
HOW (AND TO SOME EXTENT, WHY) TO STUDY BRITISH CONTENTION

Charles Tilly

University of Michigan

CRSO Working Paper #212
GBS Briefing Paper #11

Copies Available through:
Center for Research on
Social Organization
University of Michigan
330 Packard Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

HOW (AND, TO SOME EXTENT, WHY) TO STUDY BRITISH CONTENTION

Charles Tilly

University of Michigan

February 1980

Great Britain Study Briefing Papers

1. "Great Britain, 1828-1834: Historiography and Selected Bibliography," by Michael Pearlman, June 1977: issued as CRSO Working Paper #159.
2. "Some Political Issues in Nineteenth-Century Britain. Part One: The government, Catholic Emancipation," by Michael Pearlman, July 1977: issued as CRSO Working Paper #160.
3. "Some Political Issues in Nineteenth-Century Britain. Part Two: The Rights of Collective Association and Assembly; Parliamentary Reform; Industrial Conflict," by Michael Pearlman: issued as CRSO Working Paper #165, November 1977.
4. "Contentious Gatherings in Great Britain, 1828-1834: Provisional Plans for Enumeration and Coding," by Charles Tilly and R.A. Schweitzer, revised version, September 1977: issued as CRSO Working Paper #163.
5. "British Contentious Gatherings of 1828," by John Boyd, R.A. Schweitzer, and Charles Tilly, March 1978: issued as CRSO Working Paper #171.
6. "Interactive, Direct-Entry Approaches to Contentious Gatherings Event Files," by R.A. Schweitzer and Steven C. Simmons, October 1978: issued as CRSO Working Paper #183.
7. "Source Reading for Contentious Gatherings in Nineteenth-Century British Newspapers," by R.A. Schweitzer, December 1978: issued as CRSO Working Paper #186.
8. "A Study of Contentious Gatherings in Early Nineteenth-Century Great Britain," by R.A. Schweitzer, January 1980: issued as CRSO Working Paper #209.
9. "Enumerating and Coding Contentious Gatherings in Nineteenth-Century Britain," by Charles Tilly and R.A. Schweitzer, February 1980: issued as CRSO Working Paper #210.
10. "The Texture of British Contention in 1828 and 1829," by R.A. Schweitzer, Charles Tilly and John Bayes, February 1980, CRSO Working Paper #211.
11. "How (And to Some Extent, Why) to Study British Contention," by Charles Tilly, February 1980: issued as CRSO Working Paper #212.

CONTENTS

Introduction 1
A Study of Contention in Britain, 1828-1834 8
Additional Collections of Evidence 12
Interaction with Authorities 15
Variations and Changes in Repertoires 24
Interests, Organization and Action 40
Conclusions 48
References Cited. 51
Appendix: Archival Material Available for Great Britain, February 1980 . .54

NOTE. The National Science Foundation supports the research described in this paper. I am grateful to R.A. Schweitzer for his indispensable collaboration in the planning and execution of the research, to Joan Skowronski for bibliographical assistance, and to Noralee Vasher and to Sheila Wilder for help in the paper's production.

Introduction

"Historians of modern Britain," writes John Stevenson, "have always had some interest in questions of popular protest and public order if only for their bearing on the topic of the revolution manquée, why and how Britain in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries escaped a revolutionary upheaval similar to those experienced on the continent. Riots, rebellions and industrial conflict have frequently been viewed -- explicitly or implicitly -- as a barometer of social and political stability" (Stevenson 1979: 1). British historians have commonly scanned the stream of conflicts, small and large, for evidence concerning the state of the polity.

The conflicts of the 1820s and 1830s have inevitably attracted attention. The campaign for Catholic Emancipation, the rural uprisings of 1830, the drive for Reform, the repeated struggles between workers and masters, the early strivings of the Chartists, the apparent march toward a great confrontation of the classes have a drama of their own. Their patterns and connections cry out for analysis. That for several reasons:

1. because the sheer variety and intensity of contention in the period make it a privileged field of observation;
2. because the visible forms of action -- parades, brawls, electoral rallies, meetings, demonstrations, and so on -- were undergoing rapid and decisive change; in a sense, the "repertoire" of British contention which had prevailed during the eighteenth century was fast giving way to the repertoire which has prevailed into our own time;
3. because the continuous interplay among contenders and authorities provides an exceptional opportunity to watch processes of repression, facilitation, coalition, cooptation and mediation at work, and on their way to altering the national structure of power.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48109

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

3012 LITERATURE, SCIENCE & THE ARTS BUILDING

4. because the outcomes of the conflicts in the era of Reform seem to have been pivotal for the politics of nineteenth-century Britain and for the fate of the British working classes.

The period from the late 1820s into the early 1830s deserves close study for its own sake, for the sake of its place in the longer-run transformation of British political life, and for the sake of our understanding of mobilization and contention in general.

The mobilization and contention of the period took place in the context of profound economic and political change. Britain was urbanizing rapidly, industrial production was expanding, increasing in scale and moving cityward, a coal-and-iron economy was visibly taking shape. Handloom weavers, only recently flourishing, were beginning their long and painful decline. In agriculture, the proletarianization of the labor force proceeded apace. While London continued its rapid expansion, Manchester, Liverpool and other manufacturing cities became the very emblems of the industrial revolution. At the same time, national political institutions were altering fast:

During the decade 1825-35 the nature of parliamentary government was being transformed. The older notions that the business of government was essentially executive, and that whatever general measures of social policy were needed were properly the concern of parliament as a whole, and should normally be introduced not by the government but by private members, were dying . . . The modern speech from the throne, the lengthening of sessions, the drastic reduction of private members' time and the constant increase in government's all date from these few years (Macdonagh 1977: 5).

In that process, the government took to making large inquiries into the state of the nation, and legislating national reforms: not only the Reform Act of 1832, but also Catholic Emancipation (1829), the Factory Act of 1833, the Poor Law of 1834, and others besides. These were, for their time, momentous measures.

The decade after 1825, then, brought Britain extraordinary turbulence and change. On the one hand, swelling conflicts at the local and the national scale. On the other, startling transformations of the country's political and economic organization. What was going on? Could we, for example, reasonably think of the period as bringing Britain the equivalent of a revolution? If not that, a close brush with revolution? Many historians have thought one or the other.

In his grand review of The Age of Revolution, E.J. Hobsbawm places three revolutionary waves in the period from 1815 to 1848: those of 1820-1824, 1829-1834 and 1848. Although the wave of 1848 was larger and more visible, the revolutionary changes of 1829 to 1834 were in some regards more definitive.

"In effect," writes Hobsbawm,

it marks the definitive defeat of aristocratic by bourgeois power in Western Europe. The ruling class of the next fifty years was to be the 'grande bourgeoisie' of bankers, big industrialists and sometimes top civil servants, accepted by an aristocracy which effaced itself or agreed to promote primarily bourgeois policies, unchallenged as yet by universal suffrage, though harassed from outside by the agitations of the lesser or unsatisfied businessmen, the petty-bourgeoisie and the early labour movements . . . 1830 marks an even more radical innovation in politics: the emergence of the working-class as an independent and self-conscious force in politics in Britain and France, and of nationalist movements in a great many European countries (Hobsbawm 1962: 111).

If no Revolution, in any strong sense of the word, occurred in the Britain of 1830, the revolutionary wave nevertheless splashed over the British Isles:

Even Britain was affected, thanks in part to the threatened eruption of its local volcano, Ireland, which secured Catholic Emancipation (1829) and the re-opening of the reform agitation. The Reform Act of 1832 corresponds to the July Revolution of 1830 in France, and had indeed been powerfully stimulated by the news from Paris. This period is probably the only one in modern history when political events in Britain ran parallel with those

on the continent, to the point where something not unlike a revolutionary situation might have developed in 1831-2 but for the restraint of both Whig and Tory parties. It is the only period in the nineteenth century when the analysis of British politics in such terms is not wholly artificial (Hobsbawm 1962: 110-111).

Similarly, Michael Vester places the "decisive rise of the workers' movement" in the years from 1826 to 1832. The development of cooperation among trades and across regions in major strikes played its part. "Even more influential," declares Vester, "was the movement for Reform, revived in 1830, which in 1832 brought only the property-owning bourgeoisie into Parliament. This outcome tore away the remaining sympathy of workers for the middle classes. By means of their growing economic, political and publishing institutions, workers developed solidarity at a national level" (Vester 1970: 27). At that point, according to Vester, the English working class became conscious of its position and fate at a national scale.

E.P. Thompson goes one step further than Hobsbawm and Vester. He claims that "England was without any doubt passing through a crisis in these twelve months [from spring of 1831 to the next year] in which revolution was possible" (Thompson 1964: 808). Thompson places the fullest maturity of the old English working class at just that point. Indeed, he considers Reform itself to have grown from the demands of an increasingly conscious and determined working class, and to have been snatched from the working class by a frightened bourgeoisie. How close Britain came to revolution in the 1830s is, and was, a matter of strenuous debate. But almost all historians agree that the British conflicts of the time were intense, and their effects far-reaching.

British contention of the period matters not only for the historical record, but also for comparative politics. Over and over again, Britain of the Reform era appears as an exemplary case. Of what Britain is an example -- of failed revolution, of peaceful conflict resolution, of the cooptation of the petty bourgeoisie, of the creation of national electoral politics -- is, again, a matter of debate. For Gabriel Almond, the Reform Act "is generally viewed as the exemplar of incremental democratization, a largely peaceful adaptation of a political system to basic changes in economy and social structure" (Almond 1973: 23). Almond sees the further effects as far-reaching:

In the short run, antisystem pressure is reduced, but in the longer run the introduction of electoral reform triggers demands for further extensions of the suffrage to enfranchise the working class, and for welfare legislation. Public policy in the next decade or two alternates between welfare measures intended to alleviate working conditions, the lowering of food prices by eliminating agricultural protection, and repressive measures (Almond 1973: 33).

Then, through further political "linkages", much of the apparatus of British government is supposed to have altered through the chain reaction started by Reform. "The changes that the Reform Act have [sic] triggered," says Almond, "take some thirty years to settle down into a more or less stable system of interaction, with the party, cabinet, and modern bureaucratic system emerging during the second half of the nineteenth century" (Almond 1973: 34).

Thus, in one view, the British "political system" solved a major problem with Reform, but the full ramifications of the solution took decades to work themselves out.

In another variant of a fundamentally optimistic view, Reinhard Bendix accords "the system" rather less importance and the demands of workers rather more:

In England, lower-class protests appear to aim at establishing the citizenship of the workers. Those who contribute to the wealth and welfare of their country have a right to be heard in its national councils and are entitled to a status that commands respect. In England, these demands never reach the revolutionary pitch that develops rather frequently on the Continent, although occasionally violent outbursts disrupt English society as well. If the political modernization of England for all its conflicts occurred in a relatively continuous and peaceful manner, then one reason is perhaps that throughout much of the nineteenth century England was the leader in industrialization and overseas expansion. English workers could claim their rightful place in the political community of the leading nation of the world (Bendix 1964: 67).

