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## Introduction*

For some time, our group has been studying patterns of conflict in western European countries over the last few centuries. In very general terms, we have been trying to learn how large-scale changes such as industrialization and statemaking affect the capacity and propensity for collective action of different segments of the populations affected by those changes. In our view, conflict is simply one aspect of collective action: to varying degrees, the pursuit of common goals of one group hampers the pursuit of common goals by other groups. We have been concentrating our attention on relatively visible forms of conflict in hopes of keeping the research manageable, yet of shedding light on the alteration of a wide range of collective action in the course of large-scale social change.

Up to the present, our most substantial analyses have dealt with strikes and with collective violence in Italy, Germany and, especially, France for varying intervals between 1830 and 1968. In those cases, we have generally attempted a uniform, comprehensive enumeration and description of events meeting our criteria in the entire country over some substantial block of time. That included, for example, an analysis of the roughly 36,000 individual strikes reported in the French Statistique des Greves from 1890 through 1935. In those countries, we have also undertaken detailed studies of some particular events, period, places and/or populations -- for in-

* We are grateful to Sam Cohn, Carol Conell, Chris Lord, Mike Polen and Emilie Schmeidler for advice. The National Science Foundation is supporting the research described here.
stance, a close look at the Parisian insurrection of June, 1848. In some of those cases we have examined forms of collective action other than strikes and violent encounters; that includes such efforts as an attempt to trace the emergence of the demonstration as a form of action. Finally, some members of the group have studied similar phenomena in North America, Scandinavia and Great Britain.

Our newest large effort is a study of conflicts in Great Britain from 1828 thrọugh 1833. We have several different incentives for undertaking the new analysis. First, our analyses of violent events in Italy, German and France appeared to confirm our supposition that the violence was on the whole the by-product of the intervention of further interested parties in actions which were not intrinsically violent and which occurred frequentIy without significant violence. In particular, we were interested in the frequency with which the violence began with the intervention of troops, police and other specialized repressive forces. Since the only nonviolent events of which we had made large, systematic enumerations for some of the same periods and places were strikes, however, we did not have the evidence to look closely at that relationship between nonviolent and violent collective actions.

Second, it seemed worth making a sustained comparison between patterns of conflict in nineteenth-century Britain and those we had found on the Continent. Students of modern Europe often think of nineteenth-century Britain's experience as a kind of success story -- at least in "avoiding" the revolutions which occurred in France, Germany, Italy and elsewhere. A close study of conflicts in Britain should give us the means to rethink that question. More important, it should provide firmer ground for choosing among obvious alternative explanations of the differences between Britain and the continent: that Britain had fewer of the kinds of people who made
nineteenth-century revolutions and rebellions, that the most likely rebels had fewer grievances, that repression was more effective in Britain, and so on.

Our original hope was to examine the changing patterns of conflict in Britain throughout the nineteenth century. With a wide range of nonviolent events to consider, however, that would have required an enormous effort -- many times the already formidable effort per year in our studies of France and Germany. After some preliminary enumerations in scattered years from the end of the eighteenth century to the end of the nineteenth, we narrowed our attention to $1828-1833$. That period recommends itself for several reasons. First, it was a time of major movements, conflicts and collective actions: Catholic Emancipation, Reform agitation, industrial conflict, the attack on select vestries, and the great agrarian rebellions of 1830. Second, there exist excellent historical studies of some of the period's conflicts -- for example, Captain Swing, by E.J. Hobsbawm and George Rudé -- with whïch we can compare our own results. Third, we have some reason to believe that the period acted as an historical pivot in something like the same way that the revolutions of 1848. did in France and Germany: marking, and perhaps producing, a shift from reactive to proactive, from "backward-looking" to "forward-looking" collective action on the part of ordinary people.

In that period, we are attempting to enumerate, describe and analyze a large share of all the "contentious gatherings" which occurred in England, Scotland and Wales. Roughly speaking, a contentious gathering is an occasion in which ten or more persons outside the government gather in the same place and make a visible claim which, if realized, would affect the interests of some specific person(s) or group(s) outside their own number. In principle, these gatherings include just about all the events covered
in our earlier enumerations of strikes and collective violence. They also include a great many other events: demonstrations, petition meetings, delegations, group poaching, and plenty of others. Drawing the boundaries both generously and consistently is a delicate and laborious task.

We are still adjusting the procedures for that task. After doing a trial enumeration and summary coding of some events from 1830 , we did a preliminary scanning of thirty randomly selected ten-day blocks from the entire six-year period, then proceeded to enumerate systematically from the beginning of 1828. We have completed the preliminary enumeration of 1828. We find the events via a complete issue-by-issue reading of the Morning Chronicle, the Times, Gentlemen's Magazine, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Mirror of Parliament and the Annual Register. Once the events are enumerated, we plan to look for more information about them in the papers of the Home Office (of which we have already built up substantial selections via photocopy and microfilm), in other periodicals, and in secondary historical works. We are still making plans for coding of the information in machine-readable form. The file for the six-year period will probably describe on the order of 25,000 events.

We are also slowly making plans for the collection of data on the populations and areas "at risk" to contentious gatherings. The units of observation will certainly include all counties of England, Scotland and Wales. They, will probably include complete sets of hundreds of parishes within selected counties. If possible, they will also include particular populations of potential actors -- for example, the handloom weavers of Lancashire and the agricultural laborers of Leicestershire. Ultimately the choice of units and of kinds of data concerning those units will result from a compromise between the arguments we are seeking to test and the costs of getting the relevant evidence.

Figure 1 provides a simplified sketch of this study's theoretical agenda. It states the problem as the short-run explanation of the extent of a single actor's collective action. Here are the definitions of the elements:
interests: the shared advantages or disadvantages likely to accrue to the population in question as a consequence of various possible interactions with other populations.
organization: the extent of common identity and unifying structure among the individuals in the population.
mobilization: the extent of resources under the collective control of the actor.
power: the extent to which the outcomes of the actor's interactions with other actors favor its interests over those of the others. repression: the costs of collective action to the actor resulting from interaction with other groups. Facilitation consists of other groups' provision of incentives to act.
opportunity/threat: the extent to which other groups are either a) vulnerable to new claims which would, if successful, enhance the actor's realization of its interests or $b$ ) threatening to make claims which would, if successful, reduce the actor's realization of its interests.
collective action: the extent of a contender's joint action in pursuit of common ends.

