Document généré le 15 juil. 2025 19:56

Labour/Le Travailleur

Industrialization, Urbanization, and Workers' Culture
The "New" Social History and the German Proletariat in the Nineteenth Century

Larry Peterson

Volume 12, 1983

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/llt12re01

Aller au sommaire du numéro

Éditeur(s)

Canadian Committee on Labour History

ISSN

0700-3862 (imprimé)
1911-4842 (numérique)

Découvrir la revue

Citer ce compte rendu

Peterson, L. (1983). Compte rendu de [Industrialization, Urbanization, and Workers' Culture: The "New" Social History and the German Proletariat in the Nineteenth Century]. *Labour/Le Travailleur*, *12*, 173–200.

All rights reserved © Canadian Committee on Labour History, 1983

Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter en ligne.

https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/

Cet article est diffusé et préservé par Érudit.

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche.

https://www.erudit.org/fr/

REVIEW ESSAYS/ NOTES CRITIQUES

Industrialization, Urbanization, and Workers' Culture:

The "New" Social History and the German Proletariat in the Nineteenth Century

Larry Peterson

Lawrence Schofer, *The Formation of a Modern Labor Force. Upper Silesia, 1865-1914* (Berkeley: University of California Press 1975).

David F. Crew, *Town in the Ruhr. A Social History of Bochum, 1860-1914* (New York: Columbia University Press 1979).

Horant Fassbinder, *Berliner Arbeiterviertel 1800-1918*, mit einem Beitrag von Ingrid Krau (West Berlin: Verlag für das Studium der Arbeiterbewegung 1975).

Hans-Jürgen Nörnberg and Dirk Schubert, *Massenwohnungsbau in Hamburg. Materialien zur Entstehung und Veränderung Hamburger Arbeiterwohnungen und -siedlungen 1800-1967* (West Berlin: Verlag für das Studium der Arbeiterbewegung 1975).

Jürgen Reulecke and Wolfhard Weber, *Fabrik, Familie, Feierabend. Beiträge zur Sozialgeschichte des Alltags im Industriezeitalter* (Wuppertal: Peter Hammer Verlag 1978).

Wilhelm Heinz Schröder, *Arbeitergeschichte und Arbeiterbewegung. Industriearbeit und Organisationsverhalten im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt a.M.: Campus Verlag 1978).

Konrad Elsässer, *Die badische Sozialdemokratie 1890 bis 1914. Zum Zusammenhang von Bildung und Organisation* (Marburg: Verlag Arbeiterbewegung und Gesellschaftswissenschaft 1978).

Hartmut Zwahr, *Zur Konstituierung des Proletariats als Klasse. Strukturuntersuchung über das Leipziger Proletariat während der industriellen Revolution* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag 1978).

Klaus Tenfelde, *Sozialgeschichte der Bergarbeiterschaft an der Ruhr im 19. Jahrhundert* (Bonn-Bad Godesberg: Verlag Neue Gesellschaft 1977).

Mary Nolan, *Social Democracy and Society. Working-class Radicalism in Düsseldorf, 1890-1920* (New York: Cambridge University Press 1981).

Larry Peterson, "Industrialization, Urbanization, and Workers' Culture: The 'New' Social History and the German Proletariat in the Nineteenth Century," *Labour/Le Travailleur*, 12 (Fall 1983), 173-200.

THE HISTORY of the working class arose as a by-product of the modern workers' movement. As workers began to organize around demands for political equality, economic reform, and socialist emancipation, they sought to put their struggle into some sort of historical perspective, to seek out their roots, and to proclaim the legitimacy of their movement. The history of their class and movement became a source of enlightenment, one which reminded them of past suffering and first gropings toward organization, which informed their politics in the present, and which pointed the way to their victorious future in the great historical drama of capitalism and socialism that was unfolding before them. History was a weapon in their struggle. It gave workers consciousness of where they came from, what they stood for and against, how and why they fought for a better, more humane, and just society. And workers had to create their own identity and construct their own past, for they were written out of the official history of the bourgeoisie. They worked the fields and factories, built the monuments, fought the wars, and won the revolutions, but the history books spoke of entrepreneurs, kings, generals, and politicians, and only rarely mentioned the "mobs" that disturbed the tranquility of official society. They won a place for themselves and their history, not in the halls of academia but in the union halls and party congresses, in the factories and the streets.

Now that labour and working-class history has become a legitimate, even fashionable, subject of research, it is important to recall the origins of working-class historiography. For our intellectual forebears are not the great founders and methodological innovators of the bourgeois historical profession, but rather those labour union leaders and socialist militants who set aside time, in the heat of battle, to write the history of their labour unions, of the workers' movement in this or that city, of the condition of the working class at this or that moment in time. Their names will not be found on the reading lists of university courses on historiography and methodology, but the history of the workers' movement (and of modern times) cannot be written or rewritten without them.

The history of the nineteenth-century German proletariat is a particularly striking example. Working-class history emerged in the late nineteenth century as the history of workers' organizations. Franz Mehring traced the history of Social Democracy from its first tentative groupings in the *Vormärz* to the triumph of Marxism in the Erfurt Program (1891). Eduard Bernstein and Heinrich Laufenberg wrote the first histories of the workers' movement in Berlin and Hamburg. Friedrich Engels, already the author of the most famous sociological inquiry into the condition of workers in England, turned his attention in the 1870s to the effects of rapid urbanization on the social condition of workers in Berlin in his pamphlet on *The Housing Question*. His prescient sketch of housing conditions during industrialization was destined to become the forerunner of an entire subcategory of working-class historiography. The leaders of the free (socialist) and christian unions either wrote the histories of their unions themselves or appointed historical commissions to preserve the early history of their movements. A handful of bourgeois historians applied their current academic methods to write the biographies of the "great men" of the workers' movement, characteristically concentrating on leaders of bourgeois origin, as in Gustav Meyers' biography of Engels and Hermann von Oncken's biography of Lassalle, while avoiding equally important, but proletarian, leaders like August Bebel. Nevertheless, the real history of the proletariat was that which told the story of its organizations and the conditions which gave rise to them.

In the past decade a new group of historians has taken the two strands of work-

ers' history — the origins of workers' organization and the condition of workers during industrialization — and begun to rethink them. Writing the history of German workers in the nineteenth century differs greatly from writing their history since 1900. The historian must indeed write the history of *workers*, that is, workers in their "state of nature," as they were first subjected to wage labour and capitalist industry, before they had created class organizations to defend their interests, let alone challenge bourgeois power, when barely formed journeymen's, labour union, and socialist organizations were hardly distinct from one another (nor had clearly distinct goals and ideologies), and when in any case such organizations attracted only a handful of supporters from the mass of unorganized workers. The nineteenth century was a time when workers in each industry, locality, or province sought a different road to organization and consciousness, sometimes tied as much to the past as to the future, and destined only later to be unified into a great national movement. This distinction between the history of workers and the history of modern workers' organizations is the first premise of the new generation of social historians.

Nevertheless, by the watershed years 1889-91 German workers had founded stable political, economic, social, and cultural organizations. From this time forward, the history of workers and the history of workers' organization were inextricably intertwined, so that the social history of workers inevitably became the history of the development, transformation, and renewal of the organized workers' movement. Not that workers ceased to have lives separate from their organizations. But their joys and sorrows, their needs and aspirations, their daily routines and work experiences, their cultural activities, their struggles — in short, their social being and consciousness — all conditioned and were conditioned by the organizations they had created. The second theme of the new social historians is the formation of an urban proletariat and its development into an organized workers' movement. How was the working class made, and how did it make itself? What was the learning process by which a new, inchoate, and unorganized mass of wage labourers became, by the early 1900s, a class so organized and conscious that it could claim with pride to be "a state within a state?" Or, in the language of Hegel and Marx, how did workers develop from an economic class "in itself" to a consciously political class "for itself?"

In order to investigate these problems, the new social historians have reversed the emphasis of traditional working-class historiography. Their main — and novel — focus is on the social and economic history of workers prior and up to the breakthrough of modern working-class organizations, and they have redefined the specific subject matter, sources, and methods of workers' history to uncover the full range of historical processes at work. The making of the working class is no longer seen as a fatally determined economic process with an inevitable outcome, whether reformist or revolutionary. Rather, the processes of industrialization, proletarianization, and urbanization are dissected and reconstructed to show interacting structural factors (social, political, and ideological, as well as economic), and the concept of the "condition of workers" has been broadened to include their daily life and workplace experiences. The active role of workers in these processes, a role not limited to their formal organizations, has been restored to its proper place, and the cultural life of workers has been added as an important, though previously neglected, expression and determinant of their consciousness. Only after considering these subjects do the new social historians analyze the transition to a modern, organized workers' movement. To study these subjects the new social historians have uncovered and

exploited a variety of new sources or, in posing new questions, have imaginatively subjected older ones to greater scrutiny. They have succeeded in going beyond older studies based on published statistics and records of workers' organizations to construct a more concrete picture of the life patterns, organization, and social composition of the working class. Finally, the new social historians have developed new methodologies, or adapted existing ones to new problems, or gone to other disciplines, like sociology, urban planning, economics, or anthropology, to gain new insights into historical questions. Most important in this respect is the use of quantitative methods to examine areas where official statistics are inadequate or inappropriate and the systematic application of social historical methods to local and regional cases. Indeed, virtually all the new studies of German workers in the nineteenth century are local histories which underscore the diversity — as well as the common threads — in the process by which workers organized themselves as a class.

Although all are university-trained, at least two come from working-class backgrounds (a rarity among professional German historians); seven are linked, if only informally, to labour unions, workers' parties, or socialism; and five of their books are published by Social Democratic, Communist, or other leftwing publishing houses. Thus, although they have gained limited access to academia, German workers, workers' organizations, and workers' history continue to inform each other in a fruitful, ongoing relationship.

