



TRANSFORMATIONS

comparative study of social transformations



CSST
WORKING PAPERS
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor

LABOUR HISTORY--SOCIAL HISTORY--
ALLTAGSGESCHICHTE: EXPERIENCE,
CULTURE, AND THE POLITICS
OF THE EVERYDAY. A NEW DIRECTION
FOR GERMAN SOCIAL HISTORY?

GEOFF ELEY

CSST Working
Paper #18

CRSO Working
Paper #378

January 1989

LABOUR HISTORY---SOCIAL HISTORY---ALLTAGSGESCHICHTE:
EXPERIENCE, CULTURE, AND THE POLITICS OF THE EVERYDAY.
A NEW DIRECTION FOR GERMAN SOCIAL HISTORY?

GEOFF ELEY
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
ANN ARBOR, MI 48109

The works reviewed in this essay are Wolfgang Ruppert, ed., Die Arbeiter. Lebensformen, Alltag und Kultur von der Frühindustrialisierung bis zum "Wirtschaftswunder" (Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1986), pp. 512, DM 78.00; Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Hans-Gerhard Husung, eds., The Development of Trade Unionism in Great Britain and Germany 1880-1914 (London: George Allen & Unwin for the German Historical Institute, 1985), pp. viii + 400, \$34.95; Heinrich Volkmann and Jürgen Bergmann, eds., Sozialer Protest. Studien zu traditioneller und kollektiver Gewalt in Deutschland vom Vormärz bis zur Reichsgründung (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1984), pp. 354, DM ; Klaus Tenfelde, ed., Arbeiter und Arbeiterbewegung im Vergleich. Berichte zur internationalen historischen Forschung, Historische Zeitschrift--Sonderheft 15 (Munich: R. Oldenbourg Verlag, 1986), pp. 896, DM 198.00; Klaus Tenfelde and Helmut Trischler, eds., Bis vor die Stufen des Throns. Bittschriften und Beschwerden von Bergleuten im Zeitalter der Industrialisierung (Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1986), pp. 532, DM 42.00; S. H. F. Hickey, Workers in Imperial Germany. The Miners of the Ruhr (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), pp. xiv + 330, \$44.00; Franz-Josef Brüggemeier, Leben vor Ort. Ruhrbergleute und Ruhrbergbau 1889-1919 (Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1984), pp. 375, DM 24.00; Adelheid von Saldern, Auf dem Wege zum Arbeiter-Reformismus. Parteilalltag in sozialdemokratischer Göttingen (1870-1920) (Frankfurt am Main: Materialis Verlag, 1984), pp. 345, DM 48.00; Friedhelm Boll, ed., Arbeiterkulturen zwischen Alltag und Politik. Beiträge zum europäischen Vergleich in der Zwischenkriegszeit (Vienna, Munich, Zurich: Europa-Verlag, 1986), pp. 243, DM .

The most important new departure in West German historiography during the last decade has been Alltagsgeschichte, or the history of everyday life.¹ Beginning around the mid-1970s, and then rapidly adopted by broadening circles of social historians, the term has become the watchword for a flourishing universe of locally based discussion and research. Moreover, this enthusiasm extends far beyond the walls of the academy as such to encompass a much larger domain of public history, from museums, exhibitions, adult education, and the activities of local government cultural offices, to the media, local publishing, and self-organized local research. In other words, this is as much a lay as a professorial movement, not least because so many of the 1960s and 1970s generations of history graduates are without an academic job, or at best maintain a tenuous foothold in the profession. Much of the activity is borne by amateurs and semi-professionals--"barefoot historians", in the commonly used expression, which captures the distinctive mixture of zeal, anti-academicism, and populist politics so important to the élan of much of the broader movement. Furthermore, the emergence of this grass-roots phenomenon, loosely grouped since the early-1980s in the Geschichtswerkstatt (History Workshop movement) has coincided with the rise of the peace movement and the Greens, and at one level a "greening" of social history is clearly taking place. A high point in the diffusion of Alltagsgeschichte came in 1980-81, when the President's Prize for German History in Schools was devoted to the theme "Daily Life Under National Socialism", after preceding competitions on "Movements of Freedom" in one's own locality (1974-76), and "The Social History of Everyday Life" (1977-79). The quality of entries varied enormously, as did the understandings and outlooks they revealed, but the impressive thing was the scale: some 12,000 participated in the competition, amidst widespread public controversy, and much resulting publication.²

In some ways the most visible effect of this activity has been a flood of literature aimed at a general audience--memoirs, oral histories, diaries, and "eye-witness accounts"; montage combinations of documentation, pictures, and text; local histories; exhibition catalogues; and handsomely illustrated coffee table books. Much of the interest has focused on the Third Reich--in one recent review Detlev Peukert discussed over fifty works published in the early-1980s under this perspective--and in this sense Alltagsgeschichte has certainly shared in the West German public's intense preoccupation with the Nazi period since the so-called "Hitler wave" of the mid-1970s.³ But public interest in history is certainly larger than the latter. In fact, one of the earliest signs was the remarkable popularity of the 1977 Stuttgart exhibition on the culture of the Staufen period (1150-1250), followed four years later by the prestigious Prussia exhibition in West Berlin ("Prussia: Attempt at a Balance"), both of which suggested a large reservoir of interest in the national past.⁴ Moreover, while such celebrations of "national" traditions obviously lend themselves to conservative political exploitation, the Left has also been hard at work with the German past, both in the SPD through the party's Historical Commission and larger cultural and research apparatuses, and in the broader radical history milieu that includes the History Workshop movement. We can see this in the Historikerstreit, in the related efforts at contesting conservative or governmental control of the national museum projects, in the anti-fascist vigilance against sweeping Nazism back under carpet, in the legion of community history projects, and, last but not least, in the take-off of women's history. In all of these ways, Alltagsgeschichte has a definite political context.⁵

The least challenging and most commercial form of Alltagsgeschichte, which deliberately removes itself from this political domain, is the coffee

table genre, as in the series of picture books published by Droste under the rubric Fotografierte Zeitgeschichte.⁶ The most substantial effort in this area has been undertaken by the Munich publisher C. H. Beck in consultation with Hermann Glaser, the long-time cultural officer for the city of Nuremberg. Though concerned with everyday life, and to a great extent a pioneer of cultural history in the popular sense, Glaser's own activity largely predates the emergence of Alltagsgeschichte as a coherent movement of more recent and specific provenance. More traditional and antiquarian in his understanding, he stands recognizably within an older tradition of museum practice, simply extending the latter to a new and disregarded area (the lives, manners, and morals of the working class), and organizing his presentations via a synthetic category of Industriekultur (Industrial culture) as a catchall expression for the texture of life in industrial society. While progressive and humane in these terms, Glaser's work doesn't really belong with Alltagsgeschichte proper, although the popular history industry he has helped to sponsor necessarily relies on the collaboration of many Alltagshistoriker, particularly given the importance of the museum sector as a refuge for unemployed historians. Having produced and co-authored various volumes on mechanization, the impact of railways, Nuremberg in the machine age, and nineteenth century social life, all generously illustrated in large format, Glaser is now editor of a series on the "Industrial Culture of German Cities and Regions".⁷

Wolfgang Ruppert, who worked during 1978-81 at Glaser's Nuremberg Centre for Industrial Culture before moving to a chair of cultural history at Bielefeld, provides one bridge between this "soft" activity and the harder kind of Alltagsgeschichte. His splendidly produced compilation, Die Arbeiter (also published by Beck), is certainly an excellent example of the more popular genre. Beautifully illustrated and presented, and composed from the specially

commissioned contributions of thirty specialists, the book is organized into five sections (work, daily life, collective aspirations for change, the institutions of workers' culture, political and trade union organization), which provide an admirable survey of working class history in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, concentrated in the years 1860-1933. Yet few of the essays are longer than ten pages (minus the pictures), and faced with the task of covering the best part of a century can supply only the barest of introductions to their respective subjects. More seriously, Ruppert's and the publisher's presentation of the volume subtly distances it from any active political considerations. In effect, Die Arbeiter--and beyond it the larger line of commercially produced Alltag and Industriekultur literature --functions symptomatically in a larger process of historical closure, in which the labour movement, a self-conscious and distinctive working class culture, and the "world of the worker" are consigned to a distant and obsolete past. The book as such is presented as a window into a strange and vanished world, which for many readers may be an object of family-based curiosity and nostalgia, but whose material privations, no less than the utopian values and class solidarities, retain no purchase on the present. The purpose of the exercise is fascination--to engage the reader's interest and human sympathy, but not her/his political commitment. From the book as a whole, if not from some of the individual contributions, Alltagsgeschichte's critical edge is missing.⁸

If we shift the focus somewhat, there has also been a boom in the more conventional social history of the German working class during the last decade, whose findings, in fact, are usefully synthesized in Ruppert's compilation.⁹ Understandably enough, much of this research has been harnessed to the familiar priorities of labour history--less to the study of the SPD itself, perhaps

(although by now there is no dearth of literature on the history of the party per se), than to the history of the trade unions, strikes, and the workers of particular industries. In particular, we have finally acquired an excellent detailed account of the general pattern of trade union growth between the 1860s and 1914, with a sufficiently extensive monographic literature on specific categories of workers to allow provisional generalizations about the main bases of unionization to emerge.¹⁰ The volume of papers edited by Wolfgang Mommsen and Hans-Gerhard Husung on the transition to mass trade unionism, which originated in a 1981 conference on Germany, Britain and France, with the French papers dropping out for the published version, provides excellent access to this state of discussion. After a magisterial introductory survey by Eric Hobsbawm, which in twenty pages of distilled erudition elaborates the European framework for the problem, and two essays on comparative strike movements by James Cronin and Friedhelm Boll, the collection settles down into a discrete juxtaposition of the British and German experiences, in the proportion of twelve essays to seven. In the German camp, Hans Mommsen supplies a familiar general assessment of the Free Trade Unions' relations with the SPD (forming the book's conclusion with Jay Winter's analogous treatment of the unions and the Labour Party), and the rest usefully summarize aspects of their larger books: Klaus Schönhoven on the evolving configuration of localism, craft unionism and industrial unionism; Dirk Müller on the persistence of localism in Berlin; Klaus Tenfelde on the early years of German trade unionism between the 1850s and 1890s; Michael Grüttner on rank-and-file unionism on the Hamburg docks; Michael Schneider on the Christian unions; and Klaus Saul on the role of the state.¹¹

It is striking in this excellent collection how strongly the comparative analysis becomes drawn to the political level. In the most fundamental sense,

of course, economics were primary: Germany's compressed and accelerated industrialization, combined with the highly organized character of German capitalism, made the best case for the centralized model of industry-wide union organization, as against the gradualism of industrialization and early consolidation of craft unions in Britain, which allowed a far more mixed pattern of craft, industrial and general unionism to prevail. But while aware of this structural context, most German historians prefer a political answer to the national divergences between British and German trade union histories. Above all, the authoritarianism of the state is made to explain both the German unions' limited gains under the law and the greater strength of political radicalism among the working class, with the employers' anti-union rigidity attributed to the wider diffusion of the same reactionary traditions. Thus, for Tenfelde, the repressive labour and civil rights policies of the Bismarckian state artificially postponed the emergence of a "British" pattern of liberalized and accommodative industrial relations. They "disrupted the process of trade union formation" in the 1870s, just as "the 'natural' relationship between conflict and organization" (between the new forms of industrial conflict and the modern forms of collective regulation and expression, that is, "responsible" and pragmatic trade unionism) was about to take shape.¹² Recent social historians can certainly do an excellent job of grounding their analysis in a sensitive study of working conditions, community organization, labour market dynamics, and workplace sociology (as in Grüttner's work on the Hamburg dockers, which brings out the similarities with John Lovell's companion piece on London).¹³ But when it comes to explaining the differential progress of British and German trade union organization and legitimacy, it is the German state that is most commonly invoked.¹⁴

It is not the importance of political determinations as such, but their

primacy in the overall account, that deserves attention. In much German labour history there is a presumption of the labour movement's long-term adjustment to life under capitalism. For Gerhard A. Ritter, this was the SPD's "inescapable fate" once the Anti-Socialist Law had gone, and could be glimpsed in "the workers' involvement in ever greater areas of practical effectiveness, for which there were thousands of individual manifestations", from the parliamentary moderation of the South German Social Democrats, to the service activities of the labour secretariats, the participation in tribunals and other consultative arrangements, and the sensible pragmatism of trade union leaders.¹⁵ If that was so, then the SPD's revolutionary veneer--so much rhetoric and hot air, "theoretical humbug", in Ritter's view--becomes the unnecessary consequence of anti-socialist intransigence, an effect of the dominant culture's resistance to the rise of democracy, rather than the spontaneous creation of labour itself.¹⁶ The politicized oppositional culture we associate with the German labour movement was allowed to develop because "traditional patterns of authority" blinded the big employers to the rationality and justice of industrial conciliation, and because political backwardness blocked the movement's integration.¹⁷ Now, whether one accepts this line of argument or not, two of its characteristics are worth noting. First, it implies a teleology of "modern" industrial relations, based on a pluralist model of equilibrium or "partnership" between capital and labour, which in the German case was abnormally held back. Secondly, it pulls the analysis to the large-scale political and ideological level of explanation, as opposed to the "micro-historical" level expressed by the current interest in everyday life.

The power of this teleology can be seen in another growth area of German social history, the study of social protest. Here, of course, the ground is already marked out by an enormous amount of research elsewhere, beginning

8

with Rudé and Hobsbawm, proceeding through Thompson's concept of moral economy, and converging with the US sociology of collective action inspired by the turbulence of the 1960s, most associated in social historical terms with the influence of Charles Tilly.¹⁸ Developing somewhat later, in the mid-1970s, German discussion has had the advantage of these pioneering efforts, in both positive and negative terms. While one of the earliest German initiatives was Richard Tilly's contribution to The Rebellious Century, for instance, the operative agenda for the emerging research was established more via the immediate critique of his work than by following his intended example: while such criticisms were less pertinent to the more careful argumentation of brother Charles, reservations were expressed about the validity of the working distinction between "violent" and other forms of protest, about the informative and explanatory value of an "index of social tension" based on the counting of violent incidents, and about the usefulness of gross correlations between patterns of collective violence constructed in this fashion and large-scale processes of social, economic, and political "modernization".¹⁹ Almost necessarily, a strictly quantitative approach homogenizes complex processes and events, reducing each to a measurable datum removed from the determinate context that defines its meaning, whose own specificity may well disallow the aggregation. Moreover:

In so far as one believes that protest is a form of articulating people's interests, one must at least admit that it is valid to ask how the protesters were affected by economic developments, how their concrete work and living situation improved or worsened. Aggregate data on the level of the nation state do not even provide a starting-point for answering this question. The study of smaller units of investigation would, in this case, be less a step back than a methodological advance.²⁰

The conceptual and methodological pitfalls of studying social protest were quickly addressed in the German discussion--the partiality of the available

sources; the potential for both over- and under-reportage of collective actions; the blurring of crime and protest, individual and collective acts; the importance of the "negotiative process" between crowd and authorities which preceded and surrounded the taking of action, and may often have pre-empted it; the effects of repression as both a deterrent and stimulus to protest; and so on. The over-restrictiveness of focusing on "collective violence" as opposed to other forms of dissentient behaviour--on "events in which more than some minimum number of persons took part in seizing or damaging persons or property", to use the Tillys' definition--has also been recognized, because it provides distorted access to the real repertoire of collective actions and structural tension in a pre-industrial society, and ties our understanding of conflict and cohesion in the latter to the exceptional occurrence of contingent and spectacular events.²¹ Nonetheless, the most fundamental of the assumptions underlying the pioneering Anglo-American accounts of social protest--the belief that spontaneous and direct forms of popular action (the food riot and related forms of violent crowd behaviour) were superseded during modernization by more rational and organized forms of collective mobilization (such as the trade union directed strike)--has been broadly reproduced. While eschewing the positivistic over-confidence that vitiated some of the pioneering social science analyses, which invested a heavier load of explanatory expectations in the long-run measurement of collective violence that it could bear, the recent German literature leaves Rudé's classic framework of transition (from "pre-industrial" to "industrial" protest, or the "'Pilgrim's Progress' of industrial relations" which has respectable trade unionism as its goal) largely intact.²²

This teleology is certainly present in the volume of essays edited by Heinrich Volkman and Jürgen Bergmann on nineteenth century German social protest. The term itself is a curious hybrid reflecting two radical motifs of the 1960s,

when the popularity of such work began--the turning away from an older institutional approach to popular politics via the labour movement, and the belief that the real mover behind popular protests was the social contradiction of rich and poor, driven by early capitalist development. The actions of "the crowd in history" become the symptoms of a society in transition, and the defensive reactions of existing popular cultures to the disruptive effects of modernizing change, or "primitive rebellion" in Hobsbawm's sense. Volkmann and Bergmann speak of a "type of protest specific to a particular period", that between the beginnings of capitalist industrialization in the early nineteenth century and the end of the long boom of 1849-73, which also coincided with the process of German unification (p. 13). The story then becomes one of progressive sophistication, with relatively spontaneous, sporadic, uncoordinated, and locally-bounded direct actions subsiding before the planned, continuous, and supra-local representation of collective interests, increasingly in a national political setting. This is not a simplistic conception. Volkmann, in particular, has spent much of his work specifying the terms of this dynamic dichotomy, proposing a fourfold classification of protests, from the completely informal through the more structured to the more organized and pre-planned (regellos, regelmäßig, organisiert, and geplant), and stressing the coherence and rationality of even the most "spontaneous" actions in their own terms.²³ The essays in the volume excell in showing the mechanics of the transition, as popular politics responded to the combined challenge of social transformation and the new political opportunities of the 1860s. The emerging labour movement could build on existing traditions of protest by transcending them. It "translated them onto a new level, by replacing non-legal and spontaneous actions with the legitimizing function of the demand for political power".²⁴

But the teleology is still there. It speaks strongly through the contribution

of Ulrich Engelhardt, now the leading authority on trade union origins in the 1860s, who presents labour history during 1848-70 as a linear transition "from 'protest' to 'strike'" as the forms of action appropriate to the demands of the changing social system. As he describes this developmental logic: "Genuinely pre-industrial motives and forms of protest, which also extended into the early stages of industrialization..., such as food riots, machine-breaking, and so forth, automatically gave way to social interests and methods of action specifically oriented...towards the industrial economy". For labour organizations themselves, this global change imposed a "learning process" (which in Engelhardt's hands implies a straightforwardly behaviourist model of attitudinal change), which generated the modern labour movement as we know it, with the incremental growth of trade union organization and a "continual increase in the rationality of strike behaviour".²⁵ This returns us to Tenfelde's stress on the distorting effects of reactionary political traditions in blocking the natural unfolding of a pragmatic and responsible trade unionism: rather than culminating in the liberalization of labour law as in Britain, the mobilizations of the 1860s produced a return to repression, and a pluralist framework for the handling of industrial conflict was never allowed to take shape. Indeed, there is an excellent companion volume to the Volkmann/Bergmann collection, edited by Tenfeld and Volkmann on the subject of strikes, constructed around the same notion of a progressive developmental scenario, whose structural consequences were in the German case politically constrained.²⁶ Despite the critique of other aspects of the earlier sociology of collective action, the "modernization of protest"--or the "rationalization of collective behaviour in conflicts", as Tenfelde puts it--remains a defining theme of current German research.²⁷

How should we assess this motif? Recent critics have blunted the sharpness of the developmental transition at both ends. On the one hand, Andreas

Griessinger has found in his study of eighteenth century journeymen's strikes all the features associated with the later "modernization"--pre-planning, focus on the business cycle, rudimentary democratic structures and nascent trade unionism, non-violence, and supra-local organization.²⁸ On the other hand, Richard Evans and others have stressed the persistence of "older" forms (riots, hunger disturbances, violent direct actions) long after the rationalization of conflict is supposed to have reduced their salience.²⁹ As Dick Geary has argued, in an admirable summary of these implications, the suggested typification of the more modern pre-planned and broader-organized strike, based on longer-term economic calculations, bears little correspondence to the actual course of many disputes. The bases and forms of industrial militancy and its absence, and even more its relationship to the progressive model of centralized and nationally organized trade unionism, are more complex than the gross pattern of expanding rationalization allows. Moreover, once we turn from strikes to the larger repertoire of protests, it becomes clear that riots as such are less the archaic manifestations of "traditional society" or "pre-industrial" conditions than the effects of political breakdown and economic hardship more generally. In particular, the years 1916-23 saw popular disturbances every bit as extensive, varied, violent, and direct as those of the 1840s.

