

THE NEW SOCIAL HISTORY IN  
THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC  
OF GERMANY

*by*

GERHARD A. RITTER

GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

London 1991

German Historical Institute London  
17 Bloomsbury Square  
London WC1A 2LP

Tel: 071-404 5486  
Fax: 071-404 5573

ISBN 0 9511485 7 5

## FOREWORD

For some years the new social history has been at the centre of a lively debate in the Federal Republic of Germany about the role and function of history. In the narrower sense social history can be seen as a subdiscipline of history; in a broader sense as a history of society, or as general history from a social perspective. Historians have been debating the relationships between the subdisciplines of history, and the connections between history and neighbouring disciplines. The writing of social historians on the period since the end of the eighteenth century throws light on important aspects of the general development of historiography in the Federal Republic of Germany.

This study originated in a lecture on the new critical social history and its theoretical and methodological foundations that I gave to a group of Japanese historians in October 1986. The lecture was revised and expanded for publication in a book on recent trends in social history in the then two German states, Austria, Poland, France, Britain, and the United States.\* The original subject's emphasis on theory and methodology explains the nature of the present study. For the most part, research in the social history of the Middle Ages and the early modern period has been excluded. The inclusion of these areas would have revealed the importance for the development of German social history of the ideas which came out of the departments of economic and social history, most of which were established in the faculties of political economy at German universities. Like modern business history, these disciplines have hardly been touched by the debate on the 'critical' social history. The overview of research in social history which concludes this study concentrates only on the most important developments, and does not claim to be comprehensive. The original manuscript was finished in December 1986. Additional material for inclusion in the German publication and this translation had to be strictly limited. The revision of the English translation of this study was completed at the time of the unification of the two German states. The term Federal Republic of Germany and references to Ger-

---

\* Jürgen Kocka (ed.), *Sozialgeschichte im internationalen Überblick. Ergebnisse und Tendenzen der Forschung* (Darmstadt, 1989).

many relating to the period after 1945 refer – unless a different meaning is clear from the context – exclusively to the Federal Republic of Germany (including Western Berlin) as it existed before October 1990. I should like to thank Dr Angela Davies and Mrs Dona Geyer for preparing this translation.

Allmannshausen, October 1990

Gerhard A. Ritter

# CONTENTS

What is Social History?	9
I Trends in German Historiography to the End of the Second World War	9
II Continuity and New Initiatives from 1945 to the End of the 1960s	14
III The New 'Critical' Social History	21
IV The <i>Sonderweg</i> Discussion	31
V <i>Alltagsgeschichte</i> and its Critics	34
VI German and French Social History	37
VII A Preliminary Balance: Strengths and Weaknesses of the New Social History in Germany	40
VIII The Expansion and Diversification of Social History since 1960	42
References	52

## *What is Social History?*

In 1962 Werner Conze defined social history as the 'history of society, or more precisely, of social structures, processes and movements'. He pointed out that it is 'related to history as well as to sociology'.<sup>1</sup> Conze suggested that social history should not be divorced from political history, but should permeate historiography in general and provide it with a social historical basis, thus building a bridge between history and sociology, as well as between the different specialists' fields of historiography. This definition of social history clearly went beyond earlier concepts. Previously social history had been seen either as simply the history of the 'social question', or of the labour movement and socialist ideas in particular. Or it was defined in terms of what it was not – as the English historian George M. Trevelyan put it, social history was the 'history of a people with the politics left out'.<sup>2</sup>

Recently the limitation of social history to structures, processes and movements, and the emphasis on objective conditions that significantly determine human action have been rejected as too one-sided. Social historians have pointed to the importance of ways of working and living, of customs and habits, and to the problems of mediation between social structures and processes on the one hand, and the experiences, mentalities and actions of groups and individuals on the other. Social historians have been concentrating on individuals, who are influenced by their immediate social environment, and on their subjective reactions to social, economic and political structures and processes, as well as on objective structures, processes and collective phenomena. While at first sociology, economics and political science were regarded as the disciplines closest to social history, the importance of social psychology, anthropology, cultural anthropology, ethnology, and cultural history has now also been acknowledged.<sup>3</sup>

### I

#### *Trends in German Historiography to the End of the Second World War*

We shall begin by looking at older traditions in the analysis of social and economic factors in German historiography.