Figure 1 states the broad argument that the actor's current level of col-

Figure 1. A Sketch of the Theoretical Agenda

lective action is mainly a function of its mobilization level, of the combination of opportunities and threats it faces, and of its power position. It states, among other things, that interest does not translate directly into collective action, but operates through its effect on group organization, mobilization, and subjection to repression and facilitation, as well as being filtered through the current configuration of opportunity and threat. All this may be obvious. But it breaks with a large part of the social science literature on "collective behavior", "protest" and "disorder". A major task in our study of Great Britain is to specify, refine and model these relationships.

Figure 2 presents a simple hypothesis concerning the usual distribution of governmental repression, facilitation and toleration (toleration $=$ the absence of either repression or facilitation) as a function of the scale of collective action and the power of the group involved. It says that very weak groups have a range of smaller-scale actions open to them, will find themselves repressed if they exceed a certain scale, and never receive governmental facilitation for their collective action. Somewhat more powerful groups, according to this hypothesis, will be repressed for almost any collective action beyond a very small scale, but will still receive no facilitation. Beyond some critical point in group power, the extent of facilitation for smaller-scale actions increased as the extent of repression for large-scale actions declines. At the extreme, the group is the government or controls the government; there, all its collective actions are facilitated and none repressed. Two tasks of the study of Great Britain are to determine whether something like this general set of relationships does obtain, and to state how it varies with the current organization or political position of the government.

We are particularly interested in exploring a series of related prob-

1. What determines the extent to which governments repress or facilitate a given category of collective actions? Even if the diagram is correct in suggesting that the scale of the action is inversely related to its acceptability, other factors clearly matter. We witness the legalization of the strike during the nineteenth century in most western countries, but generally much later than the legalization of electoral gatherings of similar or larger size.
2. To what extent, and under what conditions, does the toleration or facilitation of a given type of action by a particular group diminish the likelihood that other groups will be punished for that same type of action? It appears, for example, that the British government's toleration of the Catholic Association during the 1820 s made it easier for other non-Catholic groups to form associations and use them politically.
3. Is it true, as it seems to be, that for any particular period and set of interacting populations, the forms of collective action tend to fall into a few relatively well-defined routines -- what we might call a repertoire of collective action? The repertoire of Europen workers in the nineteenth century, for example, commonly included the blacklist, the turnout of a single shop, the petitioning of authorities, the threat to destroy equipment and a few other forms of action, but not the sit-down strike, the demonstration, and so on. If so, why? If so, how and why does the repertoire change?
4. Is it not true that governmental repression and facilitation play a major part in the choice among forms of action which are in the reper-

## Figure 2:

HYPOTHETICAL DISTRIBUTION OF GOVERNMENTAL REPRESSION AS A FUNCTION OF THE SCALE OF COLLECTIVE ACTION AND THE POWER OF THE ACTOR.



#### Abstract

toire? European nineteenth-century governments appear to have had some short-run success in channeling working-class collective action away from attempts to control production decisions and toward attemps to control consumption -- for example, by tolerating Friendy Societies and repressing trade unions. How strong is that channeling effect?


Figure 3 is somewhat more complex than the previous two. It sums up my thinking about the conditions in which a run-of-the-mill contender for power is likely to carry on collective action. The diagram as a whole relates the collective goods produced as a result of the contender's action to the resources expended in the action. A run-of-the-mill contender has two bands of interest: a) in not falling below the 0 line -- in not receiving collective bads; b) in a narrowly-defined set of collective goods: recognition of a union, let us say, or the abolition of slavery. As a consequence of the contender's current power position, there is a schedule of probable returns from different levels of collective action. That schedule takes an S-shape on the hypothesis that small amounts of action bring punishment, the rate of return increases beyond some crucial minimum as other groups yield to pressure, but beyond some further point the group's acquisition of collective goods begins to threaten the interests of other groups sufficiently for them to organize a concerted resistance.

The current state of opportunity and threat limits which portions of the curve of probable return are actually available. The contender's current level of mobilization limits the amount of resources the contender can actually expend. In this hypothetical case the curve of probable returns crosses the two bands of the contender's defined interest. Furthermore, the current positions of opportunity, threat and mobilization make those
interest areas available. Therefore two ranges of action are likely: a lower-level action to forestall collective bads, a higher-level action to acquire collective goods. By lowering the opportunity line, raising the threat line, reducing the mobilization level, or depressing the curve of probable returns, we can define situations in which we would expect only defensive action, or no action at all.

It is a long way from these simple, abstract models to the complex, concrete contentious gatherings of Britain in 1830. The arguments and queries we have laid out here mainly concern a single actor; the events we observe, on the other hand, are often complex interactions among several groups. The arguments tend to assume that we can observe the full range of a given actor's collective action, and observe it continuously. In fact, the best our study of Britain can do is to portray the actor's appearances in a series of contentious gatherings. The arguments center on groups, but the observations deal with events -- and only some of the relevant events.

We have two ways to bridge the gap. One is to shift the observations toward groups. The other is to shift the models toward events. It should be possible to identify or to develop models which deal with the effects of mobilization, repression and group organization, yet apply to contentious gatherings. It should be possible to give strategic interaćtion a larger and more explicit place than it occupies in simple arguments It should be possible to deal more effectively with changes in the forms and distributions of collective action as functions of industrialization, urbanization, statemaking and the expansion of capitalism.

The four remaining sections of this report are 1) a summary of rule and procedures for identifying relevant events, and assembling dossiers

## Figure 3:

IDEALIZED SKETCH OF CONDITIONS FOR ACTION OF A RUN-OF-THE-MILL CONTENDER.

concerning them for coding; 2) a general agenda for coding; 3) illustrative material from the enumeration of events in February 1828 , 4) a selected list of papers from the research group as a whole.