Workers' demands for fair representation, according to Bendix, ultimately prevailed because they were compatible in principle with the maintenance of the polity, because British powerholders displayed an exceptional capacity for accommodation and, no doubt, because British prosperity provided payoffs for all political participants.

One can also insist on the distinctiveness of the British experience, and stress the importance of the 1830s, without adopting so Whiggish an

outlook as Bendix's. Keith Thomas declares that "The years 1831-1832, when the Reform Bills were at stake, can be plausibly regarded as a revolutionary crisis, held in check by the 'constitutional' element among the reformers and averted in the nick of time by the surrender of the king and lords to extraparliamentary pressure . . . The crisis was resolved by the passage of the first Reform Act, which conciliated the middle classes but left the proletariat unenfranchised" (Thomas 1978: 70; the omitted material contains the inevitable quotation from Francis Place). "The peaceful extension of participation was often as much a matter of luck as of judgment. The 1832 Act was intended by many of its supporters as a purification of the old electoral system rather than the beginning of a new one; it might never have got through if it had been recognized as the thin edge of the wedge" (Thomas 1978: 71). Muddling through, it seems, sometimes produced the equivalent of revolutionary change.

One can be still more skeptical of the ruling class's good intentions and yet consider the era of Reform an important transition. Barrington Moore argues that "To concentrate on the strength of their position in the formal and even the informal apparatus of politics would give a misleading impression of the power of the gentry and the nobility. Even if the Reform Bill of 1832, which gave the industrial capitalists the vote, disappointed the hopes of its more ardent advocates and belied the fears of its more ardent opponents, its passage mean [sic] that the bourgeoisie had shown its teeth" (Moore 1966: 33). That has, in general, been the Marxist interpretation of the struggles around Reform: they marked and facilitated the accession of industrial capital to a full place in the British structure of power. In these varied guises and more, Britain of the 1820s and 1830s serves as a reference point for comparisons with other countries which somehow staggered into the politics of a capitalist age via other routes.

A Study of Contention in Britain, 1828-1834

My collaborators and I are studying British contention in the late 1820s and early 1830s. We have undertaken a large, systematic analysis of a wide range of conflicts, partly out of interest in the period for its own sake, partly out of concern for the comparison between Britain and other countries, but mainly in order to improve our understanding of three big, sticky problems in the analysis of collective action: 1) how interactions with authorities impinge on ordinary people's collective action -- most obviously, how the authorities' strategies of repression and facilitation of different groups and types of action affect the ways that ordinary people worked together for their shared interest; 2) how and why the repertoires of collective action -- especially those forms which people use to press their interests against those of other people -- vary and change from group to group, setting to setting, time to time; 3) how the character of shared interests affect the kinds of organization ordinary people create or adopt, and how the interests and organization interact to shape the forms of collective action in which they engage.

These are large concerns, but they fall far short of exhausting the possibilities of that turbulent period of British history. They also occupy only one corner of the field of collective action. For example, many students of collective action concern themselves with the life histories of social movements, with the relative effectiveness of different strategies of action, with the attractiveness of radical groups to different segments of the population, or with the extent to which hardship or rapid social change increase the intensity of protest. These are all important issues. If our work on nineteenth-century Britain sheds light on them, we will be delighted. But they are not the major themes of our own inquiry. These

themes are interaction with authorities, repertoires of contention, and interests/ organization/action.

The three themes have strong connections. They all assume that the people whom authorities call "rioters", "protesters", "insurgents" and similar epithets are pursuing shared interests -- in fact, are choosing more or less deliberately among different possible ways of pursuing their shared interests, with some sense of the likely outcomes and the probable reactions of competitors, enemies, authorities, and other powerful people. They also assume that people learn by doing, and by other people's doing. The image they convey runs something like this: sets of people who have common interests sometimes build social organization around those interests. As threats or opportunities impinge on those interests, they sometimes mobilize for action, and sometimes act collectively on behalf of their interests. When they act collectively, they ordinarily have a limited number of forms of action -- a repertoire -- at their disposal. Repertoires of collective action vary from one group to another, but in general they are very limited, and change rather slowly. Repertoires change as a function of the group's organization and experience, but also as a function of the constraints imposed by other groups, including authorities. Authorities and other powerful people monitor other people's collective action as continuously as they can; they employ bargaining, repression, coalition, cooptation, facilitation to protect and advance their own interests in the outcomes of ordinary people's collective action. The actions of authorities and other powerful people have strong impacts on the outcomes of collective action; they therefore help shape and reshape the prevailing repertoire.

This sketch is crude and abstract: a caricature. Like a caricature, it calls attention to the salient traits of one particular approach to the study of collective action. The line of thought parades under different names:

resource mobilization, political process, rational action, et cetera. Whatever we call it, the line of thought presents collective action as problem-solving behavior. The problem-solving is rarely easy. It is often inefficient or ineffective. With the arrogance of retrospect, we will often look back at it and imagine a different, better solution to the problem. Collective action is problem-solving behavior nonetheless.

Following this line of thought, my collaborators and I are examining a large number of "contentious gatherings" which occurred in Great Britain during the years from 1828 through 1834. A contentious gathering is an occasion on which a number of people gathered in the same place and somehow made collective claims which would, if realized, affect the interests of some other set of people. In order to apply such a notion to the realities of nineteenth-century Britain, we have had to develop some specifications and restrictions. Our contentious gatherings, for example, include only those in which we have reason to believe that at least ten people acted together at some point. The "same place" must have been public space, or at least publicly accessible space. Routine assemblies of public bodies do not count -- regrettably, considering the battles that sometimes broke out in Parliament and other British governmental assemblies. The people involved must have stated the claims explicitly by word or deed; a regular meeting of a trade union or an anti-slavery society does not count unless the participants did or said something which meets our criteria for a claim. And so on. The contentious gathering, thus defined, eliminates a wide range of collective action. It aims our attention at those special moments in which people stand together publicly, and seek to make their collective will prevail.

The set of contentious gatherings we are examining consists of every event meeting our criteria we have encountered in a thorough reading of

seven periodicals from the beginning of 1828 to the middle of 1835. (We read six months beyond the 1834 cutoff in order to capture late reports.) The publications are the Times of London, the Morning Chronicle, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Mirror of Parliament, Parliament's Votes and Proceedings, the Annual Register and Gentlemen's Magazine. The set is likely to maximize our national coverage at the expense of a certain bias toward events in London as well as toward events involving Parliament and national politics. Once we have indentified a qualifying contentious gathering, we seek further information concerning the event in a variety of other sources: the correspondence of the Home Office in the archives of the Public Record Office, additional periodicals such as Cobbett's Political Register, historians' works on the 1820s and 1830s, and others. (The appendix to this paper catalogs the archival material we had on hand at the end of February 1980.) In going through the sources we use a generous definition of possible contentious gatherings -- for example, noting every announcement of meetings of private bodies, whether or not the announcement indicates the likelihood that members of the body will make contentious claims. The roughly 5,000 issues of the various periodicals we have examined have yielded something like 150,000 mentions of possible contentious gatherings.

When the process of filtering out the mentions of events which actually qualify and collating multiple mentions of the same events is finished, we expect to have 50 or 60 thousand accounts describing 12 to 15 thousand contentious gatherings. The remaining 90 to 100 thousand accounts will serve as useful background material on the gatherings and issues of 1828 to 1834. The numbers, to be sure, exaggerate the richness of the evidence; the majority of the mentions run a sentence or two. For one type of event -- the meeting whose participants sent a petition to Parliament -- we have

hundreds of instances but precious few details. Nevertheless, taken as whole the set of events provides an exceptionally comprehensive picture of contention in one important period of the nineteenth century.

After a long process of sorting and ordering, we eventually create a standardized machine-readable description of each event. In essence, the description consists of answers (sometimes numerical, but usually in words and short phrases drawn from the accounts of the events) to a flexible questionnaire: Where did the contentious gathering take place? Who took part? What did they do? What happened then? What was the outcome? And so on through many questions, reiterated for each group and place involved. The form of the record makes it easy to search the file for various combinations of issues, groups, locales and actions. (For much, much more detail on materials and procedures, see Schweitzer 1978, 1979; Schweitzer, Tilly and Boyd 1980; Schweitzer and Simmons 1978; Tilly and Schweitzer 1980.)

Additional Collections of Evidence

Some further tasks follow almost automatically from the work I have just described. The main categories are these:

1. further documentation of contentious gatherings;
2. reading and comparing supplementary sources;
3. collection of data on areas and groups.

Let me take up each one briefly.

The further documentation of contentious gatherings goes beyond the seven basic periodicals to a search of our microfilm and photocopy collections of documents from the Home Office papers, to a limited number of other archival sources, to the Political Register, the Poor Man's Guardian, the Scotsman and several other contemporary periodicals, and to a selection of published works by historians. This further documentation presents

knotty problems: whether to incorporate the new information directly into the basic machine-readable file or hold it separate while treating the basic file as a transcription of accounts in our seven standard periodicals; what to do when the new information disagrees substantially with the account we have drawn from the seven basic periodicals; how to keep the selective availability of additional information from introducing new and risky biases into our analyses; at what point to cease the search for supplementary information. We have not yet resolved any of these problems.

The reading and comparing of supplementary sources overlaps with the work of further documentation, but only incompletely. They differ because the reading and comparing has other objectives: a) to help estimate the completeness and bias of the enumeration of contentious gatherings drawn from the seven standard periodicals; b) to help gauge to what extent, and in what regards, the character of the source at hand affects the quality of the descriptions of contentious gatherings we construct from the source. For both purposes, we must produce independent enumerations and descriptions of contentious gatherings -- including gatherings not mentioned in our seven standard periodicals -- from supplementary sources. Then we must compare the enumerations and descriptions with our basic sample. It is delightful when a work as concentrated and comprehensive as E.J. Hobsbawm and George Rudé's Captain Swing comes along for comparison with our accounts of 1830's agrarian conflicts. The Home Office papers are rich enough in contentious gatherings to make a sustained comparison feasible, if enormously time-consuming. Such publications as Cobbett's Political Register yield many fewer events than our basic sources, but comparisons with them provide some sense of the political orientations of our sources. Beyond that, the work of validating our sample and checking the biases of our descriptions becomes more and more difficult.

The collection of data on areas and groups involved in contentious gatherings could last forever. The task has a megalomaniac version, an ambitious version, and a modest version. The megalomaniac version is to assemble comparable information on every single group and locality at risk to be involved in contentious gatherings -- in short, every group and locality in Great Britain. In principle, that would be desirable, for the comparison of similar groups which did and did not act tells us a good deal about the conditions favoring collective action. In practice, such a program would be foolish, guaranteed to collapse under its own weight.