The following essay examines studies in four broad areas, reflecting the problems German historians are currently researching. The first two studies examine the socio-economic parameters in which a working class was formed in heavy industry. The studies of housing in Berlin and Hamburg concentrate on an aspect of this context that formed a basic structure in the daily life of the urban proletariat. The third section analyzes recent work on the every day life of workers, aptly summarized in the title of one book as *Fabrik, Familie, Feierabend* — factory, family, and leisure time. Since there are as yet few full-length studies on this subject this section is more a report of ongoing research than an analysis of completed work. Finally, the last section deals with three major studies that epitomize and summarize the new social history of the German proletariat in the nineteenth century. They pose directly the problem of how German workers developed their political consciousness and use three different interpretations of social history to explore this question. Through these works the new social history of German workers has begun to challenge and redraw the way we understand the emergence of the modern German proletariat.

I
Industrialization and Proletarianization

STARTING IN THE 1860s and picking up speed after the wars of unification, Germany experienced a period of explosive industrialization. Within the span of little more than a generation, a land of peasants and principalities became the most powerful industrial nation of Europe. Traditionally, the economic transformation of Germany has been seen largely from the capitalists' point of view, in terms of the growth of industry. Two recent studies have concentrated on a less well known, but closely related historical process, the proletarianization of the working population. Lawrence Schofer's *The Formation of a Modern Labor Force, Upper Silesia, 1865-1914* and David Crew's *Town in the Ruhr. A Social History of Bochum, 1860-1914* analyze the social and economic transformation of Germany, and especially its impact on workers, in two archetypical centres of heavy industry. Both historians examine such aspects of this subject as the expansion of industry,

the impact of industrialization on working conditions, and the role of industrialists in society and economy; but unlike most older economic histories they concentrate particularly on the role of workers in this process — on geographic mobility, the adaptation of workers to wage labour, and the emergence of workers' protests. In addition, Schofer examines the labour recruitment policies of employers in Upper Silesia, as well as the development of labour relations from both the employers' and workers' point of view. Crew pays special attention to social mobility, class relations among workers, *Mittelstand* (middle class), and industrialists, the impact of proletarianization on social status and living standards, and causes of workers' unrest. Together, these two studies offer an informative comparison of capitalist industrialization in two different, but industrially similar, regions.

Schofer's choice of Upper Silesia is particularly welcome, for, although it was a major centre of heavy industry alongside the Ruhr and the Saar, there are few German- or English-language studies of the region. His study is divided into three parts. In the first, he analyzes the growth of coal mining and iron and steel production, distinguishing between the period of slow growth and labour surplus in the depression years of the 1870s and 1880s and the rapid growth and labour shortages from the 1890s to 1914. He also shows how industrialists succeeded in keeping down labour costs despite labour shortages by going outside the "regular," adult male labour force to employ significant numbers of women, children, and migrant foreign (mostly Russian Polish and Ruthenian) workers. Schofer then turns to the growth of the workforce, its ethnic and geographic origins, the move from rural to industrial employment, and the recruitment policies of employers. Employers relied heavily on locally-born, non-German workers, especially for unskilled labour. Workers themselves quickly severed their rural ties as they adapted to urban, industrial life. In the last section Schofer analyzes labour relations, both from the side of employers (company housing and welfare policies, wages and hours) and of workers (labour discipline and protest movements). Employers in heavy industry in fact adopted few consistently paternalistic policies; their company housing and social welfare programs were not pre-industrial in origin but rather furthered the economically rational goal of attracting and keeping a stable workforce. Employers, however, applied even these few paternalistic programs inconsistently, for they were primarily interested in reducing labour costs to sustain their profitability in a highly competitive market. They preferred to keep wages low and hours long, even at cost of an unstable and fluctuating workforce, and maintained rigid and authoritarian control of work processes. Workers reacted to such conditions through high turnover, absenteeism, migration to higher wage areas of Germany, and strikes, especially during periods of high employment and labour shortages. Schofer concludes that workers adjusted rapidly to industrial capitalism and that their individual and collective protests were "modern" reactions to industrial conditions rather than traditional forms of behaviour carried over from pre-industrial or rural life. He drives home the point that historians need to examine workers *settled into industry* and objects particularly to what he considers the romanticization of early worker protest in the work of historians like E.P. Thompson. Whatever the merits of Thompson's theses for the emergence of the workers' movement in England, Schofer argues convincingly that the German experience was substantially different.

The major limitation of Schofer's study lies in its overall approach. Schofer is a liberal economic historian, and he uses problematic economic categories. Thus, he writes about "modern" and "industrial" society without ever forth-

rightly recognizing the *capitalist* nature of industrialization. Moreover, he defines his subject as the "formation of a modern labor force," thereby objectifying social relations within an abstract category. He does not approach his subject as an historical process shaped by workers as *active* participants but instead relies on normative assumptions about the "rationality" of workers' behaviour. He shows how workers from rural backgrounds became "committed" to urban, industrial life, but he ignores how this "commitment" was mediated by the creation of a collective social life and of workers' organizations. Schofer's methodological approach amounts to a form of economic reductionism in which the social relations, practice, and consciousness of real human beings play little or no role in the development of their economic actions. It is thus not surprising that Schofer makes little attempt to distinguish between the different patterns of behaviour and protest of workers in mining and metallurgy, for to do so he would have had to delve into the social and cultural, as well as economic, peculiarities of each group. Most disappointing, however, is the way Schofer's approach limits his ability to argue his main thesis fully. German workers moved rapidly from the 1860s to create their own social, political, and labour union organizations based on class consciousness or at least on class separatism. In Upper Silesia this benefitted Polish nationalist and Catholic associations more than Social Democratic ones, although socialists found some adherents. Schofer's emphasis on the modern, industrial sources of workers' protest offers a plausible explanation for the rapid emergence of an organized workers' movement in Germany and justifies his scepticism toward a romanticization of workers' history. His lack of interest in workers' politics and organization, however, prevents him from showing the interconnections; his refusal to examine workers' culture or consciousness leads him to conclude that workers accepted the authority structure of industry instead of analyzing the origins and ramifications of worker protest; and his view of Polish workers only as a subcategory within the "labor force" prevents him from analyzing how national and religious differences among workers conditioned the development of a working class. There is much in this study of interest to the student of workers' history, but Schofer's limited and rather doctrinaire range of vision keeps him from realizing its full potential.

David Crew's study of the industrial revolution in Bochum is strongest where Schofer's is weakest, for he approaches workers as active participants in the process of industrialization. Crew's monograph is more than just another local study, for he exploits new sources in order to analyze and test a wide range of historical theses. He sees Bochum neither as a "typical" city that sums up German social history, nor simply as an example that adds to the sum of empirical studies, but rather as a test case with both unique and general characteristics. In terms of methodology Crew's study is one of the first German social histories systematically to make *society* (rather than the state or economy) the central subject, and he criticizes the dominant form of social history in the Federal Republic of Germany because it is too much oriented toward the top echelons of state and society. Although Crew examines the role of the ruling economic and political forces in Bochum, he devotes even more space to the working population. He also criticizes the dominant liberal interpretation of German history in the nineteenth century — particularly as expounded by Ralf Dahrendorf — which sees the rise of illiberal authoritarianism and later Nazism as the result of the Germans' failure to "modernize" their society and social attitudes. Crew rejects the use of Britain or France as absolute models of capitalist development; he analyzes the dynamics of German industrial growth in its own right and

shows how the development of industrial capitalist production and social relations created a specifically German form of capitalist society. Finally, Crew is innovative in his use of quantitative methods and uses sources, such as address books and savings bank records, that have seldom been used but that offer much information on the changes in German society.

Crew carefully reconstructs the social and economic contours of Bochum, surveying the course of industrial growth from the 1860s to 1914 when Bochum grew from a small market town based on agriculture into a major industrial city and providing a model analysis of Bochum's three industrial sectors, coal mining, iron and steel production, and machine building. Bochum's industrial structure decisively conditioned social and political differences within the population — and particularly within the working class — as well as patterns of geographic and social mobility. Crew also examines the different responses of Bochum's three major classes to industrialization. He analyzes the emergence of a distinct class of industrialists and a separate *Mittelstand* of shopkeepers, professional people, and whitecollar workers in relation to each other and to workers, and he tests hypotheses on the foundations of worker protest by comparing the different responses of coal miners and metal workers to capitalist industry and by analyzing the demands of miners, the most radical group of workers, in the strikes of 1889, 1905, and 1912. In a postscript Crew briefly discusses the relations between coal miners and the socialist movement.

Virtually every chapter of Crew's study contains one or more noteworthy (and well-argued and documented) revisions of conventional interpretations of German history. Crew does not see industrialization as an abstract economic process but instead analyzes the *capitalist* social relations within which it took place. He criticizes the view that Germans failed to adopt "modern" (that is, American) ideas of social mobility and demonstrates the very real and persistent insecurity of working-class (and to a lesser extent petty bourgeois) life that, despite long-term improvements in wages and hours, made widespread social mobility impossible and severely limited workers' attitudes about their life prospects. He clearly demonstrates the rigid barriers between manual and non-manual work in Germany that divided the country along class lines, but he also brings to light the social mobility of different groups of workers and *Mittelstand* on each side of this rigid divide. Crew also emphasizes the division within the working class between the predominantly unskilled migrants and the more often skilled settled workers, a division which had profound and contradictory effects on the development of the workers' movement. As for industrialists, Crew sees their paternalism, not as a premodern or anti-modern ideology, but rather as a part of a rational economic calculation to attract, stabilize, and control a workforce made up largely of immigrant workers; such paternalism was not very extensive in any case and was limited largely to areas (such as company housing) that could be manipulated to the direct economic benefit of the company. The *Mittelstand*, also, was not antimodernist but rather became an integral part of capitalist society. It grew in size and importance but was torn between the industrialist, on whom it was dependent for general prosperity, and workers, who constituted the mass of consumers. During economic crises the fierce competition for survival tended to radicalize the *Mittelstand*, leading it at times into a political alliance with the working class, but in times of prosperity it made its peace with the industrialists in a front against socialism. Finally, Crew critically analyzes the sources and causes of workers' protest, showing the inadequacy of uprooting, economic misery, and technological change (structural change, skill

dilution, status deprivation) as explanations for it. Instead, he advances the thesis that the social basis of protest and organization was the development of an "occupational community" among workers. Coal miners possessed such a community before 1914, thus explaining their militancy and the quiescence of steelworkers. Uprooting, misery, and technological changes often fueled protest movements with specific grievances. In particular, miners wanted both higher wages and shorter hours (the former to compensate for the latter) and were concerned with the increase in unpaid time traveling to the coal face and with work intensity as mines grew deeper and larger. But the existence of an occupational community among miners explains how and why such protest movements came into existence in the first place.