Since the end of the nineteenth century, most German historians working on the modern period have concentrated on political history, and especially on the history of states. The same is true of the historiography of the other major European countries at this time, though perhaps to a lesser extent than in Germany. Under the influence of historicism and of the critical-historical method of analysing written sources developed in particular by Barthold Georg Niebuhr and Leopold von Ranke, German historiography began to be dominated by the hermeneutic method of interpreting the actions and motives of individuals, especially of the central actors in politics, and the major political events they determined. It superseded the analysis of the social and economic structures that set the conditions governing politics and limited the scope of 'great men' to act.

This fixation on the state and 'grand politics' in Germany was reinforced by the leading role taken by the state in modernizing Germany's economy and society, and by Prussia's and Bismarck's creation from above of the German national state in 1871. Many of Germany's major historians had themselves played a prominent part in the national movement.

This reduction of general history to political history, which happened mainly in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, in fact broke with an older tradition in which economic and social processes, and in particular class and group conflicts, had held an important, and perhaps even central place. This tradition is exemplified by the work of Hegel, Karl Marx, and Lorenz von Stein. In his *Geschichte der sozialen Bewegung in Frankreich von 1789 bis auf unsere Tage*, Lorenz von Stein, like Karl Marx, describes the development of the proletariat as a revolutionary class; von Stein regards class consciousness and class struggle as moving forces in the history of society.<sup>4</sup> However, unlike Marx, who advocated revolutionary solutions, von Stein developed the idea of the welfare state as a means of reconciling class conflicts.<sup>5</sup>

Stein's call for a 'science of society'<sup>6</sup> was adopted in 1859 by the future head of the Prussian school of historiography, Heinrich von Treitschke.<sup>7</sup> In his five-volume work, *Deutsche Geschichte im Neunzehnten Jahrhundert*,<sup>8</sup> which was published from 1879 on, Treitschke took a large number of economic, social and cultural factors into account. Its main actor, however, was the Prussian state. Ranke's work, too, was not devoted exclusively to the

history of the state, politics, and grand ideas, but paid more attention to the social world than is often assumed.<sup>9</sup>

The controversy around Karl Lamprecht in the 1890s was a decisive turning point. It intensified German historiography's orientation towards politics and the state, and discredited non-historicist methods of structural analysis.<sup>10</sup> In a general history of Germany based on a wide-ranging concept of culture,<sup>11</sup> Lamprecht attempted to combine economic and social conditions, material culture, and mentalities with political history. He saw 'circumstances' and collective expressions of will, rather than the state and the achievements of great men as the deeper causes of historical change. As well as giving a chronological account of events, Lamprecht attempted to formulate laws of historical development. The German historical fraternity unanimously rejected his methodological approach, although technical weaknesses in his work and the lack of a clear definition of his central, social-psychological concept, 'national consciousness', were also partly responsible for this rejection. Other historians outside Germany, by contrast, viewed Lamprecht's cultural historiography very positively for some time. They included members of the New History school in the USA, and of the French *Histoire Synthétique*, forerunner of the *Annales* school, as well as Polish historians.<sup>12</sup>

Modern historians in Germany continued to be preoccupied with the state and the ideas of leading thinkers – in fact, this was the subject of the extremely subtle political brand of intellectual history which was propagated by Friedrich Meinecke. It remained highly influential until the early 1950s. However, economics and society had by no means completely disappeared from German historical research. Medievalists, historians of Antiquity, and regional and local historians continued to examine these factors. In addition, the influential new Historical School of Political Economy, centred on Gustav von Schmoller and Lujo Brentano, had since the 1870s been looking intensively at economic and social developments. Schmoller's interpretation of the significance of the state in economics and society preserved the link with administrative and constitutional history.

Max Weber attempted to produce his universal history of the development of occidental society in connection with this school. However, the intensity of his approach, the originality of his methodology and the breadth of his perspective left it far behind.

In Weber's view the main features of occidental society were increasing rationalization, bureaucratization and the establishment of capitalism.<sup>13</sup> Weber's friend and sparring partner, Werner Sombart, followed a similar approach in his work on the origin and development of modern capitalism from the thirteenth century to 1914, *Der Moderne Kapitalismus*,<sup>14</sup> which deeply influenced Weber. Of the university historians only Otto Hintze, perhaps the most original thinker among German historians in the first half of the twentieth century and himself greatly influenced by Schmoller, adopted for his own work several of Weber's topics as well as his methods of defining 'ideal types'. Hintze developed these further for the use of historians, turning them into 'real types'.<sup>15</sup> For all their concentration on state, bureaucracy and constitution, Hintze's major essays on sociology and the political system, as well as his often comparative works on constitutional history all take account of social, economic, and religious forces and institutions, and reveal a highly developed awareness of the problems of historiographical theory. Some of these essays were preliminary studies for a general comparative work on modern constitutional history (*Allgemeine Verfassungsgeschichte*), the manuscript of which was almost ready for the press when it was apparently lost in the disorder at the end of the war. On Otto Hintze's death in 1940, his brother and sister had refused to give the manuscript to his widow, Hedwig Hintze. As a Jew she had been forced to leave Germany for the Netherlands in August 1939, but she had remained in constant contact with her husband and, as his pupil and a remarkable historian in her own right, would have been qualified to edit and publish his *opus magnum*.<sup>16</sup>