The ambitious version is to seek a standard set of information for each group and each locality involved in any of the 15,000 contentious gatherings. Likely items in such a standard set would be size, political status, leadership and involvement in other forms of collective action not captured by the enumeration of contentious gatherings. With a small set of items and reasonable rules for abandoning the search when information was not readily available, the ambitious version might well take five or ten person-years of effort. That is more effort than we can currently afford to commit.

The modest version is enough to strain our resources. Its elements:

- a) for large areas such as counties and major cities, assemble information on size, general population composition, industrial activity, and other readily available characteristics;
- b) cumulate information from all contentious-gathering accounts concerning a particular group or area to characterize the group or area at the point of an individual contentious gathering -- starting with such simple matters as how many previous contentious gatherings the group or area has been involved in;
- c) commission special studies of groups and areas which appear repeatedly

in accounts of contentious gatherings. In any case, only as we get into the major analyses described below do we see clearly which items of information not contained in the accounts are so important that they deserve the effort to search them out elsewhere.

The further documentation of events, the reading and comparing of supplementary sources, and the collection of data on areas and groups follow almost automatically from our basic research design. Beyond these obvious next steps, however, we face choices. The choices entail further choices. Let me review the three major problems -- interaction with authorities, repertoires of contention and interests/organization/action -- on which we are concentrating, and describe a concrete program of research under each of the three headings.

Interaction with Authorities

How do interactions with authorities impinge on ordinary people's collective action? In a radical simplification, we can think of the relevant actions of authorities as falling into a single range from repression to facilitation.

Toward one end of the range, authorities are making collective action costly for some set of people; at the extreme, authorities not only penalize people for acting collectively, but also hinder their mobilization, attack their organization, their resources, and their persons; that is repression. Toward the other end of the range, authorities are lowering the cost of collective action for some set of people; at the extreme, authorities are operating the government as a means to the ends of that group's collective action; that is facilitation. Authorities vary their repression/facilitation as a function of the political position of the group involved, the kind of action they are taking and the claims they are making.

The first question which arises, however, is this: how much do authorities vary their response from one set of groups, actions and claims to another? It appears, for example, that magistrates were more likely to send in constables or call in the militia against workers than against middle-class reformers. Will that impression hold up to close examination? If it does, how much of the difference is attributable to the groups involved, how much to the sorts of actions they take, how much to the kinds of claim they make, how much to the interaction among all three? The contentious gatherings of 1828 to 1834 are sufficiently abundant to allow telling comparisons: between middle-class and working-class electoral rallies, between workers supporting Reform and workers resisting wage cuts, and so on.

The repression and facilitation of different forms of action likewise pose interesting problems. On the one hand, a form of action such as the public meeting or Rough Music acquired a legitimacy from toleration and use; the authorities' infringement on anyone's use of that form threatened, however distantly, the rights of other people who commonly used that form of action to pursue their ends. On that ground, we might reasonably expect the forms of action used by powerful people to be available to many of the powerless. On the other hand, authorities and powerful people gave rather different readings to similar actions by disparate groups; whether a currently peaceful assembly constituted a riot, for example, depended on the Magistrate's judgment as to whether the participants were likely to commit a crime if left unimpeded. A magistrate was, I think, generally readier to conclude that assembled day-laborers harbored some criminal intent than he was to make the same judgment about assembled merchants. Did the right to assemble afford the day-laborers any substantial protection? Again, controlled comparisons of similar actions by different groups promise to shed light on a vexing issue.

Similarly the period from 1828 to 1834 offers several opportunities to watch changes in the ways authorities dealt with a given pattern of collective action. Let me mention only two examples. The national organization, widespread assessment of dues and sustained agitation of the Catholic Association in Ireland played a significant part in the passage of Catholic Emancipation in 1829. Parliament acknowledged that part by abolishing the Catholic Association in the same legislative bundle that gave Catholics the right to serve in its ranks. Soon, proponents of parliamentary reform were adopting similar organizational tactics to advance their own cause -- and the authorities seem to have found their ability to counter those tactics compromised by the legitimating precedent of Catholic Emancipation. During the Swing rebellion of 1830, in contrast, the government's initial passivity and the magistrate's initial leniency soon altered as the vision of a general insurrection spread. These cases, and others like them, challenge us to trace and explain the changing approaches of authorities to repression and facilitation.

Given some understanding of the authorities' response, we still need to interpret the impact of that response on people's collective action. In the short run, how does the intervention of authorities in well-established sequences of action affect those sequences and their outcomes? Is it true, for example, that people were much more likely to be hurt in the course of a demonstration, meeting or rally if police forces intervened than if the gathering ran its course? In the medium run, did the way the authorities responded to one attempt at collective action visibly affect the behavior of the same or similar people on the next occasion? Did a magistrate's stepping in to

conciliate a strike, for instance, increase the likelihood that other workers in the vicinity would strike? In the long run, did well-defined approaches to the repression and facilitation of particular actions, claims and groups produce durable changes in the pattern of collective action? In the case of major waves of repression like the one which followed the Swing rebellion, for example, can we detect significant differences in the character of rural conflicts before, during and after the rebellion? Did a change in the power position of some substantial group -- for example, the arrival of the bourgeoisie in the polity at Reform -- change the acceptability of the forms of action employed by them and their working-class allies? These are challenging questions. Fortunately, they lead quite directly to analyses of British contentious gatherings: short-run analyses comparing the internal sequences of actions in similar events; medium-run analyses comparing successive rounds of collective action; long-run analyses examining the before/during/after of major crises, governmental actions, and alterations of power.

So far I have simplified the problem of interaction with authorities by a) taking the action of various contenders as a given, and proposing to examine the responses of authorities to that action, or b) taking the action of authorities as a given, and proposing to study its impact on collective action by ordinary people. The simplification is useful, but artificial. Ultimately, we must analyze the interaction of ordinary people with authorities and of various contenders with each other: the parry, thrust, advance, retreat and bluff which go on continuously. Our evidence concerning contentious gatherings offers four valuable opportunities for the treatment of

interaction: 1) the analysis of internal sequences, 2) the interplay between local and national struggles, 3) links within series of contentious gatherings, 4) variations among authorities.

The first is the analysis of internal sequences. We break the participants in a contentious gathering into "formations", then break the actions of the formations into "action phases". In order to qualify as a contentious gathering, an event must include at least one articulation of a claim by some set of ten or more people. (In general, a claim is any stated expectation which would, if realized, require another actor to expend valued resources: labor-power, information, money, and so on.) The first set of ten or more people to make a claim enters the record as formation 01. The object of that claim, whether present or not, becomes formation 02. Subsequent formations (03, 04 . . .) enter the account because they include at least one of the following characteristics:

1. They are identified in the account as being a distinctly different person or body of people, from the first two formations, and they make a distinctly different claim from other formations.
2. As a subset of an existing formation, they start or stop making a claim at a distinctly different point in time from the others; e.g. persons who are arrested during an event cease to act collectively with the rest of their formation, and become a separate formation.
3. As a subset of one formation, they start or stop being the object of a claim at a distinctly different point in time from the others.
4. However similar to other formations, they are geographically separated from the others.
5. They are the object of another formation's claim.

Having divided all participants (including absent persons who are objects of claims made during the contentious gathering) into formations, we break the actions of formations into phases. A new action phase begins whenever any formation:

1. begins to make a claim;
2. begins a new response to a claim;

3. visibly ceases a response to a claim;
4. visibly ceases to make a claim;
5. changes location;
6. changes personnel.

The action phases may include actions which occurred before the contentious gathering, as such, began; when a meeting which became a contentious gathering was announced in advance, for example, we record the advance announcement as the first action-phase. Action phases may also include actions which occurred after the gathering ended; when Parliament heard a petition formulated at a contentious gathering, for example, we record the hearing of the petition as a final action-phase.

As a result of all this detail, it is possible to follow the twists and turns of the entire contentious gathering . . . at least in those cases where the record itself documents the sequence of action. Although more complex strategies of analysis have their own seductions, the obvious way to discipline the analysis of sequences is to work with a series of dichotomies: events in which aggrieved parties are relatively successful versus events in which they gain little or nothing; violent versus nonviolent events; events which escalate versus others; events in which authorities versus others, and so on.

The second opportunity to analyze interaction takes us to the interplay between local and national struggles. In 1828 and 1829 (the sole years for which detailed observations are fully available at this writing), there is an obvious correspondence between the rise and fall of issues such as repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, Catholic Emancipation, or Friendly Society legislation within Parliament and the ebb and flow of contentious gatherings in Britain as a whole. The correspondence is not coincidental: many of the events in question consist, precisely, of assemblies which demonstrate some group's concern about one or another of these issues. It is likely

that our search procedure exaggerates the correspondence. After all, Parliament's Votes and Proceedings bring hundreds of events into our view solely because the people present sent petitions to Parliament. With due allowance for that effect, however, it looks as though each Parliamentary crisis did activate meetings, demonstrations, rallies, and other sorts of contentious gatherings throughout Britain. If so, we have evidence of a remarkable national orientation for contention. We have the chance to see which sorts of groups, regions, actions and issues displayed the greatest coordination between local and national events. And we have the opportunity to explore more subtle forms of interaction: between the content of Parliamentary discussion and the demands or complaints uttered by participants in contentious gatherings; between Cabinet maneuvering and the tactics of popular contention; between the formation of political coalitions outside the government and the realignment of collective action.

The third opportunity to deal with interaction concerns links within series of contentious gatherings: the many meetings for and against Catholic Emancipation in 1828 and 1829; the multiple industrial conflicts of 1829 and 1830; the hundreds of attacks on farmers, hayricks, and threshing machines constituting the Swing rebellion of 1830; the mobilization for Reform from 1830 through 1832, and so on. We need to identify the patterns of communication and collaboration by which similar actions spread from one locality or group to another. How much signaling and modeling went on? For example, how often did people in one locality adopt tactics which had recently been successful in similar circumstances elsewhere? How did the information flow? Where it is possible, the identification of tendencies for disparate actors to act together, or in response to each other, would tell us a great deal about the political texture of the time.

The fourth, and final, opportunity to analyze interaction takes up variation among authorities. In a close examination of repression and collective action in Lancashire from 1750 to 1830, Frank Munger (1977) has shown that regular constables were gradually replacing the Justices of the Peace in the control of smaller gatherings, that troops were being used increasingly against the workers in large industrial conflicts, and that the repressive activities of magistrates varied considerably with the economic organization of the locality. (In the major industrial centers, for example, the magistrates were significantly more inclined to call in, or send in, repressive forces against the participants in contentious gatherings than were their counterparts in the rest of the county.) Those differences, furthermore, made a difference. Deaths and injuries, for instance, occurred much more frequently in the course of contentious gatherings in which ground troops intervened.

