquage d'origine pour les produits industriels', *Bulletin de l'office des douanes*, numéro 6567, 'Protection de l'origine française' (8 March 2003).
65 Taddéi and Coriat, *Made in France*, p. 10.
66 Taddéi and Coriat, *Made in France*, p. 11.
67 Taddéi and Coriat, *Made in France*, p. 14; Stanziani, *Rules*.
68 Taddéi and Coriat, *Made in France*.
69 Millet, *Le livre,* pp. 62–63, 188; Hoskins, *Stitched Up*, pp. 79–80.
70 Courtecuisse, *Réindustrialiser*.
71 'Made in' must be analyzed in the context of European lobbies. Van Schendelen, *More Machiavelli*.
72 http://www.franceterretextile.fr/dossier-de-presse-terre-textile/
73 Y. Jégo, *En finir avec la mondialisation anonyme. La traçabilité au service des consommateurs et de l'emploi*, Rapport public, République Française: 2010. https://www.vie-publique.fr/rapport/31065-en-finir-avec-la-mondialisation-anonyme-la-tracabilite-au-service-des.
74 Birnbaum, *Source-it*; Jégo, *En finir*; Banaji, *Theory*.
75 https://www.euractiv.fr/section/elections/news/le-made-in-france-peu-efficace-et-anti-europeen/
76 Ricardo, *Des principes*; Friedman, *Capitalis*m.

Bibliography

Banaji, J., *Theory as History: Essays on Modes of Production and Exploitation*. Leiden and Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2010.

Bastien, V., and Kapferer, J.N., *Luxe Oblige*. Paris: Eyrolles, 2008.

Becker, H., *Les mondes de l'art*. Paris: Flammarion, 2006.

Berg, M., 'New commodities, luxuries and their consumers', in Berg, M., and Clifford, H. (eds), *Consumers and Luxury: Consumer Culture in Europe, 1650–1850*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999, pp. 63–87.

Berg, M., and Eger, E. (eds), *Luxury in the Eighteenth Century: Debates, Desires and Delectable Goods*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Berg, M., *Luxury & Pleasure in Eighteenth-Century Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Bergeron, L., *Les industries du luxe en France*. Paris: Odile Jacob, 1998.

Birnbaum, D., *Source-it. Global Material Sourcing for the Clothing Industry*. Genève: International Trade Centre, UNCTAD/WTO, 2005.

Blaczszyk, R.L., and Wubs, B., *The Fashion Forecasters: A Hidden History of Color and Trend Prediction*. London: Bloomsbury, 2018.

Blanc, E., and Beaumont, A., *Code général de la propriété industrielle littéraire et artistique comprenant les législations de tout le pays et les traités internationaux*. Paris: Imprimerie et Librairie générale de la jurisprudence, 1854.

Blanc-Subes, F., Le marché du papier peint à Bordeaux à la fin du XVIIIe siècle. *Le port des Lumières*, Bordeaux: MAD, 1989.

Cole, D.J., 'Patrimoine et innovation: Charles Frederick Worth, John Redfern ou la naissance de la mode modern', *Mode de recherche*, Centre de recherche Institut français de la mode: June 2011, https://d2mulcrgfv1yq5.cloudfront.net/documents/Patrimoine-et-innovation-D-J-Cole-juin-2011.pdf?mtime=20181024093800&focal=none.

Courtecuisse, M., *Réindustrialiser c'est possible!* Paris: Belin, 2020.

Dubé-Sénécal, V., *La mode francaise. Vecteur d'influence aux Etats-Unis (1946–1960)*. Laval: Presses de l'Université Laval, 2020.

Fox, C., *The Arts of Industry in the Age of Enlightenment*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010.

Friedman, M., *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Green, N., *Ready-to-Wear and Ready-to-Work: A Century of Industry and Immigrants in Paris and New York*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997.

Green, N., *The Limits of Transnationalism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2019.

Grenier, J.-Y., 'Une économie de l'identification : Juste prix et ordre des marchandises dans l'Ancien Régime', in Stanziani, A. (ed.), *La qualité des produits en France (XVIIIe-XXe siècles)*, Paris: Belin, 2003, pp. 25–53.

Grumbach, D., *Histoires de la mode*. Paris: Editions du Regard, 2008.

Guillerme, J., and Sebestik, J., *Les commencements de la technologie*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1966.

de L'Hiberderie, J., *Le dessinateur pour les fabriques d'étoffes d'or, d'argent et de soie*. Paris: Sébastien Jorry, 1765.

Higgins, D.M., *Brands, Geographical Origin, and the Global Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Hilaire-Pérez, L., *La pièce et le geste: artisans, marchands et savoir technique à Londres au XVIIIe siècle*. Paris: Albin-Michel, 2013.

Hoskins, T.E., *Stitched Up: The Anti-Capitalist Book of Fashion*. London: Pluto Press, 2014.

Jacqué, B., De la manufacture au mur: pour une histoire matérielle du papier peint (1770–1914). Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Lyon 2, 2003.

Koromyslov, M., 'Le Made in France en questions: Pratiques et opinions des professionnels francais du luxe', *Revue francaise de gestion*, 19 (2011), pp. 107–122.

'Marquage d'origine pour les produits industriels', *Bulletin de l'office des douanes*, numéro 6567, Protection de l'origine française (8 March 2003).