Nevertheless, Crew overstates his case at times. In refuting the thesis that capitalist Germany was "unmodern" or "anti-modern" he consistently ignores conservative aspects of German society, such as the continued influence among miners of traditions from the pre-capitalist, corporate period of mining and the conservative role of the Catholic Centre Party in perpetuating corporatist ideals among miners and the *Mittelstand*. The types of quantitative sources he uses to assess social differences among occupational groups are biased in favour of the settled population, and he does not seek out other kinds of sources to study more mobile groups of workers. Moreover, Crew does not adequately take into account the peculiarities of Ruhr coal mining in advancing the concept of occupational community. Such peculiarities could limit the relevance of his thesis as a general explanation of worker protest. Finally, Crew interprets social history from below in such a way as to exclude politics and organization altogether. In analyzing the *Mittelstand* he fails to discuss the political role of the Centre Party in mobilizing this class, nor does he mention that the most prominent local Catholic leader during the Great Depression simultaneously led the Catholic workers' movement and cooperated, if only briefly, with Social Democrats on issues of social reform against big business. Finally, in analyzing miners' demands during the strikes of 1889, 1905, and 1912 Crew leaves out the role of workers' organizations on the problematic assumption that history from below is concerned only with the rank-and-file. He leaves completely unexplored the crucial interaction of workers, their organizations, and their leaders in formulating miners' demands. Having ignored workers' organizations, Crew inaccurately concludes that Social Democracy failed to win support among workers in the Ruhr before 1914. Despite his subtle social analysis, Crew remains wedded to an essentially economic understanding of workers' consciousness.

In different ways the studies by Schofer and Crew recognize the central importance of workers in German industrialization, and they show that major segments of German society, especially workers, responded quickly, rationally, and effectively to industrial capitalism. At the same time they still see social history as "history with the politics left out," thus leading them to disregard the crucial role of workers' organizations. They also define social history in terms of the *employed* population, which in regions of heavy industry means primarily *male* workers. This is a major limitation of both studies, since women played an important though economically indirect, role in the social history of German workers in heavy industry, and it is indicative of the restriction of both studies to the industrial aspects of workers' history. Crew's innovative exploration of the social history of workers "from below" goes well beyond Schofer's use of abstract economic categories and brings us closer to an explanation of the reality of workers under capitalism. In the final analysis,

however, Schofer and Crew expand, but do not break out of, the traditional economic conception of social history.

II

Urbanization and Housing

SCHOFER AND CREW mention urbanization primarily in terms in terms of economic growth and the motivations of industrialists in building company housing. Indeed, few German historians have approached urbanization broadly as a social historical process, although it was the third great social transformation of nineteenth-century Germany. By contrast, Horant Fassbinder's *Berliner Arbeiterviertel 1800-1918* and Hans Jürgen Nörnberg and Dirk Schubert's *Massenwohnungsbau in Hamburg* concentrate on the impact of urbanization on workers through the study of working-class neighbourhoods and housing. These studies are an outgrowth of the attempts of a group of architectural historians and urban planners to reinterpret radically the process of urbanization in Germany and the role of the construction industry in this process. Traditionally, architectural history has been limited to the "artistic" architecture of the upper classes, the work of individual architects as artists, and changes in technology. The novelty of these two studies is their attempt to treat architecture as social history by concentrating on mass workers' housing as a legitimate subject of architectural history.

The key themes of both studies are the role of urban expansion in the process of industrialization and changes in the urban environment as they affected different social classes, especially workers. They explore the relation of the labour market to urban growth and the economics of the housing market in meeting the needs of an expanding labour force and in determining the kinds of housing built for different classes of German society. They also explore the social impact of urbanization and housing on the quality of working-class life, as well as the way capitalist urbanization and construction conditioned the formation of working-class neighbourhoods and communities. Finally, they analyze the impact of worker protest and the organized workers' movement in altering urban planning and in improving the quality of housing, culminating after 1918 in the construction of cooperative and public housing. Since these studies are written by scholars trained as architectural historians, they are by their very definition interdisciplinary, employing the analytic methods and research techniques of architectural history and urban planning along with social, economic, and political history. They also approach their subjects in terms of social and economic theory, specifically Marxism, using the dialectical method and the theories of historical materialism to situate the overall dynamics as well as the specific economic processes of urbanization and housing construction. Of primary importance is their analysis of the differential impact of urbanization in terms of capital accumulation, class society, and social conflict. This interdisciplinary and theoretical approach distinguishes these studies from the works of most professional historians and broadens the way we see the social history of workers. The results of their studies should encourage other scholars to go further in this direction.

Fassbinder analyzes the "process by which the housing and spatial conditions of urban working-class life developed from the beginning of the industrial revolution," and he addresses four major questions about this process. Why did the rate of urban growth increase so rapidly in the industrial era? Why were the housing conditions of workers so poor, and why was working-class housing concentrated in specific neighbourhoods? What forces conditioned the development of the spatial structure of the urban agglomeration? And what was the function of the state and municipal planning in the development of the structure of land use and in the determination of housing conditions for work-

ers? Fassbinder analyzes the "agglomeration of the means of production and of the proletariat during the industrial revolution" in the Prussian capital city as a necessary introduction to his main subject, for the rapid increase in workshops and industrial complexes and the massive influx of workers into the city (a tenfold increase between 1831 and 1875) revolutionized land use, urban structures, and housing. Moreover, Fassbinder shows how the economically determined concentration of certain industries in Berlin (such as machinery, clothing, furniture, and later electrical engineering) decisively conditioned the changing face of the city. Berlin grew both from the basis of the pre-industrial city, with the new centres of industry expanding outward from the traditionally lower-class "ring" to the north, east, and south of city centre, and was structurally transformed by industrialization, with new, more homogeneous neighbourhoods, the emergence of prosperous bourgeois neighbourhoods in the West End, and the concentration of administrative and financial offices in the old city centre. Berlin changed from a pre-industrial city of small workshops and mixed, little differentiated neighbourhoods into an industrial metropolis with neighbourhoods segregated by class and function. At first industrial suppliers and housing for workers had to be close to industrial establishments; firms needing transportation connections, more space, and lower rents located along canals and rail lines on the outskirts of the city, whereas small workshops producing such wares as clothing and furniture established themselves in new manufacturing neighbourhoods in close proximity to the city centre and commercial outlets. The refinement of rail transport and the introduction of efficient means of mass transportation at the end of the nineteenth century completed the transformation of the city. The increased mobility of the urban population made possible the construction of large-scale industrial complexes, the more complete separation of industrial from residential areas, and the class segregation of housing.

The most original aspect of Fassbinder's study is his use of the labour theory of value to explain the way in which specific types of housing were distributed among different neighbourhoods. Fassbinder applies Marx's theoretical analysis in *Capital* creatively to the specific conditions of housing and construction in Berlin during the industrial revolution, demonstrating in detail the inner workings of Berlin's real estate and construction markets. In the first part of his analysis he uses the labour theory of value to explain the distribution of housing among workers, showing how housing was based on the exchange of commodities (housing space exchange for rent) and how the amount of rent was determined by the level of productivity in the construction industry and by the size and quality of housing. The distribution of housing was determined by how much and what quality space each class could afford. For workers rent formed part of the value of their labour power; if capitalists were to promote the expanded reproduction of capital (entailing the influx of workers into the city and urban growth), they needed to ensure a minimum level of housing and wages. Housing was built, however, only if there was a sufficient market to realize a profitable exchange of commodities, and the construction industry was subject to the same vicissitudes of the business cycle as other sectors of industry. In the second half of his analysis Fassbinder uses the theory of the maximization of ground rent (urban land being a limited commodity and ownership of land constituting a special form of monopoly) to explain the size and type of buildings and the overall distribution of housing and other types of buildings within the city. Maximization of ground rent became a major economic motive only with the onset of the industrial revolution, when urban growth made land a

scarce and valuable commodity. High ground rents in the bourgeois West End led to the construction of better buildings with fewer stories, more open spaces, but also high rents, whereas the low ground rents in the industrial/working-class ring around the rest of the city resulted in buildings with more stories, smaller apartments, fewer streets and public spaces, and more tenements built around narrow back courtyards. A greater saturation in land use was needed in the working-class neighbourhoods to compensate for the lower ground rents. Low wages, competition among the mass of immigrant workers for housing, and the economic workings of the construction industry and of the ground rent maximization led to poor housing conditions for workers, whereas the revenue obtained by the bourgeoisie from surplus value made possible the purchase of much better housing for them in the West End.