Munger's findings raise questions about the Britain of 1828 to 1834. Do the same regularities hold for all of Britain? What of the places of other authorities: the Lords Lieutenant, the mayors, the Home Secretary, employers, churchmen? Our evidence concerning contentious gatherings does not tell us all we need to know. Much of the authorities' maneuvering took place behind the scenes. But to the extent that different authorities appeared visibly in the course of contentious gatherings, or became the objects of their claims, we have the opportunity to trace the correlates and effects of their involvement.

In sum, how interactions with authorities impinge on ordinary people's collective action raises a challenging series of problems:

- a) responses of authorities to different combinations of actions, groups and claims;
- b) the impact of authorities' actions on collective action:
 - 1. short-run: intervention in sequences of action, etc.;
 - 2. medium-run: how response to one round of action affects the next round;
 - 3. long-run: the effects of major crises, political events, and responses to series of collective actions;
- c) the interaction among contenders and authorities:
 - 1. internal sequences;
 - 2. relations between local conflicts and national politics;
 - 3. links within series of events;
 - 4. variation among authorities.

Our collection of evidence on contentious gatherings makes possible a significant start on each of these problems.

Variations and Changes in Repertoires

In examining hundreds of contentious gatherings, one quickly develops a sense of déjà lu: not only with respect to recurrent actors and long-lived issues, but also with respect to the forms of actions themselves. One meeting fades into the next, one march up the street resembles another, even attacks on looms and poaching affrays take certain limited, repeated forms. We can conveniently capture that sense of limited repetition in a theatrical metaphor: any group who have a common interest in collective action also acquire a shared repertoire of routines among which they make

a choice when the occasion for pursuing an interest or a grievance arises. The metaphor calls attention to the limited number of performances available to any particular group at a given time, to the learned character of those performances, to the possibility of innovation and improvisation within the limits set by the existing means, to the likelihood that not only the actors but the objects of their action are aware of the character of the drama that is unfolding and, finally, to the element of collective choice that enters into the events which outsiders call riots, disorders, disturbances and protests.

The Britain of 1830 was in the midst of a major, and relatively rapid, shift from one sort of repertoire to another. Let us think of them, crudely but conveniently, as the repertoires of the eighteenth and of the nineteenth century. In the eighteenth-century repertoire, the anti-tax rebellion, the food riot and the concerted invasion of fields or forests were the most distinctive forms of revolt. But a great deal of relatively peaceful collective action went on, first, through deliberate (although sometimes unauthorized assemblies of corporate groups which eventuated in declarations, demands, petitions or lawsuits, or, second, via authorized festivals and ceremonies in the course of which ordinary people symbolized their grievances.

As compared with other repertoires, this eighteenth-century array of performances had some special characteristics worth noticing:

- a tendency for aggrieved people to converge on the residences of wrongdoers and on the sites of wrongdoing rather than on the seats of power; (sometimes, of course, the two coincided;)
- the extensive use of authorized public ceremonies and celebrations for the acting out of complaints and demands;
- the rare appearance of people organized voluntarily around a special interest, as compared with whole communities and constituted corporate groups;

- the recurrent use of street theater, visual imagery, effigies, symbolic objects and other dramatic devices to state the participants' claims and complaints;
- the frequent borrowing -- in parody or in earnest -- of the authorities' normal forms of action; the borrowing often amounted to the crowd's almost literally taking the law into its own hands.

The newer repertoire which was becoming dominant in the Britain of 1830 was essentially the one with which we work today: featuring special-purpose associations, directed especially at the seats of power, frequently involving the explicit announcement of programs and organizational affiliations, relying relatively little on routine public gatherings, festivities and ceremonies. The strike, the demonstration, the electoral rally, the formal meeting are obvious examples. Employed in the service of a sustained challenge to the existing structure or use of power and in the name of some defined interest, this array of actions constitutes what we have known since the nineteenth century as a social movement. The point of calling these well-known changes alterations of repertoires is to stress that the available means of action were (and are) learned, historically specific, rooted in the existing social structure, and seriously constraining. The theoretical advantage of doing so is to focus explanations of collective action on group choices among limited sets of slowly-changing alternatives.

To get a quick sense of the contrast between the "eighteenth-century" and "nineteenth-century" repertoires, we might reflect on two contentious gatherings from 1829. On the 23d of February 1829:

A large body of journeyman weavers assembled yesterday afternoon in the open space opposite the Duke of Bedford Public-House, Seabright-Street, Bethnal-Green-Road, to hear a letter from the Duke

of Wellington, in answer to a memorial presented to His Grace by the journeymen on the 3d instant. The memorialists ascribed the dreadfully distressed condition in which they have been for some time past to the repeal of the laws prohibiting the importation of foreign wrought silks, and the answer of His Grace, expressing in plain terms his opinions on that subject, may be considered an important document (Times, 24 Feb. 1829: 4).

Wellington replied that smuggling, rather than legal imports, was the problem, and promised his efforts for both temporary and permanent relief of their suffering. The meeting passed resolutions of thanks (very likely ironic) to the Duke for his consideration, but reiterated the demand for prohibition, and empowered a committee to work toward that end.

A few days later, on the 6th of March, "a number of boys and disorderly lads" (to quote the account) gathered at the Castle Hill of Inverness for the purpose of burning a sort of effigy expressive of their hatred of Popery. They afterwards adjourned to the High-street, and encamped in front of the Exchange, directly before the Police-office. Here they continued for some time, shouting and huzzaing, till one of their number procured another effigy, or scarecrow, which he hoisted up, and immediately the whole party set off en masse down Church-street. They turned up New-street, and, we regret to state, broke the door and windows of the Catholic chapel. On return to their former position, their number had greatly increased, and the authorities began to be alarmed. With a view to intimidation, a boy, who was rendering himself conspicuous in the affair, was suddenly seized and clapped into the

Police-office. This, however, operated but as a signal to the mob, and in a few minutes the windows of the Police-office were demolished, the door broken, several of the watchmen hurt with stones, and the culprit liberated (Times, 17 Mar. 1829: 3).

The crowd milled for a while, then dispersed. The Magistrates, continued the account, "have offered a reward for the discovery of the persons who broke the windows of the Chapel and Police-office, and have very properly issued an address to the inhabitants, requesting that heads of families, masters, and employers, may look diligently to those under their charge."

The contrast between the two events is instructive: The weavers meet, elect a chairman, form a committee and pass resolutions. The lads of Inverness meet, burn an effigy, march up the street, smash windows and kick in doors. Their actions spring from two different repertoires, the Inverness youngsters from a repertoire that had been prevalent in the eighteenth century and was now, in 1829, on its way out, the Spitalfields weavers from a repertoire: some of whose elements have eighteenth-century precedents, but that was on its way to dominating the collective action of the nineteenth century -- not to mention the twentieth. The new repertoire gave a large place to self-selected special interests and formal associations, maintained a strong connection with electoral politics, and tended to produce, on the average, larger and more highly coordinated actions.

Pressed into service, the metaphor of repertoire seems useful. But is it more than a convenient evocation, something besides a name for the fact that groups differ in the ways they act together? In order to bear much analytic weight, the notion of repertoire must represent a detectible

tendency for existing groups to rely repeatedly on a limited number of well-defined forms of collective action. We ought to find groups modifying and replacing those forms incrementally in the light of success and failure in achieving their ends. Abrupt shifts and sudden inventions should be rare. Those repertoires, furthermore, should not be perfectly uniform for all groups in Great Britain, but should vary somewhat with the interests, organization, and particular experience in collective action of the group in question. The agenda for the study of repertoires therefore consists, first, of determining whether repertoires, in some strong sense of the word, actually exist and, second, of examining how and why the particular forms of collective action vary and change.

What opportunities do we have to work at these broad tasks? We have the opportunities a) to look closely at the histories of particular forms of collective action; b) to examine variation in the collective-action repertoires of particular localities, groups and movements; c) to decompose the major types of action into their elements; d) to assemble continuous information on forms of conflict and collective action which do not necessarily constitute "contentious gatherings", as our definitions identify them.

The histories of particular forms of collective action take us to questions such as these:

1. Did donkeying, and other forms of Rough Music, decline notably as a form of action during the period from 1828 to 1834? Which groups and regions retained it?
2. Did the extension of the electorate with the Reform Bill of 1832 promote a wider use of the electoral rally, and other actions resembling the electoral rally, as a vehicle for the statement of grievances and demands which were not strictly electoral?

3. Can we detect the adoption by non-Catholic groups in Britain of the Catholic Association's successful tactics? Did it happen before leaders of Reform more or less self-consciously borrowed the model of Catholic Emancipation?

4. Did the sorts of assemblies which demanded tribute, wage changes and the destruction of threshing machines during the Swing rebellion of 1830 tend to disappear from the laborers' repertoire after the dramatic repression of the rebellion?

5. Did the demonstration, as a distinctive form of action, somehow crystallize in Britain during the mobilization for Reform?

These and similar questions require a broad familiarity with the evidence and a supple use of the sources. The analysis of the patterns which show up in our machine-readable descriptions of these particular types of action should, nevertheless, provide a good sense of the main trends, and a useful specification of just what has to be explained.

Study of the repertoires of particular localities, groups and movements is likewise challenging. On the one hand, the idea of a repertoire of collective action, as I have formulated it, should apply most clearly and effectively to particular localities, groups and movements rather than to Britain as a whole: a determinate set of people does the learning, remembering and choosing. On the other hand, the effectiveness of any repertoire depends on relationships among groups: a demonstration, for example, accomplishes political work because several parties recognize that the ability to bring people into the streets to display their numbers and determination on behalf of a specific set of claims helps place the group and its claims on the regular political agenda. The entry of the demonstration into the British repertoire involved magistrates, mayors and Home Secretaries as well as the demonstrators themselves. In that sense, a repertoire could easily be lodged in the political structure of a national state

-- or some other political unit -- rather than in the collective memory of a particular interest group.

In either case, fortunately, the same empirical procedures recommend themselves. At the level of the contentious gathering, we must follow particular sets of people from one event to the next, in order to trace the range of actions in which they engage. Where we have evidence about their deliberations on the way to action, we must scan the deliberations for indications of the alternative actions among which they were choosing. Having thus established the repertoires of particular sets of people as best we can, we must then look at the variation in those repertoires: to what extent do they vary by trade? By locality? By political orientation? By the nature of the claims and the character of the authorities involved?

These questions become especially interesting when we are dealing with a movement of some kind: a sustained challenge to the existing structure of power whose leaders speak in the name of a broad interest. In the years from 1828 through 1834, the Reform movement is the dominant example, but such movements as those for Catholic Emancipation and factory reform also deserve close attention. To some extent, large movements seem to develop their own repertoires, which spread across the diverse groups and localities which take part in them. Whose repertoires prevail? How does the movement repertoire form and spread? The cataloging of specific forms of action according to actor and situation is essential.

That cataloging leads directly to the third procedure in the analysis of repertoires: the decomposition of major types of action into their elements. We begin, reasonably enough, with events bounded and labeled more or less

as contemporaries bounded and labeled them: this set of actions is a food riot, that one an attack on machinery, and so on. This first approach borrows the observations and interpretations of the time; it thereby promises to identify the coherent alternative forms of action which were built into the existing social structure.