## EVENTS TO BE ENUMERATED

The events are "contentious gatherings" (CGs), occasions in which ten or more persons outside the government gather in the same place and make a visible claim which, if realized, would affect the interests of some specific person(s) or group(s) outside their own number. Most CGs in our period fall into one or more of the following categories: 1) collective violence, 2) meetings, 3) demonstrations, 4) parades, 5) assemblies, 6) rallies, 7) celebrations, 8) delegations, 9) strikes, 10) union activities. More precisely, the events included are all occasions:

1. reported in the London Times, Morning Chronicle, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Annual Register, Gentlemen's Magazine and/or The Mirror of Parliament.
2. occurring in England, Scotland or Wales,
3. beginning on any date from 1 January 1828 through 31 December 1833,
4. in which ten or more persons outside the government:
a. gather in the same place,
b. make a visible claim which, if realized, would affect the interests of some specific person(s) or group(s) outside their own number.

Terms which therefore require working definitions
reported
occurring
in England, Scotland, Wales
beginning

```
persons
outside the government
gather
same place
visible claim affecting interests
specific person(s) or group(s)
```

DEFINITIONS AND RULES OF THUMB
reported. Any mention in any context. If, for example, an M.P. lays on the table a petition "from a numerous meeting in Oldham" which conforms to all our other criteria, that meeting enters the sample. In parliamentary debates, mentions of meetings do not need numerical information to be included. For example, if Mirror of Parliament reports a meeting of parishioners at Preston to petition Parliament, but makes no mention of how many people attended the meeting, we will assume provisionally that at least 10 people took part.
occuring in England, Soctland or Wales Ten or more people must have gathered within the political boundaries (including territorial waters) of England, Scotland or Wales. If any part of the action occurs within those boundaries, the entire event falls into the sample.

Sometimes it is difficult to determine how many people are involved in an event or action. In vague cases take the following terms to mean at least ten people:

| AFFRAY | DEMONSTRATION | MOB | RIOTOUS ASSEMBLAGE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ASSEMBLY | DISTURBANCE | MULTITUDE | THRONG |
| BRAWL | GANG | NUMEROUS | TUMULTOUS ASSEMBLY |
| CONCOURSE | GATHERING | RALLY |  |
| CROWD | GENERAL BODY/BODY | RIOT |  |

## beginning on any date from 1 January 1828 through 31 December 1833

The event begins at the first point at which at least ten of the people who eventually make the visible claim are gathered without further dispersal before they make the claim. The day begins at midnight.

1) ưse exact date when given.
2) use calendar to assign date if day of the week is given. Example, "Tuesday" or "Tuesday last"; when there is not reason to believe that the date could be off by a week or more.
3) if it is unclear that the article is giving you an exact date, (for example, the article is from another newspaper) then assign the date using the calendar and use on the approximate dating tags, WITHIN: 1 week, 2 weeks, 1 month, 2 months, 3 months. Fill out a date comment card to explain your reasons for that choice.
4) in Parliamentary Debates, when no clear date is given, assign a month, the same as the newspaper report the article is in, except if it is the first day of that month, then use the last month. Then date the day 00 and fill in the year and sequence number and add, approximately within 3 months. So a mention of a meeting in an April 16th London Times would read as follows:

$$
\text { 828-04-00-01 app. w/in } 3 \text { months. }
$$

Also number the log page in the same manner. The 00 page should come at the end of each month.

You can gather that if the event is reported in a London paper and takes place in or near London, that yesterday or a day given is close enough to be the calendar date assigned. In that case, no comment card need be filled out, and no approximate date need be assigned.
persons Any human being who can reasonably be presumed to have intentionally participated in the making of the claim
outsidethe government When officers are acting in the capacity given them by their offices and no group of ten or more non-officers is acting with them, we exclude the action. If ten or more officers act together but on their own responsibility, we include their action. Among the sets of people commonly named in discussions of English governments in the nineteenth century, we are actually distinguishing three categories, (a) officers, (b) public committees, and (c) citizenry. As officers, we are considering:

sentially similar organizations.

As segments of the citizenry we are considering Freeholders, Householders, Inhabitants, Landowners, Leypayers, Occupiers, Parishioners, Ratepayers, Tithepayers and essentially similar collections of people. One day we may well want to analyze the actions of public committees, of segments of the citizenry, and of other groups (such as members of particular crafts, associations, age-sex groups or families) separately. For the present, the crucial distinction separates officers from all the rest. Officers often appear as parties in collective actions involving: public committees; segments of the citizenry and/or other groups. But the only circumstances under which their concerted action qualifies by itself is when they take part in a group of ten or more persons who on their own responsiblity assemble to make a publicly visible claim, demand or complaint.

As citizens we are considering everyone else.
gather same place Ten or more persons, meeting, assembling or any of the key words used in Page 14 to define a get-together. Place is defined as:
a) specific location, church, inn, field,
b) secondary location, town, parish, city,
c) area location, county, hundred, etc.
or any combination of these.
visible claims affecting intersts of some specific persons or groups
We are trying to prepare a comprehensive list of occasions where people outside the government assemble to make a publicly visible claim, demand, or complaint. At one time or another, we use all the following words to
describe what we're after: claims, demands, complaints, grievances, aspirations, interests, dissatisfactions. Some of these words, such as "demands", clearly have an object outside the group. Others, like "dissatisfactions", do not necessarily have outside objects; one can easily be dissatisfied with oneself. We want to concentrate on actions which do have a target outside the acting group. Let's talk about claims and objects of claims. We are trying to build a sample of gatherings in which -- or by which -people articulate claims on actors outside their own group.

What sorts of claims? Basically, any expectation which would, if realized, require the other actor to expend valued resources: money, laborpower, information, and so on. What sorts of actors? Basically, any other set of real people. That excludes a group's claims on itself. It excludes a group's claims on supernatural or imaginary beings. It does not however, exclude claims on an imaginary "power structure", if the group identifies some real people with that structure. Nor does it exclude claims on real people in their capacities as self-declared agents of supernatural beings or imaginary groups: priests, soothsayers, charlatans, members of invented conspiracies. It dọes not exclude claims on real people present at the same gathering, just so long as there is a we/they separation between actors and objects which is not simply an internal division of the acting group and which is more durable than the gathering itself. In fact, "any other set of real people" does not exclude any individual anywhere, just so long as there is a gathering in which enough people articulate claims on that individual.