Hans-Jürgen Nörnberg and Dirk Schubert start with a similar thesis that it is necessary "to explain the nature and forms of mass housing" through "the development of the productive forces and the construction industry, as well as the structures of work processes," and they approach their subject by analyzing the "interdependence of political and socio-economic processes and their effects on the construction of mass housing." They discuss a wide range of themes, including changes in the productive forces, market conditions, Hamburg's overall place in the German economy, changes in the relations of production, the social and economic conditions of workers, and the political struggles that coincided with the organization of the workers' movement. These factors are then related specifically to housing conditions through an examination of the construction market and industry and of public and private housing policies. Important for the former were the nature of housing as a commodity, the problems of financing mass housing, construction standards, and rents, while housing policies ranged from state regulation of construction, to private reform proposals to provide adequate working-class housing, to various attempts to build company or cooperative housing as a solution to the housing crisis. Particularly interesting is the use the authors make of floor plans and maps, both of exemplary reform proposals that set the standards for changes in mass housing and of typical housing and residential complexes. These are based on plans submitted to the state regulatory body for construction and on buildings and neighbourhoods that still exist, and they provide a graphic demonstration of the evolution of housing in Hamburg. Hamburg was Germany's largest ocean port. Thus, the development of international trade and transport had a disproportionate impact on urban growth and the distribution of functions within the city. Especially in the late nineteenth century Hamburg developed new port facilities with large-scale shipbuilding and new export industries located in the harbour. This transformation was made possible by the mass migration of workers to Hamburg, workers who were housed in vast new tenement complexes on the outskirts of the city and travelled to the harbour on mass transportation. By 1900 Hamburg's neighbourhoods were even more sharply segregated than Berlin's along class and industrial/residential lines.

In comparison to Fassbinder's study, Nörnberg and Schubert are more empirical and less theoretical, although they also use Marxist theory as an analytic and explanatory tool. Nörnberg and Schubert emphasize working-class housing more than urban development and concentrate on construction rather than working-class neighbourhoods. They also provide a more detailed treatment of the state's housing policies and regulations, and they place greater emphasis on changes in the relationship between home and workplace than does Fassbinder. Indeed, Fassbinder is primarily interested in the overall development of the urban agglomeration under

capitalism through which he seeks to explain the distribution of housing and economic functions among different neighbourhoods, whereas Nörnberg and Schubert approach the same themes and problems on a more microcosmic level, through the basic unit of workers' housing.

Despite their contribution to the social history of workers, both studies share several weaknesses. Their original research is often limited to architectural history and urban planning, and it is not always complemented by a reexamination of social historical sources, leading at times to a schematic reliance on theoretical explanations. The authors of both studies mention the role of the organized workers' movement and of workers' protests after 1848 as a major reason for the gradual improvement of housing conditions in Berlin and Hamburg, but the role of the workers' movement needs to be examined in greater detail. Most important, the concentration of Fassbinder on working-class neighbourhoods and of Nörnberg and Schubert on mass housing leads to an overemphasis on purely economic determinants, and within these on the accumulation and reproduction of capital, in the process of urbanization. The function of cities within the capitalist system, however, is much broader than this, and the face of urban agglomerations is also shaped by a variety of other factors. In particular, cities are centres of the circulation of capital and of the distribution of wages and surplus value, and they serve as centres for the political and ideological institutions of capitalist societies. Berlin and Hamburg are classic examples, in different ways, of the multifaceted and complex nature of capitalist cities. Although these broader questions are less directly related to working-class neighbourhoods and mass housing than the factors discussed in these two studies, they nevertheless play a crucial role in urban development that should be examined more closely. Urban workers did not live in a vacuum, and their lives need to be seen within the overall context of capitalist society.

Fassbinder, Nörnberg, and Schubert have made an invaluable contribution to the history of German workers in the nineteenth century with their studies of urban growth and housing. Outside the workplace, housing was probably the most pervasive economic structure to affect workers' lives, determining and limiting the way they could live. It is indeed impossible to understand the social history of workers without knowing the spatial world in which they spent their non-working hours and in which working-class housewives and children spent all their time. The empirical evidence presented by these authors is reason alone to welcome their studies, but they go a step further in trying to explain how and why working-class housing and neighbourhoods developed in the way they did. More studies of urbanization and housing are needed for other German cities (one of company and private housing in the Ruhr would be especially welcome) to show the full range of urban conditions during and after the industrial revolution. Social historians should take up this theme and expand upon it to examine the impact of the urban environment on workers' culture, the development of the workers' movement, and working-class attitudes and views of life. Urbanization and housing had a profound impact on working-class life and attitudes, and these subjects have been ignored by historians of the working class for too long. Fassbinder, Nörnberg, and Shubert have opened the way for social historians to integrate these subjects into an overall understanding of the history of German workers.

III

Workers' Culture

HISTORIANS HAVE LONG agreed that the creation of labour unions and workers' or socialist parties grew out of the response of workers to industrialization. This sim-

ple statement, however, raises more questions than it answers. The specific responses of workers to capitalist industry have been so varied that the linear economic determinism implied in such a formulation cannot by itself adequately explain differences in timing, forms, or consciousness, no matter how justified the overall thesis. An analysis of social structures and politics can fill in many of the gaps in our understanding of how workers responded to capitalist industrialization. Nevertheless, there remains an entire area of workers' experience — attitudes, norms of behaviour, forms of sociability — that touches directly on workers' consciousness of themselves and their environment. In recent years more and more historians have begun to delve into this little charted region of working-class life in an attempt to discover some of the ties between the raw impact of social, economic, and political processes and the ways workers comprehended and responded actively to them. Workers' culture has become a major topic of social historical research because it can show concretely the mediating mechanisms between economy, social structure, and politics, on the one hand, and workers' consciousness and organization, on the other. The history of workers' culture is in fact so new that there are as yet few book-length studies, and the interested reader should look particularly at the 1976 and 1981 volumes of *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* (with the emphasis on workers' culture and the workplace, respectively), the special issue of *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* on "Arbeiterkultur im 19. Jahrhundert" (1979, with several theoretical and methodological discussions), and the "Special Issue on Workers' Culture" of the *Journal of Contemporary History* (April 1978, with eight out of eleven articles that deal entirely or in part with Germany and Austria, including a useful overview of research by Gerhard Ritter).

Fabrik, Familie, Feierabend, a collection of original articles edited by Jürgen Reulecke and Wolfhard Weber, serves as a useful introduction to the current research into workers' culture. Its title indicates the three broad areas that historians have defined as the subject matter of workers' culture — everyday life as seen at the workplace, in the working-class family, and in leisure time activities. The last theme has been further subdivided between informal social activity and "organized" culture, that is, recreational and cultural associations often linked in Germany to labour unions and political parties. Of particular interest are three articles that explore the impact of industrialization and technological change on working conditions and work processes and the consequent changes in work community among miners and skilled metalworkers; three articles that analyze the impact of housing conditions and nutrition, especially in the Ruhr, on family life and the response of workers; and three articles that discuss forms of workers' sociability and organized recreation, especially the social associations of Ruhr miners and the sports clubs that became important in the first decades of the twentieth century. Reulecke and Weber's anthology also introduces the major areas of controversy among historians of workers' culture. To what extent were cultural forms carried over from pre-industrial communities, and how were they transformed by capitalist industrialization? How did workplace, family, and forms of sociability outside of work retard or encourage class consciousness? To what extent did informal and organized workers' culture influence each other? Finally did the organized workers' movement, especially the Social Democratic Party (SPD), create a class-conscious, proletarian counter-culture, or did socialists instead organize workers into a subculture that never quite broke away from the larger popular and bourgeois cultural forms of German society ? As one can see by the very formulation of these questions, German historians are approaching

workers' culture in terms of a larger, essentially political, problem: what kind of consciousness did workers develop, and how does it affect our understanding of labour unions and the political organizations of workers, and especially the SPD before 1914? Finally, this anthology offers an introduction to the varied approaches of historians to German workers' culture. While all the articles touch on workers' consciousness, they concentrate on the experience of workers in general, outside of labour unions and political parties. Even the articles on consumer cooperatives and socialist sports clubs explore so-called mass organizations where party activists worked or played alongside many non-party members. Moreover, the articles examine the everyday life of workers and avoid the exceptional highpoints of the workers' movement. Thus, conclusions about workers' consciousness are based, not on a preselected group of organized political activists who had already developed a highly articulate class consciousness, but on the mass of workers in the very process of responding to the conditions of proletarian life, those workers to whom the SPD and labour unions appealed for mass support. Also noteworthy is the article by Franz Brüggemeier and Lutz Niethammer on *Schlafgänger, Schnapskasinos, und schwerindustrielle Kolonie*. Along with Niethammer's article *Wie wohnten Arbeiter im Kaiserreich?* in the 1976 volume of *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, this article carries the discussion of urbanization and housing to the everyday experience of workers and their families, thus showing concretely how the overall processes analyzed by Fassbinder, Nörnberg, and Schubert shaped the consciousness and social activity of workers. Finally, this collection demonstrates the enormous variety of sources and methods that can be used in studying workers' history. Reulecke and Weber's anthology shows that at least some German historians are finally taking seriously all aspects of workers' lives, in a way that used to be restricted for the upper classes. The social history of workers is finally becoming just that, and no longer a mechanical extension of economic processes and living standards.