Yet it is possible, in principle, that repertoires and conventional categories did not coincide. We might discover, for example, that the event called a "food riot" consisted of varying combinations of well-learned actions:

- * the public complaint against profiteers
- * the articulated demand that local authorities assure and control the food supply
- * the inventorying of food in private hands
- * the blockage of shipments
- * the public sale of seized food at below the market price.

All of these occurred sometimes in "food riots", yet it was rare for all to occur in the same event. Perhaps the individual actions, rather than the events into which they compounded, constituted the repertoire.

In any case, it is likely that different kinds of events had coherent elements in common. The open-air protest meeting and the demonstration, for example, both commonly featured a march through public space, in which people carried symbols both of their identity and of the cause they supported. Perhaps the evolution of the forms of contention occurs mainly through the creation, combination and alteration of such elements while other elements stay more or less constant. If so, the analysis of repertoires will take a new turn. We will concentrate on the decomposition of the major types of action, as seen by contemporaries or historians, into their elements.

Our machine-readable descriptions of contentious gatherings provide some of the necessary material. The items we describe include 1) the event as a whole; 2) each place in which some action occurred; 3) each formation, or set of people acting together, taking part in the contentious gathering; 4) each action phase -- each visible change in the behavior of any formation in the course of the event; 5) each source from which we have drawn evidence for the description; 6) further comments on the description of individual items or of the event as a whole. To illustrate how the transcription works, let us look at two events from 1830's agrarian uprisings. The first took place in Kent on 28 October 1830; as the second event recorded for that day, it acquired the name 830 10 28 02.

The places involved, as recorded in machine-readable form were:

KENT	HOLLINGBOURNE	MR. RICHARD THOMAS' FARM
KENT	HOLLINGBOURNE	MR. THOMAS SAMWAY'S HOUSE
KENT	HOLLINGBOURNE	MR. JOSEPH OLIVER'S HOUSE
KENT	HOLLINGBOURNE	MR. WILLIAM HORTON'S HOUSE

The formations were:

01	LABOURERS	(other names: body of men, agricultural labourers, mob)
02	THOMAS, RICHARD	
03	SAMWAY, THOMAS	(other names: farmer)
04	OLIVER, JOSEPH	(other names: farmer & tanner, witness; gentleman)
05	HORTON, WILLIAM	(other names: farmer)
06	ROPER, BATCHELOR	(other names: farmer)
07	SOMEONE	
08	MOB, PART OF	(other names: prisoners; labourers; Edward Chapman, Mathew Walter, William Robinson)
09	JUDGE	(other names: learned judge)

01 (LABOURERS), 07 (SOMEONE) and 09 (JUDGE) entered the event because they made claims -- 07 having arrested 08 (PART OF MOB) -- while the other formations qualified as objects of claims. Most of the claims were wage demands. The action phases ran as follows:

SEQUENCE NUMBER	ACTING FORMATION(S)	OBJECT OF ACTION	ACTION VERB	ACTION
0101	01		assemble	On Thursday, the 28th of October last...a body of men from 80 to 100... assembled
0201	01	02	*demand	They said they assembled to have their wages raised, and...wished every married man to receive half-a-crown a day and every single man 2s.
0301	02		*agree	...regular rate of wages... conform to...
0401	02		go away	...gave a cheer and went away
0501	01	03	come to	They... came to my house [Thomas Samway]
0601	01	03	demand	They...demanded an increase of wages...
0701	03	01	*answer	I said I was willing to pay what the others did...
0801	01		go away	...they said that was no answer, and went away

SEQUENCE NUMBER	ACTING FORMATION(S)	OBJECT OF ACTION	ACTION VERB	ACTION
0901	01	04	come to	The mob came to my house [Joseph Oliver]
1001	01	04	demand	The witness here stated the demand which the prisoners and their companions had made to other witnesses.
1101	01		go awaythey went away.....
1201	01		*go to	[go to]
1301	01	05	demand	They demanded higher wages, and asked [william Horton] for money
1401	01		go away	After beating the door with sticks they went away
1501	01	06	*demand	Mr. Batchelor Roper, another farmer, deposed to the same facts
1601	01		*end	[end]
1701	07	08	*arrest	[arrest]
1801	09	08	*try	[three names above] indicted....guilty

(Starred action verbs represent our inferences from the text, as do bracketed descriptions of the action.) The source for the one account we have of this event is the trial report in the Times of London, 23 December 1830. More material from the account is in our machine record, but the truncated summary above gives the main elements of the record.

Let us look at a second event, which took place in Sussex about ten days later, on 8 November 1830. The one place involved was the parish of Guestling. Formations:

- 01 LABOURERS (other names: paupers)
- 02 HEADS OF PARISH (other names: Mr. Parsons)
- 03 LATE MASTERS (other names: employers)
- 04 MR PARSONS

Action phases:

- 0101 01 02 notify . . . gave notice to the heads of the parish that their company was requested to meet them at 10 o'clock Monday . . .
- 0201 01 assemble . . . about 130 labourers were assembled
- 0301 01 03 resolve They soon informed their late masters . . . they had resolved on receiving higher wages
- 0401 01 04 demand . . . we demand that you do immediately give up 500. a year to our employers
- 0501 04 01 agree The parson very readily agreed to do so . . .
- 0601 01 04 cheer . . . the men gave three cheers . . .
- 0701 01 go to . . . every one went to his . . . home . . .

The action phases provide an abbreviated but comprehensible narrative of the event. In the one case, the local agricultural laborers assemble to proceed from farm to farm. In the other, they assemble to address the heads of the parish. (In the second case, according to material I have omitted, the

laborers asked for wages of 2s. 3d. in winter and 2s. 6d. in summer, proposing that the parson -- whose name was, indeed, Mr. Parsons -- remit the necessary 500 pounds from his local tithe.) In both cases, they demanded higher wages, and got them. Since in both cases we record WAGE DEMANDS as the "major issue", that fact, too, is readily apparent from the machine record. The action phase transcriptions make it possible, then, to follow the various sequences by which the hundreds of similar events unfolded in the fall of 1830.

The general mix of action verbs for an area, population or period tells us something about the character of the action. In all events for the year 1829, for example, the verbs which appeared 20 times or more were:

meet (303)	resolve (90)	cheer (111)
enter (47)	destroy (20)	attack (29)
assemble (121)	arrive (35)	separate (35)
petition (265)	parade (21)	applaud (27)
*oppose (112)	*end (452)	*arrive (23)
adjourn (40)	disperse (39)	address (26)
proceed (48)	thank (114)	requisition (25)
collect (25)	*meet (114)	*cheer (22)
refuse (21)	*gather (33)	follow (24)
*arrest (34)	stone (31)	beg (27)
*support (24)	*hear petition (211)	*address (25)

(* means that we have inferred the verb from the text; in all other cases, the word is the one employed in our source.) The list makes it clear that many of 1829's contentious gatherings were meetings: assemble, address, resolve, cheer, petition, and so on. Not all, however; destroy, parade, attack, stone, arrest also find their places on the list. A simple approach

to decomposing types of action into their elements, then, consists of identifying the recurrent sequences, two or three verbs at a time, of these and less frequent action verbs. If we can then match particular sets of those sequences with contemporary definitions of major types -- the recurrent sets of action verbs which together identify an event as a food riot or an electoral rally, for example -- so much the better. If we can do that, we have some chance of using the action verbs to pin down similarities and dissimilarities among different types of collective action.

The action verbs provide the most promising start for the decomposition of types of action, but not the only one. Our action-phase descriptions also include identifications of all formations that joined in a particular action, identifications of all formations that were objects of a given action, and concise narratives of the action at each phase. The identifications make it feasible to join actors with their characteristic forms of action, and even to sort out implicit coalitions among groups which commonly act together. The concise narratives make it feasible -- at a considerable effort -- to place the spare action verbs in a richer context of interaction.

Under the heading of repertoires, our final opportunity is to assemble continuous information on forms of conflict and collective action which do not necessarily constitute "contentious gatherings" as our definitions identify them. The evidence already collected provides a start on that task. Our first broad reading of the periodicals bring back thousands of mentions of three forms of action: strikes, meetings and petitions. The great majority

of these actions fail to meet our exacting standards for contentious gatherings. (In some cases, we are undoubtedly ruling out valid events because our evidence is insufficient; but in the majority of the cases, it seems unlikely that ten or more people gathered in a publicly accessible place and made visible claims of the sort we require.) The accounts of strikes and meetings provide an ample, if biased, portrait of the way those crucial sorts of events worked in Britain of the 1820s and 1830s. The enumerations of petitions to Parliament are comprehensive, although they provide little information on the way most petitions came into being. Beyond the basic sources of our enumeration, the voluminous papers of the Home Office likewise contain thousands of accounts of strikes and meetings. They also offer scattered information on the genesis of petitions. For these three types of action, at least, our sources make possible general sketches of variations over time, space, and social setting. Those sketches will be invaluable bases for the interpretation of the ebb and flow of contentious gatherings.

In summary, the study of repertoires involves:

1. close examination of the histories of particular forms of collective action which show up within contentious gatherings;
2. study of variation in the collective-action repertoires of localities, groups and movements;
3. decomposition of the major types of action into their elements;
4. tracing forms of conflict and collective action which do not necessarily constitute contentious gatherings, as we define them.

Together, these efforts should help us decide whether the learning, choice and adaptation implied by the metaphor "repertoire" were actually guiding popular collective action in the 1820s and 1830s.

Interests, Organization and Action

These varied analyses of collective action rest on a strong, simple cornerstone: the idea that collective action springs from shared interests, as mediated by the social organization of the sets of people who share those interests. The thought is old, but not self-evident: many sociologists and historians have, in fact, imagined that shared beliefs or common exposure to the stresses of social change were the essential grounding of collective action. To emphasize interests and organization as the foundations of collective action is to propose a relatively rationalistic account of that collective action.

But which interests? In general, the interests which count for collective action are rooted in the organization of production. Britain of the 1820s and 1830s was a capitalist world in the making, increasingly divided between a small number of capitalists and a growing mass of workers who were either already proletarian or facing proletarianization. (I mean proletarian not in the extreme form of working in large manufacturing establishments under strict time-discipline, but in the classic sense of working for wages using expropriated means of production; agricultural laborers and small-shop employees qualify.) A full class analysis will go from that general observation to a careful delineation of exceptions and variations: the continuing power of great landlords, the survival of master artisans, the partial (if precarious) independence of handloom weavers, the multiple varieties of agricultural tenure. The class analysis becomes the basis for the attribution of interests.