...this suggests that there is no unilinear development in which "modernization" necessarily entails the abandonment of violent forms of protest. To a certain extent the protests of the lower social orders have been shaped as much by conjunctural as by structural variables. Furthermore, in so far as the nature of food riots changed over time, the concept of "pre-industrial protest" may obscure as much as it reveals.³⁰

Certain things have certainly been clarified: the forms and incidence of popular disturbances between the 1810s and 1860s have finally been mapped, bringing the German research up to the levels of Britain and France;³¹ the

sociology of the German crowd has been defined;³² the structured rationality of popular actions explored;³³ the relationship to political context laid clear.³⁴ As in the British and French discussions, the rootedness of popular protests in local structures of publicly sanctioned customary culture (as in Thompson's "moral economy"), which mediated the effects of economic development, shortages, pauperism, etc., is emphasized over the simplicities of the so-called "uprooting thesis", which presents protest as the direct consequence of social dislocation.³⁵ Even allowing for Griessinger's critique, German research also confirms the usefulness of Hobsbawm's classic typology, which sees a movement from crisis-related strike propensity in the early stages of industrialization (when strikes were mainly a response to extreme distress), through the phase of "classic competition" between the 1850s and 1890s (when workers learned to exploit their labour power in a more calculated and disciplined fashion during the upturns of the business cycle), to the era of monopoly or organized capitalism after the 1890s, when the growing centralization of employer and union resources combined with the new forms of state intervention to reduce the element of spontaneity in favour of planning and strategic rationalization.³⁶ Above all, the social protest research sets the stage for the emergence of the organized oppositional culture of the SPD, which is linked to an implicit model of modernizing political development. The latter is succinctly described for the British context by Charles Tilly:

Cumulatively, ...the evidence provides a warrant for thinking that Britain's collective-action repertoire underwent major alterations between the 1760s and the 1830s; that the eighteenth century parochial and patronized forms of collective action did, indeed, give way to the nineteenth and twentieth century national and autonomous forms; that deliberately formed associations became more and more prominent vehicles for the conveyance of grievances and demands; that the joining of a special-purpose association to a popular base, or at least to the appearance of a popular base, became a standard way of

doing political business; that, increasingly, sustained challenges to the existing structure or use of power took the form of representations by leaders and delegates of named associations, accompanied by displays of popular support for those representations; that these processes all accelerated at the end of the 1830s; that, in short, the British were creating the social movement.³⁷

As a result of the developmental process, therefore, the relationship between popular capacities and state-political authority was reconfigured into a national system of political activity and representation, in which the customary culture of locality was exchanged for the associational arena of civil society and the public realm. But it is unclear where "culture" itself fits in this progressive scenario. Volkmann and Bergmann include a whole range of phenomena in their broader category of protest which fall generically within the ambit of popular culture as practically defined by social historians, from forms of job-changing, go-slow, and taking-off in the culture of work, to drinking and other leisure pursuits, popular piety and religious enthusiasm, popular community rituals, social criminality (such as wood theft), and forms of social deviance (including mental illness, alcoholism, domestic violence, and so on). But this larger cultural domain tacitly drops out of the picture with the developmental transition to associational politics, and the interesting questions of the definition of protest are never really resumed once the process of popular interest articulation is captured by the Free Trade Unions and the SPD. To put it strongly, culture is taken to be subsumed in the political colonizing of the social world, or at least to be ordered by the new agencies of the political realm.

But the culture of protest did not disappear with trade unionism and the rationalized politics of the nation-state. The various developmental frameworks mentioned above--from Rudé, Hobsbawm and Tilly, to the specifically German

arguments of Volkmann, Engelhardt, and Tenfelde--have a definite purchase on the organized behaviour of the labour movement, because the party and trade unions had adopted the teleology of rational organization to such a great extent as ^(their own) conscious aspiration. But for the working class as a whole this was a different story. We can show this with one of the more dissentient essays in the Volkmann/Bergmann volume, Lothar Machtan's and René Ott's study of the South German Beer Riots of early-1873. On the one hand, these were an instance of impeccably "traditional" protest when such forms are supposed to have been passing away; on the other hand, they were frowned upon by the SPD, who certainly believed they should be superseded. The striking thing about the Beer Riots (and about similar disorders before 1914), in fact, was the extent to which the labour movement became drawn into the coalition of disapprobation. The familiar cycle of military repression had in any case been reinforced by a novel unanimity of middle-class opinion, which under the newly established constitutional legality of the German nation-state could finally abandon its old misgivings about the use of troops in the interests of public order. But the socialists also marked their distance from the "excesses" and "folly of the masses", drawing a sharp moral-political line between the respectable working-man's self-improving sobriety and the "unenlightened" turbulence of the streets beneath. Such disapproval brought the labour movement into an ambiguous relationship with certain working-class realities, reflecting an uneasy ambivalence about important aspects of popular culture.³⁸

Invoking Foucault, therefore, Machtan and Ott stress the ways in which socialists themselves colluded in the moral policing of working-class existence, the unwitting accomplices in the moralizing of the social order. Drinking, in particular, concentrated these implications. The tavern was a crucial vehicle of working-class sociability and political life. Socialists were also

inclined to play down the short-term importance of the "alcohol problem", stressing its origins in the social pathology of capitalism. Drunkenness was a symptom of the latter, and not the result of individual failings or a disordered family situation. But at the same time, this easily became a kind of denial, in which the drink problem was displaced from the respectable core of the working class onto the disorderly and demoralized poor. The SPD's self-understanding remained firmly embedded in older traditions of self-improving respectability, and although from the 1890s it increasingly broadened its base towards the semi-skilled and unskilled sections of the working class, party officials were always suspicious of the lumpenproletariat proper, which functioned as an equivalent of the "dangerous classes" in the socialist imagination. The lumpenproletariat became a convenient and elastic moral category, into which all the features of working-class culture and behaviour socialists disliked could be dumped, the antithesis of the disciplined and class-conscious proletariat whose allegiance they had already shaped. In stressing the virtues of dignity, sobriety, frugality, self-improvement, and an orderly family life, Social Democrats were naturally pursuing strategies of working-class survival in an alienating and demoralizing social environment. But in doing so by negative example, they found themselves participating willy-nilly in much the same elaborated distinctions between respectability and roughness that liberals had earlier pioneered.³⁹

In other words, beneath the formalization of a labour movement culture was a popular culture that remained relatively impermeable to the former's attractions and rationalizing effects. This could be seen partly in the various explosions of collective violence before 1914, which burst spectacularly through the integument of Social Democratic representation, such as Red Wednesday in Hamburg in 1906 or the Moabit Disturbances of 1910.⁴⁰ It could be seen

partly also in the cultural demarcation of Social Democratic self-understanding against the lumpenproletarian "other". In these respects, it becomes vital to explore those aspects of popular culture or working-class experience that don't fit very easily into the conventional story of labour history.⁴¹ We should certainly avoid constructing a hard dichotomy between the organized labour movement and a larger universe of working-class culture more or less permanently beyond its reach. The representative function of the SPD and its trade-union and cultural activities extended far beyond the immediate memberships into the wider reaches of the working class, particularly for certain purposes and at certain times (like an election campaign or a strike). The boundaries were very fluid in that sense. But conversely, the distance between the formal and quotidian cultures was also reproduced inside the labour movement itself, because the former also neglected whole dimensions of experience--"a broad spectrum of expectations, anxieties, and hopes", or the contradictory fullness of the working-class "lifeworld"--even of its own card-carrying members.⁴² In fact, the labour movement's sympathy for the real diversity of working-class interests or the existential realities of working-class life could be extremely terse, particularly as we move upwards from the party and trade-union grass roots to the leaderships' preferred corporate self-presentation. It is this uncertainty in the movement's relations with the working class even within its own ranks--affirming and disparaging by turns--that recent work on trade unionism and social protest finds difficulty in handling. On the other hand, it is precisely here that the current interest in Alltagsgeschichte is addressed. So it is to the latter that we must now return.

II

What, more exactly, does the concept of Alltagsgeschichte connote? At a

superficial level, it seems rather like the German name for "history from below", with the latter lagging simply a decade or so behind the Anglo-American precursors because of the West German profession's particularly entrenched post-war conservatism. As is by now well-known, it took the famous Fischer Controversy of the 1960s together with the general intellectual radicalism of that time and the loosening of the ideological climate before the conditions for an ambitious and extensive social history were assembled in the Federal Republic, so that a good deal of catching-up had to occur on ground covered much earlier and more naturally in Britain and the USA.⁴³ Beneath the slogan of social history in those two countries an enormous diversity of methodological and empirical departures were accomplished. Within this larger field of activity, history from below was never a single movement, but was always complex and heterogenous. In Britain and the USA it also enjoyed a very different lineage, growing in the former from a mainly labour history base with strong Marxist and Labour-Socialist inspiration, in the latter more variously from forms of non-Marxist sociology and the populism of the New Left. Given the multiform character of the 1960s turn to social history, the rich plurality of approaches and definitions, and the major disjunctions among national historiographical traditions, it would be foolish to reduce this process to a few convenient generalizations.

At the same time, for our present purposes, which concern more specifically the social history of the working class, it is worth dwelling briefly on three particular aspects of the 1960s departures, each of which is generally attached to the influence of Edward Thompson's The Making of the English Working Class (London, 1963). One was the shift from an institutionally and biographically centred conception of the labour movement to the analysis of the class "itself" and its conditions of life, with a new stress on "consciousness", "culture",

and "ways of life". The second was the gravitation of empirical research to a novel territory beyond either politics or work, defined more residually than theoretically in cultural terms, but suggested by all the characteristic themes of New Left counter-cultural discourse--community and self-management; popular recreation, from entertainment to drinking and sport; madness, criminality, and deviance; youth; the family; and eventually the history of women, sexuality, and gender. But thirdly, this exuberant conquest of a new agenda also entailed a major change of perspective, in which history became simultaneously an act of partisanship, identification, and retrieval. For a large number of British and American practitioners, social history meant writing the history of ordinary people--recovering suppressed alternatives, returning people to a knowledge of their own past, reconstructing the main record "from the bottom up". Invariably linked to some form of active political commitment--to the Black civil rights movement and its descendants, to the women's movement, or to some socialist ideal of working-class emancipation--this broad democratic identification was a sustaining motivation of the early departures. Shorn of some naivety and romanticism, and recast by intervening political developments, it remains a powerful element in much social-history discussion. In Thompson's famous words, he wished "to rescue the poor stockinger, the Luddite cropper, the 'obsolete' hand-loom weaver, the 'utopian' artisan, and even the deluded follower of Joanna Southcott, from the enormous condescension of posterity". Or, in the words of a very different social historian, social history is about "retrieving European lives".⁴⁴

These purposes are worth recalling because they figured centrally in the subsequent West German turn to the study of everyday life. West German historical debates were certainly not without their overtly political dimension earlier in the 1960s. But on the whole, these were concerned more with matters of

general interpretation and political development than with the more fundamental realignment of historical inquiry, so that progressive energies were largely consumed with the Fischer Controversy and similar revisionist endeavours. By the late-1960s social history was being advocated as a desirable priority, but it was not until later, in the mid-1970s, that the Anglo-American example came to be replicated. Even then, it was the more social-scientific directions, such as family and demographic history, mobility studies, and the study of collective action, that won most attention--and within a liberal perspective of modernizing the discipline, as opposed to the more radical and populist motivations so important in the English-speaking world ten years before.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

It was only gradually that another perspective gathered shape. In the mid-1970s--just as social science history announced its claims, via the new journal Geschichte und Gesellschaft, and a variety of major research projects

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]--a few alternative voices could be heard. In 1976 Hans Medick published a major article on "The Proto-Industrial Family Economy", which anticipated the appearance of his collaborative volume with Peter Kriedte and Jürgen Schlumbohm on proto-industrialization, and announced a long-term engagement with problems of popular culture in the transition from feudalism to capitalism.⁴⁵ In the same year Lutz Niethammer and Franz Brüggemeier published a remarkable article on workers' experience of housing in the Kaiserreich, in which a vital area of social life was explored for its relationship to structures of working-class solidarity running beneath the levels of party, trade-union, and associational activity which normally

form our understanding of working-class consciousness.⁴⁶ Then, in 1977, Alf Lüdtké edited an issue of the journal SOWI (Sozialwissenschaftliche Informationen für Unterricht und Studium) on the theme "Needs, Experience and Behaviour", which assembled the first systematic indication of what the new perspectives on Alltagsleben would mean. The following year, Jürgen Reulecke and Wolfhard Weber took this a step further in a showcase of current empirical research, with fourteen essays on "the social history of everyday life in the industrial age", covering aspects of worktime, the family, and leisure.⁴⁷

What all of these texts had in common was a shifting of the social history agenda away from the prevailing definitions of the emerging social science history, but without returning it to the old institutionally or politically bounded conception of the working class. The point was to develop a more qualitative understanding of ordinary people's circumstances and lives, both by investigating the material realities of daily existence at work, at home, and at play ("the production and reproduction of immediate life", in Engels' well-known phrase), and by entering the inner world of popular experience in the workplace, the family, the neighbourhood, the school, and all those contexts normally assigned to the cultural domain. By exploring social history in its experiential or subjective dimensions, conventional distinctions between the "public" and the "private" might be transcended, and a way of making the elusive connection between the political and cultural realms finally be found. Moreover, it was precisely these "insides" of the "structures, processes and patterns" of social analysis--"the daily experiences of people in their concrete life-situations, which also stamp their needs"--which are usually left out.⁴⁸ Alltagsgeschichte became the rubric ideally suited for bringing them in.

We can get a better grip on this question, perhaps, by considering some

aspects of Alltagsgeschichte's theoretical inspiration. What follows does not pretend to completeness, and each of my points conceals much further complexity. But the new interest in Alltagsleben is something more than the German version of a generic social history, and some account of its specificity should be given.

(1) The first point concerns the intellectual lineage of the West German New Left. This is a complex formation, which to national outsiders can seem unfamiliar to the point of impenetrability. The Hegelian cast of a Marxism refracted through the Frankfurt School is part of this, but for our purposes two other influences are more salient: on the one hand, the utopian and heterodox Marxist philosopher, Ernst Bloch, whose Principle of Hope and other writings informed much of the conscious utopianism of the 1960s and early-1970s; and on the other hand, the German student movement's broader anti-authoritarianism, which produced a totalized assault on the repressive and alienated qualities of conventional living, emblematically represented in Henri Lefebvre's Everyday Life in the Modern World.⁴⁹ The characteristic text of this vital conjuncture, prominently cited in much of the Alltag literature, which unites a variety of separate late-sixties moments, from the simultaneous revival and critique of the Marxist tradition to the concern with cultural politics, mass consumerism, and the consciousness industry, is undoubtedly Oskar Negt's and Alexander Kluge's Öffentlichkeit und Erfahrung. Zur Organisationsanalyse von bürgerlicher und proletarischer Öffentlichkeit (Frankfurt, 1972), with its discursive centering of a "proletarian life-context" around the category of experience. What I want to argue is that this interest in a theory of human needs imparted a quality to West German Alltagsgeschichte that was not present in the earlier Anglo-American literature and forms a powerful motif in the current discussion. On the other hand, Edward Thompson also turned to such themes in the mid-1970s,

calling for the "education of desire" in his new edition of William Morris, and contributing to a belated convergence of radical historians in Britain and Germany around ^(very) utopian themes. ⁵⁰

(2) Secondly, some exponents of Alltagsgeschichte have taken a strong turn towards "ethnological ways of knowing" as the best means of realizing their goals. ⁵¹ The key voice here is Hans Medick, together with Alf Lüdtke and other collaborators at the Max Planck Institute of History in Göttingen, which has been a major center of international discussion around the meeting of history and anthropology during the last ten years. Much of this originated in Medick's systematic preparation for his Swabian village study, in common with the work on proto-industrialization, but by the late-1970s it had clearly taken on a momentum of its own. A series of international Round Tables were held beginning in 1978, producing two programmatic essay volumes. At one level Medick has seen himself travelling a path blazed by the likes of Edward Thompson and Natalie Davis since the mid-1960s. At the same time, his work reflects an independent engagement with current Anglo-American anthropology, including that of Marshall Sahlins, Sidney Mintz, Clifford Geertz, and Jack Goody. Equally central, though, is Pierre Bourdieu's "theory of practical action". ⁵²

(3) This ethnological turn was partly a response to the optimistic teleology of modernization and the "objectivist" concern with structures and processes of macro-historical development, which seemed to dominate West German "historical social science". On the one hand, the claims of "progress" were to be treated with a sceptical eye. In this sense, the perspective of history from below--the interest "in historical 'losers' or in non-establishment views of the processes of change"--found natural sustenance in much of recent anthropology, which since the 1960s has been impressed as much by the costs as by the gains of

the under-developed world's encounter with the West.⁵³ Shifting perspective onto the "internal costs" of social transformations in this way brings the casualties of progress more to the forefront of historical inquiry, as Edward Thompson and others in the Anglo-American discussion had so eloquently argued:

One of the gains from an anthropological approach, which has increasingly been accepted into the social historian's discipline, is increased insight into the costs of modernization and industrialization. We can see in a similar perspective not only the contemporary third and fourth worlds but also all those groups, levels, and classes in European society itself that were in growing measure pauperized, excluded, and frequently also deprived of their rights in the course of the secular upheavals of the sixteenth through nineteenth centuries.⁵⁴