When describing the possible content of such claims, we enumerate:
a) peitioning or addressing or memorializing locel or national government, either for or against government;
b) opposition to goyernment policy, form of government or particular agents of it;
c) support for government;
d) support for an enemy of government;
e) control of local government or institution;
f) other grievances and dissatisfactions, including religious, social or economic issues, discussion of complaints about wages, hours or conditions of work;

Here are some rules of thumb for the identification of qualifying and non-qualifying claims:

1. In the absence of contradictory information, collective violence constitutes prima facie evidence of a claim. If ten or more persons act together to attack, damage or forcibly seize a person or object, that is provisional evidence of a claim.
2. Even if the ultimate aim of the activity is the making of some sort of claim, purely organizational efforts do not qualify in themselves. For example, the creation of a local Reform Association does not in itself constitute a claim. If, on the other hand, ten or more persons who are organizing an association state a qualifying claim as they do so, that claim counts.
3. Benefit suppers, balls, expositions and the like do not qualify in themselves, regardless of the cause for which they are conducted. If, however, we acquire further evidence of the making of a claim (e.g. a claim-making proclamation by the organizers of the benefit,
or a widely-cheered claim-making speech in the course of the event), a benefit qualifies in the same way any other gathering qualifies.
4. A speech by a single person which states a claim, articulates a grievance or makes a demand constitutes evidence of a collective claim under any of these conditions: a) the group formally adopts the speaker's views by petition, resolution. or memorial; b) the reporter explicitly imputes approval of the claim to the participants in the gathering; c) the group mainifestly voices an opinion by cheering, jeering or other vocal display.
5. If a gathering includes two or more factions, at least one of which has ten or more participants, claims made by one of the factions on another if the issues and divisions in question extend beyond the particular gathering and the particular set of participants. For example, when Henry Hunt and his supporters show up at a parish vestry meeting and challenge the powers of the local elite to control the election of new vestry officers, the division extends beyond that meeting and the claim qualifies.
6. Explicit support for government, or denial of support to government, qualifies. It can take the form of support for institutions (Parliament, the present government, the constitution) or of support for specific officers of government: the aldermen, bailiffs, beadles, boroughreeves, and so on, listed earlier. It can take the form of deliberate denial of support for these institutions or officers. The institutions and officers must be currently in office; for example, a celebrating banquet for $a$ member-elect of Parliament does not in itself qualify. Evidence of such support or denial includes a) participation in events,
including celebrations and festivities, whose commonly-understood purpose is the display of support, e.g. Lord Mayor's Day parade; b) the reporter's imputation of support or rejection; c) articulation of a sentiment through cheering, jeering, and so on, however, a simple toast (e.g. "To the King") does not qualify in itself, even if participants cheer.
7. Gatherings explicitly conducted to support or condemn an action of government state qualifying claims if the participants themselves articulate sentiments by passing resolutions, cheering speeches, and so on.
8. Simple expressions of support or rejection do not qualify if the objects are a) non-governmental institutions or officers in Britain or elsewhere, b) governmental institutions or officers outside of Britain. If a gathering makes further claims on either of these categories of objects, however, the claims qualify. For example, a banquet in honor of the deposed king of Spain would not qualify unless the participants directly stated the demand that he be reinstated.

BOUNDARIES OF CONTENTIOUS GATHERINGS
Most CGs will occur on one day at one location; however, many will last longer and/or will take place at several sites, so we must delineate boundaries in time and space. Activities will de considered to be part of the same CG if:

1. they occur on the same day, or on consecutive days and
2. there is strong evidence of overlapping personnel within the citizen formation(s), such as continuous interaction between two or more of the formations identified in the initial activity' and
3. the activities involve the same issue, or some directly related issue (e.g. the escalation of demands).

Activities that meet the above criteria will be def ined as one CG even through they occur in different locations (e.g. different towns).

If an event qualifies on the grounds of the kind of action and kind of group involved, but we lack sufficient information to assign it a time and place in Britain from 1828 through 1833, we exclude the event pending further information. If only one of these elements -- time or place -- is uncertain, we include the event pending further information.

GENERAL AGENDA FOR CODING
This is a provisional set of plans for the preparation of a machinereadable description of each CG. The record for a single event will contain the following sections:

1. EVENT as a whole, including identification and summary descriptions of all major features.
2. PLACE: one unit per place in which the event occurred.
3. FORMATION: one unit per formation participating in the event.
4. ACTION-PHASE: one unit per action by any formation.
5. SOURCE: one unit per source from which information concerning this event was drawn.
6. COMMENTS: one unit per comment. All keyed to specific locations in sections 1-5.
7. Event Sectior:
identification number: starting date plus sequence number on that date
accuracy of starting date
day of week on which event began
date on which event ended
```
accuracy of ending date
duration: days
duration: hours
low estimate of total participants
high estimate of total participants
best estimate of total participants
best estimate of person-days + margin of error
best estimate of person-hours + margin of error
best estimate of arrests during even + margin of error
best estimate of arrests after event + margin of error
best estimate of wounded during event + margin of error
best estimate of killed during event + margin of error
number of formations
summary of formation type(s)
summary of participation by authorities
sumary of repression exercised during event
summary of repression exercised after event
summary of major target(s) of action
broad event type
summary of background
summary of outcome
```


## 2. Place Section

one unit per place in which the action occurred. A "place" is any named location, plus any unnamed location in which we have strong reason to believe that some portion of the action occurred. We produce a unit for "someplace" in two circumstances: 1) we cannot locate the action in at
least one specific parish; 2) we have strong reason to believe that some portion of the action occurred outside the places for which the account contains specific names. A "name" can be very general: by the river, on the road, at the market, and so on.
a) for initial coding
principal name of place, alphabetic. Parish takes priority. If it is impossible, name county; if county is impossible, country. Place inferred locations in parenthesis. Thus OXFORD means the account specifically mentions Oxford, (OXFORD) that we have inferred the location from the account or its context.
detailed name of place, alphabetic. Blank if we have a parish name and no other place information. SOMEPLACE if the principal place is a county or a country (England, Scotland, Wales) and we have no further information on location within the county or country; a more specific designation such as "near Norwich" (in parenthesis if inferred) takes precedence over SOMEPLACE. SOMEPLACE ELSE for additional places not specifically named.
b) for coding after alphabetic sort of place sections
sequence number for grid square location: 0 if some portion definitely took place in this grid square location, 1 to 9 if one of a cluster of 1 to 9 possible continuous grid square locations, used to describe irregular shapes, e.g. a street, town, riverbank, road. Note: this means that a single piace record may contain 1 to 9 subrecords for grid square location.
grid square location per Gazetteer: two letters plus five digits vertical location within grid square: 0 if not known, 1 to 9 if known horizontal location within grid square: 0 if not known, 1 to 9 if known margin of error for grid square location
location in British census of 1831: nine digits