Hintze's attempt to mediate between the history of the state and social history by systematically incorporating structural analysis into general history, however, was not the path taken by the mainstream of historiography. What happened was that even before the turn of the century economic and social history split off to form a separate discipline, which, by 1893, had already become established at the universities. It had its own journal, the *Zeitschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, predecessor of the current *Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, and its own professorships, usually outside the faculty of philosophy. Within the discipline, economic history clearly dominated over social history, whose subject matter was much less clearly defined. The

institutional link between social and economic history established at that time has remained intact in Germany to the present day,<sup>17</sup> whereas in English-speaking countries economic history was established as a separate discipline first, with social history emerging only in the last twenty-five years. In Germany, therefore, the tendency for economic historians to rely on theoretical models comprehensible only to trained economists has been limited – a trend which has come to dominate the New Economic History in the USA, for example. It has also helped to prevent economic history being separated completely from general history in Germany.

After the First World War, academic historians turned even more strongly towards politics, the state, and their own nation. This can partly be explained by the fact that many historians of the time were involved in refuting the theory of Germany's guilt for the First World War, and in refuting French claims to the Rhine border. Another factor was that most of the historians who regarded a monarchy as the most appropriate form of rule for Germany believed that they should use their historical work to counteract the dangers which in their view the revolution of 1918-19 and the transformation of the Kaiserreich into the Weimar Republic represented to continuity and tradition.<sup>18</sup> Finally, the First World War itself and the international tensions of the post-war period also increased Germany's isolation from developments in the social sciences in the West. During the Weimar period the social sciences in Germany, and political economy in particular, to a large extent lost the strong historical dimension which they had originally possessed. As disciplines they became more specialized, and new methods evolved.

Even the Nazi period did not witness a radical break in the continuity of German historiography. Although the regime favoured advocates of racist historiography, they remained outside the mainstream.<sup>19</sup> National Socialism's *völkisch* (racial-nationalist) ideas, which to some extent stimulated the study of demographic questions and non-governmental areas of community life, were not adopted by the majority of university historians, who continued to concentrate on the state. The new value which Nazi ideology placed on the *Volk* (people) and the *Volksgemeinschaft* (national folk community) had an impact on the writing of Gunther Ibsen and Otto Brunner. Their work, together with older German traditions and models from abroad

influenced Werner Conze, and through him, the rebirth of social history after 1950.<sup>20</sup> A second and different tradition later connected the new social history in the Federal Republic of Germany with such liberal or socialist historians as Johannes Ziekursch, Veit Valentin, Hajo Holborn, and Hans Rosenberg,<sup>21</sup> none of whom really belonged to the historical establishment in the Weimar Republic. They had begun to criticize the traditional interpretation of German history, which was still orientated towards the nation and the state, by turning to economic and social factors, but these early initiatives were cut short by the Nazi period, or could only continue in exile in the United States.<sup>22</sup>

## II

### *Continuity and New Initiatives from 1945 to the End of the 1960s*

The total defeat of Germany, the rejection of ideas of nation and the *Machtstaat* (power state) which had been over-emphasized and perverted by National Socialism, and the division of the country all meant that the end of the Second World War represented a deep break in German history. However, its impact on historiography, on the methods of historians, and the position of social history within the discipline was somewhat delayed. As early as 1946 Friedrich Meinecke, the Nestor of German historians, wrote his widely acclaimed book, *Die deutsche Katastrophe*, in which he suggested that the '*saeculare* degeneration of the German *Bürgertum* (middle classes) and of the idea of the German nation', a degeneration which went a long way back,<sup>23</sup> could provide 'a guide-line for a critical review of German historiography'.<sup>24</sup> Other German historians of standing spoke of the 'aberration of German history' (Siegfried A. Kaehler),<sup>25</sup> and claimed that the German view of history needed to be 'revised'.<sup>26</sup> In Munich in 1949, the chairman of the Association of German Historians, Gerhard Ritter, gave a speech at the opening of the Association's first post-war conference. In his address on 'The Current State of German Historiography and its Future Tasks' he called for 'our traditions to be subjected to a full critical scrutiny' and himself provided a critique of 'our exuberantly state-happy historiography'.<sup>27</sup> He asked whether 'concern about foreign theories, and fear of over-simplifying historical reality with its