On the other hand, this also involved a shift in the historian's agenda from impersonal social processes to the experiences of human actors. "If social science had traditionally assumed the existence of objective sets of relationships, the need now was to study the social and cultural world from the perspective of the women, men and children who composed it".⁵⁵ That is, the priority was a social history of subjective meanings, derived from highly concrete micro-historical settings. This was not to supplant but to specify and enrich the understanding of structural processes of social change. In fact, shifting the focus to everyday life would specifically transcend any "sharp dichotomy opposing objective, material, structural, or institutional factors to subjective, cultural, symbolic, or emotional ones".⁵⁶

(4) Finally, the interest in fascism was a further ingredient in the mix that produced the current wave of Alltagsgeschichte. For left-wing historians shaped by the sixties, the "fascism debate" conducted in and around the journal Das Argument was just as important as the Fischer Controversy in opening new perspectives on the origins of Nazism.⁵⁷ It produced an emphasis on authoritarian continuities tied to the interests and politics of a particular dominant class

coalition which certainly looked very similar to the analysis of the Kaiserreich developed by Fischer. But it also led to a broader set of questions posed by the extremism of the Nazi experience, concerning the bases of domination and resistance in German society and the generation and persistence of fascist potentials, which certain individuals then carried to the larger sweep of the German past. The writings of Lutz Niethammer and Alf Lüdtke, in particular, have shown a consistent connectedness to the earlier problematic--Lüdtke via his studies of the context of state violence in earlier nineteenth-century Prussia, Niethammer from his original work on de-nazification and neo-Nazi survivals, through a variety of social history projects, to his current concern with the experience of fascism in popular memory.⁵⁸ In both cases, one might say, Alltagsgeschichte has become a medium for resuming earlier intellectual and political commitments. Much of the burgeoning literature on everyday life in the Third Reich lacks this thematic and biographical continuity with the 1960s, it should be said, not least because the theoretical fascism debate had essentially exhausted itself by the mid-1970s in a process of increasingly formulaic abstraction. But now that substantive discussion is beginning to revive, the long-term consistency of Lüdtke and Niethammer looks all the more impressive.⁵⁹

It is worth approaching the definition of Alltagsgeschichte obliquely in this way, by considering the purposes that compose it, because, more so than other such intellectual tendencies perhaps, it remains an extremely heterogeneous phenomenon. Moreover, each of the orientations listed above (others right also be added)--towards the intellectual legacy of the New Left, towards anthropology, towards a sociology of subjective meanings, towards an experiential history of fascist potentials--is a highly variable quantity. There is no shortage of manifestoes and programmatic statements, it is true,

but these should not be reduced to any misleading uniformity.⁶⁰ At the very least we have to distinguish between three overlapping phenomena: (a) the extreme anthropological orientation of some work on rural society (Medick) and to a lesser extent the working class (Lüdtke), centred mainly on Göttingen and its network, with strong affinities to work in Volkskunde (folklore/ethnology) at the Ludwig Uhland Institute for Empirical Cultural Studies at Tübingen; (b) working class social history based on critical use of oral sources, but with close links to established forms of labour history sponsored by the trade unions and the SPD's Friedrich Ebert Foundation in Bonn (Niethammer and his collaborators in Essen and the Fernuniversität in Hagen, Jürgen Reulecke in Bochum, Detlev Peukert in Essen, and so on); (c) the wider semi-professional milieu of grass-roots activity, inspired by ideals of taking history to the people and a democratic public history (via exhibitions, radical museum projects, local government cultural initiatives, adult education circles, community histories, and other forms of locally grounded collaborative research), coordinated to some extent through the History Workshop movement.⁶¹ In addition, some account must also be taken of the increasingly important presence of women's history, because although the latter had independent origins beyond the early Alltagsgeschichte initiatives (which were actually surprisingly inattentive to its concerns), there is now a strong convergence of the two.⁶² More diffusely--and despite the extreme hostility of some social science historians--"everyday life" has also worked itself onto the general social history agenda.⁶³

Allowing for this diversity, however, there are some grounds for regarding Alf Lüdtke's writings as the strongest typification of Alltagsgeschichte's possibilities and limitations, not because they are representative in some straightforward sense, but because they explicate the assumptions of the approach

so elaborately and follow its logic to such a provocative and unsettling extreme. For one thing, Lüdtke was one of the earliest interlocutors on the subject, and during the last decade has emerged as one of the most consistent and programmatic advocates of Alltagsgeschichte's pedagogic, political, and historiographical value, quite apart from its virtues in more immediate methodological and theoretical terms. His centrality to the discussion is emphasized by a major organizational contribution--as editor and moving spirit of the journal SOWI (launched in the early-1970s and aimed at teachers in the social sciences, a kind of radical alternative to the official journal of the historical profession in this pedagogic respect, the stodgily conservative Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht), which has consistently given exposure to the new perspectives; as an immediate colleague and collaborator of Medick at the Max Planck Round Tables; and as one of the leading academic activists in the History Workshop movement. Moreover, Lüdtke's career unites the four orientations discussed above more completely perhaps than any other of the major commentators: he participated in the post-Fischer discussions of the Kaiserreich during the early-1970s very much as a left-wing outsider, and was one of the few to link the new historiography explicitly to the New Left fascism debate; he is also one of the few to apply the insights of the ethnological turn uncompromisingly to the social history of the working class, as opposed to the study of rural society; and he has gone furthest in articulating the formal sociology which the microscopic study of everyday life requires. To a great extent, Lüdtke draws out what the practice of many less theoretical researchers merely implies.⁶⁴

What, then, is Lüdtke's formulation of the agenda? First, there is the familiar call to history from below, the marking out of a particular empirical terrain:

At the centre....are the lives and sufferings of those who are frequently labelled, suggestively but imprecisely, as the 'small people' [kleine Leute]. It involves their work and non-work. The picture includes housing and homelessness, clothing and nakedness; eating and hunger, love and hate. Beyond this, certain thematic emphases have emerged, such as the history of work, of gender relations, of the family, and especially of popular cultures. Thus attention is no longer focused on the deeds (and misdeeds) and pageantry of the great, the masters of church and state.⁶⁵

Secondly, there is the emphasis on subjectivity and experience, on the social production and construction of meaning, in ways theorized partly via the turn to ethnology/anthropology, but partly also (of which more below) via forms of ethnographic analysis taken from ethnomethodology and symbolic interactionism in sociology. Thirdly, there is an insistence on the need for "systematic decentralization of analysis and interpretation", by the careful construction of historical "miniatures", in the hope of capturing more of the ambiguities and contradictions of workers' perceptions and behaviour as they actually live their lives.⁶⁶ Fourthly, this implies no retreat into the particular, as opposed to a different way of allowing the big questions of process and structure to be posed. In fact, Alltagsgeschichte "cannot be isolated from the relations of production, appropriation, and exchange, and the related interest structures of a society".⁶⁷ Nor, fifthly, does it imply leaving politics out or neglecting the political dimension, because the same local context also allows the questions of the public and the private, the personal and the political to be searchingly posed. Lastly, this has major political implications for the present, because for Lüdtké the effort at understanding the "otherness" of popular culture in the past is simultaneously an act of solidarity and identification, and illuminating the processes of contestation in one time helps strengthen the understanding of change in another.⁶⁸

The special interest of Lüdtké's work is that it focuses on the local,

personal, and quotidian contexts in which the possibilities for either conformity or resistance are ultimately made. Of course, it has been a commonplace of social history that the issue of class consciousness is not exhausted by simply establishing the numbers of workers passing through socialist and trade union organizations, but needs to be addressed via a much broader conception of working class culture. In effect, Lüdtke pushes this culturalist approach even further by entering the more difficult territory of workers' daily lives, locating the potential for solidarity in the innumerable small ways in which workers created and defended a sense of self, demarcated a kind of autonomous space, and generally affirmed themselves in a hostile and limiting world. The key to Lüdtke's argument is the concept of Eigensinn--an almost untranslatable combination of self-reliance, self-will, and self-respect, or the act of reappropriating alienated social relations, particularly at work, but also at school, in the street, and any other contexts externally determined by structures and processes beyond workers' own ^{immediate} control. ⁶⁹ Such small acts of self-affirmation may not have expressed a consciously anti-capitalist outlook and may well have been innocent of formal political or trade union concerns. But at a more basic level, this everyday culture "in the factory or the office, in the tenement house and on the street", conveyed "an intense political sensibility and militancy". Workers' apparent indifference to organized politics did not mean that they had no idea of an alternative society or the good life, simply that such aspirations were normally locked in a "private" economy of desires. If that was so, moreover, a vital question concerns the manner and circumstances in which the connection to "real" politics could be made. ⁷⁰

Lüdtke's approach allows us to see how this articulation could take place. On the one hand, only a minority of workers were ever members of the socialist party and its trade unions, and still fewer had a developed or consistent

familiarity with the finer points of socialist ideology. On the other hand, the experience of everyday life, as the terrain where the abstract structures of domination and exploitation were directly encountered, encouraged attitudes of independence and solidarity which afforded obvious political potential: in a class-circumscribed context of social value and action, where movements actively addressed people in class conscious ways, Eigensinn could provide the experiential bases of a much broader mobilization. In other words, the workers' Alltag generated a culture of resistance, which, under circumstances of general social and political crisis (such as the revolutionary years of 1918-20) or during smaller local mobilizations, might acquire fuller political meaning. Then, the worlds of politics and the everyday moved together.

However, there was nothing natural or pre-given about a progressive juncture of this kind--about the synchrony of the labour movement and the working-class parties with the broader working-class culture of everyday life. In fact, there were two "spectacular" instances of the latter failing to move "in time": first, in August 1914; and then again, in early-1933. Here Lüdtké argues suggestively that it was the growing abstraction of the political in the narrower sense--"the arena of formalized politics and large-scale political organization" at the level of the state--into a separate realm removed from the participation and experience of most ordinary workers--the "everyday politics" of Eigensinn--that ultimately rendered the latter so vulnerable to radicalized systems of domination, once the democratic openings of 1918-20 had been missed. Under the Third Reich, when the formal structure of working-class politics had been destroyed, the quotidian structures of solidarity and self-assertion were all that was left, but while they offered vital resources for working-class survival, ^{in some private and existential sense} these provided Nazism with no new challenge and in some ways signalled accommodation. ⁷¹ In this sense, Lüdtké's advocacy of Alltagsgeschichte is

the very opposite of a populist romanticism, and it is precisely "the ambivalence and ambiguities" of Eigensinn that are being stressed. If we are to understand the relationship between popular consciousness and formal politics, he argues, it is on the inner world of popular experiences and the subjective dimension of class relations--on quotidian culture as an elementary site of contradiction--that we have to fix. This is the contribution the advocates of Alltagsgeschichte hope to make.

If "the subject" appears on the stage in history and anthropology once again, then it is only within this context of the uneven social production of meanings--in association with this complex process whereby a selection is made and must be made out of the store of connotations, values, and symbols of a "culture". It would be false to assume that such processes take place in a neutral field under conditions of equal abilities and opportunities. The issue is rather one of the ongoing struggle for meanings. The struggle is formed in the context of the social relations of individuals, groups, classes, and cultures, which at the same time are constituted by the struggle. Reciprocity, dependency, and resistance--and their mingling--are therefore not "structurally given"; in reality they come into being only in the struggle for meaning.⁷²

Finally, what is the social theory that corresponds to this historical practice? The practitioners themselves are not always much help in this respect, because they are not necessarily very explicit about the theoretical underpinnings of their project. As mentioned above, Negt's and Kluge's Öffentlichkeit und Erfahrung functions as a kind of ur-text of the movement, and a certain tissue of anthropological reference is also clear enough, together with the major indebtedness to Thompson and other representatives of Anglo-Marxist historiography. But Lüdtke stands relatively alone in developing a more elaborate sociological rationale for his case. In this respect, industrial relations and the sociology of work are perhaps less important than a complex relationship to phenomenology, ethnomethodology, and social interactionism, with their stress on the "social

construction of reality" through the meaningful transactions of the experienced world.⁷³ Significantly, this has also been taken more recently in a strongly anthropological direction via Bourdieu's theory of practice and cultural forms, and it is worth remarking here on the influence of Paul Willis's sensitive ethnographies of British working class life, because his and the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies' development reveal a similar set of theoretical and methodological orientations.⁷⁴ Ultimately, though, it may well be the sixties radicalism of Henri Lefebvre, for whom everyday life was "the time of desire", the real locus of revolutionary contradiction in an alienated social world, that resonates most powerfully through Lüdtkke's work.⁷⁵

III

When we turn from these ideas back to the recent literature on trade unions and the social history of the working class, it is striking how little the concerns of Alltagsgeschichte have so far influenced the mainstream of the scholarly discussion. This is patently true of the collection on trade unionism edited by Mommsen and Husung, somewhat less so of the volume on social protest. When social historians move away from the immediate subject matter of cultural studies, it seems, the established procedures of labour history (perfectly proper in themselves, of course) easily take command. This is perhaps more surprising in the case of Klaus Tenfelde's imposing guide to the current state of international research--nineteen separate historiographical contributions in seven sections (the Editor's introduction; workers in the mainly pre-industrial economies of the eighteenth century; comparative social stratification; community, class, and culture; social conflict and trade unions; the ideology and politics of the labour movement; and the literature of individual lands), focused

mainly on Germany, France, Britain, and the United States, with further attention to Scandinavia, Poland, and the Soviet Union as well. Tenfelde's own introductory survey of sources and problems ranges incidentally over the literature of Alltagsgeschichte as such (most directly in a section on workers' mentalities during industrialization), and a number of authors show themselves cognisant of these concerns (notably David Crew, in a critical survey of community studies in the USA, Britain, Germany, and France). But Vernon Lidtke's contribution on "Workers' Culture in Germany and England", where some explicit discussion of the turn to everyday life should have been very much to the point, is in this respect remarkably disappointing: again, the everyday dimensions of working-class culture are necessarily present in Lidtke's treatment, but the specific conceptual challenge of Alltagsgeschichte as outlined above is dealt with extremely perfunctorily via a discussion of the GDR historian Jürgen Kuczynski's four-volume compilation, Geschichte des Alltags des deutschen Volkes, which, while symptomatically interesting, is hardly typical of the current discussion in the FRG.⁷⁶

This neglect is noteworthy, because by now the claims of Alltagsgeschichte have become the object of much professional controversy, and indeed figures like Tenfelde have been centrally involved in the relevant debates.⁷⁷ Moreover, a figure like Lidtke has been putting the case for the history of everyday life carefully and consistently for a full decade, first as a counterpoint to the various social science critiques of the older political and institutional labour history, and then increasingly as a fully-fledged alternative to them. It is entirely characteristic that he should appear in the Volkmann/Bergmann volume from this point of view.⁷⁸ German social history is a plural discourse, and it is a pity that neither the Mommsen/Husung nor the Tenfelde volumes provide access to the emerging Alltag discussion in this respect. There may be some

value, therefore, in exploring the recent monographic literature to see how far the concerns of Alltagsgeschichte figure in its pages.

Coal-miners provide a good place to start. Miners are in many ways the archetype of the oppressed but militant proletariat. Dark, dirty, and dangerous, their work has always attracted the social reportage of sympathetic middle-class observers, just as it defines a special place in the imagery and folklore of the labour movement. Frequently living in isolated and self-contained communities, united by the muscular solidarities of the coal-face, and hardened by the dignity of their exceptionally difficult labour, miners easily evoke the more romantic and heroic associations of the class struggle. The same qualities have also made mining communities a favourite context for the more "culturalist" kind of social history. This has been classically true of the work in Britain, recently brought to an imposing but tragic climax in the mythology of the three great strikes of 1972, 1974, and 1984-85. The distinctiveness of miners' culture is also accentuated in the British case by the northern location of the major English coalfields (particularly those in Yorkshire and Durham), and even more by the militant coalfields of Scotland and South Wales. ⁷⁹ Miners occupy a similar place in the traditions of the labour movement in Germany. The last ten years have seen a flourishing of literature on the coalminers of the Ruhr, although the other centres of extractive industry (Upper Silesia, the Mansfeld copper region) necessarily figure less prominently in the West German research, given their location in Poland and the GDR since 1945. Together with David Crew's pioneering social history of Bochum and Erhard Lucas's studies of labour militancy in the German Revolution, we have an impressive general history of the miners of the Ruhr up to 1889, and a fine array of monographic research emanating from the History Departments of the Universities of Bochum and Essen, the most innovative and ambitious

of which (and the most finely attuned to the concerns of Alltagsgeschichte) is the collective oral history project initiated by Lutz Niethammer in Essen.⁸⁰

For our purposes, the books by Klaus Tenfelde and Helmuth Trischler, Stephen Hickey, and Franz-Josef Brüggemeier open an excellent window onto the current state of inquiry. Tenfelde, of course, has established himself as one of Germany's leading labour historians.⁸¹ This handsome edition of miners' pleas and petitions basically recapitulates the analysis originally developed in his first book and further elaborated in the essays on strikes referred to above: the growth of a democratic and class-collective trade-union consciousness out of the Ruhr miners' older corporate traditions, once the legal guarantees of the latter were dismantled by the liberal deregulation of the coal industry during 1850-65 and the existing structures of miners' representation swamped by the enormous later-nineteenth century expansion.

While enjoying the organizational and cultural resources of their earlier situation (especially the independence of the miners' working arrangements underground, the distinctive corporate insurance organization of the Knappschaft, and the privileged access to a protective state bureaucracy), the miners were faced with the need to reshape their collective behaviour to withstand the new pressures of untrammelled capitalism, particularly once the depression set in after 1873. Thus the strike of 1889 and the unionization which ensued were the results of a Lernprozess ("learning-process") which brought the miners into the modern era of organized labour protest. The miners' petitions, as the traditional medium of redress, based in the specific structures of the state-regulated Prussian mining industry, a definite body of nineteenth century legal-political precedent, and customary ideas of justice, provide a valuable means of tracking the shift.