We arrive at one of those pulse-quickenning choice points: a point combining high risk with high opportunity. The risk is evident enough. Any attribution of interests is risky, and in this case our main body of evidence bears only indirectly on those interests. We must work with some combination of hypothesis, indirect inference, and outside evidence. Yet the opportunity is also great. For the observations on thousands of contentious gatherings, down to everyday affairs, show us ordinary people articulating their interests time after time, in a wide variety of circumstances. At least these four possibilities for fresh inquiry arise:

- a) analyses of the way collective-action repertoires vary as a function of combinations of interest and organization,
- b) the pitting of imputed against articulated interests, and
- c) examination of changes in groups' power positions as determinants of their forms of action.

Given an analysis of class interests as defined by the relations of production, Britain of the 1820s and 1830s offer the spectacle of wide variation in the organization based on those interests: informal craft structures, friendly societies, trade unions, clubs, communities, and sometimes no substantial organization at all. Although the forms of organization correlated roughly with the relations of production, and although the forms of organization correlated roughly with the relations of production, and although the forms of organization themselves shaped the interests of one group of another, to some extent one can separate the two. That presents the first challenge: to see how collective-action

repertoires vary as a function of different combinations of interest and commitments. Fastidious comparisons promise the greatest intellectual return: among the groups of workers in different industrial cities studied by Asa Briggs, John Foster, and others; between London's Spitalfields silk-weavers and other artisans; among the small merchants of the industrial North, the commercial South, and the agricultural Midlands.

Brian Brown's analysis of the Lancashire mass strike in 1842 gives an idea of the possibilities of such comparisons. Building on the ideas, definitions and procedures of and study of 1828 to 1834, Brown drew accounts of contentious gatherings from the Northern Star to make detailed comparisons among parishes. He found, among other things:

1. negative relationships between the frequency of Chartist contention and the recent pace of industrialization and urban growth;
2. no relationship between the frequency of Chartist contention and the urban proportion of the population;
3. a strong positive relationship between the frequency of Chartist contention and the proportion of textile factory workers in the labor force;
4. a strong relationship between Chartist and non-Chartist contention;
5. powerful effects of changing repression on the frequency and success of strike activity.

Brown's analysis starts us on the way to detailed examination of the day-to-day organization and collective action of Lancashire's textile workers during the time of Chartism (Brown 1979). Parallels in the period from 1828 to 1834 spring to mind at once. The next task -- for Brown and for us -- is to specify and document the social relations and social processes which connect the industrial workers' collective action with their interests (as defined by their position in the structure of production) and their day-to-day organization.

The pitting of imputed against articulated interest addresses an ancient problem of political analysis: the degree to which people's "real" interests, as determined by an external standard, govern their behavior. Do people commonly act on misapprehensions of their interest, on mistaken beliefs, on the basis of false consciousness? Does interest, instead, somehow override mistaken belief? Or -- on the model of a class in itself becoming a class for itself -- does interest channel belief? I am more inclined to the third view: that interest, at least in the long run, channels belief. Whether that view is correct or not, however, we need evidence. The evidence should permit us to compare the interests people actually articulate in the course of collective action with those we impute to them on the basis of their general social position.

The machine-readable transcriptions of contentious gatherings lend themselves to a crude version of the comparison. Both the summaries of major issues and the descriptions of action phases permit the matching, in a general way, of different kinds of formations with the sorts of demands, complaints and other claims they made. We can, for example, determine whether handloom weavers who acted ^{publicly} defined themselves/as members of a trade facing misery, further proletarianization, and extinction. We cannot plumb their psyches, but we can catch some of their words.

The words suggest a more refined analysis which is thinkable with the materials at hand, although not with the part we have made machine-readable. The more refined analysis follows the lead of E.P. Thompson and others who have used a close reading of working-class texts to establish the programs, grievances and world-views of workers. It is possible to go through our accounts of contentious gatherings, sort out the reported utterances of

different groups of participants, then examine those texts for characteristic ways of defining the group, distinguishing it from other groups, stating analyses and grievances. It is then possible to compare the language of those utterances with the language of other standard texts: radical tracts, the popular press, the literature of friendly societies, and so forth. Which ones match best? Which ones, if any, display class-conscious separation from other classes? In which ones do we find similar analyses, categories, vocabularies? The comparison of texts can range from a broad, thoughtful reading to a precise count of key words; we must strike a balance between richness and reliability. So long as it is done intelligently, the comparison of the language of the crowd with the language of alternative analyses and programs which are available to the crowd should allow us to situate the crowd and its interests more confidently.

A related possibility. Why not undertake a parallel reading of the texts of the crowd's allies, antagonists, and objects? We might be able to achieve two valuable results. The first is to determine whether the analyses, categories and vocabularies of these other groups somehow articulate with those of the groups whose collective action we are analyzing -- articulate by negation, by complementarity, or by partial agreement. The pattern of agreement and disagreement should give us a means, fragile but useful, of understanding the interests at work in the coalitions and oppositions of the time. The second attainable result is a rough mapping of the political positions of different parties to collective action. In principle, for example, we ought to be able to use the language of parliamentary debate to place formations which appear repeatedly in our contentious gatherings within broad categories: clearly members of powerful groups which have their own spokesmen in Parliament; members of groups which do not have their own people in Parliament, but on whose behalf Members commonly speak;

groups whose right to act politically the Members recognize implicitly or explicitly, but on whose behalf no one speaks; groups whose right to exist or to act politically (such words as "mob" and "rabble" come to mind) the Members tend to deny. Mixed cases -- notably those in which well-defined Parliamentary factions differ in their placement of the groups in question -- are doubly interesting. Given the strong relationships we are discovering between the rhythms and contents of Parliamentary debate, on the one hand, and those of contentious gatherings, on the other, I will not be surprised to discover a) that most formations which appear frequently in contentious gatherings also came up repeatedly in Parliamentary discussion; b) that the Parliamentary discussion arrays them with relative precision from major power-holders to outcasts; c) that the Parliamentary placement of the groups involved is a reliable index of their current national political position. The final opportunity to study interests, organization and action consists of examining changes in groups' power positions as determinants of their forms of action. The phrase is a mouthful, but it refers to a well-known phenomenon. In general, we know that powerful groups use different means to work their wills than do the powerless. In fact, we commonly use the different means as a gauge of power: anyone who can go straight to a Cabinet member for a solution to his problems looks powerful. People who break windows to emphasize their grievances probably have little power. So far as I know, no one has worked out that relationship in detail.

Our study of British contention provides some intriguing opportunities for research on the question. The most inviting is again Reform: with enfranchisement, did the collective-action repertoires of master artisans, shopkeepers and other petty bourgeois change? We have some indications that they did.

The Birmingham Political Union, for example, marched at the front of the Reform campaign, and stood as a model of unity across classes. Yet the class coalition sundered immediately after the passage of the Reform Bill:

Most of the five hundred mercantile and professional men who had joined the union now left it, and some of them, including Parkes and Green, went so far as to advertise their resignations. To these seceders, the council once more became the much-riddled "Brummagem legislature" elected by "Attwood's scum," an absurd body which supposed that their public-house talk about issues had serious consequences for the nation. Perhaps their departure was to be expected. What was unanticipated was the defection of the shopkeepers from the activities of the union.

Almost at once the council had to recognize the altered status of the shopkeepers: the council's declaration of the "middle classes" on distress included "the tradesmen" for the first time with the manufacturers and merchants, a move made necessary, McDonnell observed, because the shopkeepers no longer identified with the workers on the question of distress (Flick 1978: 101).

A sharper statement of class realignment would be hard to find. In Birmingham and elsewhere, the enfranchised petty bourgeois seem to have abandoned the collective-action repertoire of Reform as travelers flee the plague. Our evidence concerning contentious gatherings before, during and after the agitation for Reform permits a first reading of that shift: how generally, how visibly, and how did the victors of Reform abandon their erstwhile working-class allies?

Other "natural experiments" come immediately to mind: the changing power position of Dissenters with Test and Corporation repeal, of Catholics with Emancipation, of the local poor with the 1834 Poor Law. Nor need we limit our attention to major legislation. If some form of the indexing of power position via Parliamentary debate which I proposed earlier yields reliable results, then changes in that indexed position for one group or another give us a warrant to look for changes in their forms of collective action, in so far as their participation in contentious gatherings reveals those changes. The analysis need not, for that matter, take place at the national level. For many purposes, it will be more illuminating to search out power shifts within a city or a region, and then to examine repertoire changes associated with those power shifts.

In summary, examining the interplay of interests, organization and action takes us toward three main kinds of investigation:

1. analyses of the way collective-action repertoires vary as a function of combinations of interest and organization; for the most part, controlled comparisons of periods, places and groups will serve best;
2. the pitting of imputed against articulated interests for particular groups, periods and places;
3. examination of changes in groups' power positions as determinants of their forms of action.

Although these are very general questions indeed, they apply precisely to the momentous struggles occurring in the Britain of 1828-1834, and suggest a valuable series of inquiries into the "contentious gatherings" of the time.

Conclusions

Some historians of nineteenth-century Britain will find this way of posing historical problems eccentric, and the procedures I have proposed for their resolution ponderous. In fact, quite a few historians will feel that the careful study of contentious gatherings dignifies trivial events while ignoring the genuine springs of politics. Speaking of the Hobsbawm-Rudé analysis of Swing, Checkland and Checkland declare that

This approach maximizes the oppressive nature of the regime in dealing with protest, arguing that politicians, officialdom and the military were more prone to violence than were the workers. This kind of thinking rests upon the attitude that protest, because it occurs, is a symptom of tension meaningful for society as a whole, that the 'crowd' which carries it out is rational and controlled, free of any tendency to pass into a 'mob', and that the authorities in dealing with the situation should have taken this into account.

The opposing view is that the protests, though frightening to contemporaries, were not all that formidable or concerted, but were a discrete set of incidents, spasmodically related to the worst times and the most adversely affected groups, and encapsulated within particular regions. The question might well be asked by those who take this view: if the labourers had developed a serious consciousness of oppression, and of their role and their solidarity, why then did not the envisaged link-up take place?

By extension this approach argues that regrettable though the need for public discipline may have been, protest was on a modest scale, not comparable to what has occurred in other societies (Checkland and Checkland 1974: 25).

Needless to say, the Checklands subscribe to the latter view. Almost needless to say, I subscribe to the former. The study of contentious gatherings stands straight in the line occupied by Hobsbawm and Rudé: arguing that everyday conflicts result from, and reveal, durable social divisions; claiming that, on the whole, contention is problem-solving behavior; thinking that the grievances and demands ordinary people stated sprang from experience and reflection; suggesting that participants in widely-separated events pooled their knowledge, and responded to each other's successes and failures. Despite our heavy reliance on computers, our basic procedures simply extend and standardize procedures long since developed by Hobsbawm, Rudé and other pioneers in the historical study of popular collective action.