wealth of individual phenomena' had not 'dangerously narrowed' the perspective of German historians. He suggested that a generalizing view should take its place beside an individualizing one, and that historians should be willing to learn from the 'methods of economics and the social sciences, even from the natural sciences'.<sup>28</sup> Ritter went on to say that historians must not allow their aversion 'to general concepts, that is, a typology, go so far as to result in a lack of any concepts ... Our historical subjects should lead to greater depths, to the innermost relations between social-economic and intellectual life, and they should widen in scope in order to allow us to understand the nature of the global forces which alone determine the fate of the world today'.<sup>29</sup>

Shortly after the founding of the Federal Republic, a member of the same generation, Hans Herzfeld, attempted to reply to this call for a more universal approach. He included a wide range of non-German research in his two-volume work, *Die moderne Welt 1789-1945*,<sup>30</sup> which went far beyond the limits of national thinking.

On the whole, this first phase in the revision of the German view of history after the war had limited results. The older tradition of political historiography continued to dominate. German historians' first critical confrontation with their own history was halted in its tracks when foreign historians constructed a line of continuity directly linking Luther, Frederick the Great, Bismarck, and Hitler. This forced German historians on to the defensive. The dogmatic historical materialism of contemporary East German historians, whose work was soon placed in the service of the political system, was also a factor. The main reason, however, was that in contrast to the German Democratic Republic, few changes were made in the staff of history departments in West Germany except for the removal of a few historians who had been closely associated with National Socialism, and few new historians were recruited. At any rate, the majority of German historians clung to the traditional methods of historicism – albeit 'a historicism which was politically and morally tamed',<sup>31</sup> and continued to fight shy of looking at social and economic structures and processes.

There were, however, important exceptions. The Tübingen historian Rudolf Stadelmann examined social processes and trends in his book, *Soziale und politische Geschichte der Revolution von 1848* (1948), in which he drew upon his own research on

artisans.<sup>32</sup> He saw his study as contributing to a typology of European revolutions, and he set history the task of 'discovering certain regularities in political and social behaviour. The psychologists and political scientists of the eighteenth century had a similar aim.'<sup>33</sup> Stadelmann's work had little impact because of his early death in 1949. By contrast, the historian Theodor Schieder, who taught at the University of Cologne, had a great influence on the next generation of historians.<sup>34</sup> From the early 1950s on, Schieder published seminal articles on the methodological problems of historiography. His writing 'combined genetic-narrative accounts with structural analyses based on ideal types'.<sup>35</sup>

In the field of contemporary history, Karl Dietrich Bracher's classic work, *Die Auflösung der Weimarer Republik* (1955),<sup>36</sup> linked a detailed, systematic analysis of the political power structures of the Weimar Republic with an account of developments from 1930 to 1933. In his highly original study Bracher analysed the authoritarian elements in German history and the structural flaws in the constitution, which were factors in the weakness and eventual downfall of the Weimar Republic. He also wanted to contribute to the analysis of the general problem of power and its decay in democracies. Bracher's book, which was influenced by contemporary American political and social science, had a mixed reception. Some historians criticized Bracher for adopting unhistorical methods.<sup>37</sup> Others suggested that the book put forward a deterministic view of the history of the Weimar Republic, overlooking the fact that the study gave an important place to the thoughts and actions of leading men. Others again saw Bracher's study as representing an important advance to a new 'reformist' view of German history.<sup>38</sup>

The 1950s witnessed the emergence of a school of contemporary history which was highly critical of the German past. The establishment of the *Institut für Zeitgeschichte* in 1951 and the founding of the journal *Vierteljahrsshefte für Zeitgeschichte* in 1953 made contemporary history a focus of intensive study. It generated new methodologies and benefited from lively interaction with international research. However, for a long time, the methods of social history played a very small part in the study of German contemporary history. It has been suggested<sup>39</sup> that this made it easier for historians to face up to the moral implications of Germany's recent past (*Vergangenheitsbewältigung*), whereas the concepts and methods of social history might have helped them to evade these issues.