Assembled from a variety of sources (but mainly from the records of the Prussian Mining Office) and covering the period 1816-1933, with a major concentration in the years 1850-71 (some 72 out of 300 documents) and the period before 1914, the petitions reflect the changing bases of miners' experience and collective action. As Tenfelde and Trischler argue, the growing ineffectuality of appeals to given forms of royal and bureaucratic paternalism under the liberalized regime of private capital impelled the miners towards a more "efficient" means of representing their interests, namely, via the strike and permanent trade-union organization. The petition movement of 1858-60 was a first watershed in this disillusionment, followed by the Essen Miners' Petition of 1867, whose rejection by the authorities brought the Essen miners out on strike a year later. Further petition movements occurred in conjunction with the strikes of 1889 and 1905, and evidence of the older tradition persisted throughout the life of the Empire. But the "husks of the older forms" were increasingly filled with "new contents". In particular, customary notions of justice (as in the idea of moral economy) gave way to a new language of rights and social justice focused on the wage, larger questions of distribution, and ultimately citizenship and political participation. Citing parallel shifts among other groups of workers, Tenfelde and Trischler see this as a general "transition to modernity"--"from traditional forms of grievance articulation to modern forms of conflict regulation". To that extent, the usual labour whiggery raises its familiar head. But the editors also emphasize the petitions' value as a source for the miners' daily lives and for the changing perceptions of work and its social relations. This is certainly how the publishers have chosen to present the book, with the jacket's reference to the "life-circumstances" of working people ("their ways of thinking, their cares, and their hopes"), "from the unaccustomed perspective of the human subjects themselves". 62

By contrast with Tenfelde's account of the miners' early history, Stephen Hickey's study pays a minimum of attention to the miners' original corporate traditions (in fact, the latter are not mentioned at all until the tail end of the chapter on work, halfway through the book).⁸³ From one point of view, this makes a great deal of sense: when the mining population was experiencing such a massive expansion (from 12,741 to 394,569 in the Ruhr as a whole during 1850-1913), and new urban societies were being manufactured out of virtually nothing (Bochum grew from 19,000 to 256,000 people between 1855 and 1910, Hamborn from 5,300 to 103,000 in the same period), it is far from clear that the miners' old privileges and traditional culture could retain the kind of salience stressed by Tenfelde. When migrants were flooding in from far and near (in Bochum in 1907 63 per cent of the population were immigrants, 24 per cent from beyond Rhineland-Westphalia, while for miners specifically the figures were still higher, 84 and 37 per cent), with such a startling diversity of linguistic, religious, ethnic, and customary cultures, and such enormous local mobility, the effectivity of existing traditions was bound to be small. As Hickey says: "When we speak of the working class in the Ruhr at this time, therefore, we are referring to a group composed overwhelmingly of people who had moved to a new home, frequently over long distances". And: "The 'working class', therefore, was not an established, settled, cohesive community; instead, we see a class numerically strong but socially disorientated, geographically unsettled, and culturally diffuse".⁸⁴ This makes a major difference to how we approach the miners' culture and the question of militancy, for Tenfelde's Lernprozess (the miners' measurement of their new situation against their former privileges) was by definition irrelevant to the incomers, who were undergoing a different Lernprozess of their own. As Brüggemeier says, "it is difficult to explain how the memory of better times could be

so powerful as to shape the thinking and behaviour of miners, who in 1889 had not experienced these times themselves".⁸⁵

Proceeding from this disunity of the Ruhr working class, Hickey supplies a valuable corrective to the more optimistic accounts of class formation, which overestimate the forces making for cohesion within the working class. While the general title of his book actually conceals a concentration of research on the eastern Ruhr (and Bochum in particular), he does a fine job of outlining the problems facing the labour movement in the novel environment of the coalfield. This is conveyed via a carefully layered account of the factors inhibiting working-class solidarity, beginning with the question of labour mobility, and continuing through those of housing, religion, and the conditions of work, which then form the context for the discussion of strikes, trade unions, and the SPD. The treatment of religion and ethnicity is especially important in this respect, highlighting the separate associational and communal worlds fostered by the Catholic and Protestant churches, together with the substantial national sub-cultures of the Poles and other minorities (such as the Protestant Masurians), all of which were deliberately endorsed by the employers, by among other things the allocation of housing along ethno-religious lines. This powerful stress on "the fluid, unstable, and divided character of working-class society and politics, in contrast to those factors which fostered cooperation and solidarity", is a distinguishing feature of Hickey's book.⁸⁶ In fact, neither of the themes stressed by social historians elsewhere in the "making of the working class"--artisanal traditions and a particular ideal of working-class community--were relevant to the frontier societies being created at breakneck pace in the Ruhr before 1914. In Hickey's account, culture divided more than it united the Ruhr working class.

This presents us with an interesting paradox. On the one hand, the great

coal strikes of 1889, 1905, and 1912 gave the miners a deserved reputation for militancy: these were general strikes affecting the whole of the Ruhr coalfield (with peaks of 80 per cent of all miners in the first two cases, some 60 per cent in the third), while the intervening years were also punctuated by smaller movements affecting particular localities or groups of mines (for example, at least seventeen in the Bochum area during 1889-1914). The miners' record also stood out in comparison with the Ruhr's other major industry, iron, steel, and heavy engineering, which recorded few industrial actions and low levels of unionization. By contrast with metalworkers in the Ruhr, who were fragmented by elaborate hierarchies and craft-derived demarcations of skill, endless varieties of job classification, and the basic division between skilled worker and labourer, the miners had a fairly cohesive occupational community further reinforced by residential segregation.²⁷

But on the other hand, each of the first two major strikes and nearly all the smaller ones were launched spontaneously by rank-and-file against the resistance of the union hierarchy, through unofficial actions in which the younger hauliers (as opposed to the more senior face-workers) invariably took the lead. Indeed, Otto Hue, the miners' leader who emerged in the 1890s, built the union's strategy on a resolute critique of such spontaneous militancy, strongly influenced by the strike failures of 1889-93, when the young union had tried unsuccessfully to capitalize on the impetus of 1889. For Hue, the union's strategy had to be predicated on weakness. The miners were divided by religion and nationality, with organized Catholic (1894) and Polish (1902) rivals to the Social Democratic union. Combined with the organized power of the employers, who disciplined their workers via forms of company paternalism, these conditions placed socialist trade unionists at a serious disadvantage. Hue's response was a cautious style of labour leadership, stressing discipline,

continuity of organization, political "neutrality", and the conserving of resources for the future, as against a more confrontational kind of militancy.

By exploring the structural context of working-class formation in the Ruhr so carefully, Hickey in effect provides a sympathetic materialist account of reformism, which was founded (he argues) on a realistic assessment of the obstacles to effective labour organizing. Though Hue's approach bespoke a reformist rather than a revolutionary vision of socialism, it was none the less "class-conscious" for that. Given the ethnic and religious diversity of the mining workforce, a genuine "class" strategy required the softening of socialist hostilities to political Catholicism, it could be argued, for otherwise the socialist union would simply confirm its own sectionalism and undermine the bases for industry-wide mobilization. Thus the success of both the 1889 and 1905 strikes in maintaining such a high level of sustained participation had rested on the cross-confessional and cross-national solidarity of SPD, Catholic, and Polish trade unionists, whereas the 1912 strike was called by the Socialist, Polish, and small liberal unions against the opposition of the Catholic one, and collapsed after a week as a result.

At the same time, this was not the whole story. The hard-nosed "realism" of the strategy could not compensate for the modesty of its success: even at its peak in 1905 the SPD union counted only 29.4 per cent of the Ruhr miners, dwindling to 15.8 per cent by 1913. More to the point, the strategy was ill-suited for integrating the localized, intermittent, and frequently turbulent rank-and-file militancy that actually gave the union the momentum for its bitterly secured gains. Nor would this necessarily be any different if the union won its reformist breakthrough, whether by employer recognition or sympathetic pro-union laws: as the First World War would reveal, this could lead just as well to the union's co-optation, which drove a further wedge between its

bureaucratic leaders and an alienated rank-and-file. Over the longer term, this conundrum--reconciling the case for centralism with the countervailing demands of inner-union democracy--proved the source of tremendous conflict.

This is the point at which the very different analysis of Franz-Josef Brüggemeier is pitched. Brüggemeier endorses the lines of Hickey's structural account, but questions its sufficiency. For beneath the level of the miners' formal organization (and the gross statistics of cultural disunity) were certain informal structures of solidarity which point the analysis in a different direction. Thus the miners enjoyed a high degree of below-ground autonomy, where small work-teams ("comradeships") organized the work, trained newcomers, and generally handled the functions normally discharged by managers and foremen. In consequence, the wages-system became all the more important as the medium of managerial control, as employers asserted their right to set the rate and judge the amount and quality of the miners' output: the encounter with this harsh disciplinary regime, which reflected a strictly authoritarian view of managerial prerogative, then further solidified the miners' everyday solidarity. The coalowners' reactionary paternalism (which included the blacklist and company unions) also extended to the social sphere, which they sought to command above all via company housing. But again, Brüggemeier argues, this situation also delivered the materials of informal cooperation and solidarity. The isolated, self-contained, and homogeneous miners' colonies (which in the northern Ruhr housed from a half to two thirds of mining employees by 1914) created the potential for community, and the coalowners' manipulative calculation (the creation of a stable and dependent core of workers loyal to the company) might easily boomerang against them. Moreover, the miners also improvised their own systems of self-help, which helped compose an alternative culture of mutuality. One example was the "half-open family structure", which allowed

"rootless" young miners to develop bonds of attachment and solidarity as lodgers (Schlafgänger) with mining families (one in five mining households had lodgers at any one time, rising in the northern colonies to one in two). Another example was the "schnapps-casino": formed in response to a chronic shortage of public houses in the new coal towns, these miners' drinking clubs filled a vital need of sociability, as well as providing premises for SPD and trade union activity. Flourishing in the wake of the 1889 strike (some 110 with 16,640 members in 1894, concentrated in the northern parts of the Ruhr), they were eventually banned by a change in the licensing laws in 1896.⁸⁸

As such, there is perhaps little to distinguish Brüggemeier's analysis from much Anglo-American working-class history, with its stress on popular creativity and cultural autonomy in the workplace and wider recreational domain. However, Brüggemeier's ability to get inside the miner's skin and ground the discussion of cultural forms in the subjective and existential, as well as the material, realities of work and life in the coalfield is more unusual.⁸⁹ Likewise, the particular conceptual apparatus of Alltagsgeschichte is also specific to the German discussion, in ways suggested above. But what is really distinctive, arguably, is the place of the labour movement in the account. Basically, Brüggemeier argues, the trade union and Socialist views of working-class advancement inserted themselves between the miners and the fruits of their everyday experience, in ways which squandered the mobilizing potential of the informal solidarity structures mentioned above. Thus the authorities might rail against the schnapps-casinos as "the real hotbeds of drunkenness, malingering, brutalization, domestic ruin, and family distress", which corroded the moral basis of the resistance to Socialism, but Socialists had prejudices of their own about the disorderly roughness of the miners' everyday culture (p. 153). In fact, from a late-twentieth-century vantage-point it is extraordinarily

difficult to get past such ideological encrustations, deposited by a century's achievements and defeats, to reconstruct the real substratum of political possibilities that may have lain beneath.

Of course, since the 1960s there has been a well-developed literature on the vitality of rank-and-file movements, focused on the unharnessed democratic potential of the workers' councils in the German Revolution of 1918-20. Another literature has stressed the constitutive importance for the late-nineteenth-century labour movements of artisanal traditions, in which craft pride and workshop autonomy became transmuted into a modern ideology of workers' control. Brüggemeier's achievement is to have taken these ideas--and others, such as David Crew's stress on the miners' occupational community--and grounded them in a sensitive analysis of the practical context of social relations in the mining industry and mining communities--of the miners' Alltag in its material and experiential dimensions. This is explicitly not a romanticized glorification of miners' spontaneity or their essential militancy (p. 254). On the contrary. In a moving passage at the very end of the book, accompanied by a remarkable photograph of a miner and his wife shortly before the former's death from pneumoconiosis in 1920, Brüggemeier invokes the anonymous thousands of miners who died between 1889 and 1919, for whom the utopian upsurge of the socialization movement of 1919 holds only an abstract relevance:

Their life story showed no upwards development, and they achieved no personal high-point. For them, the optimistic dynamic of my account of the miners' history had no or very little meaning. For them, the independence and possibilities for action I have described lasted only for a short time, and were removed by repeated reverses: at times they lived in the bitterest poverty, from which there was no escape. Personal hopes they had abandoned long ago--long before the miners' collective hopes of early-1919 had been dashed (p. 258).

The point is not the superior virtue of the miners' everyday culture in some

elemental political sense, but first the tension between the "informal" and "formal" regions of the miners' collective experience, and second the degree to which the former delivered a political capacity which the organized labour movement failed to tap, and which as a result became obscured even for the vast majority of the miners themselves.

For Brüggemeier, the socialization drive of early-1919 epitomized this tragic contradiction. On the one hand, this was a rolling wave of rank-and-file militancy which washed across the bureaucratic moderation of the miners' union and the SPD, whose limited parliamentary conception of the German Revolution--and the larger political history of Weimar this endowed--has refracted later understanding of what the socialization of the mines could have achieved. On the other hand, the movement grew from precisely the informal solidarity structures Brüggemeier describes:

Socialization was no mere utopia or abstract construction, it was also the sum of [the miners'] experiences; not just projection, but also a taking up of elements and structures grounded in the everyday; a continuation of the everyday (p. 251).

This returns us, in fact, to Lüttke's distinction between the alienated realm of formalized political action and the informal domain of the everyday. It is remarkable how easily labour leaders assimilated the social fears of the Ruhr bourgeoisie, charging the miners not only with lack of discipline and immature consciousness, but also on occasion a generalized lack of "culture". In this view, the workers' problems would start to disappear once the labour movement had organized, educated, and re-formed them (p. 256). The irony, Brüggemeier argues, is that the miners already possessed a culture of great resourcefulness, which both at the pit and in the colony supported a relatively independent social space, a kind of "semi-public" domain. Where trade union and party leaders saw only roughness, turbulence, and disorder, which lacked

the discipline for a genuine emancipatory movement, Brüggemeier finds the unevenly assembled raw materials of a broader-based and organically rooted popular movement.

If there is a drawback to the account, it is the absence of an analysis of the SPD itself. For if the labour movement coexisted in such a tense and problematic relationship with its intended mass constituency, it becomes vital to explore the party's own interior relations to see how far they connected to workers' everyday experiences and how far not. Primary sources for this purpose are notoriously hard to find, but we are fortunate now in having Adelheid von Saldern's study of the SPD in Göttingen, based on the unexpected discovery of the local party's minute-book for the years 1899-1910, which provides exceptional insight into how the movement conducted its affairs.⁹⁰ Of course, Göttingen was a very different environment from the Ruhr--it was neither a big-city bastion of SPD strength (like Nuremberg, Hamburg, or Berlin) nor a major industrialized region (like the Ruhr or Saxony), but a medium-sized university town with little developed industry. There was little tradition of popular-democratic politics until the local SPD was formed after the lifting of the Anti-Socialist Law in 1891. The local party was of modest size--190 members among some 30,000 inhabitants in 1908--with a relatively poorly developed "sub-cultural" apparatus--a workers' gymnastic club formed in 1894 (some 40 members in 1906), a consumers' cooperative more loosely connected to the party (3,459 members in 1905), a trade-union legal advice office opened in 1913 (counseling 406 people in that year, including 191 not yet organized), two grievance committees aimed at collecting complaints for the construction industry and the factory inspectorate, a youth committee formed in 1909, and a child protection committee formed in 1914. Some industrialization occurred from the 1890s, notably in the precision tools and optical branches attached to

the university, but only the railway repair shop and a textile factory had over 400 employees, and the rest--textiles and various light industry--were small-scale.

On the other hand, for these very reasons Göttingen becomes a very good example of a particular type of Social Democratic environment--smaller semi or non-industrial provincial towns and country districts, which certainly experienced the impact of national industrialization, but within a social structure still dominated by more "traditional" features (in this case the university, a Prussian garrison, a fragmented industrial structure, and a large small-business sector) which worked against the rise of a strong labour movement. In this situation--which, following a current usage, von Saldern calls the "Social Democratic province"--the typical SPD member was a poorly-paid craft worker in a small shop (as opposed to the one large linen mill, the railway works, or the better-paid precision engineering branch), whose more successful self-employed representatives invariably provided the local leadership (in Göttingen the master-shoemaker Wilhelm Stegen and the joiner-turned-tobacconist Fritz Wedemeyer).⁹¹ Faced with a difficult environment for recruiting and building a local movement--an atomized working class, large parts of which still migrated between the town and the surrounding countryside, and a local culture dominated by the university, with few opportunities for coalition making with the non-socialist parties--the local SPD was thrown back on its own resources, which, as mentioned above, were not very large. This produced a beleaguered mentality familiar from the larger literature on the SPD, with its stress on the party's ghettoized existence in Imperial-German society and self-contained isolation in the political system. But unlike the party in bigger cities, the Göttingen SPD lacked the "sub-cultural" resources that usually went with a broader base in the local working class. Instead, it found itself increasingly dependent on the regional

party apparatus in Hanover: aside from the internal routines of branch life, its public activity was largely confined to the regionally and nationally initiated propaganda and agitation.

As it happened, the Hanover SPD was reformist in political outlook. But the roots of the reformism in von Saldern's title had an altogether deeper explanation. In fact, the Göttingen Social Democrats were not themselves "reformists" in any straightforward sense. For one thing, simple reformism made no sense of their immediate situation. Apart from the limited exception of the industrial tribunals and public insurance committees, the local working class had no concrete reforms or participatory opportunities to mitigate the overriding experience of exclusion, while the Imperial state's tariff and fiscal policies constantly re-emphasized the social inequities perpetuated by this undemocratic political structure. This constantly recharged sense of disadvantage and injustice fired a radical critique of the system's class characteristics, for which Kautsky's official centrist ideology--a philosophy of socialist inevitability, fueled by the logic of capitalist accumulation and crisis, and articulated through a strategy of legal parliamentary advance--proved the perfect expression. Yet despite this class-conscious outlook, which in its own terms was avowedly revolutionary, the practical parameters of the Göttingen party's situation encouraged attitudes and practices which ultimately conduced to reformist rather than radical politics. For when it came to mobilizing a broader base of popular support, whether in the more stable circumstances before 1914 or in the revolutionary crisis of 1918-20, the local party's structural disadvantages sustained a political psychology that was extremely disabling.

Faced with the under-development of the local economy, class structure, and working-class consciousness, the Göttingen Social Democrats turned inward,

compensating for the deficit by an over-developed stress on national politics and the general German situation. Objectively constrained by Göttingen's provincialism, they overcame the latter subjectively by appropriating the advanced experience of others. Frustrated by the immediate circumstances, they switched their energies to national affairs. As von Saldern says, this had the virtue of providing a coherent vision of politics, with a strongly developed class analysis, and constantly pulled party discussions to the national and international, as opposed to the local and provincial, levels of politics. But conversely, it also slighted local issues, and the local party abstained almost completely from the municipal arena. This was a crucial weakness, because it deprived the party of an essential bridgehead to a larger potential constituency. It stamped the local SPD as a socializing agency for an existing core of members, as opposed to a campaigning movement of broader popular-democratic range. The primarily national orientation was not favourable to a grass-roots style of community-based agitation. The Göttingen party preferred grand-historical events to the cultivation of its own local traditions. It also favoured a strongly centralist organization over one stressing local initiative and accountability. Fundamentally, this betrayed ^{le} lack of political self-confidence, which recourse to the authority and expertise of the higher party bodies naturally did nothing to overcome.