The workplace experience of workers is a particularly shadowy area of their history, for which professional historians (mostly intellectuals of bourgeois origin) have traditionally had neither the training nor background to understand. Thus, a real breakthrough in the study of workers' culture is Wilhelm Heinz Schröder's *Arbeitergeschichte und Arbeiterbewegung*, an examination of the relation between industrial work and workers' organizational behaviour in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Schröder defines workers' history as the "emergence and development of workers' latent interests," whereas the history of the workers' movement deals with their manifest interests, that is, their consciousness. His study explores the relation between the two, specifically the greater or lesser propensity of different groups of workers to organize labour unions, by concentrating on workers' history, and it attempts to define the social and economic structures and relations at the workplace that condition the emergence of workers' organization. Schröder provides a detailed discussion of the preconditions of industrial work (the geographic mobility and qualification structure of workers), the forms of industrial work (an analysis of changes in work processes and conditions from production under the handicraft, domestic, and manufacturing systems to factory industry), and the conditions of industrial work (length of the workday, the wage system, and the age structure of workers). Schröder has undertaken an ambitious project, and his conclusions must be considered a first attempt to synthesize what is known about the workplace conditions of German workers. The breadth of his subject means that Schröder has to rely on national, general, not

always comparable statistical sources, on limited available secondary literature, and on only two more deeply researched case studies (of shoemakers and cigarmakers). Moreover, Schröder's approach is largely foreign to the methods of most social historians, for he is attempting to define a set of categories through which to analyze workers' history. In many ways his book is a theoretical reinterpretation, from the viewpoint of the "new" social history, of Jürgen Kuczynski's *Die Theorie der Lage der Arbeiter*. In fact, Schröder's study is organized around theoretical economic and social categories, rather than an empirical case. He thus raises questions about the very nature of historical science, which he does not directly address. His emphasis on structural categories, in particular, lacks a concept of social practice which could address the question of workers' struggles over control of work processes; his creation of an abstract "conflict" model is an inadequate attempt to introduce such a concept to mediate between essentially static Weberian ideal types. In contrast, many of the articles in the 1981 volume of *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* move toward a concept of social practice by analyzing day-to-day shopfloor struggles, their relation to labour union organization, and attempts by factory owners to neutralize work conflicts. Still, *Arbeitergeschichte und Arbeiterbewegung* should shake up the way social historians view workers' history. Schröder's categories and conclusions form a starting-point both to study the workplace experience of specific groups of workers and to develop a social theory for the development of workers' organization under capitalism.

By far the most researched areas of German workers' culture are workers' cultural organizations, especially those tied to the SPD, and the cultural policies of the SPD itself. The emergence of such cultural organizations was rooted in the rigid separation that the capitalist factory introduced between work and leisure time, and they depended upon the formulation of a separate social identity among workers and upon workers' ability to increase the amount of leisure time at the expense of the workday. Workers' cultural organization both grew out of the structure of everyday life under capitalism and expressed a conscious rejection of bourgeois-dominated cultural groups. Moreover, the ability of workers to organize and enjoy their leisure time depended greatly upon their level of education. Konrad Elsässer's study of the relation between education and workers' organization *Die badische Sozialdemokratie 1890 bis 1914* is a solid addition to our knowledge of how the SPD responded to these problems in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Elsässer analyzes both the SPD's attempts to expand workers' education in the party's own press, auxiliary organizations, libraries, and schools and its program for educational reform, particularly its advocacy of a *Volksschule* that would secularize and modernize the schools and break down the class-based structure of German education by introducing a general school ensuring equality of opportunity for all children. Baden's SPD was one of the most reformist sections of the party, but also one in which anti-revisionist groups emerged to advocate the development of class consciousness, rather than reform of the existing school system, as the goal of party educational policy. Elsässer analyzes both the struggles in the party over the nature of educational policies and the major programmatic compromises the party had to accept when it joined the National Liberals in parliament in support of a reform to secularize education against the powerful Catholic Centre Party. Secularization of education was an important reform with far-reaching consequences, but did the SPD give up more than it gained by accepting a reform that fell far short of the *Volksschule* and directed the party's attention away from its own education of a class conscious proletariat?

Elsässer poses the key questions about Social Democratic cultural policies. Did the socialist cultural organizations develop and reinforce a socialist class consciousness? What do the cultural organizations say about the overall level of workers' consciousness? What alternatives were open to the SPD, and what were their political implications? Many of the recent articles on workers' culture deal with such themes as choral societies and songs of the workers' movement, health organizations, sports clubs, workers' libraries, and the celebration of May Day; most are not as party-oriented as Elsässer's study. Taken as a whole these studies reach no consensus on what organized workers' culture says about workers' consciousness — whether it attests to revolutionary socialism or social reformism. Nevertheless, they arrive at three points of agreement. Workers formed cultural organizations on their own initiative, out of their own communities, and generally without requiring party membership. The SPD itself, as a political party, only occasionally intervened in the cultural movement; the cultural organizations themselves were autonomous and were linked in spirit, rather than formally, to the SPD. And they expressed a profound, class-based opposition to the German state and to bourgeois cultural organizations, without necessarily developing an articulate socialist or proletarian alternative to bourgeois cultural forms and ideologies. I would draw one further conclusion. Organized workers' culture was rooted in the structures of everyday life under capitalism, but it was also a conscious response by workers to these structures. Attempts to see workers' culture in terms of sharp dichotomies — between reformist or socialist consciousness, integration into capitalist society or revolutionary struggle against it, workers' subculture or proletarian counter-culture — fail to take account of the active struggle of workers to comprehend and transform this essentially contradictory reality. In attempting to organize themselves culturally, German Social Democratic workers before 1914 first posed the complex problems of cultural revolution that later generations of socialists and communists have sought to resolve.

The biggest problem now facing historians of workers' culture is to define what workers' culture is. The term itself is new to German historiography, although concepts of proletarian culture, the history of workers' social mores, and the ethnography of workers have a longer intellectual tradition in the German workers' movement and social sciences. The history of organized culture has been easier to define — and thus has been more studied — because it bases itself on formal, quasi-political organizations or analyzes the response of workers to "high" culture (especially through musical societies, peoples' theatre, and reading habits). Only the German Democratic Republic has developed a more refined concept of workers' culture, centred around labour and investigating the totality of living conditions and everyday life in the light of the struggle against capitalism, but there workers' culture is a subject for anthropologists rather than historians. In the Federal Republic, workers' culture is negatively defined according to those aspects of workers' lives that do not fall into economic, social structural, or political categories. If the central issue of workers' culture is defined as the relationship between consciousness (of economic, social, and political structure and relations) and organization (the active forming and transforming of such structures and relations), in the everyday experience of workers at work, home, and play, then in fact workers' culture is not a separate subject at all, but is instead an integral part of any discussion of the structures and relations of economy, society, and politics. This, I would suggest, is the most fruitful way of approaching the subject. Thus, the concentration on the workplace, the family and sociability, and

organized culture becomes part of a larger historical investigation into the formation of workers as a separate class under capitalism, one particularly suited to explore the activity, behaviour, and attitudes of the mass of workers prior to, outside, and at the base of formal workers' organizations. In fact, three of the most important treatments of German workers' culture in the nineteenth century are studies that pose the broader question of the formation of class and class consciousness.

IV
The Making of the Working Class

INDUSTRIALIZATION, proletarianization, urbanization, the transformation of everyday life, and the creation of a workers' culture to correspond to the new economic and social realities — these are all aspects of the process through which workers came to constitute themselves as a distinct social entity in the nineteenth century. By itself, however, each aspect tells only one part of the story. For German workers went a step further. They consciously developed the goal of becoming masters of their own economic and social, political and cultural lives and created organizations through which to achieve it. Workers organized themselves into a class. Three studies — Harmut Zwahr's *Zur Konstituierung des Proletariats als Klasse*, Klaus Tenfelde's *Sozialgeschichte der Bergarbeiterschaft an der Ruhr im 19. Jahrhundert*, and Mary Nolan's *Social Democracy and Society* — have tried to delineate the complex range of historical processes through which workers organized themselves as a class by studying workers in three very different settings — in Leipzig, the Ruhr, and Düsseldorf. All three studies are distinguished by their emphasis on *society* as a distinct area of historical determination and by their recognition of the role of organization in the formation of class and class consciousness. By applying the results of social history to the political development of German workers, they provide a deeper and fuller picture of German workers in the nineteenth century.

Historians have long known about the activities of August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht in Leipzig in the 1860s and 1870s. However, Hartmut Zwahr is the first historian to study the workers who lifted these two men to national leadership of the German workers' movement. The subject of Zwahr's study is class formation, and its strength lies in his ability to use the concrete example of Leipzig to define the factors that enter into class formation and to delineate the dynamics of their development over time. He divides his study analytically into economic, social, and politico-ideological structures, but the crux of his argument lies in the *social* sphere, for it was only when workers developed a cohesive community of interests among themselves, with strong social bonds tying them together, that they succeeded in transforming themselves from wage labourers into an organized, political force, backed by a common class consciousness. Zwahr's introduction of social structures as a deciding factor in the formation of the proletariat as a class marks a major advance in the historiography of the German Democratic Republic. He moves away from strict economic determinism, as well as from political history that looks down on workers from the pinnacles of their organizations, and recreates the totality of structures through which workers formed themselves into a politically conscious class. Zwahr starts with two basic propositions — that wage labour was introduced into Leipzig's industry in the first decades of the nineteenth century and that by 1869 workers in Leipzig had become a leading force in the founding of the first Marxian socialist party in world history. In exploring how Leipzig's workers moved from the first to the second point, Zwahr thoroughly exploits both traditional qualitative and mass quantitative

sources in order to test, specify, modify, and document his argument. He uses statistics on the growth of industry, extant factory regulations, and evidence on technological changes to plot the course of economic growth and changes in the social relations of production, and he uses conventional printed records and police reports to reconstruct the development of workers' organization and action. To these he adds, however a quantitative analysis of the composition, growth, and social interaction of Leipzig's workers based on municipal registration documents of immigrant workers and on such social records as the choice of godparents. He goes a step beyond historians like Crew, who uses address books to analyze the social mobility and residential distribution of workers, to reconstruct the dynamic formation and transformation of social relations among workers.