NOTE on the Place Section. This is not the only information on places that we will eventually have available for analysis. We plan to construct a separate Place File including at least all parishes in which events occurred and all counties, whether or not events occurred in them. The addition of further places, if any, will depend on cost, convenience and analytic urgency. The likely items of information in such a file are: name of the administrative unit (parish, etc.) proper name of the place position within administrative hierarchy: parish, hundred, county, etc. grid square location per Gazetteer
location in 1831 census
population in 1831
other characteristics of that place: presence or absence of market, extent of manufacturing, etc. characteristics of specific location within that place: inn, church, public square, shop, etc. enumeration of all events occurring in that place

## 3. Formation Section

One unit per formation known to be present. Every participant must be assigned to at least one formation. So must every action: if we know some action occurred, but can't assign it to a specific formation, we create a formation named SOMEONE. There may be more than one SOMEONE. In that case, we name them SOMEONE 1 , SOMEONE $2, \ldots$.

A formation is a set of people who act together andor interact with another formation in the course of the event. The first formation named must
have $10+$ members. We divide the remainder into as few formations as possible: generally one formation for each set of people who act distinguishably in the course of the event.
formation numbers: two digits
overlap with other formations: list of other formation's numbers
relation of this formation to event: particpant, spectator, etc.
name(s) of formation: alphabetic, including SOMEONE (in parenthesis if the name is inferred rather than given explicitly).
social composition of formation: alphabetic, including DK (don't know) other words describing formation: alphabetic, including NONE [in parenthesis if inferred from account, e.g. (LED BY TAILOR)].
place of origin or normal residence: alphabetic, including DK
words used to describe magnitude of formation: alphabetic, including NONE
[in parenthesis if inferred from account, e.g. (GROUP FILLED SQUARE)]
number of participants: low estimate $(50+=$ at least $50,101+=$ more than í̛O, etc.)
number of paritipcants: high estimate
number of participants: best estimate
source of best estimate: code (when the available accounts contain more than one estimate, write COMMENT)
number of person-days: best estimate $(00=$ unknown, $01=$ participation lasted less than one day)
number of person hours: best estimate. $00=$ unknown, $01=1$ ess than 1 hour. Person-days and person-hours are additive. For example, 025, 075 means 25 person-days +75 person-hours, a reasonable estimate for a formation of 25 people in continuous action for 1 day plus three more hours. 01 , 75 means 0 person-days +75 person-hours. Note alternative estimates as COMMENTS.
source of best estimate: code best estimate of number arrested. Note alternative estimates as COMMENTS. source of best estimate: code best.estimate of number wounded. Note alternative estimates as COMMENTS. source of best estimate: code best estimate of number killed. Note alternative estimates as COMMENTS. source of best estimate: code

NOTE: best estimates of person-days, person-hours, arrests, wounded, killed, must each sum to totals given in EVENT SECTION

## 4. Action-Phase Section

An event begins at the first point at which at least ten of the people who eventually make a claim which would qualify the event for inclusion in our sample are gathered without dispersing before they make the claim. The event ends when the last set of people which has made such a claim in the course of the event disperses. If new claims by $10+$ people which would independently qualify the event for inclusion arise in the course of the event, they keep the event going.

A new action-phase begin when any formation begins a new action. At least one phase must describe action before the events begins; when possible, there should be one such unit for each formation present at the beginning of the event. At least one phase must descride action after the event ends; when possible, there should be one such unit form each formation which survived to the end of the event.

If more than one formatinn changes action at the same time, we make a phase unit for each formation and assign each unit the same time.
begins; 2) at the beginning of the eyent; 3) in the course of the event; 4) at the end of the event; 5) after the event.

Every formation named must appear in at least one action-phase.

Sequence number: first new phase at this time. Two digits; $00=$ sometime

Order number for multiple phases which start simultaneously: one digit
date; year, month, day
clock time: $2400=$ midnight; $0000=$ unknown
relation to event: $1=$ before event begins; $2=$ action initiating event;
3 = in course of event; $4=$ action ending event; $5=$ after event ends
formation number: $00=$ someone (if used, we must enumerate a SOMEONE forma-
tion; $99=$ all formations
action: alphabetic, including DK (definitely permits phrases such as
ATTEMPT TO . . . . ; in parenthesis if our summary or inference, without parenthesis if direct transcription of words in account)
object of action: alphabetic, including DK, NONE, FORMATION 23, etc.
immediate consequences for object: alphabetic, including DK, NONE (consequences occurring during same action-phase only; use after-event phases for later consequences).

## 5. Source Section

One unit per source. In principle, there should be one source unit per cover sheet and one cover sheet per source unit.
name of source: alphabetic. Standard abbreviations for major sources
location within source: information will vary with type of source. For newspapers, for example, location will typically be date, page, location on page
further identifying information: includes NONE. May cite headline, indicate location in footnote, and so on.
comments on source: alphabetic. Includes NONE. May mention quality, contradiction of other sources, use made in coding.
6. Comment Section

One unit per comment. May be keyed to any location within EVENT, PLACE, FORMATION, ACTION-PHASE, OR SOURCE sections. In some cases, the codebook will require the coder who uses a certain code to make a COMMENT.
location in record: numerical code
comment: alphabetic