A major symptom of this lack was the local party's approach to education. On the one hand, the SPD's marginality to local politics was dealt with by an alternative stress on "culture"--meaning the self-conscious cultivation of progressive values--and culture for these purposes (particularly given the local thinness of the recreational and self-improving SPD sub-culture) was almost wholly subsumed in a conventional conception of "education". On the other hand, the operative notion of the latter was a thoroughly non-subversive

one, in which education meant the "reception of existing educational goods" (p. 235). Of course, in themselves belief in the liberating power of knowledge and the desire to overturn the existing monopoly on academic education (given local fuel by the presence of the university) are hardly to be gainsaid. But at another level, such ideas uncritically replicated the existing structure of values:

The party activists wanted to live worthy, upstanding, moral, moderate, and disciplined lives--on the one hand, to show the workers who were not yet organized a good example; on the other hand, to show bourgeois society that one was up to all tasks, that one deserved good standing and respect. (p. 235)

As we know from the accumulated literature on the subject, the SPD's cultural politics was positively oriented towards existing "high culture", whether in the form of classical literature, theatre, art, and music, or in the broader area of taste, morality, and sensibility. At the level of intentions, the overall context of political exclusion kept such politics tied to an oppositionally constituted counter-cultural goal. But when the constitutional context changed and the SPD acquired democratic legitimacy after 1918, the assimilationist logic of its cultural attitudes was less encumbered by the earlier oppositional aims. Instead, the party's political radicalism became heavily compromised by its conservative cultural values, on everything from attitudes towards hierarchy and authority, the use of military language, and the fetishizing of order and discipline, to the latent patriotism, and the patriarchal view of family, childraising, and the place of women.⁹²

Thus the negative side of the pursuit of culture was an almost complete failure to challenge the hegemonic values, whether by means of a more subversive "movement culture", or by building the infrastructure for a much broader oppositional public. Von Saldern distinguishes between the periods before and

after the turn of the century in this respect. In the Göttingen party's youth, some effort was made to generate the larger momentum, but this was largely a matter of stimulating participation of existing members (for example, by the common reading of newspaper and journal articles, the assignment of political reports, and the use of a question-box at meetings), and after 1901-02 even this internal effort fell away (with barely a single collective reading a year during 1904-07, as against eight in 1900 and 1901). There was little attempt to agitate a wider public: public meetings were held indoors; May-Day was marked by an inner-party festivity rather than a public rally; meetings were organized around lectures, with little chance for more spontaneous exchange; strikes were carefully depoliticized. Above all, there was no attempt at integrating the SPD's politics with the personal lives and everyday circumstances of the membership, let alone with those of the workers at large. There was even a conscious de-politicizing of everyday discourse, most of all on matters affecting the family, sexuality, and private life. In practice, daily life was measured against the established precepts of party affairs, with a premium on the rational ordering of social practices and situations. This left major areas of working-class conservatism intact, particularly in relation to women and children, and indeed dignified them via the quest for respectability, while other aspects of ordinary workers' culture--the "rough" ones beyond the Göttingen party's small immediate domain--were attacked or dismissed. This involved a debilitating neglect of the entire creative and imaginative realm, von Saldern argues, with a far-reaching failure to ground the party's socialist ideals in any prefigurative approach to the problems of everyday life.

Where does this leave us? It re-emphasizes the importance of Lüdtké's argument about the alienated quality of formal working-class politics. There has been much discussion during the last decade (and not just in German history:

of the need to "disaggregate" the histories of the working class and of the labour movement as a more sensible basis for putting them back together again, and there is now a healthier awareness of the partial and problematic nature of socialism's class-representative claim/aspiration to express and embody the class consciousness of the working class.⁹³ But unless we are to leave the social and the political histories of the working class as discrete endeavours, or to give up the idea of a "culturalist" grounding of labour history, we need a research strategy and conceptual framework capable of specifying the nature of the relationship.⁹⁴ And it is here that the possibilities of Alltagsgeschichte are so exciting. Whether we take Brüggemeier's stress on informal solidarity structures, or von Saldern's critique of the Göttingen SPD's failure to connect the party's practice with the practical, personal, and experiential dimensions of ordinary working-class life, or Lüdtke's more theoretical insistence on the disjunctive and non-synchronous relationship between the formalized political discourse and the everyday politics of Eigensinn, the Alltag historians are extraordinarily suggestive as to how future discussion might proceed. If we are to advance the discussion of working-class formation and working-class politics--if we are to understand how high degrees of social solidarity, political cohesion, and wider social influence can be achieved among wage-earning populations otherwise fragmented by sectional, religious, ethnic, sexual, and cultural contradictions--it is to the ideas of the Alltagshistoriker that we must partly look.

IV

Alltagsgeschichte is a phenomenon of its time. Partly, as roughly indicated earlier in this essay, this is to do with the uncertainties of the West German historical profession, in the complex conjuncture of methodological debate,

generational politics, higher educational contraction, and conservative Tendenzwende since the late-1970s. Historiographically, the context was provided by the sequential reception between the mid-1960s and mid-1970s of two distinct paradigms--the social-science history project of a general "history of German society", guided by a revived Weberian sociology, formed in the mould of postwar US social and political theory at the sixties high point of its influence, and explicitly oriented around "Western" principles of enlightenment and modernity; and on the other hand, the more culturalist type of social history discussed in this essay, inspired by French and British examples, informed by post-1968 Marxisms and radical sociologies, and with a strong anthropological interest in the inside and underside of social life, which is far more sceptical about liberal conceptions of progress and modernization. Moreover, underlying the turn to everyday life is a major uncertainty about the progressive political agency of the working class, coming partly from the integration of the SPD and trade unions and their growing distance from older traditions of working-class mobilization, partly from the structural dissolution of the working class itself in the traditional sense of the term. Not only has the labour movement withdrawn from its original vision of cultural emancipation, but the working class has ceased to be the self-evident addressee of such a project, and has even left the stage as an obvious social force, let alone as an active class-subject. Alltagsgeschichte has been driven less by the motivating purpose of older labour history--the belief in the forward march of the working class--than by the realization of its opposite, that by the late-1970s the march had stopped.⁹⁵

This has produced a strong sense of the finiteness and historical specificity of the working-class culture whose potential had always inspired the social historians of the Left. In West Germany, of course, there have been particular reasons for the weakness and residual quality of the traditional labour movement

culture since the war--not only the destructive impact of Nazism, which set out systematically to disorganize the bases of the latter, but also the essential indifference of the SPD to their reconstruction after the liberation, leading to the formal break of the Godesberg Program in 1959. But this abandonment of the movement's cultural ambition, while brutally precipitated in the German case by 1933-45, was already inscribed in the pre-1914 disjunctions between labour-movement and everyday culture, and while not inevitable, the diminishing prospects of a genuinely alternative and oppositional working-class culture were becoming clearer during the Weimar Republic. The KPD kept the latter alive, as did the SPD's autonomous cultural movement with its ideas of "cultural socialism" (Kultursozialismus) and the "new being" (neue Mensch), elaborated via the spectacular massed festivals of the later-1920s. But at the same time, the movement was now bitterly split, with the more militant and inventive grass-roots activity proceeding through the KPD, and the SPD and trade unions channelling their efforts through training courses for functionaries and the conventional educational institutions of the now-democratic state, while leaving any broader ambitions to a separate cultural apparatus safely removed from "real" politics.

Still more seriously, the labour movement faced entirely new competition from the commercial mass-leisure sector, whose accessible technologies--"film, radio, gramophone, photography, travel, traffic, bicycle"--proved immensely appealing to working-class youth.⁹⁶ The new apparatus of the "culture industry", from the razzmatazz of the cinema and the burgeoning mass entertainment media to the growth of spectator sports, the star-system, and the machineries of advertising and fashion, proved remarkably successful in servicing the "private economy of desire", and arguably occupied precisely the human space of the everyday that the labour movement had neglected to fill. Moreover, once the institutional infrastructure of the labour movement had been smashed, this

"private" recreational domain was also the scene of the fascist state's most effective cultural effort.⁹⁷ The inter-war Left in Europe was not devoid of creative response, and the anti-fascist-cum-Popular Front campaigns of the later-1930s provided the context in which the challenge of the new media began to be addressed (an opportunity from which the German working-class parties were necessarily excluded). But the traditional cultural labour movement's difficulties in coping with the new culture of leisure is a common theme of the essays in Friedhelm Boll's collection, not least because the skilled craftsman's shop-based culture of work--in a real sense the material correlate of the socialist cultural activity away from work--was also coming under attack through the variegated rationalization movement.⁹⁸ Not only was the territory of everyday needs colonized increasingly by a commercial leisure sector beyond the labour movement's political control, the more limited domain of traditional socialist culture was also being foreclosed. As Langewiesche says:

The labour movement's old dream of quasi-natural cultural progress foundered on the reality of the new society, because the expansion of leisure did not translate into the opportunity for human self-realization. The labour movement had always seen its cultural organizations as a prefiguration of society's future as a whole. The capitalist commercialization of leisure had not included this optimistic view of the future in its plan.⁹⁹

For a mixture of historiographical and political reasons, therefore, Alltagshistoriker are rethinking the labour movement's relationship to the working class. The sense of contemporary historical flux, an awareness of historic transition, in which the insufficiency of traditional left nostrums and the restructuring of their economic and sociological assumptions are widely acknowledged--in short, the de-centering of a classical vision of the progressive agency of the working class--undoubtedly lies behind this social-history revisionism. The flourishing of Alltagsgeschichte is in that sense an intellectual

counterpart to the rise of the new social movements. It is no surprise that the fiercest response to the new thinking among historians has come from those who are most heavily invested in the liberal-democratic evolution of the SPD since 1945, which at another level is precisely the alienation of the labour movement's formalized institutional discourse from the mundane perceptions and experiences of ordinary workers in the production and reproduction of their everyday lives that historians such as Lüdtke, Brüggemeier, and von Saldern are seeking to explore. Such polemics will surely persist.¹⁰⁰ But the more important test will be Alltagsgeschichte's ability to follow through on its own assumptions. One priority will be the pushing of the analysis forward, through the Nazi time to the foundation years of the Federal and Democratic Republics and beyond, to the fractured moment of the 1950s and 1960s in which the contemporary configuration of West German society and politics was actually made. Another will be the bringing of gender properly into the account, for neither the social-science nor the Alltag approaches have currently given it the conceptual centrality it deserves, an omission which the exposition of this essay also reflects. My own purpose has been more modest, namely, to have surveyed an expanding area of German historical work, to have specified some of the operative preoccupations, and to have pulled out some of the more interesting potentials.

FOOTNOTES

1. A good case could also be made for the emergence of a separately constituted women's history. But in sheer volume Alltagsgeschichte has been hard to match. Moreover, in its motivating questions West German women's history has much in common with Alltagsgeschichte, even though much of the latter's actual production may not be very sensitive to specifically women's history concerns. Finally, some older debates (e.g. concerning the claims of social history as against traditional forms of diplomatic and political history, the question of continuity, or the singularity of Nazism) remain as lively as ever, but without exactly generating new departures. For the latest of these older-style controversies, see Richard J. Evans, "The New Nationalism and the Old History: Perspectives on the West German Historikerstreit", Journal of Modern History, 59 (1987), pp. 761-97; and Geoff Eley, "Nazism, Politics and Public Memory: Thoughts on the West German Historikerstreit, 1986-87", Past and Present, 121 (1988), forthcoming.
2. For an overview, see "'Ein kräftiger Schub für die Vergangenheit': Spiegel-Report über die neue Geschichtsbewegung in der Bundesrepublik", Der Spiegel 23 (June 6, 1983), pp. 36-42. Materials from the school competition are presented in Dieter Galinski and Ulla Lachauer (eds.), Alltag im Nationalsozialismus 1933-1939 (Braunschweig, 1982); Dieter Galinski, Ulrich Herbert, and Ulla Lachauer (eds.), Nazis und Nachbarn. Schüler erforschen den Alltag im Nationalsozialismus (Reinbek bei Hamburg, 1982); and Dieter Galinski and W. Schmidt (eds.), Die Kriegsjahre in Deutschland 1939-1945 (Hamburg, 1985).
3. Detlev J. K. Peukert, "Das 'Dritte Reich' aus der 'Alltags'-Perspektive", Archiv für Sozialgeschichte XXVI (1986), pp. 533-56.
4. Of course, part of the point was that these subjects were not connected to the

Third Reich, and so represented dimensions of the German past that could be reappropriated without embarrassment. The exhibitions figured into a conservative project for reconstituting a healthy sense of German national identity by by-passing or "normalizing" the Nazi time, and simultaneously recovering the value of earlier periods. The Bitburg scenario had a key place in this project, as do the plans (hotly contested by other parts of the political spectrum) for a Museum of German History in West Berlin and a House of History of the Federal Republic in Bonn. For the context of this current discourse, see Eley, "Nazism, Politics and Public Memory", and Evans, "The New Nationalism".

5. Ibid., and Heide Gerstenberger and Dorothea Schmidt (eds.), Normalität oder Normalisierung? Geschichtswerkstätten und Faschismusanalyse (Münster, 1987). For the larger context of radical public history, see Geschichtswerkstatt Berlin (ed.), Die Nation als Ausstellungsstück: Planungen, Kritik und Utopien zu den Museumsgründungen in Bonn and Berlin (Hamburg, 1987).
6. E.g. Rolf Italiaander (ed.), Wir erlebten das Ende der Weimarer Republik (Düsseldorf, 1982); Klaus-Jörg Ruhl, Brauner Alltag. 1933-1939 in Deutschland (Düsseldorf, 1981); Georg Holmsten, Kriegsalltag. 1939-1945 in Deutschland (Düsseldorf, 1981); Robert Fritsch, Nürnberg unterm Hakenkreuz. Im Dritten Reich 1933-1939 (Düsseldorf, 1983).
7. See Hermann Glaser, Maschinenwelt und Alltagsleben. Industriekultur in Deutschland (Frankfurt, 1981); Glaser, Wolfgang Ruppert, and Norbert Neudecker (eds.), Industriekultur in Nürnberg. Eine deutsche Stadt im Maschinenalter (Munich, 1980); Glaser and Neudecker, Die deutsche Eisenbahn (Munich, 1984); Glaser and Walther Pützstück (eds.), Ein deutscher Bilderbuch 1870-1918. Die Gesellschaft einer Epoche in alten Photographien (Munich, 1982). See also Jochen Boberg, Tilman Fichter, and Eckhart Giller (eds.),

Exerzierfeld der Moderne. Industriekultur in Berlin im 19. Jahrhundert (Munich, 1982); and Volker Plagemann (ed.), Industriekultur in Hamburg. Des Deutschen Reiches Tor zur Welt (Munich, 1984). Glaser was first known for his classic Spießler-Ideologie. Von der Zerstörung des deutschen Geistes im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert (Freiburg, 1964), transl. as The Cultural Roots of National Socialism (London, 1978).

8. Ruppert's volume is actually an extremely complete rendition of working-class experience, including some fine vignettes by more engaged authors, such as Franz-Josef Brüggemeier's contribution on housing (pp. 117-26), and Lothar Machtan's on strikes (pp. 258-78--one of the longest in the book). Clearer cases of the depoliticized type of presentation can be found in Glaser's series cited in footnote 7. For example, among the 94 contributions in Plagemann (ed.), Industriekultur in Hamburg, there is no discussion of the great cholera of 1892, whose central role in the city's social and political history has recently been highlighted in Richard J. Evans 676-page magnum opus, Death in Hamburg. Society and Politics in the Cholera Years 1830-1910 (Oxford, 1987). Likewise, the short chapter on "Politics and Parties" (pp. 363-70) floats disconnectedly at the very end of the compilation, on what analytically becomes an amorphous melange of interesting cultural snippets.
9. For general background see the following: Richard J. Evans (ed.), The German Working Class 1888-1933: The Politics of Everyday Life (London, 1982); Geoff Eley, "Joining Two Histories: the SPD and the German Working Class, 1860-1914", in Eley, From Unification to Nazism: Reinterpreting the German Past (London, 1986), pp. 171-99; Richard J. Evans, "Social Democracy and the Working Class in Imperial Germany", European History Quarterly, 18 (1985), pp. 77-90.
10. Ulrich Engelhardt, Nur vereint sind wir stark. Die Anfänge der deutschen

Gewerkschaften 1862/3 bis 1869/70, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1977); Willy Albrecht, Fachverein--Berufsgewerkschaft--Zentralverband. Organisationsprobleme der deutschen Gewerkschaften 1870-1890 (Bonn, 1982); Klaus Schönhoven, Expansion und Konzentration. Studien zur Entwicklung der Freien Gewerkschaften im Wilhelminischen Deutschland 1890-1914 (Stuttgart, 1980); Gerhard A. Ritter and Klaus Tenfelde, "Der Durchbruch der Freien Gewerkschaften Deutschlands zur Massenbewegung im letzten Viertel des 19. Jahrhunderts", in Ritter, Arbeiterbewegung, Parteien und Parlamentarismus (Göttingen, 1976), pp. 55-101.

11. Some of Hans Mommsen's essays are collected in Arbeiterbewegung und Nationale Frage. Ausgewählte Aufsätze (Göttingen, 1979). In addition, he has sponsored a large amount of research on the labour movement in the Ruhr: e.g. Hans Mommsen (ed.), Arbeiterbewegung und industrieller Wandel. Studien zu gewerkschaftlichen Organisationsproblemen im Reich und an der Ruhr (Wuppertal, 1980), with essays by himself, Schönhoven, Tenfelde, and others; and Mommsen and Ulrich Borsdorf (eds.), Glück auf Kameraden! Die Bergarbeiter und ihre Organisationen in Deutschland (Cologne, 1979). Otherwise, see Schönhoven, Expansion; Dirk H. Müller, Gewerkschaftliche Versammlungsdemokratie und Arbeiterdelegierte vor 1918 (Berlin, 1985); Klaus Tenfelde, Sozialgeschichte der Bergarbeiterschaft an der Ruhr im 19. Jahrhundert (Bonn, 1977); Michael Grüttner, Arbeitswelt an der Wasserkante. Sozialgeschichte der Hamburger Hafendarbeiter 1886-1914 (Göttingen, 1984); Michael Schneider, Die Christlichen Gewerkschaften 1894-1933 (Bonn, 1982); Klaus Saul, Staat, Industrie, Arbeiterbewegung im Kaiserreich. Zur Innen- und Sozialpolitik des wilhelminischen Deutschlands 1903-1914 (Düsseldorf, 1974).
12. Tenfelde, "Conflict and Organization in the Early History of the German Trade Union Movement", in Mommsen and Husung (eds.), Development, pp. 213, 204

13. Grüttner, "The Rank-and-File Movements and the Trade Unions in the Hamburg Docks from 1896-7", and John Lovell, "The Significance of the Great Dock Strike of 1889 in British Labour History", *ibid.*, pp. 114-29, and 100-13.
14. I have discussed the problems with this approach in a number of places, including "Joining Two Histories", and "Capitalism and the Wilhelmine State: Industrial Growth and Political Backwardness, 1890-1918", both in Eley, From Unification to Nazism, pp. 171-99, and 42-58; David Blackbourn and Geoff Eley, The Peculiarities of German History. Bourgeois Society and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Germany (Oxford, 1984), pp. 91ff.; and Geoff Eley and Keith Nield, "Why Does Social History Ignore Politics?", Social History 5 (1980), pp. 249-72.
15. Gerhard A. Ritter, Die Arbeiterbewegung im Wilhelminischen Reich 1890-1900 (Berlin, 1959), pp. 149, 208, 187.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 127.
17. For a general statement of this view, see Hans-Ulrich Wehler, The German Empire 1871-1918 (Leamington Spa, 1985), pp. 131-7.
18. To provide detailed references here would be otiose. But the ur-texts of this literature are: Eric J. Hobsbawm, Primitive Rebels. Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movement in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries (Manchester, 1959); George Rudé, The Crowd in History (London, 1964); Edward P. Thompson, "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century", Past and Present 50 (1971), pp. 76-136; and in a different sense, Charles Tilly, The Vendée (Cambridge, Mass., 1964). For a useful survey of the broader literature as of a decade ago, see Robert J. Holton, "The Crowd in History: Some Problems of Theory and Method", Social History 3 (1978), pp. 219-33.
19. See Charles Tilly, Louise Tilly, and Richard Tilly, The Rebellious Century 1830-1930 (Cambridge, Mass., 1975), and Richard Tilly, "Popular Disorders

in Nineteenth-Century Germany", Journal of Social History 4 (1970), pp. 1-40. The key early German debate was in Geschichte und Gesellschaft 3 (1977), where Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, "Zur historischen Analyse von Gewalt" (pp. 236-56), and Karin Hausen, "Schwierigkeiten mit dem 'sozialen Protest'" (pp. 257-63), developed the case against Richard Tilly. On the other hand, Charles Tilly's framework is extremely careful to avoid such gross correlations, and in fact he is not interested in "an index of social tension" at all. Richard's is the weakest of the three parts of The Rebellious Century, and the real object of Haupt's and Hausen's critique is Richard Tilly and Gerd Hohorst, "Sozialer Protest in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert: Skizze eines Forschungsansatzes", in Konrad Jarausch (ed.), Quantifizierung in der Geschichtswissenschaft (Düsseldorf, 1976), pp. 232-78. The latter replied in "Sozialer Protest, Gewalt, Rebellion und die Kritik", Geschichte und Gesellschaft 3 (1977), pp. 418-21.