The economic foundation for the formation of a working class in Leipzig was the emergence of a homogeneous factory proletariat. Zwahr traces this development from the decline of the guild system, through the emergence of capitalist/worker relations in early forms of manufacturing, to the reorganization of industry under the factory system in the 1860s. He pays close attention to the development of power relations between workers and bourgeoisie, analyzing the introduction of factory rules and discipline, changes in work organization, and the mechanization of production. Zwahr also analyzes the composition of wage workers, especially their extremely diverse social, geographic, and industrial origins. Though originally composed of disintegrating pre-capitalist classes and downwardly mobile groups, most immigrant workers had been subjected to some form of wage labour before arriving in Leipzig, and once there they developed greater social cohesion as manufacturing workers came to predominate. In the 1860s the capitalist factory brought both skilled and unskilled workers together to form the "solid core" of Leipzig's working class. Economic processes alone, however, could not mould workers from diverse and fragmented social backgrounds into a class. Zwahr discovers the emergence of a more cohesive social grouping among workers in their progressive social interactions. In particular, he stresses the emergence of a hereditary proletariat and the creation of a proletarian community, which he analyzes through the establishment of proletarian families and marriage relations. By 1860 Leipzig possessed both a hereditary proletariat that aided the formation of a stable working class and a proletarian community that tied workers from different backgrounds and industries into a whole. Two of Zwahr's conclusions are particularly noteworthy. A hereditary proletariat emerged before the introduction of the factory system, and when confronted with the industrial revolution of the 1860s this hereditary proletariat was exceptionally receptive to socialist ideas. Finally Zwahr analyzes urban growth in Leipzig, which in the 1860s forced all groups of workers out of the old city and into new, more socially homogeneous suburbs around the new factories. Capitalist urbanization completed the social process begun by proletarianization and industrialization.

Nevertheless, to be a class, workers had to develop a qualitatively new identity of themselves as workers and organize themselves autonomously around their specific interests and goals. The strength of Zwahr's analysis of workers' politics and ideology lies in his emphasis on the development of bourgeois/worker relations and conflict, his close attention to the evolution of workers' consciousness in the context of incomplete, but progressive, economic, social, and political transformations, and his recognition of the role of organization in moulding a separate class identity. The gradual emergence of workers' consciousness and organization was punctuated by major qualitative leaps (especially in the revolutions of 1830 and

1848 and in the 1860s), in which workers came to a greater understanding of themselves and their goals and expanded their organizational means, experience, and unity. And workers established continuity in their actions while expanding the bonds among different segments of the working class. Zwahr shows conclusively that most working-class leaders in the 1848 revolution were already members of a hereditary proletariat. He also shows (through an analysis of the choice of godparents) that these leaders maintained and consolidated their ties with each other even in the dark years of repression between 1849 and 1860. All the strands in the formation of a proletariat came together in Leipzig in the mid-1860s — the consolidation of a hereditary proletariat and proletarian community; industrial revolution and the massive introduction of the factory system; the creation of a homogeneous factory proletariat; economic struggles with employers and political struggles with bourgeois nationalists, liberals, and democrats; and the continuity of workers' organization and leadership from the 1840s. The complex interrelationships of these strands as they developed from the 1820s to the 1860s indeed make understandable the founding of the *Sozialdemokratische Arbeiterpartei* in 1869, with Leipzig as one of its most solid centres.

Zwahr's analysis of the formation of the proletariat is truly impressive, whether in terms of research, methodology, or theoretical argument. Still, he could have carried his analysis of social structures further. For example, his study is too heavily male-oriented. He should have discussed the life cycles and work patterns of working-class women, as seen for example through working-class sexuality, internal family relations, and the impact of the wage system on families. Women surely played a key role in the social formation of the proletariat, though one that is not as visible as the role of males in economic production or political organization. Zwahr also fails to explore connections between workers' community and political organization. His discussion of the workplace ties directly into his analysis of trade union and political organization, but he makes no comparable analysis of sociability and association outside the workplace. The social life of workers goes beyond the family, and an investigation of their cultural life, leisure activities, and community associations would have strengthened Zwahr's chapter on social structures. However, these limitations should not detract from Zwahr's accomplishment. His emphasis on the totality of structures and relations, innovative use of social historical sources and methods, and conclusions about the dynamics of changes in social relations all modify our understanding of the formation of the working class in nineteenth-century Germany.

At the same time that Leipzig's workers were laying the foundation of the SDAP, the coal mining regions of Germany were first undergoing the transformation to capitalist social and economic relations. Most of the major coal fields lay in Prussia, and Prussia had long laid legal claim to control and direct mining within a strictly regulated, corporate structure. Coal mining was only opened to the free market — and thus to capitalist relations of wage labour — by stages in the 1850s and 1860s when the Prussian state dismantled its regulatory controls over mining. Klaus Tenfelde's *Sozialgeschichte der Bergarbeiterschaft an der Ruhr im 19. Jahrhundert* is a history of the transformation of Ruhr coal mining and coal miners from the corporate to the capitalist systems. It is a monumental study with such breadth of scope and wealth of detail that it can only be called a "total" history. Tenfelde draws from the best elements of several historical traditions — from the French emphasis on comprehensiveness, social structures, and *mentalités;* the American interest in workplace conditions, technique, and control; and the Ger-

man concern with the role of the state and with workers' organization and the condition of workers as determinants of their consciousness. Particularly noteworthy is Tenfelde's broad definition of the relations of production. He neither ignores economic relations nor reduces them to a mechanism predetermined by the level of technology and mode of property ownership, but instead brings out their full *social* dimension, paying close attention to legal, ideological, and cultural structures, political (power) relations, and their impact on the organization and development of the productive forces. Tenfelde's approach is exhaustive rather than innovative. Lack of sources covering the entire Ruhr for this time period limits the usefulness of quantitative analysis (local studies of individual towns, especially after 1860, are more suited to such methods), but Tenfelde compensates for this by a thorough and imaginative exploitation of manuscript and printed sources. At times, as in his discussion of miners' living standards on the basis of exemplary family budgets, his conclusions are every bit as convincing as rows of statistics, and they bring the subject to life in a way statistics never can.

One of the key conclusions of Tenfelde's study is that Ruhr miners responded quickly to the capitalist transformation of mining, both through protests and in cultural and social, then economic and political associations. Protest and association were separate, though closely related responses to industrialization. They were also complex and contradictory. While miners seized upon their new freedom as wage workers (that is, freedom from the obligations and restrictions of the corporate system), they also continued to claim the rights and privileges they had long enjoyed. Thus, from the 1860s Ruhr miners moved quickly toward modern forms of labour union and political organization, while preserving much of their rich cultural heritage in social and cultural associations. Nor were economic/political and social/cultural organization rigidly separate. Social and cultural associations, growing out of the corporate social insurance institution (the *Knappschaft*), often served as the basis of union and political organizations. Because of the carryover of a miners' community and culture from preindustrial days, miners already possessed an organizational base from which to build unions and political associations. This shortened the learning process wage workers went through in building new organizations and fueled protests with demands for traditional rights; but it also retarded the emergence of class action and consciousness by perpetuating corporate ideals. Thus, the movement of Ruhr miners was thoroughly infused with both forward- and backward-looking elements.

Much of Tenfelde's study is an extremely detailed analysis of the transformation of mining from the *Direktions-* to the *Inspektionsprinzip*, that is, from state control and regulation of production and the conditions of labour to a free market system, based on private property in the mines and wage labour. In this part of his study, Tenfelde is mainly concerned with the structures of life and labour, and his account is distinguished by a thorough understanding of changes in work processes and organization. The novelty of his approach is that he looks at the transformation of mining in terms of how it affected miners' lives and community. He carries history from below a step further than most historians by seeing the changes through the miners' eyes and incorporating this perspective into the core of his analysis of changes in legal, administrative, economic, and social structures. Thus, when Tenfelde turns in his last section to the development of Ruhr miners from corporate to class consciousness, his analysis of protest movements and miners' organizations grows directly out of everything that has preceded. In his last section Tenfelde provides a convincing explanation of a phenomenon that previous histo-

rians have never adequately understood. Why, after the emergence of militant, class conscious, socialist miners' organizations, did an unusually large number of Ruhr miners give their allegiance instead to the Catholic union and party? Tenfelde finds the roots of the Catholic miners' associations in the persistence of a corporate community and set of beliefs. The Catholic Church responded positively to Catholic miners who organized themselves around traditional bodies like the *Knappschaft*, and it responded positively again when Catholic miners raised demands for social reforms to ease the impact of capitalist industrialization and developed modern labour union organizations to back such demands. A simultaneous defense of traditional rights and advocacy of modern social reforms, growing out of the miners' community, accounts for the success of the christian miners' movement. Nevertheless there was a qualitative change in miners' consciousness, for even Catholic associations tended to be *class* organizations. Finally, Tenfelde emphasizes that the emergence of class consciousness was dependent, not only on social practice and struggles, but also on the existence of social structures conducive to workers' organization. And such social structures were not limited to the workplace, but comprised the miners' community and culture as well. Tenfelde, too, sees the development of class and class consciousness in terms of the totality of structures and relations affecting workers.

Tenfelde's study is so comprehensive and consistently researched that my criticisms are only peripheral to his conclusions. First Tenfelde could have said more about changes in family life and the urbanization of mining. Changes in the family were very important in the emergence of an exceptional militancy among miners' wives in later struggles, and urbanization brought miners together for the first time with other groups of workers. Second, Tenfelde writes in an almost impenetrable academic German style, leavened in his section on miners' organization and consciousness only by a more active description of miners' struggles. This writing style is all the more disconcerting because Tenfelde himself was a miner. His excessively intellectualized style contrasts negatively with his sensitivity toward work processes and miners' community. Finally, Tenfelde tends to exaggerate the voluntaristic aspects of historical processes. He argues that the state could have transformed elements of the corporate system to ease the impact of industrialization on workers, and he is not entirely convinced of the historical necessity of the process of liberalization. He has misgivings about the emergence of class conscious workers and seems to view the state as a force above classes. Tenfelde is certainly right to emphasize that the triumph of liberal capitalist ideology shaped the manner in which mining was deregulated, but the logic of his structural analysis points quite clearly to objective constraints within the *capitalist* transformation of mining. More socially-protective legislation would have modified, but not fundamentally altered, its outcome. In the end, Tenfelde expresses the complex, contradictory class consciousness of Ruhr miners. Proud of his community and heritage, he looks backward to the era of state-protected rights and privileges in order to look forward to a more humane and collectively responsible organization of society and economy.