Leroudier, E., 'Les dessinateurs de la fabrique lyonnaise au XVIIIe siècle', *Revue de l'histoire de Lyon*, 1908, pp. 13–31.

Leroudier, E., *Les Cahiers d'Étienne Benoit (1761–1771): Livre de Raison d'un Dessinateur de la Fabrique lyonnaise*. Lyon: M. Camus et Carnet, 1930.

Maillet, T., *Histoire de la médiation entre textile et mode en France: des échantillonneurs aux bureaux de style (1825–1875)*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Paris, EHESS, 2013.

Mandeville, B., *La fable des abeilles, première partie*. Paris: Vrin, 2007.

Miller, L., *Designers in the Lyon Silk Industry, 1712–1787*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Brighton Polytechnic, 1988.

Millet, A., 'La manufacture de Sèvres ou les stratégies de l'imitation: Entre acquisition d'un savoir-faire et marqueur d'identité (18e-19e siècles)', *Entreprises et histoire*, 1 (2015), pp. 36–48.

Millet, A., 'Transmettre le dessin de fabrique: Matérialité et immatérialité du livre technique en manufacture (18e-19e siècles)', in Hilaire-Pérez, L., Nègre, V., Spicq, D., and Vermeir, K. (eds), *Le livre et les techniques avant le 20e siècle. À l'échelle du monde*, Paris: CNRS Éd., 2016, pp. 273–284.

Millet, A., *Vie et destin d'un dessinateur textile, d'après le Journal d'Henri Lebert, 1794–1862*. Seyssel: Champ Vallon, 2018.

Millet, A., *Le livre noir de la mode: Création, production, manipulation*. Paris: Les Pérégrines, 2020.

Minard, P., *La fortune du colbertisme: état et industrie dans la France des Lumières*. Paris: Fayard, 2014.

de Montesquieu, C., *De l'esprit des lois*. Geneva: Barillot & Fils, 1748.

Pouillard, V., 'Managing fashion creativity. the history of the Chambre Syndicale de la Couture Parisienne during the interwar period', *Investigaciones de Historia Economica/Economic History Research*, 12 (2016), pp. 76–89.

Pouillard, V., 'Intellectual property rights and country-of-origin labels in the luxury industry', in Pierre-Yves, D., Pouillard, V., and Roberts, J. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Luxury Business*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020, p. 403.

Pouillard, V., *Paris to New York: The Transatlantic Fashion Industry in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2021.

Ricardo, D., *Des principes de l'économie politique et de l'impôt*. London: John Murray, 1817.

Roche, D., *Histoire des choses banales: naissance de la consommation dans les sociétés traditionnelles, XVIIe-XIXe siècle*. Paris: Fayard, 1997.

Rouzaud, C., *Un problème d'intérêt national: les industries du luxe*. Strasbourg: Librarie du Recueil Sirey, 1946.

Saillard, O., *Mode d'Ici, Créateurs d'ailleurs*. Paris: Flammarion, 2014.

Sapori, M., *Rose Bertin, la couturière de Marie Antoinette*. Paris: Perrin, 2010.

Schendelen, R.V., *More Machiavelli in Brussels: The Art of Lobbying the EU*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2013.

Schweitzer, M., 'American fashion for American women: the rise and fall of fashion nationalism', in Blaszczyk, R.L. (ed.), *Producing Fashion: Commerce, Culture and Consumers*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2008, pp. 130–149.

Simon, P., *Monographie d'une industrie de luxe: la haute couture*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1931.

Slitine, F., *Samson, génie de l'imitation*. Paris: Massin, 2002.

Sougy, N., 'La Fabrique de Paris au XIXe siècle. Qualités de produits et formation des fabricants', in Lembré, S., and Millet, A. (eds), *Entre art et industrie: les enjeux*

de la formation technique. XVIIIe-XXe siècles. Artefact. *Techniques, histoire & sciences humaines*, 2 (2014), pp. 89–100.

Stanziani, A., *Rules of Exchange: French Capitalism in Comparative Perspective, Eighteenth to Early Twentieth Centuries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

Taddéi, D., and Coriat, B., *Made in France: l'industrie francaise dans la compétition mondiale*. Paris: Libraire Générale française, 1993.

de Tarde, G., *Les lois de l'imitation*. Paris: F. Alcan, 1890.

Troy, N., *Couture Culture. A Study in Modern Art and Fashion*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2003.

Vabre, S., *Le sacre du Roquefort. L'émergence d'une industrie agro-alimentaire*. Tours: Presses Universitaires Francois-Rabelais, 2015.

Vérin, H., 'La technologie: science autonome ou science intermédiaire', *Documents pour l'histoire des techniques*, actes de la journée d'études doctorales en histoire des techniques, n°14, (2007), pp. 134–143.

Zajtmann, D., 'L'organisation professionnelle comme source de légitimité. Le cas de la Fédération de la couture, du prêt-à-porter des couturiers et des créateurs de mode', *Mode de recherche*, Centre de recherche Institut français de la mode, 11 (2011), https://d2mulcrgfv1yq5.cloudfront.net/documents/Lorganisation-professionnelle-D-Zajtmann-juin-2011.pdf?mtime=20181024093031&focal=none.