20. Hausen, "Schwierigkeiten", p. 263.
21. Tilly, Tilly, and Tilly, Rebellious Century, p. 15.
22. The quoted phrase is Andrew Charlesworth's in Charlesworth (ed.), An Atlas of Rural Protest in Britain 1548-1900 (London, 1983), p. 64.
23. Heinrich Volkmann, "Kategorien des sozialen Protests im Vormärz", Geschichte und Gesellschaft 3 (1977), pp. 164-89. In following this direction, Volkmann is consistent with the main lines of social protest research descending from the works of Hobsawm, Rudé, Thompson, and Charles Tilly.
24. Arno Herzig, "Vom sozialen Protest zur Arbeiterbewegung. Das Beispiel des märkisch-westfälischen Industriegebietes (1780-1865)", in Volkmann and Bergmann (eds.), Sozialer Protest, p. 280.
25. Ulrich Engelhardt, "Von der 'Unruhe' zum 'Strike'. Hauptzielsetzungen und -erscheinungsformen des sozialen Protests beim Übergang zur organisierten

- Gewerkschaftsbewegung 1848/49-1869/70", *ibid.*, pp. 251, 229f., 252.
26. Klaus Tenfelde and Heinrich Volkmann (eds.), Streik. Zur Geschichte des Arbeitskampfes in Deutschland während der Industrialisierung (Munich, 1981).
See also Volkmann, "Modernisierung des Arbeitskampfes? Zum Formwandel von Streik und Aussperrung in Deutschland 1864-1975", in Hartmut Kaelble et al., Probleme der Modernisierung in Deutschland (Opladen, 1978), pp. 110-70; and Hartmut Kaelble and Volkmann, "Konjunktur und Streik während des Übergangs zum Organisierten Kapitalismus in Deutschland", in Dieter Langewiesche and Klaus Schönhoven (eds.), Arbeiter in Deutschland. Studien zur Lebensweise der Arbeiterschaft im Zeitalter der Industrialisierung (Paderborn, 1981), pp. 267-95.
27. Klaus Tenfelde, "Konflikt und Organisation in einigen deutschen Bergbaugebieten 1867-1872", Geschichte und Gesellschaft 3 (1977), pp. 212-35.
28. Andreas Griessinger, Das symbolische Kapital der Ehre. Streikbewegungen und kollektives Bewusstsein deutscher Handwerksesellen im 18. Jahrhundert (Frankfurt, 1981).
29. Richard J. Evans, "'Red Wednesday' in Hamburg: Police, Social Democrats and Lumpenproletariat in the Suffrage Disturbances of 17 January 1906", Social History 4 (1979), pp. 1-31; Friedhelm Boll, Massenbewegungen in Niedersachsen 1906-1920. Eine sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu den unterschiedlichen Entwicklungstypen Braunschweig und Hannover (Bonn, 1981); Dick Geary, "Protest and Strike: Recent Research on 'Collective Action' in England, Germany, and France", in Tenfelde (ed.), Arbeiter und Arbeiterbewegung im Vergleich, pp. 364ff.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 365f.
31. E.g. Hans-Gerhard Husung (on North Germany, 1815-47), Rainer Wirtz (Baden, 1815-48), Heinrich Volkmann (Germany as a whole, 1830-32), Manfred Gailus (Germany as a whole, 1847-49), Jürgen Bergmann (workers in 1848), all

- in Volkmann and Bergmann (eds.), Sozialer Protest, pp. 21-35, 36-55, 56-75, 76-106, 283-303.
32. In addition to the essays by Volkmann and Gallus just mentioned, see Hermann-Josef Rupieper, "Die Sozialstruktur der Trägerschichten der Revolution 1848/49 am Beispiel Sachsen", in Kaelble et al., Probleme der Modernisierung, pp. 80-109; Ruth Hoppe and Jürgen Kuczynski, "Eine Berufs- bzw. Klassen- und Schichtanalyse der Märzgefallenen 1848 in Berlin", Jahrbuch für Wirtschafts- geschichte (1964), pp. 200-75.
33. E.g. Bernhard Parisius (on Oldenburg agricultural labourers, 1800-48), Dirk Blasius (the Königsberg cholera riot of 1831), Josef Mooser (on the religious context of rural protests in Minden-Ravensberg in the 1840s), and Lothar Machtan and René Ott (the South German beer riots of 1873), in Volkmann and Bergmann (eds.), Sozialer Protest, pp. 198-211, 212-27, 304-24, 128-66. See also Rainer Wirtz's pioneering essay, "Die Begriffsverwirrung der Bauern in Odenwald 1848. Odenwälder 'Excesse' und die Sinsheimer republikanische Schilderhebung", in Detlev Püls (ed.), Wahrnehmungsformen und Protestverhalten. Studien zur Lage der Unterschichten im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert (Frankfurt, 1979), pp. 81-104; Dirk Blasius, Bürgerliche Gesellschaft und Kriminalität. Zur Sozialgeschichte Preussens im Vormärz (Göttingen, 1976); and the essays in Heinz Reif (ed.), Räuber, Volk und Obrigkeit. Studien zur Geschichte der Kriminalität in Deutschland seit dem 18. Jahrhundert (Frankfurt, 1984).
34. The essays by Husung and Wirtz are especially careful in this respect. Finally, a number of the authors in the Volkmann/Bergmann volume have also published full-length books: Husung, Protest und Repression im Vormärz. Norddeutschland zwischen Restauration und Revolution (Göttingen, 1983); Wirtz, "Widersetzlichkeiten Excesse, Crawalle, Tumulte und Skandale". Soziale Bewegung und gewalthafter sozialer Protest in Baden 1815-1848 (Frankfurt, 1981); Mooser, Ländliche

Klassengesellschaft 1770-1848. Bauern und Unterschichten, Landwirtschaft und Gewerbe im östlichen Westfalen (Göttingen, 1984); Jürgen Bergmann, Wirtschaftskrise und Revolution. Handwerker und Arbeiter 1848/49 (Stuttgart, 1986).

Volkman's pioneering Habilitationsschrift, "Die Krise von 1830. Form, Ursache und Funktion des sozialen Protests im deutschen Vormärz" (Free University of Berlin, 1975), completed as social protest research in West Germany was just getting underway, remains unpublished. Access to the larger literature and broader Central European context can now be had through Helmut Reinalter (ed.), Demokratische und soziale Protestbewegungen in Mitteleuropa 1815-1848 (Frankfurt, 1986). Among the extended references, the following are especially suggestive: Josef Mooser, "Rebellion und Loyalität 1789-1848. Sozialstruktur, sozialer Protest und politisches Verhalten ländlicher Unterschichten im östlichen Westfalen", in Peter Steinbach (ed.), Probleme politischer Partizipation im Modernisierungsprozess (Stuttgart, 1982), pp. 57-87; Rainer Wirtz, "Zur Logik plebeischer und bürgerlicher Aufstandsbewegungen--Die gescheiterte Revolution von 1848", Sozialwissenschaftliche Informationen für Unterricht und Studium (SOWI) 8 (1979), pp. 83-88. For the role of the state and the social organization of state power, see Alf Lüdtke's difficult but pathbreaking "Gemeinwohl", Polizei und "Festungspraxis". Staatliche Gewaltsamkeit und innere Verwaltung in Preussen 1815-1850 (Göttingen, 1980), abstracted in "The Role of State Violence in the Period of Transition to Industrial Capitalism: the Example of Prussia from 1815 to 1848", Social History 4 (1979), pp. 175-221.

35. By now, the "uprooting" thesis has been well and truly beaten into the ground by Charles Tilly and his co-thinkers in the context of their anti-Durkheimian sociology. See Charles Tilly, As Sociology Meets History (New York, 1981), and "Retrieving European Lives", in Olivier Zunz (ed.), Reliving the Past. The Worlds of Social History (Chapel Hill, 1985), pp. 17-19. There is a succinct discussion in David Crew, Town in the Ruhr. A Social History of

Bochum 1860-1914 (New York, 1979), pp. 164-74. The same basic argument was already developed by Rudé and Thompson.

36. As in so many ways, Hobsbawm established the lasting framework for such analysis. See "Economic Fluctuations and Some Social Movements" (orig. pub. 1952), in Labouring Men. Studies in the History of Labour (London, 1984), pp. 126-57. There is an excellent summary in Geary, "Protest and Strike", pp. 373ff. See also the essays by Friedhelm Boll, "International Strike Waves: A Critical Assessment", and James E. Cronin, "Strikes and the Struggle for Union Organization: Britain and Europe", in Mommsen and Hulsung (eds.), Development, pp. 78-99, 55-77.
37. Charles Tilly, "Britain Creates the Social Movement", in James E. Cronin and Jonathan Schneer (eds.), Social Conflict and the Political Order in Modern Britain (New Brunswick, N.J., 1982), p. 35.
38. Lothar Machtan and René Ott, "'Batzebier!' Überlegungen zur sozialen Protestbewegung in den Jahren nach der Reichsgründung am Beispiel der süddeutschen Bierkrawalle vom Frühjahr 1873", in Volkmann and Bergmann (eds.), Sozialer Protest, pp. 128-66. Protests were directed at landlords and brewers seeking to raise the price of beer, and took the form of classic food/price actions. See also Werner Blessing, "Konsumentenprotest und Arbeitskampf. Vom Bierkrawall zum Eierboykott", in Tenfelde and Volkmann (eds.), Streik, pp. 109-23, focusing on the period 1844-50.
39. These comments are based on James S. Roberts, Drink, Temperance, and the Working Class in Nineteenth-Century Germany (London, 1984).
40. Evans, "'Red Wednesday'"; Helmut Bleiber, "Die Moabiter Unruhen 1910", Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft 3 (1955), pp. 173-211.
41. Sympathetic work on popular criminality and deviance is usually focused on "pre-industrial" settings before the labour movement proper arrives on the

scene, implying that such phenomena diminish in significance with industrialization. E.g. Bernhard Parisius, "'Dass die liebe alte Vorzeit wo möglich wieder hergestellt werde'. Politische und soziokulturelle Reaktionen von oldenburgischen Landarbeitern auf ihren sozialen Abstieg 1800-1848", Dirk Blasius, "Sozialprotest und Sozialkriminalität in Deutschland. Eine Problemstudie zum Vormärz", and Josef Mooser, "Religion und sozialer Protest. Erweckungsbewegung und ländliche Unterschichten im Vormärz am Beispiel Minden-Ravensberg", all in Volkmann and Bergmann (eds.), Sozialer Protest, pp. 198-211, 212-27, 304-24. Where such analysis has been resumed, it has been mainly on the Nazi time, when "normal" cultural and social life was interrupted, thereby driving protest and cultural expression into displaced forms of activity.

42. Alf Lüdtke, "Protest--oder: Die Faszination des Spektakulären. Zur Analyse alltäglicher Widersetzlichkeit", *ibid.*, p. 339.
43. I originally made this argument in Geoff Eley, "Memories of Under-Development: Social History in Germany", Social History 2 (1977), pp. 785-92. Discussions of the 1960s breakthrough and its legacy are now legion. The most useful are: Hans-Ulrich Wehler, "Historiography in Germany Today", in Jürgen Habermas (ed.), Observations of "The Spiritual Situation of the Age" (Cambridge, Mass., 1984), pp. 221-59; Georg Iggers, Introduction to Iggers (ed.), The Social History of Politics. Critical Perspectives in West German Historical since 1945 (Leamington Spa, 1985), pp. 1-48; Roger Fletcher, Introduction to Fritz Fischer, From Kaiserreich to Third Reich. Elements of Continuity in German History (London, 1986), pp. 1-32.
44. Thompson, Making, p. 12; Tilly, "Retrieving European Lives".
45. Hans Medick, "The Proto-Industrial Family Economy: The Structural Function of Household and Family during the Transition from Peasant Society to Industrial Capitalism", Social History 1 (1976), pp. 291-315; Peter Kriedte, Hans

Medick, and Jürgen Schlumbohm, Industrialization Before Industrialization. Rural Industry in the Genesis of Capitalism (Cambridge, 1981; orig. German ed., 1977). Among Medick's later essays are: "The Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism: Renewal of the Debate", in Raphael Samuel (ed.), People's History and Socialist Theory (London, 1981), pp. 120-30; "Plebeian Culture in the Transition to Capitalism", in Raphael Samuel and Gareth Stedman Jones (eds.), Culture, Ideology and Politics. Essays for Eric Hobsbawm (London, 1983), pp. 84-113.

46. Lutz Niethammer and Franz-Josef Brüggemeier, "Wie wohnten Arbeiter im Kaiserreich?", Archiv für Sozialgeschichte XVI (1976), pp. 61-134.
47. See SOWI 6 (1977), pp. 147-96: "Bedürfnisse, Erfahrung und Verhalten", esp. Lüdtkke's guide to reading, "Fundstellen zur historischen Rekonstruktion des 'Alltagslebens'", pp. 188-9; Jürgen Reulecke and Wolfhard Weber (eds.), Fabrik--Familie--Feierabend. Beiträge zur Sozialgeschichte des Alltags im Industriezeitalter (Wuppertal, 1978). See also the cognate writings of Dieter Groh: "Basisprozesse und Organisationsproblem", in Ulrich Engelhardt et al. (eds.), Soziale Bewegung und politische Verfassung (Stuttgart, 1976), pp. 415-31; "Die soziale Logik des Alltäglichen: Alltagsleben, Klassenbildung, politisches Handeln", Arbeitspapiere der Projektgruppe "Basisprozesse und Organisationsproblem", No. 20 (University of Konstanz, 1978); "Base-Processes and the Problem of Organisation: Outline of a Social History Research Project", Social History 4 (1979), pp. 265-83. Püls (ed.), Wahrnehmungsformen und Protestverhalten, is also relevant here. At this early stage, the main centres of activity were the Universities of Essen and Konstanz, and the Max Planck Institute of History in Göttingen.
48. Alf Lüdtkke, "Zur Einleitung", SOWI 6 (1977), p. 147.
49. For Ernst Bloch, see esp. his The Principle of Hope, 3 vols. (Cambridge,

Mass., 1986), and Erbschaft dieser Zeit (Zurich, 1935); and for his place in the German New Left, see the materials assembled in Rudi Dutschke, Die Revolte. Wurzeln und Spuren eines Aufbruchs (Reinbek bei Hamburg, 1983), pp. 223-63. For Lefebvre, see Mark Poster, Existential Marxism in Postwar France. From Sartre to Althusser (Princeton, 1975), pp. 238-60, 386ff. Everyday Life in the Modern World (New York, 1971) originated in a number of texts going back to the 1930s, whose German editions was the two-volume Kritik des Alltagslebens (Munich, 1973-75). Much of the German anti-authoritarian movement focused on sexuality from an early stage, before being overtaken by the emergence of the women's movement, and was distinctly pre-feminist in the exuberance of its libertarianism and simplicity of its anti-bourgeois sensibility. See Reimut Reiche, Sexualität und Klassenkampf (Frankfurt, 1968; Eng. transl. London, 1970).

50. See Edward P. Thompson, William Morris: Romantic to Revolutionary (London, 1977), p. 793. See also Barbara Taylor, Eve and the New Jerusalem (London, 1983); Gareth Stedman Jones, "Utopian Socialism Reconsidered", in Samuel (ed.), People's History and Socialist Theory, pp. 138-45; Sheila Rowbotham, Dreams and Dilemmas. Collected Writings (London, 1983), e.g. pp. 216-20.
51. Hans Medick, "'Missionaries in the Row Boat'? Ethnological Ways of Knowing as a Challenge to Social History", Comparative Studies in Society and History 29 (1987), pp. 76-98, pub. in an earlier version in Geschichte und Gesellschaft 10 (1984), pp. 295-319.
52. The flagship works of this grouping are the volumes generated by the Round Tables: Robert Berdahl et al., Klassen und Kultur. Sozialanthropologische Perspektiven in der Geschichtsschreibung (Frankfurt, 1982); Hans Medick and David Sabean (eds.), Interest and Emotion. Essays on the Study of Family and Kinship (Cambridge, 1984). The following works have also emerged from

the same circle: William M. Reddy, The Rise of Market Culture: The Textile Trade and French Society, 1750-1900 (Cambridge, 1984), and Money and Liberty in Modern Europe: A Critique of Historical Understanding (Cambridge, 1987); Gerald M. Sider, Culture and Class in Anthropology and History: A Newfoundland Illustration (Cambridge, 1986); David Warren Sabean, Power in the Blood: Popular Culture and Village Discourse in Early Modern Germany (Cambridge, 1984).