The making of the German working class was an ongoing process. Though concluded in Leipzig by 1870-71 and well underway among Ruhr miners by the founding of the free miners' union in 1889, the workers' movement did not achieve its breakthrough in Düsseldorf until the decade before 1914. Mary Nolan traces the formation of class consciousness in Düsseldorf through the prism of Social Democratic organization from the repeal of the anti-socialist laws in 1890 to the revolutionary upheaval of 1918-20.

Unlike other recent histories of German workers, she focuses primarily on political and labour union organization, but this approach is fully justified because Social Democracy was the great unifying force that welded workers from diverse origins into a class between 1890 and 1914. Nevertheless, Nolan places the development of the SPD firmly within a social context. First, she examines the overall development of the SPD concretely through one of its local sections. Second, she analyzes the structure and politics of the party in social terms, especially through the social composition of the party (based on a quantitative analysis of membership registration documents) and the competition between the SPD and Centre Party for allegiance of Düsseldorf's mostly Catholic workers. Indeed, Nolan is one of the first historians to examine these two crucial aspects of the SPD in depth. Finally, she pays special attention to the SPD's attempts to create a new workers' culture through the activities of its cultural organizations. In analyzing the SPD as a political party from the viewpoints of local history, social history, and history from below, she effectively undermines monolithic national interpretations and makes it possible critically to reexamine the politics of workers in Wilhelmine Germany.

For the history of the workers' movement in Düsseldorf does not conform to the conventional view that sees the SPD as becoming progressively integrated (though negatively) into German society, with reformists increasingly dominant in its ranks and interested in an evolutionary transformation of capitalism into democratic (parliamentary) socialism. Instead, Nolan finds that class differences became accentuated, not diminished, after 1890. The SPD in Düsseldorf operated within a context of organized capitalism, authoritarian politics, and political Catholicism, the complex interplay of which repeatedly reinforced the alienation of workers from national society but also sharply restricted the avenues open to workers to achieve their political and economic goals. Wilhelmine Germany became a stalemated society that was unable to repress or absorb the workers' movement but whose rigid political and economic structures turned more and more workers to Social Democracy as an alternative. Nolan's study is particularly strong in demonstrating the social and economic limits of the German state and politics and the response of the SPD in organizing workers within them. The SPD concentrated its energies on building a mass party organization in sharp political opposition to the state; it seized on the Centre Party's support for and participation in conservative governments to break into the Catholic working class; and it fostered cultural organizations to reinforce workers' opposition to the state and to offer a cultural, as well as political, alternative to capitalist and Catholic hegemony. Nolan tests the political response of workers in elections, mass protests and the changing social composition of the SPD. Heavily dependent at first on skilled, immigrant, Protestant workers, especially from Düsseldorf's machine shops, the SPD by 1908 was attracting an increasing number of immigrant Catholic workers; only the native Catholic working class, with strong traditional ties to the local Church and Catholic subculture, remained impervious to socialist appeals. Although the SPD did not succeed in creating a socialist counter-culture that was completely separate from bourgeois ideology and cultural forms, it nevertheless formulated a radical political alternative, deeply rooted in the social and political conditions of Düsseldorf's workers and loosely allied with national leaders, like Rosa Luxemburg, who supported a confrontational, mass strike strategy. Strong organization and political leadership led, not to bureaucratic reformism and oligarchy, but to a deeper, more responsive, mass-based radicalism. Backed by solid documentary evidence, Nolan's study

offers a refreshing reinterpretation of the SPD's history that emphasizes the learning process of workers and the complex interaction of economic, social, political, and ideological forces that conditioned the development of workers' consciousness.

Nolan's treatment of World War I and the revolution of 1918-19 is more problematic. Her analysis shows clearly how the political strategies and type of organization developed by the SPD before 1914 conditioned the split in the party, in which the vast majority of Düsseldorf's SPD went over to the Independent Social Democrats in opposition to the war. It also shows how the pre-1914 attitudes of local Social Democratic leaders predisposed them first to follow events and then to advocate the seizure of political power by the party and the nationalization of industry by the state rather than to develop a strategy based on mass participation, industrial militancy, and workers' control of production. Nolan reinforces the conclusions of other local histories of the 1918-19 revolution that emphasize the spontaneity of workers, the diversity of their political positions, the similarity of the revolutionary process in different localities (starting with demands for democratization and demilitarization but radicalized in favour of socialization as national SPD leaders stalled on reforms and allied themselves with the military), the widespread support among workers for socialization, and the importance of local factors in determining the balance of forces and timing of the revolutionary process in different regions. Although the course of the revolution followed a definite logic, to which students of revolutions should pay close attention, there were enough fluidity and alternative positions among workers to have allowed for several different outcomes. What Nolan does not come to grips with, are the reasons for the ultimate failure of German radicalism. The ones she advances point to the local limitations of the SPD in Düsseldorf, which could have been balanced by other factors nationally or in other parts of Germany. The fundamental weakness of German radicalism was its local fragmentation, of which Düsseldorf is a classic example. There was no nationally organized movement to mediate between localities, coordinate their actions, combine their strengths, neutralize their weaknesses, and — crucially — counteract the coercive forces of the government in Berlin during the early months of the revolution. The basic question of the revolution still comes down to national power.

Moreover, Nolan fails to explore one important aspect of Düsseldorf's social and economic development. Although she provides an overview of Düsseldorf's economy, she does not analyze its development in depth, especially the types of *industry, pace of growth, workplace conditions*, and mechanization and rationalization of production, and this leads her to overemphasize the role of small and medium industry and to leave unexplored the increasingly important large-scale, heavy industry. By the end of World War I, most of Germany's biggest metal concerns, tied closely to the Ruhr, had located factories in Düsseldorf or its suburbs, and over half of the city's 60,000 metalworkers were employed in the eleven largest factories. This "second" industrial revolution led to a whole new range of forces and problems in Düsseldorf's workers' movement that surfaced in 1919 and 1920. Masses of workers turned against their leaders and created new Communist or syndicalist organizations to the left of Social Democracy; unskilled workers rejected the traditional domination of the skilled over the socialist movement; groups of skilled workers broke with their traditional comrades to join the unskilled; the industrial suburbs, dominated by heavy industry, for the first time became more radical than the city; grassroots economic militancy emerged as a major force in Düsseldorf's workers' movement; and works councils and workers control were put on the agenda after

the military defeat of the political revolution. In short, Düsseldorf's unskilled workers in heavy industry underwent a massive *prise de conscience* during the war and revolution of 1918-19. Nolan's political emphasis on the SPD as it existed organizationally before 1914 limits her analysis of the revolution to those who dominated the party and free unions, that is, primarily skilled metalworkers from small and medium machine shops. Her overemphasis on politics and organization prevents her from exploring the less visible social ferment among unskilled workers that might best have been approached in terms of work and community outside or on the fringes of formal workers' organizations. Thus, the social and economic transformation that heavy industry brought to Düsseldorf between 1895 and 1914 and the impact of the war in activating and mobilizing unskilled workers in heavy industry remain to be studied. Nolan solidly analyzes the making of Düsseldorf's first working class between 1890 and 1914, but she misses the point when she calls the revolution of 1918-19 the unmaking of that class. Rather, the revolution of 1918-19 set off a new process, the *remaking* of Düsseldorf's working class, thereby ushering in the key problem that faced revolutionary workers during the Weimar Republic.

Zwahr, Tenfelde, and Nolan have succeeded in synthesizing the perspectives and categories from which the "new" social history views German workers. First, they start theoretically and historically from the introduction of wage labour, and they define their subject broadly as the making of a working class within the parameters of this basic social relationship. By comparison, Schofer's treatment of the "formation of a labour force" is too abstract, passive, and one-dimensional, whereas Crew's concept of "occupational community" is more suited to explaining the economic militancy of specific groups of workers. Neither of their approaches can adequately explain the moulding of a common political consciousness among workers from different geographic, social, and occupational backgrounds in cities like Leipzig or Düsseldorf. Second, Zwahr, Tenfelde, and Nolan examine the history of the workers' movement in relation to workers' history, placing their emphasis on the social structures and relations that conditioned the formation of class and class consciousness. They pay particularly close attention to the creation of a proletarian community, whether in terms of the workplace, the family, sociability, or formal organization, and they de-emphasize subjects like living standards and social mobility that have long preoccupied both liberal and Marxist historians. Thus, they shift the focus away from the victimization of workers or individual attempts by workers to escape wage labour and toward those factors that can explain the cohesive and collective response of workers to capitalist industrialization. This means, finally, that they recognize the active role of workers in the making of class and class consciousness, and they investigate workers' political and labour union organizations as an essential moment in this process. They do not artificially separate workers' history from "above" and "below;" nor do they reject the former as a part of workers' history because of a misplaced enthusiasm over having discovered the latter; but instead they analyze the impact of the organized workers' movement within the totality of structures and relations in the development of workers' consciousness. In Germany, formal organization, indeed leadership, played a crucial role in forming and expanding class consciousness. Not only can it not be ignored, but it must assume a central place in any history of German workers. In sum, by viewing workers' organizations in a larger context, Zwahr, Tenfelde, and Nolan have offered a more plausible analysis of the determinants, quality, and limitations of workers' consciousness than previous histories of Ger-

man workers in the nineteenth century.