In keeping with the tradition, I want to tread a pace or two beyond the assertion that the contentious gatherings of 1828 to 1834 were meaningful in their own terms. I believe they help us understand the

the political changes that were going in Britain as a whole, in ways that parliamentary speeches and the correspondence of leaders cannot. Not that the worlds of Parliament and of popular contention existed on opposite sides of an unbridgeable chasm; on the contrary, they interacted continuously. But in the contentious gatherings of the time we see the interests, organization and accumulated tactical experience of ordinary people in action, and in confrontation with the national structure of power.

REFERENCES CITED

Gabriel A. Almond

- 1973 "Approaches to Developmental Causation, in Gabriel A. Almond, Scott C. Flanagan and Robert J. Mundt, eds., Crisis, Choice, and Change. Historical Studies of Political Development. Boston: Little, Brown.

Reinhard Bendix

- 1964 Nation-Building & Citizenship. Studies of Our Changing Social Order. New York: Wiley.

Brian R. Brown

- 1979 "Lancashire Chartism and the Mass Strike of 1842: The Political Economy of Working Class Contention," CRSO [Center for Research on Social Organization, University of Michigan] Working Paper 203.

S.G. and E.O.A. Checkland, eds.

- 1974 The Poor Law Report of 1834. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Carlos Flick

- 1978 The Birmingham Political Union and the Movements for Reform in Britain, 1830-1839. Hamden, Connecticut: Archon.

E.J. Hobsbawm

- 1962 The Age of Revolution. Europe 1789-1848. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

E. J. Hobsbawm and George Rudé

- 1969 Captain Swing. London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Oliver MacDonagh

- 1977 Early Victorian Government, 1830-1970. New York: Holmes & Meier

Barrington Moore, J r.

- 1966 Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy. Lord and Peasant in the Making of the Modern World. Boston: Beacon Press

Frank W. Munger, Jr.

- 1977 "Popular Protest and its Suppression in Early Nineteenth Century Lancashire, England: A Study of Historical Models of Protest and Repression," unpublished doctoral dissertation in sociology, University of Michigan.

R.A. Schweitzer

- 1978 "Source Reading for Contentious Gatherings in Nineteenth-Century British Newspapers," CRSO Working Paper 186.
- 1979 "The Study of Contentious Gatherings in Early Nineteenth-Century Great Britain," Historical Methods, 12: 1-4.

R.A. Schweitzer and Steven C. Simmons

- 1978 "Interactive, Direct-Entry Approaches to Contentious Gathering Event Files," CRSO Working Paper 183.

R.A. Schweitzer, Charles Tilly and John Boyd

- 1980 "The Texture of British Contention in 1828 and 1829," CRSO Working Paper 211.

John Stevenson

- 1979 Popular Disturbances in England, 1700-1870. London: Longman.

Keith Thomas

- 1978 "The United Kingdom," in Raymond Grew, ed., Crises of Political Development in Europe and the United States. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

E.P. Thompson

- 1964 The Making of the English Working Class. London: Gollancz.

Charles Tilly and R.A. Schweitzer

- 1980 "Enumerating and Coding Contentious Gatherings in Nineteenth-Century Britain," CRSO Working Paper 210.

Michael Vester

- 1970 Die Entstehung des Proletariats als Lernprozess. Frankfurt a/M: Europäische Verlagsanstalt.

APPENDIX: ARCHIVAL MATERIAL AVAILABLE FOR GREAT BRITAIN, FEBRUARY 1980

As supplementary material for describing contentious gatherings and as the basis of interpretations of the evidence, we have collected a good deal of documentation from the Public Record Office, London, and a small amount of material from the British Library. Some of it consists of general notes, some of photocopies of selected documents, some of microfilms covering whole boxes or major parts of them. The microfilms of H.O. 52 listed were, for the most part, filmed for the Center for Research Libraries at our suggestion, and are on long-term loan from the Center. The rest are the permanent property of our research group, and will be available indefinitely for use in Ann Arbor. I am grateful to Sharon Jablonski for preparing the inventory of our holdings.

Key:

S.P.	State Papers
C.O.	Colonial Office
M.P.O.	Metropolitan Police
Rail	British Rail archives
ADM	Admiralty

SERIES	ITEM	BOX	NOTES	PAGES OF PHOTOCOPY	FRAMES OF MICROFILM	YEARS	CONTENTS
H.O.	19			1		1823-28	Registers: Criminal petitions
H.O.	19			1		1831	Petition to High Chancellor
H.O.	36		+	13		1832	Treasury Entry Books
H.O.	40		+	24		1823-25	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40		+	10		1826	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40		+	54		1826	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40		+	30		1826,1827	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40				all	1828	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40		+	60		1829	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40		+	29		1829	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40		+	18		1830	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40		+	24		1830	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40		+	35		1830,1831	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40	3	+	2		N.D. (1831)	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40	4	+	6		1830	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40		+	10		1830,1831	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40	4	+	1		1830	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40		+	15		1831	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40	1	+	7		1831	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40	2	+	11		1831	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40		+	8		1832	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40	2	+	6		1832	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40		+	24		1833,1834	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40		+	13		1829,1838	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40		+	6		1829,1838,1839	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40		+	10		1838	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40		+	3		1838	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40		+	7		1838	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	40		+	19		1841,1842,1855	Home Office: disturbances
H.O.	41		+	*BMP MICROFILM		1828-1830	H.O. Entry Books: Out-letters & disturbances
H.O.	41		+	7		1823,1824	H.O. Entry Books: Out-letters & disturbances
H.O.	41			BMP MICROFILM		1830	H.O. Entry Books: Out-letters & disturbances
H.O.	41			BMP MICROFILM		1831	H.O. Entry Books: Out-letters & disturbances
H.O.	41			BMP MICROFILM		1831	H.O. Entry Books: Out-letters & disturbances
H.O.	41		+	BMP MICROFILM		1831-1834	H.O. Entry Books: Out-letters & disturbances
H.O.	41		+	5		1833,1834	H.O. Entry Books: Out-letters & disturbances
H.O.	41		+	BMP MICROFILM		1834	H.O. Entry Books: Out-letters & disturbances
H.O.	41		+	31		1834	H.O. Entry Books: Out-letters & disturbances
H.O.	41			53		1842	H.O. Entry Books: Out-letters & disturbances

* BRITISH MICROFILM PROJECT

SERIES	ITEM	BOX	NOTES	PAGES OF PHOTOCOPY	FRAMES OF MICROFILM	YEARS	CONTENTS
H.O.	41	17	+	108		1842	H.O. Entry BOOKS: out-letters & disturbances
H.O.	20		+	13		1853,1860	H.O. Entry Books: out-letters & disturbances
H.O.	26		+	21		1834,1835,1842 1846,1847	H.O. Entry Books: out-letters & disturbances
H.O.	42	21	+	22		1830	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	42	25	+	1		1793	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	42	27	+	2		1793	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	42	30	+	3		1794	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	42	34	+	11		1795	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	42	35	+	10		1795	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	42	36	+	9		1795	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	42	37	+	6		1795	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	42	43	+	3		1798	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	42	46	+	1		1798	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	42	96	+	2		1809	Home Office: Domestic
H.O.	42	99	+	3		1809	Home Office: Domestic
H.O.	42	148	+	1		1816	Home Office: Domestic
H.O.	4]	149	+	6		1816	Home Office: Domestic
H.O.	42	150	+	10		1816	Home Office: Domestic
H.O.	42	151	+	2		1816	Home Office: Domestic
H.O.	42	158	+	43		1816,1817	Home Office: Domestic
H.O.	42	159	+	6		1817	Home Office: Domestic
H.O.	42	160	+	4		1817	Home Office: Domestic
H.O.	43	6	+	29		1795	Home Office Entry Books: Domestic Out-letters
H.O.	43	7	+	24		1795,1861	Home Office Entry Books: Domestic Out-letters
H.O.	43	17	+	2		1809	Home Office Entry Books: Domestic Out-letters
H.O.	43	31	+	3		1823,1825	Home Office Entry Books: Domestic Out-letters
H.O.	43	36	+	BMP MICROFILM		1828-29	Home Office Entry Books: Domestic Out-letters
H.O.	43	36	+	15		1828-29	Home Office Entry Books: Domestic Out-letters
H.O.	43	37	+	BMP MICROFILM		1829	Home Office Entry Books: Domestic Out-letters
H.O.	43	37	+			1829	Home Office Entry Books: Domestic Out-letters
H.O.	43	38	+	19		1830	Home Office Entry Books: Domestic Out-letters
H.O.	43	39	+	BMP MICROFILM		1830-31	Home Office Entry Books: Domestic Out-letters
H.O.	43	39	+	19		1830-31	Home Office Entry Books: Domestic Out-letters
H.O.	43	40	+	16		1831	Home Office Entry Books: Domestic Out-letters
H.O.	43	41	+	15		1831,1832	Home Office Entry Books: Domestic Out-letters
H.O.	43	42	+	11		1832	Home Office Entry Books: Domestic Out-letters
H.O.	43	43	+	7		1832	Home Office Entry Books: Domestic Out-letters
H.O.	43	74	+	6		1848	Home Office Entry Books: Domestic Out-letters
H.O.	43	75	+	22		1848	Home Office Entry Books: Domestic Out-letters

SERIES	ITEM	BOX	NOTES	PAGES OF PHOTOCOPY	FRAMES OF MICROFILM	YEARS	CONTENTS
H.O.	44	15	+	3		1825	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	44	16	+	26		1826	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	44	18	+	1-26, 32-34			Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	44	19	+	3		1830	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	44	20	+	12		1830	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	44	21	+	22		1830	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	44	22	+	45		1830	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	44	23	+	26		1830	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	44	24	+	40		1831	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	44	25	+	27		1831, 1832	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	44	31	+	4		1838	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	44	56	+		all	1832	Home Office: Correspondence: Domestic
H.O.	48	5		3		1795	Home Office: Law Officers: Reports and Correspondence
H.O.	48	14	+	1		1809	Home Office: Law Officers: Reports and Correspondence
H.O.	48	26	+	7		1825	Home Office: Law Officers: Reports and Correspondence
H.O.	48	28	+	47		1830	Home Office: Law Officers: Reports and Correspondence
H.O.	48	29	+	47		1831-33, 1838	Home Office: Law Officers: Reports and Correspondence
H.O.	48	34	+	4		1842	Home Office: Law Officers: Reports and Correspondence
H.O.	48	40	+	7		1848	Home Office: Law Officers: Reports and Correspondence
H.O.	49	7	+	19		1829, 1830, 1831	Home Office: Law Officers: Letter Books
H.O.	50	4	+	7		1795	Home Office: Military: Correspondence and papers
H.O.	50	13	+	4		1822, 1825	Home Office: Military: Correspondence and papers
H.O.	50	14	+	8		1830-33	Home Office: Military: Correspondence and papers
H.O.	50	210	+	4		1809	Home Office: Military: Correspondence and papers
H.O.	50	372	+	1		1795	Home Office: Military: Correspondence and papers
H.O.	50	386	+	1		1795	Home Office: Military: Correspondence and papers
H.O.	51	31	+	4		1828, 1831	Home Office: Entry Books; Military
H.O.	52	5	+	4	all	1828-29	Home Office: All Counties Correspondence
H.O.	52	6	+		all	1830	Home Office: Bedford Devon
H.O.	52	7	+	175	all	1830	Home Office: Dorset-Huntington