53. Hans Medick and David Warren Sabean, "Introduction", in Medick and Sabean (eds.), Interest and Emotion, p. 1.
54. Medick, "'Missionaries'", p. 82f.
55. Iggers, "Introduction", p. 41.
56. Medick and Sabean, "Introduction", p. 2.
57. The issues of Das Argument devoted to this discussion were: 30 (1964); 32 (1965); 33 (1965); 41 (1966); 47 (1968); 58 (1970). The best-known contribution from an English-language point of view, and the most influential in the longer term for historians, was undoubtedly Tim Mason's "Der Primat der Politik--Politik und Wirtschaft im Nationalsozialismus", 41 (1966), pp. 473-94, and the subsequent exchange with the GDR historians, Eberhard Czichon and Dietrich Eichholtz/Kurt Gossweiler in 47 (1968), pp. 167-227. Mason's essay was translated as "The Primacy of Politics--Politics and Economics in National Socialist Germany", in Stuart Woolf (ed.), The Nature of Fascism (London, 1968), pp. 165-95.
58. For Lüdtke, see the following: "Zur Kontinuitätsfrage", Das Argument 70 (1972), pp. 105-16; "Staatsstreich oder Krieg--Zum Deutschen Kaiserreich von 1871", Neue Politische Literatur 18 (1973), pp. 309-58; "Faschismus-Potentiale und faschistische Herrschaft oder Theorie-Defizite und antifaschistische Strategie", Gesellschaft. Beiträge zur Marxschen Theorie 6 (Frankfurt, 1976),

pp. 194-241; "Gemeinwohl", Polizei und "Festungspraxis"; "Role of State Violence"; "The State and Social Domination in Eighteenth and Nineteenth-Century Prussia", in Samuel (ed.), People's History and Socialist Theory, pp. 98-105; "'Formierung der Massen' oder: Mitmachen und Hinnehmen? 'Alltagsgeschichte' und Faschismusanalyse", in Gerstenberger and Schmidt (eds.), Normalität oder Normalisierung?, pp. 15-34; "Hinnehmen und 'Durchkommen': Arbeitererfahrungen vor und im deutschen Faschismus--oder: Historische Subjekte im alltagsgeschichtlicher Perspektive", in Lüdtkke (ed.), Alltagsgeschichte: Zur Rekonstruktion historischer Erfahrungen und Lebensweisen (Frankfurt, 1988), forthcoming. For Niethammer: Angepasster Faschismus. Politische Praxis der NPD (Frankfurt, 1969); Entnazifizierung in Bayern. Säuberung und Rehabilitierung unter amerikanischer Besatzung (Frankfurt, 1972; repub. as Die Mitläuferfabrik, Berlin/Bonn, 1982); with Ulrich Borsdorf and Peter Brandt (eds.), Arbeiterinitiative 1945 (Wuppertal, 1976); with Brüggemeier, "Wie wohnten Arbeiter?", and "Schlafgänger, Schnapskasinos und schwerindustrielle Kolonie", in Reulecke and Weber (eds.), Fabrik, Familie, Feierabend, pp. 135-75 (now transl. in Iggers [ed.], Social History of Politics, pp. 217-58); with Alexander von Plato (eds.), Lebensgeschichte und Sozialstruktur im Ruhrgebiet 1930-1962, 3 vols. (2nd ed., Bonn, 1986); "Zum Wandel der Kontinuitätsdiskussion", in Ludolf Herbst (ed.), Westdeutschland 1945-1955 (Munich, 1986), pp. 65-83; "'Normalisierung' im Westen. Erinnerungsspuren in die 50er Jahre", in Dan Diner (ed.), Ist der Nationalsozialismus Geschichte? Zu Historisierung und Historikerstreit (Frankfurt, 1987), pp. 153-84.

59. In this sense, Lüdtkke's essay, "Faschismus-Potentiale und faschistische Herrschaft", becomes simultaneously a concluding expression of the earlier debate and a bridge to current activity. Among the latter, the work of Detlev Peukert and Ulrich Herbert deserves particular mention: Peukert, Die

Edelweisspiraten. Protestbewegungen jugendlicher Arbeiter im Dritten Reich. Eine Dokumentation (Cologne, 1980); Peukert, Inside Nazi Germany. Conformity and Opposition in Everyday Life (London, 1987; orig. German, Cologne, 1982); Peukert and Jürgen Reulecke (eds.), Die Reihen fast geschlossen. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alltags unterm Nationalsozialismus (Wuppertal, 1981); Herbert, Fremdarbeiter. Politik und Praxis des "Ausländer-Einsatzes" in der Kriegswirtschaft des Dritten Reiches (Bonn, 1985); Herbert, "Zur Entwicklung der Ruhrarbeiterschaft 1930 bis 1960 aus erfahrungsgeschichtlicher Perspektive", in Niethammer and von Plato (eds.), Lebensgeschichte und Sozialkultur, Vol. 3: "Wir kriegen jetzt andere Zeiten". Auf der Suche nach der Erfahrung des Volkes in nachfaschistischen Ländern, pp. 19-52; Peukert, "Alltag und Barberei. Zur Normalität des Dritten Reiches", and Herbert, "Arbeit und Vernichtung. Ökonomische Interesse und Primat der 'Weltanschauung' im Nationalsozialismus", in Diner (ed.), Ist der Nationalsozialismus Geschichte?, pp. 51-61, and 198-236; Peukert, "Youth in the Third Reich", and Herbert, "Good Times, Bad Times: Memories of the Third Reich", in Richard Bessel (ed.), Life in the Third Reich (Oxford, 1987), pp. 25-40, and 97-110.

60. See, for instance, the debate between Peukert and Lüdtkke: Peukert, "Arbeiteralltag--Mode oder Methode?", in Heiko Haumann (ed.), Arbeiteralltag in Stadt und Land (Berlin, 1982), pp. 8-39; Lüdtkke, "'Kolonisierung der Lebenswelt'--oder: Geschichte als Einbahnstrasse?", Das Argument 140 (1983), pp. 536-41; Peukert, "Glanz und Elend der 'Bartwichserei'. Eine Replik auf Alf Lüdtkke", *ibid.*, pp. 542-9. The programmatic statements for and against are now legion, and these references make no pretense at a complete bibliography. Among the most salient of recent contributions are: Lutz Niethammer, "Anmerkungen zur Alltagsgeschichte", in Klaus Bergmann and Rolf

Schörken (eds.), Geschichte im Alltag--Alltag in der Geschichte (Düsseldorf, 1982), pp. 11-29; Medick "'Missionaries'"; Alf Lütke, "The Historiography of Everyday Life: The Personal and the Political", in Samuel and Stedman Jones (eds.), Culture, Ideology and Politics, pp. 84-113; Lütke (ed.), Alltagsgeschichte (with essays by Lütke, Peter Schöttler, Dorothea Wierling, Wolfgang Kaschuba, Harald Dehne, and Niethammer); Niethammer, "Fragen--Antworten--Fragen. Methodische Erfahrungen und Erwägungen zur Oral History", in Niethammer and von Plato (eds.), "Wir kriegen jetzt andere Zeiten", pp. 392-445. Wolfgang Kaschuba, "Volkskultur--Themen, Publikationen, Perspektiven. Ein Forschungsüberblick aus volkskundlicher Sicht", Archiv für Sozialgeschichte XXVI (1986), pp. 361-98. For the main attacks, each of which now subsumes a number of earlier critiques, see Hans-Ulrich Wehler, "Königsweg zu neuen Ufern oder Irrgarten der Illusionen? Die westdeutsche Alltagsgeschichte: Geschichte 'von innen' und 'von unten'", in Franz Brüggemeier and Jürgen Kocka (eds.), "Geschichte von unten--Geschichte von innen". Kontroversen um die Alltagsgeschichte (Hagen, 1985), pp. 17-47; Jürgen Kocka, Sozialgeschichte. Begriff, Entwicklung, Probleme (2nd ed., Göttingen, 1986), pp. 132-76, and "Sozialgeschichte zwischen Strukturgeschichte und Erfahrungsgeschichte", in Wolfgang Schieder and Volker Sellin (eds.), Sozialgeschichte in Deutschland. Entwicklungen und Perspektiven im internationalen Zusammenhang, vol. I: Die Sozialgeschichte innerhalb der Geschichtswissenschaft (Göttingen, 1986), pp. 67-89. See also Klaus Tenfelde, "Schwierigkeiten mit dem Alltag", Geschichte und Gesellschaft 10 (1984), pp. 376-94; Eve Rosenhaft, "History, Anthropology, and the Study of Everyday Life", Comparative Studies in Society and History 29 (1987), pp. 99-105.

61. For the relationship to Volkskunde, see Kaschuba, "Volkskultur", and the same author's "Volkskultur und Arbeiterkultur als symbolische Ordnungen. Volkskundliche Anmerkungen zur Debatte um Alltags- und Kulturgeschichte",

in Lüdtké (ed.), Alltagsgeschichte; Martin Scharfe, "Towards a Cultural History: Notes on Contemporary Volkskunde (folklore) in German-speaking countries", Social History 4 (1979), pp. 333-43; Helmut Fiehlauer and Olaf Bockhorn (eds.), Die andere Kultur. Volkskunde, Sozialwissenschaften und Arbeiterkultur. Ein Tagungsbericht (Vienna, 1982). For a critical but sympathetic labour-history view, see Michael Schneider, "In Search of a 'New' Historical Subject: The End of Working-Class Culture, the Labour Movement, and the Proletariat", International Labor and Working-Class History 32 (1987), pp. 46-58. For the History Workshop movement, see Peter Schöttler, "Die Geschichtswerkstatt e. V.: Zu einem Versuch, basisdemokratische Geschichtsinitiativen und -forschungen zu 'vernetzen'", Geschichte und Gesellschaft 10 (1984), pp. 421-4; Alfred Georg Frei, "Alltag--Region--Politik: Anmerkungen zur 'neuen Geschichtsbewegung'", Geschichtsdidaktik 9 (1984), pp. 107-20; Anthony McElligott, "The German History Workshop Festival in Berlin, May-June 1984", German History 2 (1985), pp. 21-9; and the various issues of the newsletter/journal, Geschichtswerkstatt (1983--), including Geschichtswerkstatt Berlin (ed.), Die Nation als Ausstellungstück, which doubled as no. 11.

62. In the early Alltagsgeschichte initiatives, women were notable mainly by their absence--e.g. none of the contributors to SOWI 6 (1977) :: Berdahl et al., Klassen und Kultur; two out the sixteen to Reulecke and Weber (eds.), Fabrik, Familie, Feierabend; one out of twenty-two in Peuker and Reulecke (eds.), Die Reihen fast geschlossen; two out of fifteen in another early collection, Gerhard Huck (ed.), Sozialgeschichte der Freizeit. Untersuchungen zum Wandel der Alltagskultur in Deutschland (Wuppertal, 1980). Women's history themes have also been introduced to a great extent from the outside by an independently developing women's history. See Frauengruppe Faschismusforschung, Mutterkreuz und Arbeitsbuch. Zur Geschichte der Frauen in der Weimarer Republik

und im Nationalsozialismus (Frankfurt, 1981); Karin Hausen (ed.), Frauen suchen ihre Geschichte. Historische Studien zum 19. und 20. Jahrhundert (Munich, 1983); and in English, Renate Bridenthal, Atina Grossmann, and Marion Kaplan (eds.), When Biology Became Destiny. Women in Weimar and Nazi Germany (New York, 1984). Of course, this had as much to do with the discriminatory structures of the profession as with any insensitivities of the Alltagshistoriker themselves, and while the numbers of women remain low (e.g. five out of seventeen contributors in Gerstenberger and Schmidt [eds.], Normalität oder Normalisierung?), gender has become much more central to current discussion. See Dorothea Wierling, "Alltagsgeschichte und Geschichte der Geschlechterbeziehungen--über historische und historiographische Verhältnisse", in Lüttke (ed.), Alltagsgeschichte; and the general contents of Niethammer and von Plato (eds.), Lebensgeschichte und Sozialkultur, 3 vols.

63. E.g. compare the tone of Kocka, Sozialgeschichte, with that of his early pronouncements on the subject, such as "Klassen oder Kultur? Durchbrüche und Sackgassen in der Alltagsgeschichte", Merkur 36 (1982), pp. 955-65, and "Historisch-anthropologische Fragestellungen--ein Defizit der Historischen Sozialwissenschaft? Thesen zur Diskussion", in Hans Süssmuth (ed.), Historische Anthropologie: Der Mensch in der Geschichte (Göttingen, 1984), pp. 73-83.
64. Apart from the works cited in footnotes 58 and 60, see the following essays by Lüttke: "Zum Problem des kulturellen Wandels im 19. Jahrhundert", Archiv für Sozialgeschichte XIV (1974), pp. 623-30; "Alltagswirklichkeit, Lebensweise und Bedürfnisartikulation", in Gesellschaft. Beiträge zur Marxschen Theorie 11 (Frankfurt, 1978), pp. 311-50; "Erfahrung von Industriearbeitern--Thesen zu einer vernachlässigten Dimension der Arbeitergeschichte", in Werner Conze and Ulrich Engelhardt (eds.), Arbeiter im Industrialisierungsprozess (Stuttgart, 1979), pp. 494-512; "Arbeitsbeginn, Arbeitspausen, Arbeitsende. Skizzen

zu Bedürfnisbefriedigung und Industriearbeit im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert", in Huck (ed.), Sozialgeschichte der Freizeit, pp. 95-122; "Genesis und Durchsetzung des 'modernen Staates'. Zur Analyse von Herrschaft und Verwaltung", Archiv für Sozialgeschichte XX (1980), pp. 470-91; "Geschichtswissenschaft und Öffentlichkeit. Zu den Wirkungen und Barrieren eines Wissenschaftsbetriebes in der Bundesrepublik", in Mentalitäten und Lebensverhältnisse. Beispiele aus der Sozialgeschichte der Neuzeit (Göttingen, 1982), pp. 416-38; "Gewalt im Alltag: Herrschaft, Leiden, 'Körpersprache'? Formen direkter und 'sanfter' Gewalt in der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft", in Jörg Calliess (ed.), Gewalt in der Geschichte. Beiträge zur Gewaltaufklärung im Dienste des Friedens (Düsseldorf, 1983), pp. 271-95; "Organizational Order or Eigensinn? Workers' Privacy and Workers' Politics in Imperial Germany", in Sean Wilentz (ed.), Rites of Power: Symbolism, Ritual, and Politics since the Middle Ages (Philadelphia, 1985), pp. 303-33; "Protest--oder: Die Faszination des Spektakulären. Zur Analyse alltäglicher Widersetzlichkeit", in Volkmann and Bergmann (eds.), Sozialer Protest, pp. 325-41; "'Deutsche Qualitätsarbeit', 'Spielereien' am Arbeitsplatz und 'Fliehen' aus der Fabrik: Industrielle Arbeitsprozesse und Arbeiterverhalten in den 1920er Jahren--Aspekte eines offenen Forschungsfeldes", in Boll (ed.), Arbeiterkulturen zwischen Alltag und Politik, pp. 155-97; "'Fahrt ins Dunkle?' Erfahrung des Fremden und historische Rekonstruktion", in U. A. J. Becher and Klaus Bergmann (eds.), Geschichte--Nutzen oder Nachteil für das Leben? (Düsseldorf, 1986), pp. 69-78; "Betriebe als Kampffeld: Kontrolle, Notwendigkeits-Kooperation und 'Eigensinn'. Beispiele aus dem Maschinenbau, 1890-1940", in R. Seltz, U. Mill, and E. Hildebrandt (eds.), Organisation als soziales System. Kontrolle und Kommunikationstechnologie in Arbeitsorganisation (Berlin, 1986), pp. 103-39; "Zu den Chancen einer 'visuellen Geschichte'. Industriearbeit in historischen Fotografien", Journal

für Geschichte, 3/1986, pp. 25-31; "Arbeiterpolitik versus Politik der Arbeiter. Zu Unternehmensstrategien und Arbeiterverhalten in deutschen Grossbetrieben zwischen 1890 und 1914/20", in Jürgen Kocka (ed.), Arbeiter und Bürger im 19. Jahrhundert. Varianten ihres Verhältnisses im europäischen Vergleich (Munich, 1986), pp. 202-12; "Cash, Coffee Breaks, Horseplay: Eigensinn and Politics among Factory Workers in Germany circa 1900", in Michael Hanagan and Charles Stephenson (eds.), Confrontation, Class Consciousness, and the Labour Process (New York, 1986), pp. 65-95; "Hunger in der Grossen Depression. Hungererfahrungen und Hungerpolitik am Ende der Weimarer Republik", Archiv für Sozialgeschichte XXVII (1987), pp. 145-76.

65. Lüdtke, "'Alltagsgeschichte': Verführung oder Chance? Zur Erforschung der Praxis historischer Subjekte", unpublished paper, p. 1.
66. Ibid., pp. 10, 12.
67. Lüdtke, "Zur Einleitung", SOWI 6 (1977), p. 147.
68. On the other hand, Lüdtke rightly points out that "taking the subject seriously" does not inevitably mean uncritical identification with people in the past, as some critics polemically claim. In fact, getting inside the skin of Nazis is just as important as imaginatively recreating the outlook of an anti-Nazi worker. See "'Alltagsgeschichte'", p. 14.
69. See "Organizational Order or Eigensinn?", p. 305: "...the creative reappropriation of the conditions of daily life implied a striving for time and space of one's own". Lüdtke contrasts "horseplay" and other forms of enjoyable timewasting at work (from walking around to gossiping and daydreaming), all of which were forms of self-affirmation at the bosses' expense, with the entitled breaks, which were used practically and soberly for recharging one's energies. Physical horseplay--ritualized practical jokes or initiation acts--was especially important, as it carved a niche of worktime and shopfloor space for workers'

self-directed activity. Such demonstrative expression of "being-by-oneself and with one's workmates" allowed an independent shopfloor culture to form, a culture with unpleasant--masculinist, hierarchical, egotist--features as well as democratic and egalitarian ones. Ibid., pp. 311ff. For the classic analysis of this kind: Paul Willis, Learning to Labour: How Working-Class Kids Get Working-Class Jobs (2nd. ed., New York, 1981).