## CONTENTIOUS GATHERINGS ENUMERATED IN

FEBRUARY 1828

| Type of CG | Place | Date | Issue |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| meeting | Weymouth | $02-02$ | parliamentary election |
| meeting | London | $02-02$ | protection of victualler trade |
| meeting | Poultry | $02-04$ | test corporation acts |
| meeting | Edinburgh | $02-04$ | petition king about political favors |
| gathering | Liverpool | $02-05$ | election to parliament |
| gathering | Durham | $02-05$ | local election |
| gathering | Dover | $02-06$ | election to parliament |
| violence | London | $02-06$ | crowd attacks informer |
| parads | Weymouth | $02-07$ | election |
| meeting | Sheffield | $02-07$ | vestry, church rates |
| violence | Newbury | $02-07$ | crowd attacks informer |
| demonstration | Weymouth | $02-09$ | election |
| meeting | Windsor | $02-10$ | tax on carts |
| gathering-crowd | Weymouth | $02-11$ | election |
| gathering-mob | London | $02-13$ | threatens informer |
| gathering-crowd | Durham | $02-13$ | country elections |
| meeting | London | $02-15$ | licensed vs. non-licensed sellers |
| violence | Atherstone | $02-16$ | poaching affray |
| meeting | Leicester | $02-18$ | coin laws |
| gathering | Weymouth | $02-18$ | election victory celebration |
| meeting | Mary-la-bonne | $02-20$ | parish rates |
| violence | Scarborough | $02-28$ | smuggling affray |
| meeting | February | test and corporation acts |  |
|  |  | approximately |  |

Type of CG
Place
Date
Issue

| meeting | Islington | February approximately | test and corporation acts |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| meeting | London | February approximately test and corporation acts |  |
| meeting | Honiton | February approximately test and corporation acts |  |
| meeting | Dorchester | February approximately test and corporation acts |  |
| meeting | Manchester | February approximately stamp duties |  |

page_ $\frac{1}{\text { date_ } 218-1828}$ column _2 $\frac{\text { Top }}{\frac{\text { Middle }}{\text { Bottom }}}$
(2) Spindel Schweitzer ( ) Lord ()Guest ( ) Eaton ( )Lewis () Burke ()Dunkle ( )Burns ()Driver


(1) VIOLENCE ( ) property damage ( ), personal injury ( ),
(2) meetings (Љ
( ) Election
( ) Vestry
( ) Livery
( ) Dinner
( ) Political club/party
seizure of property, spaces or persons ( ), threat of any of the above ( ).
( ) with petition, address, etc.
( ) opposition to government
( ) support for government
( ) support for enemy of government
( ) control of local government/institution
( $)$ other grievances and dissatisfaction
( $)$ opposition to other peoples or groups
( ) objectives unclear
( ) notices, requests (for past or future meetings)
( ) other (list)
(3-8) GATHERINGS
demonstrations ( ), parade( ), assemblies, crowds, mobs ( ), gatherings ( ), rallies ( ), special celebrations (),
other ( ) $\qquad$
(9) DELEGATIONS, DEPUTATIONS ( )
(10) LABOR ACTIVITIES () strike, turnout (), lockout (), combination or union mention (), threats to stop work (), work stoppages ! ), return to work (), deputations of workers (.).
(11) LEGAL ACTIONS ( )
arrests ( ), examinations ( ), pretrial info. ( ), trials/court procedings ( sentences, executions; etc. (). Be sure to check the appropiate areas above that pertain to the action that brought about the arrest or trial.

## EXTRA

EXTRA
swearing in of special constables (), arson or suspected arson ( ), machine breaking, destruction of looms or threshers, etc. ( ).

Objective of action INTER PR rave in Their trade

## Participants Licensed victuallers

Number $\qquad$ Leaders $\qquad$ Charles BLEADEN


Yesterday, last week, a few days ago
Location LONOON TAVERN, LONdON specific place, inn, field, etc. village or town/city

Duration(if known)
1 day or less, a few days, more
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GREAT BRITAIN STUDY SAMPLE RECORDING SHEET 3-76
( ) Hansard ( ) HOP
( ) LONDON TIMES
(レ) MORNING CHRONICLE



(1) VIOLENCE ( )
property damage ( ), seizure of property, spaces or persons ( ), personal injury ( ), threat of any of the above ().
(2) MEETiNGS (
( ) Election
( ) Vestry
( ) Livery
( ) Dinner
( ) Political club/party
( ) with petition, address, etc.
( ) opposition to government
( ) support for government
( ) support for enemy of government
( ) control of local government/institution
( $)$ other grievances and dissatis factions
( ) opposition to other peoples or groups
( ) objectives unclear
(Y) notices, requests (for past or future meetings)
( ) other (list)
(3-8) GATHERINGS
demonstrations ( ), parade( ), assemblies, crowds, mobs ( ), gatherings ( ), rallies ( ), special celebrations (), other ( ) $\qquad$
(9) DELEGATIONS, DEPUTATIONS (.)
(10) LABOR ACTIVITIES () strike, turnout (), lockout (), combination or union mention ( ), threats to stop work (), work stoppages ! ), return to work ( ), deputations of workers (.).
(11) LEGAL ACTIONS ( )
arrests ( ), examinations ( ), pretrial info. ( ), trials/court procedings ( ) sentences, executions; etc. (). Be sure to check the appropiate areas above that pertain to the action that brought about the arrest or trial.

## EXTRA EXTRA

swearing in of special constables ( ), arson or suspected arson ( ), machine breaking, destruction of looms or threshers, etc. ( ).

Objective of action AGANST NON-LICeNsed SelleRS
Participants_ Licensed UICTUALLER'S
Number $\qquad$ Leaders $\qquad$ CHIS. BLEADEN

Date $\qquad$ Duration(if known) 1 day or less, a few days, more
Location LONdon TAvern, LONdON, specific place, inn, field, etc. village or town/city

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  <br>  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  Yna <br>  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | EMxbuw <br>  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  GTMer Mir <br>  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  <br>  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Hem |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  RHC |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | $e_{0}$ |  |  |
|  | , |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 10 |  |  |
|  |  Sain anilin Eo 0 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 边 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

GREAT BRITAIN STUDY SAMPLE RECORDING SHEET 3-76
( ) Hansard ( ) HOP
( ) LONDON TIMES
( 5 MORNING CHRONICLE


(1) VIOLENCE ( ) property damage (), personal injury (),
selzure of property, spaces or persons (), threat of any of the above ().
(2) meetings ( )
( ) Election
( ) support for enemy of government
( ) Vestry
( ) control of local government/institution
( ) Livery
( ) Dinner
( ) Political club/party
(). other grievances and dissatis factions
( ) with petition, address, etc.
( ) opposition to other peoples or groups
( ) opposition to government
( ) support for government
( ) objectives unclear
( ) notices, requests (for past or future meetings)
( ) other (list)
(3-8) GATHERINGS
 rallies ( ), special celetrations (), other ()
(9) DELEGATIONS, DEPUTATIONS (.)
(10) LABOR ACTIVITIES ()
strike, turnout ('), lockout (), compination or union mention (), threats to stop work (), work stoppages (), return to work (), deputations of workers (.).
(11)

LEGAL ACTIONS ( )
arrests ( ), examinattons (), pretrial info. ( ), trials/court procedings (), sentences, executions, etc. (). Be sure to check the appropiate areas above that pertain to the action that brought about the arrest or trial.