The recent social histories of German workers in the nineteenth century underscore both their diversity and the complexity of their formation into a class. Each region or locality, even among centres of coal mining and steel production, exhibited its own peculiarities in the social composition, industrial structure, cultural life, or political action and organization of workers in ways that defy any simple, linear economic determinism. Certainly economic structures and relations (such as levels of technology, modes of property ownership, and organization of work) exercised an enormous underlying influence on the emergence of a working class. The new social histories, however, refute any notion that the economic sphere existed separately and autonomously as some kind of "base," and they show time and again how capitalist production was thoroughly infused and shaped by wider social relations and structures. Put another way, the wage system is not just an economic structure but rather a social relation in the broadest sense of the word. The structures and relations of society and culture, of politics, law, and ideology all helped define the limits in which a working class emerged, and they were all challenged and transformed by workers as they developed their consciousness and organization. Yet, in all this diversity there were unifying historical processes that tended to bring workers from different backgrounds and localities together. Industrialization, proletarianization, and urbanization were the most important of these, and they created the homogenizing conditions for the national organization of workers beyond the peculiarities of each locality. Even in these processes, however, the new social historians deny the fatality of economic structures. Perhaps the most important contribution of the best of these studies is their insistence that class formation is a *political* process. Favourable economic conditions alone are insufficient for the making of the working class unless workers actively develop their consciousness and organization, and the development of consciousness and organization comprises social and cultural life as well as workplace struggles and political parties. Granted the limiting and conditioning impact of economic, social, and politico-ideological structures and relations, workers still can and must seize on the area of freedom left to them to transform their own lives and identity. German workers in the nineteenth century did just that, and the organizations they founded played a crucial role in welding them into a class and in moulding and transforming their consciousness.

The new social history is premised upon certain basic historiographical approaches to workers' history. Its historical and theoretical starting-point is the emergence of wage labour. But wage labour is a *social* relation which comprises other classes and a specific organization of human society. The object of study is this society in its broadest sense, and the new social history emphasizes the totality of structures and relations within which the working class was formed. It defines the structural constraints which limited the objective possibilities open to workers, but it also sees history as social practice in which workers can act to transform these same structures. In investigating workers' history, the new social historians are remarkably free of methodological fetishism. Quantitative analysis, in particular, is only one of a variety of methods, more suited to certain subjects and sources than to others. These historians have transcended the increasingly sterile debate among historians over quantitative analysis by placing their emphasis on defining the *problem* to be investigated and then developing methods and exploiting available sources to test their hypotheses. At the same time they are committed to extensive empirical research. They reject the tendency among many German social historians in other fields to rely on abstract model-building, backed by cur-

sory research, and to choose the most easily researched subjects, usually those dealing with the state and upper echelons of society; hence the imaginative, complex, and varied ways they define problems, develop methods, and seek out sources. By combining a broad social perspective with detailed empirical research the new social historians point the way to a new synthesis of German workers' history.

The lines of this new synthesis are only beginning to emerge, and they still must be elaborated further and empirically tested. However, some preliminary conclusions can be drawn. The early emergence, consolidation, and growth of a socialist workers' movement in Germany was due to a convergence of many factors — social, ideological, and cultural, as well as economic and political — in the 1860s. Germany simultaneously experienced an industrial and urban revolution, the stabilization of a hereditary proletariat in certain key, rapidly growing cities like Berlin, Leipzig, and Hamburg, and the authoritarian unification of the nation marked by the failure of liberal bourgeois political reform. Thus, at the same time that a growing mass of workers was recruited for factory industry, Germany's social and political structures became rigidified along particularly sharp class lines. The fact that this occurred in the 1860s meant that Germany industrialized more rapidly, more suddenly from a lower economic starting-point, and at a higher technological level than countries like France or Britain. It also meant that the early workers' movement benefitted directly from the political, organizational, and ideological advances of workers in other countries. The timing and the social and political context of industrialization created an environment particularly suited to the propagation of Marxist ideas and drastically shortened the learning process of workers. After 1870-71 continued industrial growth at an advanced technological level and under widely fluctuating boom-and-bust conditions between 1873 and 1895 expanded and extended the constituency for a class conscious, socialist workers' movement. Workers became permanently alienated from national society both through the discriminatory authoritarian political system from which there were few individual avenues of escape. On the positive side, workers responded to their social and political exclusion by creating their own community, separate from and opposed to bourgeois society and culture. Social Democracy played a crucial role in this process. On the one hand, its emphasis on class organization and consciousness grew out of the conditions of proletarian life. On the other hand, it expanded from the organizational base it had built in the 1860s, thereby shortening the learning process of new groups of workers. Later groups of workers could be and were integrated more quickly into the workers' movement because of the prior existence of class organizations and the experience of Social Democratic militants as they moved to the new centres of industry. New industrial workers still did not join or support the SPD immediately. But whereas it took workers in Leipzig in the early nineteenth century two to three generations to develop permanent organizations and class consciousness, after 1870 this learning process had been reduced to the time period of a generation or less. Economic, social, and political conditions between 1890 and 1914 merely reinforced these previous trends. Germany became an increasingly stalemated society. The socialist workers' movement could not be easily repressed by or absorbed into capitalist society, nor could workers break out of their isolation and exclusion in either a reformist or a revolutionary direction. In 1914 there were still major groups of workers outside or on the margins of Social Democracy — sections of the Catholic working class, women, foreign workers, agricultural labourers, unskilled workers recruited during the "second"

industrial revolution. However, the stage was set for their mobilization and radicalization, too, during the crises of World War I and the November revolution.

From an interpretive point of view some additional conclusions can be drawn. While the new social historians have confirmed the correctness of E.P. Thompson's emphasis on class as a social relation and on the active making of a working class, they also stress the equal importance of limiting and conditioning structures in determining the nature of workers' consciousness. And, although they recognize the role of social, cultural, political, and ideological structures, in addition to economic ones, they bring out the specificity of German workers' experience and show that Thompson's concern with moral community and pre-industrial traditions is not universally valid in analyzing the making of the working class. By the same token, they call into question the rigid division made by Leninist theory between workers' spontaneity and class consciousness, as well as its corollary that only a vanguard party of professional revolutionaries, led by intellectuals (even if working-class ones), can carry class-conscious ideology into the workers' movement. While not minimizing the importance of political organization, leadership, or ideology in shaping and extending workers' consciousness, most of these historians emphasize the essentially dialectical learning process of workers, in which their action, practice, and initiative in forging social bonds mediate between the spontaneous experience of wage labour and the organization of a collective, class-conscious alternative to it.

Many aspects of the history of German workers in the nineteenth century remain to be studied. Schröder's attempt to develop a history of theory and causation is one possible direction for future work. Its aim would be, not just to synthesize what is known about workers and their organizations, but to provide a scientific explanation for this empirical knowledge and to define the problems for further research. This approach promises a real understanding of the *collective* nature of workers' history, thus breaking out of the ingrained bias of bourgeois historical ideology to see workers in essentially individualistic terms. In terms of subject matter, much more work needs to be done on the "second" industrial revolution of the late nineteenth century, especially its impact on both organized skilled and unorganized unskilled workers. This subject raises the question of the dynamic remaking of the working class as new groups of workers are created and develop their consciousness in the context of existing workers' organizations. Any understanding of the 1918-19 revolution and the conflicts in the German workers' movement during the Weimar Republic is ultimately dependent upon a social analysis of changes in the working class between 1890 and 1914 and during World War I. Finally, the social formation of the proletariat, both as a distinct subject of research and as a determining matrix of structures and relations, has only begun to be studied. The foundation has been laid, however, for a thorough investigation of urbanization and housing, workplace experiences, the working-class family, and forms of sociability. Social historians need to develop a more refined definition of workers' culture and then apply it to the study of workers' community. On the other hand, the history of working-class women, which ideally can show the impact of the wage system simultaneously on work, family, and community, is a virtually unexplored field. It is a telling sign of the bias of male historians, no matter what their ideology, that the only one of these historians to deal at length with women, with sensitivity and insight, is herself a woman. (Schröder does not even have a separate category for sex among the conditions of industrial work.) It seems like an elementary truism to remind historians that the formation of the working

class and the success of workers' organization could not have occurred without the participation and support of women. Yet the tacit exclusion of women from the new social history testifies to the persistence of one aspect of old labour history. It is an impediment to our understanding of the history of German workers that should be overcome once and for all. Finally, historians should broaden the study of social relations to include workers' sexuality, for sexual behaviour and attitudes of workers comprised an integral part of their lives that touched directly on economic conditions, social norms, power relations, and forms of repression. A study of male and female prostitution in Berlin in the late nineteenth century, similar to the work that has been done on Great Britain, would be particularly suited to illuminate this complex aspect of working-class life, and it could lead into a broader discussion of the sexual policies of Social Democracy that would explore workers' sexuality and class consciousness in relation to the leading role of Social Democrats in raising such issues as homosexual rights, birth control, and the legalization of abortion. Clearly, much more work needs to be done. However, these studies provide an excellent starting-point.

Telos

a quarterly journal of radical thought

Issue No. 55 — Spring 1983

SPECIAL ISSUE ON
FRENCH SOCIALISM

COHEN: *The Problem of French Socialism*
LIPIETZ: *Which Social Forces are for Change?*
JULLIARD: *Mitterrand*
PORTELLI: *The French Socialist Party*
BONGIOVANNI: *The French Communist Party*
SHRYOCK: *The CFDT*
MOTHÉ: *Democracy at the Workplace?*
CAROUX: *De-centralization?*
PAQUOT: *Nationalizations?*
KESSELMAN: *The General's Revenge*
ZUKIN: *Deindustrialization*
GONZALES: *Gaullism with a Human Face?*
RAULET: *The Agony of Marxism*
Notes and Commentary:
TOURAINE: *State and Social Forces in France*
BIRNBAUM: *All is Calm*
LEFORT: *French-style Socialism*
ROSANVALLON: *Social Corporatism*
FOUCAULT: *On Post-Structuralism: An Interview*
GORZ: *The Reconquest of Time*
GORZ: *On Self-Management: An Interview*
VIVERET, HASSNER: *On French Foreign Policy*
MOISI: *On French Military Policy*

Subscriptions cost $20 per year for individuals; $40 for institutions. Foreign orders add 10 percent. Checks must be in U.S. funds. No Canadian checks can be accepted. Back issues prior to No. 50 cost $5.00 each; No. 50 and subsequent issues are $5.50 each. Institutions pay $10.00 each for all back issues. For a full list of available back issues and to subscribe, write:

Telos, Box 3111, St. Louis, MO 63130 USA.