SERIES	ITEM	BOX	NOTES	PAGES OF PHOTOCOPY	FRAMES OF MICROFILM	YEARS	CONTENTS
H.O.	52	8	+		all	1830	Home Office: Kent-Middlesex
H.O.	52	9	+		all	1830	Home Office: Monmouth-Somerset
H.O.	52	10	+		all	1830	Home Office: Stafford-Sussex
H.O.	52	11	+		all	1830	Home Office: Warwick-York, Wales, etc.
H.O.	52	12	+		all	1831	Home Office: Berks-Gloucester
H.O.	52	13	+		all	1831	Home Office: Hants-Lancaster
H.O.	52	14	+		all	1831	Home Office: Leicester-Northumberland
H.O.	52	15	+		all	1831	Home Office: Northampton-York
H.O.	52	16	+		all		Home Office: Wales
H.O.	52	17	+		all	1832	Home Office: Berks-Kent
H.O.	52	18	+		all	1832	Home Office: Lancaster-Lincoln
H.O.	52	19	+		all	1832	Home Office: Middlesex-Stafford
H.O.	52	20	+		all	1832	Home Office: Suffolk-York
H.O.	52	21	+		all	1832	Home Office: Wales
H.O.	52	22	+		all	1833	Home Office: Berks-Somerset
H.O.	52	23	+		all	1833	Home Office: Stafford-Wales
H.O.	52	24	+		all	1834	Home Office: Berks
H.O.	52	25	+		all	1834	Home Office: Northampton-Wales
H.O.	60	1		2		1823	H.O. Entry Books: Police Courts
H.O.	60	2		2		1834	H.O. Entry Books: Police Courts
H.O.	62	1	+	2		1828	H.O. Entry Books: Metropolitan Police: Daily Reports
H.O.	64	1		13		1831	H.O. Entry Books: Police; Rewards, Pardon and Secret Service
H.O.	64	2	+	2	all	1831	H.O. Entry Books: Police; Rewards, Pardon and Secret Service
H.O.	64	11	+	1		1828	H.O. Entry Books: Police; Rewards, Pardon and Secret Service
H.O.	64	16	+	11		1830-31	H.O. Entry Books: Police; Rewards, Pardon and Secret Service
H.O.	65	1	+	8		1795	H.O. Entry Books: Police; Out-letters
H.O.	65	10	+	14		1842	H.O. Entry Books: Police; Out-letters
H.O.	79	4	+	14		1830,1831,1832	H.O. Entry Books: Confidential Letters
H.O.	119	8		11		1827-1833	Home Office: Law Officers; Miscellaneous Reports
S.P.	37	3	+	+		1764	State Papers: Domestic: George III
S.P.	37	4	+	+		1765	State Papers: Domestic: George III
S.P.	37	10	+	+		1773-1774	State Papers: Domestic: George III
S.P.	37	11	+	+		1775-1776	State Papers: Domestic: George III
S.P.	37	20	+	+		1780	State Papers: Domestic: George III
S.P.	41	26	+	+		1773-1777	State Papers: Military
C.O.	5	7	+	+		1755-1779	Colonial Office: America and West Indies: Original Correspondence

SERIES	ITEM	BOX	NOTES	PAGES OF PHOTOCOPY	FRAMES OF MICROFILM	YEARS	CONTENTS
C.O. 5	119		+	+		1771-1773	Colonial Office: America and West Indies: Original Correspondence
C.O. 5	120		+	+		1774	Colonial Office: America and West Indies: Original Correspondence
C.O. 5	121		+	+		1774-1775	Colonial Office: America and West Indies: Original Correspondence
C.O. 5	138		+	+		1771-1775	Colonial Office: America and West Indies: Original Correspondence
C.O. 5	175		+	24		1774-1783	Colonial Office: North American Colonies; Original Correspondence
C.O. 5	378		+	88		1764-1768	Colonial Office: South Carolina: Original Correspondence
C.O. 5	388		+	7		1744-1753	Colonial Office: South Carolina: Original Correspondence
C.O. 5	389		+	12		1748-1751	Colonial Office: South Carolina: Original Correspondence
C.O. 5	390		+	18		1762-1767	Colonial Office: South Carolina: Original Correspondence
C.O. 5	391		+	6		1764-1768	Colonial Office: South Carolina: Original Correspondence
C.O. 5	392		+	6		1768-1769	Colonial Office: South Carolina: Original Correspondence
C.O. 5	393		+	16		1769	Colonial Office: South Carolina: Original Correspondence
C.O. 5	394		+	10		1770-1772	Colonial Office: South Carolina: Original Correspondence
C.O. 5	395		+	+		1773	Colonial Office: South Carolina: Original Correspondence
C.O. 5	396		+	130		1773-1777	Colonial Office: South Carolina: Original Correspondence, Secretary of State
C.O. 5	407		+	1		1766-1767	Colonial Office: South Carolina: Letters from Secretary of State
C.O. 5	408		+	3		1768-1782	Colonial Office: South Carolina: Letters from Secretary of State
C.O. 5	409		+	7		1767-1772	Colonial Office: South Carolina: Letters to Secretary of State
C.O. 5	410		+	3		1772-1781	Colonial Office: South Carolina: Letters to Secretary of State

SERIES	ITEM	BOX	NOTES	PAGES OF PHOTOCOPY	FRAMES OF MICROFILM	YEARS	CONTENTS
TREASURY OFFICE: GENERAL NOTES ON THE SERIES							
M.P.O.	1	3	+	12		1830	Metropolitan Police Offices: Letter Books: Office of the Commissioner
M.P.O.	1	4	+	3		1830-1831	Metropolitan Police Offices: Letter Books: Office of the Commissioner
M.P.O.	1	6	+	6		1831	Metropolitan Police Offices: Letter Books: Office of the Commissioner
M.P.O.	1	7	+	3		1831	Metropolitan Police Offices: Letter Books: Office of the Commissioner
M.P.O.	1	8	+	4		1831-1832	Metropolitan Police Offices: Letter Books: Office of the Commissioner
M.P.O.	1	9	+	3		1832	Metropolitan Police Offices: Letter Books: Office of the Commissioner
M.P.O.	1	12	+	2		1833	Metropolitan Police Offices: Letter Books: Office of the Commissioner
M.P.O.	1	13	+	2		1833	Metropolitan Police Offices: Letter Books: Office of the Commissioner
M.P.O.	1	14	+	1		1833	Metropolitan Police Offices: Letter Books: Office of the Commissioner
M.P.O.	1	44	+	29		1830-1836	Metropolitan Police Offices: Letter Books: Office of the Commissioner
M.P.O.	1	50	+	1		1830-1839	Metropolitan Police Offices: Letter Books: Office of the Commissioner
M.P.O.	2	70	+	2		1831-1840	Metropolitan Police Offices: MEPO District Extension: General Correspondence
M.P.O.	4	13	+	2		1830	Metropolitan Police: Miscellaneous Books: Reports
M.P.O.	4	14	+	2		1830	Metropolitan Police: Miscellaneous Books: Reports
M.P.O.	4	15	+	1		1831	Metropolitan Police: Miscellaneous Books: Reports
M.P.O.	4	16	+	1		1831	Metropolitan Police: Miscellaneous Books: Reports
M.P.O.	4	17	+	2		1832	Metropolitan Police: Miscellaneous Books: Reports
M.P.O.	4	18	+	2		1832	Metropolitan Police: Miscellaneous Books: Reports
M.P.O.	4	18	+	2		1832	Metropolitan Police: Miscellaneous Books: Reports
M.P.O.	4	19	+	2		1833	Metropolitan Police: Miscellaneous Books: Reports
M.P.O.	4	22	+	1		1834	Metropolitan Police: Miscellaneous Books: Reports

SERIES	ITEM	BOX	NOTES	PAGES OF PHOTOCOPY	FRAMES OF MICROFILM	YEARS	CONTENTS
<u>RAIL</u>	GENERAL NOTES ON THE FOLLOWING NUMBERS IN SERIES:						
Rail	113	1,3-4					
Rail	113	10					
Rail	113	44-51					
Rail	186	2,3					
Rail	186	7					
Rail	186	49					
Rail	186	69-70					
Rail	186	77-100					
Rail	635	1					
Rail	635	16-19					
Rail	635	103					
Rail	635	187-192					
Rail	635	209-317					
Rail	635	327-333					
ADM	55	23		23		1792	Admiralty: Log Books: Supplementary Series II Explorations

BRITISH MUSEUM
NOTES ONLY

Place Papers MSS 1863 through 43668

Peel Papers MSS 40181 through 40617

WORKING PAPERS OF THE CENTER FOR RESEARCH ON SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

The Center for Research on Social Organization is a facility of the Department of Sociology, University of Michigan. Its primary mission is to support the research of faculty and students in the department's Social Organization graduate program. CRSO Working papers report current research and reflection by affiliates of the Center; many of them are published later elsewhere after revision. Working Papers which are still in print are available from the Center for a fee of 50 cents plus the number of pages in the paper (88 cents for a 38-page paper, etc.). The Center will photocopy out-of-print Working Papers at cost (approximately five cents per page). Recent Working Papers include:

- 202 "Proletarianization: Theory and Research," by Charles Tilly, August 1979, 20 pages.
- 203 "Lancashire Chartism and the Mass Strike of 1842: The Political Economy of Working Class Contention," by Brian R. Brown, August 1979, 55 pages.
- 204 "Macro Issues in the Theory of Social Movements. SMO Interaction, the Role of Counter-Movements and Cross-National Determinants of the Social Movement Sector," by Mayer N. Zald, August 1979, 23 pages.
- 205 "Immigrant Women in the City: Comparative Perspectives," by Leslie Page Moch and Louise A. Tilly, September 1979, 87 pages.
- 206 "Keeping the Navvies in Line: Variations in Work-Discipline Among Victorian Railway Construction Crews," by Samuel Cohn, October 1979, 27 pages.
- 207 "Demographic Origins of the European Proletariat," by Charles Tilly, December 1979, 105 pages.
- 208 "Contention and Peasant Rebellion in Seventeenth-Century France," by Charles Tilly, January 1980, 54 pages.
- 209 "A Study of Contentious Gatherings in Early Nineteenth-Century Great Britain," by R.A. Schweitzer, January 1980, 4 pages.
- 210 "Enumeration and Coding Contentious Gatherings in Nineteenth-Century Britain," by Charles Tilly and R.A. Schweitzer, February 1980, 84 pages.
- 211 "The Texture of Contention in Britain, 1828-1829," by R.A. Schweitzer, Charles Tilly and John Boyd, February 1980, 150 pages.