## EXTRA EXTRA

swearing in of special constables (), arson or suspected arson (), machine breaking, destruction of looms or threshers, etc. ().

Objective of action ELeCT/ON
Participants FRIeNds of MR. SUGDEN
Number $\qquad$ Leaders MR. SUGDen
Date $\frac{\text { Feb. } 7,1828 \text { Jhons }}{\text { Yesterday, last week, a few days ago }}$
Duration(if known)
1 day or less, a few days, more
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GREAT BRITAIN STUDY SAMPLE RECORDING SHEET 3-76
( ) Hansard () HOP
(し) LONDON TIMES
( ) MORNING CHRONICLE
page $\frac{3}{\text { date } 2 \cdot 11 \cdot 1828}$ column $\frac{3}{\text { day } M} \frac{\text { Top }}{\substack{\text { Middle } \\ \text { Bottom }}}$
( 2 Spindel
(-) Schweitzer
( ) Lord () Guest
( ) Eaton ( )Lewis
()Burke ( )Dunkle

(1) VIOLENCE ( )
property damage ( ), seizure of property, spaces or persons ( ), personal injury (), threat of any of the above ().
(2) meetings ( )
( ) Election
( ) support for enemy of government
( ) Vestry
( ) control of local government/institution
( ) Livery
( ) other grievances and dissatisfactions
( ) Dinner
( ) opposition to other peoples or groups
( ) Political club/party
( ) objectives unclear
( ) with petition, address, etc. ( ) notices, requests (for past or future meetings)
( ) opposition to government
( ) other (list)
( ) support for government
(3-8) GATHERINGS
 rallies (), special celeநrations (), other ()
(9) DELEGATIONS, DEPUTATIONS (.)
(10) LABOR ACTIVITIES ( ) strike, turnout ('), lockout (), compination or union mention (), threats to stop work (), work stoppages (), return to work ( ), deputations of workers ().
(11) LEGAL ACtions ()
arrests ( ), examinations (), pretrial info. ( ), trials/court procedings (), sentences, executions; etc. (). Be sure to check the appropiate areas above that pertain to the action that brought about the arrest or trial.

## EXTRA EXTRA

swearing in of special constables (), ,:.... arson or suspected arson (), machine breaking, destruction of looms or threshers, etc. ( ).

Objective of action Sugcleas poblec ENTRY inTo Toon
Participants_FRieuds An ADherents
Number LARGE CONCOURSE Leaders NA

Date $\qquad$ Duration(if known)
Yesterday, last week, a few days ago
1 day or less, a few days, more
Location TRIUM Phant 647e, weymouzh specific place, inn, field, etc. village or town/city
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SELECTED PAPERS, 1963-1976, FROM THE STUDY OF SOCIAL CHANGE AND COLLECTIVE ACTION.

This list is incomplete, but it includes all the reports which still have any importance. * means extra copies were available on 15 January 1977. We don't usually duplicate items once they are in print.

Risto Alapuro
1974 "Peasants, States and the Capitalist World System: A Review" CRSO (Center for Research on Social Organization) Working Paper 103.
"On the Political Mobilization of the Agrarian Population in Finland: Problems and Hypotheses," Scandinavian Political Studies 11: 51-76.

Ronald Aminzade

1972

1973
*1976a

1976b
"Mobilization and Political Violence: The Case of the Working Class of Marseille, France, 1830-1871," Working Paper.
"Revolution and Collective Political Violence: The Case of the Working Class of Marseille, France, 18301871" CRSO Working Paper 86. Revised, condensed version of Aminzade 1972, lacking the earlier paper's detailed observations on individual industries.
"A Marxist Approach to Occupational Classification," CRSO Working Paper 132.
"Breaking the Chains of Dependency: From Patronage to Class Politics," forthcoming in the Journal of Urban History.

Kenneth Amoroso
1968 "Industrialization, Urbanization: Effects on Disturbances (England, 1800-1850)," Working Paper.

Roderick Aya
1975 "The Missed Revolution. The Fate of Rural Rebels in Sicily and Southern Spain, 1840-1950." (Papers in European and Mediterranean Societies, AnthropologischSociologisch Centrum, Universiteit van Amsterdam, no. 3).

Lynn Eden
*1976 "Poker, Especially Political Poker."
"Inter-Industry Propensity to Strike in France, 1891 to 1930," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Toronto.

## William Gleberzon

1967 "Memorandum: The French Resistance, 1940-1944," Working Paper.

Michael Hanagan
1976a "The Logic of Solidarity: Social Structure in a French Town," forthcoming in the Journal of Urban History.

1976b "Artisans and Industrial Workers: Work Structure, Technological Change, and Worker Militancy in Three French Towns: 1870-1914." Unpublished doctoral dissertation in history, University of Michigan.

James Lang
1975
Conquest and Commerce: Spain and England in the Americas (New York: Academic Press).

Lynn Lees

1965 "Area Report: England," Working Paper.
Lynn Lees and Charles Tilly
1972 "The People of June 1848, CRSO Working Paper 70.
*1974 "Le peuple de juin 1848," Annales: Economies, Sociétés Civilisations, 29: 1061-1091; revised, abridged French translation of Lees and Tilly 1972.
"The People of June 1848," in Roger Price, ed., Revolution and Reaction. 1848 and the Second French Republic (London: Croom Helm).

Allan Levett

1975 "Centralization of City Police in the Nineteenth Century United States," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in sociology, University of Michigan.

Bruce Levine
*1970 "Economic Development and Social Mobilization: Spain, 1830-1923," Working Paper.

1973 "Foreign and Domestic Conflict. The British and Swedish Labor Movements, 1900-1950," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Micnigan.