70. "Organizational Order or Eigensinn?", p. 322.
71. "Betriebe als Kampffeld", p. 132. Lüdtkke uses the example of Social Democratic skilled workers at Krupp, who survived the Nazi time by withdrawing into precisely such an informal culture of work, which at one level incorporated some sense of pride in and on the job. At the same time, such skilled workers were drawn inexorably into the Nazi system during the war with the mass influx of forced foreign workers, whom they necessarily faced in supervisory and semi-managerial roles, and in whose exploitation they structurally shared. In this sense, Eigensinn ensured survival and complicity.
72. Medicus, "'Missionaries'", p. 98.
73. See Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckman, The Social Construction of Reality (Harmondsworth, 1971); Alfred Schutz, The Phenomenology of the Social World (Evanston, Ill., 1967); Harold Garfinkel, Studies in Ethnomethodology (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1967); Jack D. Douglas (ed.), Understanding Everyday Life: Toward a Reconstruction of Sociological Knowledge (Chicago, 1970). For German references: Arbeitsgruppe Bielefelder Soziologen (ed.), Alltagswissen, Interaktion und gesellschaftliche Wirklichkeit, 2 vols. (Reinbek bei Hamburg, 1973); "Alltag", Kursbuch 41 (1975); Thomas Leithäuser, Formen des Alltagsbewusstseins (Frankfurt, 1976); E. Weingarten, F. Sack, and J. Schenkein (eds.), Ethnomethodologie. Beiträge zu einer Soziologie des Alltagshandelns (Frankfurt, 1976); K. Hammerich and M. Klein (eds.),

- Materialien zur Soziologie des Alltags (Opladen, 1978); Negt and Kluge, Öffentlichkeit und Erfahrung. See also Agnes Heller, Everyday Life (London, 1984), and the brilliant discussions in Patrick Wright, On Living in an Old Country. The National Past in Contemporary Britain (London, 1985), esp. pp. 1-32. For the larger theoretical frame, see Stuart Hall, "The Hinterland of Science: Ideology and the 'Sociology of Knowledge'", in Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (ed.), On Ideology (London, 1978), pp. 9-32 (esp. 19-21), and "Cultural Studies and the Centre: Some Problematics and Problems", in Stuart Hall, Dorothy Hobson, Andrew Low, and Paul Willis (eds.), Culture, Media, Language (London, 1980), pp. 15-47 (esp. 22-24).
74. See Willis, Learning to Labour; Hall, "Cultural Studies and the Centre".
75. Lefebvre, Everyday Life, pp. 61, 182. As suggested above, much of the theoretical inspiration was mediated via Negt and Kluge's Öffentlichkeit und Erfahrung. See also their more recent intervention: Oskar Negt and Alexander Kluge, Geschichte und Eigensinn (Frankfurt, 1980).
76. See the following essays in Tenfelde (ed.), Arbeiter und Arbeiterbewegung im Vergleich: Klaus Tenfelde, "Sozialgeschichte und vergleichende Geschichte der Arbeiter", pp. 13-62; David F. Crew, "Class and Community. Local Research on Working-Class History in Four Countries", pp. 279-336; Vernon Lidtke, "Recent Literature on Workers' Culture in Germany and England", pp. 337-62 (esp. 340-4). See also Jürgen Kuczynski, Geschichte des Alltags des deutschen Volkes, 4 vols. (Cologne, 1981-2). More generally, Tenfelde's volume is a magnificent critical compilation, which is necessarily somewhat uneven in its general European coverage.
77. See the citations in footnote 60 above.
78. Lidtke, "Protest--oder: Die Faszination des Spektakulären".
79. The literature on British miners is now enormous. For an introduction,

see Raphael Samuel (ed.), Miners, Quarrymen and Saltworkers (London, 1977); Samuel, Barbara Bloomfield, and Guy Boanas (eds.), The Enemy Within. Pit Villages and the Miners' Strike of 1984-5 (London, 1986); and for fine regional study, Hywel Francis and David Smith, The Fed. A History of the South Wales Miners in the Twentieth Century (London, 1980).

80. Crew, Town in the Ruhr; Erhard Lucas, Zwei Formen von Radikalismus in der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung (Frankfurt, 1976), and Märzrevolution 1920, 3 vols. (Frankfurt, 1973, 1974, 1978); Klaus Tenfelde, Sozialgeschichte der Bergarbeiterschaft; Hickey, Workers in Imperial Germany; Brüggemeier, Leben vor Ort; Tenfelde and Trischler (eds.), Bis vor die Stufen. The fullness of current research may be approached via Mommsen and Borsdorf (eds.), Glück auf Kameraden!; and Niethammer and von Plato (eds.), Lebensgeschichte und Sozialkultur.
81. Aside from the various works already cited, Tenfelde is the author of a major community study, Proletarische Provinz. Radikalisierung und Widerstand in Penzberg/Oberbayern 1900 bis 1945 (Munich, 1981), and many important essays. See in particular: "Bergarbeiterkultur in Deutschland. Ein Überblick", Geschichte und Gesellschaft 5 (1979), pp. 12-53; "The Herne Riots of 1899", in Iggers (ed.), Social History of Politics, pp. 282-312. Trischler is the author of a dissertation on colliery overmen: Helmuth Trischler, "Technische Angestellte im deutschen Bergbau. Sozialgeschichte der Steiger 1815-1945", University of Munich, PhD, 1986.
82. See esp. Tenfelde and Trischler (eds.), Bis vor die Stufen, pp. 27-31. The phrase "transition to modernity" is taken from note 90 on p. 43, where the phrase "habitus of appeal" is also used, thereby formally invoking Pierre Bourdieu, whose Outline of a Theory of Practice (Cambridge, 1977) has become an essential text for the Alltagshistoriker.

83. Hickey, Workers, pp. 165-8.
84. Ibid., pp. 24, 35.
85. Franz-Josef Brüggemeier, "Ruhr Miners and their Historians", in Samuel (ed.), People's History and Socialist Theory, p. 329.
86. Hickey, Workers, p. 292.
87. Crew, Town in the Ruhr, esp. pp. 186-94.
88. Brüggemeier, Leben vor Ort, pp. 52-74, 142-61; Brüggemeier and Niethammer, "Schlafgänger", pp. 158-65.
89. Anglo-American work is still surprisingly dominated either by union-centred studies or by social-control perspectives centred on campaigns to organize and dominate the public recreational sphere, up to the mass commercialization of leisure in the twentieth century. In this sense, Hickey is much closer to the Anglo-American mainstream--not surprisingly, as he deliberately set out in the early-1970s to introduce then-unfamiliar British social history approaches into the German discussion. A stronger body of work similar to Brüggemeier's can be found in women's history: compare, e.g., Judith L. Newton, Mary P. Ryan, and Judith R. Walkowitz (eds.), Sex and Class in Women's History (London, 1983). For an excellent example from within the established union-centred paradigm, see Royden Harrison (ed.), Independent Collier. The Coal Miner as Archetypal Proletarian Reconsidered (London, 1978); and for really radical reconsiderations of the "archetypal proletarian", Beatrix Campbell, "Baths and Bosses: the Miners", in Wigan Pier Revisited. Poverty and Politics in the Eighties (London, 1984), pp.97-115. For the shifting of perspectives via recent political experiences, see Samuel, Bloomfield, and Boanas (eds.), Enemy Within; and esp. Vicky Seddon (ed.), The Cutting Edge: Women and the Pit Strike (London, 1986), esp. Beatrix Campbell, "Proletarian Patriarchs and the Real Radicals", pp. 249-82.

90. Von Saldern, Auf dem Wege. See also the same author's essays: "Wilhelminische Gesellschaft und Arbeiterklasse: Emanzipations- und Integrationsprozesse im kulturellen und sozialen Bereich", Internationale wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung (IWK) 13 (1977), pp. 469-505; "Die Gemeinde in Theorie und Praxis der deutschen Arbeiterorganisationen 1863-1920. Ein Überblick", IWK 12 (1976), pp. 295-352; "Sozialdemokratische Kommunalpolitik in wilhelminischer Zeit. Die Bedeutung der Kommunalpolitik für die Durchsetzung des Reformismus in der SPD", in Karl-Heinz Nassmacher (ed.), Kommunalpolitik und Sozialdemokratie. Der Beitrag des demokratischen Sozialismus zur kommunalen Selbstverwaltung (Bonn, 1977), pp. 18-62; "Arbeiterkultur in sozialdemokratischer Provinz (1890-1914)", in Peter E. Stüdemann and Martin Rector (eds.), Arbeiterbewegung und kulturelle Identität (Frankfurt, 1983), pp. 10-34; "Arbeiterradikalismus--Arbeiterreformismus. Zum politischen Profil der sozialdemokratischen Parteibasis im Deutschen Kaiserreich. Methodisch-inhaltliche Bemerkungen zu Vergleichsstudien", IWK 20 (1984), pp. 483-98; "Arbeiterkulturbewegung in Deutschland in der Zwischenkriegszeit", in Boll (ed.), Arbeiterkulturen, pp. 29-70. Von Saldern's first book was a study of social and political change in Göttingen: Vom Einwohner zum Bürger. Emanzipation der städtischen Unterschicht 1890-1920 (Berlin, 1973). She is currently working on the relationship between housing policies and working-class culture between the 1920s and 1960s: "Sozialdemokratie und kommunale Wohnungsbaupolitik in den 20er Jahren--am Beispiel von Hamburg und Wien", Archiv für Sozialgeschichte XXV (1985), pp. 183-237; "Workers' Movement and Cultural Patterns in Urban Housing Estates and Rural Settlements in the 1920s", unpublished paper, 1986.
91. Von Saldern provides a valuable appendix of 54 potted local SPD biographies (pp. 290-300). The term Provinz has an important place in much Alltagsgeschichte

and Green-oriented politics, implying the return to a certain kind of grassroots activity and the simultaneous validation of rural and small-town concerns and aspirations historically neglected (and frequently demonized) by the more orthodox (and metropolitan) Left as "provincialism". Given the historic associations of the latter, and the fascist proclivities ascribed to the provincial mentality by the Left, this has been a key departure. See Dieter Bellmann, Wolfgang Hein, Werner Trapp, and Gert Zang, "'Provinz als politisches Problem", Kursbuch 39 (1975), pp. 81-127; and for the major historiographical achievement of the perspective, see Gert Zang (ed.), Provinzialisierung einer Region. Regionale Unterentwicklung und liberale Politik in der Stadt und im Kreis Konstanz im 19. Jahrhundert. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft in der Provinz (Frankfurt, 1978).

For a more recent statement: Zang, Die unaufhaltsame Annäherung an das Einzelne: Reflexionen über den theoretischen und praktischen Nutzen der Regional- und Alltagsgeschichte (Konstanz, 1985).

92. This contrast between the Imperial and Weimar situations is made strongly in von Saldern's contribution to the Boll volume, "Arbeiterkulturbewegung", p. 34f.
93. The literature relevant to this point is now vast. See the citations in footnote 9 above. Otherwise, I have discussed the issues further in Geoff Eley, "Edward Thompson, Social History, and Political Culture: The Making of a Working-Class Public, 1780-1850", in Harvey J. Kaye and Keith McClelland (eds.), E. P. Thompson: Critical Debates (Cambridge, 1989), forthcoming. On the theoretical front, see Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics (London, 1985); Barry Hindess, Politics and Class Analysis (Oxford, 1987). For some of the connections between history and politics, and across national

- historiographies, see Jane Caplan, "Myths, Models and Missing Revolutions: Comments on a Debate in German History", Radical History Review 34 (1986), pp.87-99.
94. For all its importance, the "linguistic turn" of social history, which has become so important in the English-speaking world, is ultimately evasive on this issue. See Gareth Stedman Jones' widely discussed Languages of Class. Studies in English Working-Class History 1832-1982 (Cambridge, 1983); and Joan W. Scott, "On Language, Gender, and Working-Class History", International Labor and Working-Class History 31 (1987), pp. 1-13, which radicalizes the evasion. The best response to Stedman Jones has been Robert Gray, "The Deconstruction of the English Working Class", Social History 11 (1986), pp: 363-73. For an excellent study arguing for the abandonment of cultural analysis in favour of a locally specified framework of working-class interests and working-class politics: Michael Savage, The Dynamics of Working-Class Politics. The Labour Movement in Preston, 1880-1940 (Cambridge, 1987).
95. See Eric J. Hobsbawm et al., The Forward March of Labour Halted? (London, 1981); and for the German equivalent, Rolf Ebbighausen and Friedrich Tieman (eds.), Das Ende der Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland? Ein Diskussionsband für Theo Pirker (Opladen, 1984). For the fuller German context, see Schneider, "In Search of a 'New' Historical Subject".
96. Von Saldern, "Arbeiterkulturbewegung", p. 59.
97. E.g. Victoria de Grazia, The Culture of Consent: Mass Organization of Leisure in Fascist Italy (Cambridge, 1981); Luisa Passerini, Fascism in Popular Memory: The Cultural Experience of the Turin Working Class (Cambridge, 1987); Tracy H. Koon, Believe, Obey, Fight. Political Socialization of Youth in Fascist Italy, 1922-1943 (Chapel Hill, 1985); Tim Mason, "The Workers' Opposition in Nazi Germany", History Workshop Journal 11 (1981), pp. 120-37;

Tim Mason, "Die Bändigung der Arbeiterklasse im nationalsozialistischen Deutschland. Eine Einleitung", and Hasso Spode, "Arbeiterurlaub im Dritten Reich", in Carola Sachse, Tilla Siegel, Hasso Spode, and Wolfgang Spohn, Angst, Belohnung, Zucht und Ordnung: Herrschaftsmechanismen im Nationalsozialismus (Opladen, 1982), pp. 11-53, and 275-328.

98. See Boll's own Introduction, "Vergleichende Aspekte europäischer Arbeiterkulturen", in Boll (ed.), Arbeiterkulturen. The essays by Stefano Musso, "Skilled Metal Workers and Fascist Unions in Turin in the 1930s" (pp. 133-42), Noëlle Gérôme, "Das Sankt-Eligius-Fest in den Schmieden der Renault-Eetriebe von Billancourt. Industrielle Kultur und Klassenkämpfe" (pp. 143-54), and Lüdtkke, "'Deutsche Qualitätsarbeit'", deal directly with the culture of work and its erosion. Madeleine Rébérioux, "Arbeiterbewusstsein und Arbeiterkultur in Frankreich zwischen den beiden Weltkriegen" (pp. 17-28), makes the point that the culture of work per se was more important to the working class in France before 1914, as a centrally organized socialist sub-culture did not exist. For the same reason, Danielle Tartakowsky suggests, the Communist Party was much quicker to respond to the challenge of the mass entertainment media (such as film) in France than in Germany: see "Von der Ablehnung dominanter Kultur zu ihrer produktiven Veränderung. Die Entwicklung der Kulturpolitik der KPF in der Zwischenkriegszeit" (pp. 123-32). The most extreme way in which the culture of work was undermined was, of course, the mass unemployment of 1929-33: for a brilliant treatment of its effects on the possible forms of working-class culture in Berlin, see Eve Rosenhaft, "The Unemployed in the Neighbourhood: Social Dislocation and Political Mobilization in Germany 1929-33", in Richard J. Evans and Dick Geary (eds.), The German Unemployed. Experiences and Consequences of Mass Unemployment from the Weimar Republic to the Third Reich (London, 1987), pp. 194-227. For some general reflections

on the shifting historiography and problematic of working-class culture, see Leon Fink, "Looking Backward: Reflections on Workers' Culture and the Conceptual Dilemmas of the New Labor History", unpublished paper.

99. Dieter Langewiesche, Zur Freizeit des Arbeiters. Bildungsbestrebungen und Freizeitgestaltung österreichischer Arbeiter im Kaiserreich und in der ersten Republik (Stuttgart, 1979), p. 300.
100. See the works cited in footnote 60 above.

PROGRAM ON THE
COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SOCIAL TRANSFORMATIONS
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

WORKING PAPER SERIES

The Program on the Comparative Study of Social Transformations is an interdisciplinary research program at the University of Michigan. Its faculty associates are drawn primarily from the departments of Anthropology, History, and Sociology, but also include members of several other programs in the humanities and social sciences. Its mission is to stimulate new interdisciplinary thinking and research about all kinds of social transformations in a wide range of present and past societies. CSST Working Papers report current research by faculty and graduate student associates of the program; many will be published elsewhere after revision. Working Papers are available for a fee of \$1.00 for papers under 40 pages and for \$2.00 for longer papers. The program will photocopy out-of-print Working Papers at cost (\$.05 per page.) To request copies of Working Papers, write to Comparative Study of Social Transformations, 4010 LSA Building, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1382 or call (313) 936-1595.

- 1 "Program in Comparative Study of Social Transformations," by William H. Sewell, Jr., Terrence J. McDonald, Sherry B. Ortner, and Jeffery M. Paige, May 1987, 15 pages. Also CRSO Working Paper #344.
- 2 "Labor History, Uneven Development, and the Autonomy of Politics: The Dockworkers of Nineteenth-Century Marseille," by William H. Sewell, Jr., July 1987, 45 pages. Also CRSO Working Paper #346.
- 3 "Coffee, Copper, and Class Conflict in Central America and Chile: A Critique of Zeitlin's Civil Wars in Chile and Zeitlin and Ratcliff's Landlords and Capitalists," by Jeffery M. Paige, September 1987, 10 pages. Also CRSO Working Paper #347.
- 4 "In Search of the Bourgeois Revolution: The Particularities of German History," by Geoffrey Eley, September 1987, 61 pages. Also CRSO Working Paper #350.
- 5 "The Burdens of Urban History: The Theory of the State in Recent American Social History," by Terrence McDonald, May 1988, 50 pages. Also CRSO Working Paper #355.
- 6 "History, Sociology, and Theories of Organization," by Mayer N. Zald, May 1988, 42 pages. Also CRSO Working Paper #357.
- 7 "Have Social Historians Lost the Civil War? Some Preliminary Demographic Speculations," by Maris A. Vinovskis, May 1988, 55 pages. Also CRSO Working Paper #358.
- 8 "Revolution and the Agrarian Bourgeoisie in Nicaragua," by Jeffery M. Paige, 42 pages. Also CRSO Working Paper #363.
- 9 "Nationalism and Class as Factors in the Revolution of 1917," by Ronald G. Suny, October 1988, 42 pages. Also CRSO Working Paper #365.

- 10 "The Original Caste: Power, History, and Hierarchy in South Asia," by Nicholas B. Dirks, October 1988, 30 pages. Also CRSO Working Paper #367.
- 11 "The Invention of Caste: Civil Society in Colonial India," by Nicholas B. Dirks, October 1988, 24 pages. Also CRSO Working Paper #368.
- 12 "Sociology as a Discipline: Quasi-Science and Quasi-Humanities," by Mayer Zald, October 1988, 43 pages. Also CRSO Working Paper #369.
- 13 "Constraints on Professional Power in Soviet-Type Society: Insights from the Solidarity Period in Poland," by Michael D. Kennedy and Konrad Sadkowski, November 1988, 37 pages. Also CRSO Working Paper #371.
- 14 "Evolutionary Changes in Chinese Culture," by Martin K. Whyte, November 1988, 20 pages. Also CRSO Working Paper #372.
- 15 "World Market, Class Conflict, and Rural Coercion in Post-Colonial Buenos Aires," by Karl Monsma, November 1988, 22 pages. Also CRSO Working Paper #373.
- 16 "Ritual and Resistance: Subversion as a Social Fact," by Nicholas B. Dirks, December 1988, 39 pages. Also CRSO Working Paper #375.
- 17 "Social Transformations of Gender in Andean South America: A Working Annotated Bibliography," by Janise Hurtig, December 1988, 24 pages. Also CRSO Working Paper #376.
- 18 "Labour History—Social History—Alltagsgeschichte: Experience, Culture, and the Politics of the Everyday. A New Direction for German Social History?" by Geoff Eley, January 1989, 85 pages. Also CRSO Working Paper #378.
- 19 "Notes on the Sociology of Medical Discourse: The Language of Case Presentation," by Renee R. Anspach, January 1989, 32 pages. Also CRSO Working Paper #379.