1974 "Political Power and Collective Action: British and Swedish Labor Movements, 1900-1950," CRSO Working Paper 100.

1975
"Tribute Systems," Working Paper.
Kenneth A. Lockridge
*1976 "Modernization, the American Revolution, and Man," CRSO Working Paper 129.

Abdul Qaiyum Lodhi
1971 "Urbanization, Criminality and Collective Violence: A Study in Sociology," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Toronto.
A.Q. Lodhi and Charles Tilly

1973 "Urbanization, Criminality and Collective Violence in Nineteenth-Century France," American Journal of Sociology, 79: 296-318.

John Merriman
1972 "Radicalization and Repression: The Experience of the Limousin, 1848-1851," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in History, University of Michigan.

1974 "Social Conflict in France and the Limoges Revolution of April 27, 1848," Societas, 4: 21-38.

1975a "The Demoiselles of the Ariege, 1829-1831," in John M. Merriman, ed., 1830 in France (New York: New Viewpoints).

1975b "Radicalisation and Repression: A Study of the Demobilization of 'the 'Democ-Socs'-.during the Second French Republic," in Roger-Price, ed., Revolution and Reaction 1848 and the Second French Republic (London: Croom Helm).

1976
"The Norman Fires of 1830: Incendiaries and Fear in Rural France," French Historical Studies, 9: 451-466.

Frank Munger
1972 "The Use of Criminal Statistics in the Study of Collective Conflict: First Impressions," Working Paper.
"A Comparison of the Dissatisfactions and Collective Action Models of Protest: The Case of the Working Classes of Lancashire, England, 1793-1830," CRSO Working Paper 105: presented to the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association.
"Popular Protest and its Suppression in Early Nineteenth Century Lancashire, England: A Study of Theories of Protest and Repression," draft of doctoral dissertation.

Catherine Paradeise
1971
"La criminalité à Paris au début du XIXe siècle," Working Paper.

Jeff Pearson
1970 "On Watching the State and Contenders in a Parliamentary Context," Working Paper

Michael R. Polen
1972
"The J-curve explanation of collective violence: a replication," unpublished master's thesis in Sociology, Bowling Green State University.

William G. Roy
1973 "Collective Violence, Political Contention and Repression in France, 1866-1965," CRSO Working Paper 86.

1974 "Endogenous and Exogeneous Explanations of Late Nineteenth-Century U.S. Imperialism," CRSO Working Paper 97; presented to the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association.

1975 "Integration of a National Business Elite: The U.S., 1890-1905," CRSO Working Paper 120.

James Rule and Charles Tilly
1965 Measuring Political Upheaval (Center of International Studies, Princeton University).

1972 "1830 and the Unnatural History of Revolution," Journal of Social Issues, 28: 49-76.

Joan Scott and Louise A. Tilly
1975 "Women's Work and the Family in Nineteenth Century Europe," Comparative Studies in Society and History, 17: 36-64.

Edward Shorter

1965 "Area.Report: Germany," Working Paper.
1971 The Historian and the Computer (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall).

Edward Shorter and Charles Tilly

| 1971a | "The Shape of Strikes in France, 1830-1960," Comparative Studies in Society and History, 13: 60-86. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1971b | "Le dêclịn de la grève violente en France de 1890 à 1935," Le Mouviement Social, 79: 95-118. |
| 1971c | "Strike Waves in France, 1890-1968," CRSO Working Paper 63 |
| 1972 | "Internationale Unterschiede in der Streikbewegung, 1900-1968," presented to the International Tagung der Historiker der Arbeiterbewegung, VIII Linzer Konferenz. |
| *1973 | "Les vagues de grèves en France, 1890-1968," Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations, 28: 857-887; revised French version of Shorter and Tilly 1971c. |
| 1974 | Strikes in France, 1830-1968 (New York and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). |

David Snyder
1969 "Non fanno sempre l'amore: Collective Violence in Italy, 1880-1900," Working Paper.
"Industrialization and Industrial Conflict in Italy, 1878-1903," Working Paper.
"Determinants of Industrial Conflict: Historical Models of Strikes in France, Italy and the United States," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology, University of Michigan.
"Institutional Setting and Industrial Conflict: Comparative Analyses of France, Italy and the United States," American Sociological Review, 40: 259-278.

David Snyder and William R. Kelly
1976
"Industrial Violence in Italy, 1878-1903," American Journal of Sociology, 82: 131-162.

| 1972 | "Hardship and Collective Violence in France, 18301960," CRSO Working Paper 72; revised version published as "Hardship and Collective Violence in France, 1830-1960," American Sociological Review, 37: 520-532. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1973 | "How to Get From Here to There," American Sociological Review, 38: 501-504 (reply to cricitism of 1972). |
| 1974 | "On Debating and Falsifying Theories of Collective Violence," American Sociological Review, 39: 610612 (reply to further criticism of 1972). |

1963a "Queries on Social Change and Political Upheaval in France," Working Paper.
"The Evolution of Political Disturbances in France, 1830-1960," presented to the American Sociological Association.
"Reflections on the Revolutions of Paris: A Review of Recent Historical Writings," Social Problems 12: 99121; reprinted in Bobbs-Merrill Reprint Series.
"A travers le chaos des vivantes cités," in Paul Meadows and Ephraim H. Mizruchi, eds., Urbanism, Urbanization and Change (Reading Mass.: AddisonWesley).
"Methods for the Study of Collective Violence," in Ralph W. Conant and Molly Apple Levin, eds., Problems in the Study of Community Violence (New York: Praeger).
"Collective Violence in European Perspective," in Hugh Davis Graham and Ted Robert Gurr, eds., Violence in America: Historical and Comparative Perspectives (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office; also published in slightly different formats by Signet and Bantam).
"The Changing Place of Collective Violence," in Melvin Richter, ed., Essays in Social and Political History (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
"Introduction" to Jacques Godechot, The Taking of the Bastille (New York: Scribner's).

| 1970c | "Clio and Minerva," John C. McKinney and Edward Tiryakian, eds.; Theoretical Sociology: Perspectives and Developments (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts). |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1970d | "The Historical Study of Political Conflict," presented to the Daedalus Conference on New Trends in History, Rome. |
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