The 1950s, which are often wrongly regarded as an unpolitical and stagnant decade, also witnessed the beginning of the systematic study of parliamentary institutions, political parties, interest groups and elections. Research in these previously neglected areas was given a boost by the founding of the *Kommission für die Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien* in 1951-52.<sup>40</sup>

The vital factor in the development of the new German social history since the 1950s, however, has been the work of Werner Conze, and the institutions and publications which he founded. As already mentioned, Conze was inspired by the emphasis on the *Volk* as a subject of history in the writings of Otto Brunner and his teacher Gunther Ipsen. Like many other sociologists at the end of the Weimar Republic and in the Third Reich, Ipsen advocated a close connection between sociology and history.<sup>41</sup> Conze's interest in historical demography and agrarian history was fostered by Ipsen, who also influenced his view of the transition from an agrarian to a modern industrial economy.<sup>42</sup> After the war Conze was inspired by the tradition of the Historical School of Political Economy which had been carried on by Carl Brinkmann at Göttingen, as well as by Otto Hintze's universal approach. 'Distantly borrowing' the concept of 'structural history' from the founder of the French *Annales* school, Fernand Braudel,<sup>43</sup> Conze advocated a social history which combined traditional hermeneutics with modern analytical methods, and bridged the gulf separating it from political history. In 1954 Otto Brunner had already seen social history not as an 'area of specialization, not as a "discipline" in its own right' but as a 'way of seeing that places people and groups of people into a wider social context'.<sup>44</sup> Like Brunner, Conze did not want merely a greater emphasis on social history as a subdiscipline of history, but an integrated discipline which would produce a grand synthesis between the different branches of history.<sup>45</sup> His aim was to rescue social and economic history from its peripheral position, to revive the legacy of Gustav Schmoller, Max Weber, and their contemporaries, and 'on this basis to bring German historiography fully back into the international academic community'.<sup>46</sup>

Conze expressed his programme most clearly in a lecture on the structural history of the technical-industrial age as a subject for research and teaching, which he gave at the Düsseldorf Academy in 1957.<sup>47</sup> In it he called for the establishment of an

interdisciplinary research institute for the study of the period from the late eighteenth century to the present. He stressed collective trends and movements caused largely by developments in trade, industry and technology, the growing role of the masses, and the emergence of a global context, and called for close co-operation between historiography and sociology, political science and economics. The methods, concepts, and contents of the social sciences were to be adapted to the needs of structural history. This sort of structural history, which would not hesitate to use statistics, would focus not on actions and events, but on 'continuity and change in structures'.<sup>48</sup>

This ambitious programme for a structural history could not be realized. Conze later acknowledged that he had 'not been aware of the theoretical implications of a "structuralism" which had not yet become apparent'.<sup>49</sup> Nevertheless, he had brought the power of circumstances and collective social movements to the attention of historians, had underlined the importance of typological methods, and had identified the key elements of the concept of social history which were later developed by the 'critical' social history school. Perhaps his main achievement, however, was to have stimulated research in social history. In addition to his work on structural history, Conze's important essay 'Vom "Pöbel" zum "Proletariat"' (1954),<sup>50</sup> his studies on the German *Vormärz*,<sup>51</sup> and his essay 'Nation und Gesellschaft. Zwei Grundbegriffe der revolutionären Epoche' (1964),<sup>52</sup> indicated the direction which research in social history would take. The last-mentioned essay, which was originally given as a lecture at the Congress of German Historians in 1962, was closely connected with a project 'examining the dissolution of the old and the creation of the modern world through the history of the terms and concepts used to describe them'.<sup>53</sup> This undertaking attempted to combine *Begriffsgeschichte* with cultural history, political history, and especially social history, in a continuation of the work of both Hintze and Brunner.<sup>54</sup> The result of this project was the publication of a multi-volume historical reference work entitled *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, edited by Conze together with Otto Brunner and Reinhart Koselleck. One of the main features of the project was the development of the concept of a *Sattelzeit* by Reinhart Koselleck. The idea behind this was that from the middle of the eighteenth century to the eve of the

contemporary age, key social and political terms changed, reflecting the gradual breakdown of corporate society and the processes of industrialization, urbanization, secularization, and mass politicization.<sup>55</sup>

Conze's initiatives are firmly anchored in two research institutions, the Heidelberg *Institut für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, which he founded, and the *Arbeitskreis für moderne Sozialgeschichte*, which he built up and led. A second long-running publication series, *Industrielle Welt*, put out by the *Arbeitskreis* also provides a forum for Conze's initiatives.<sup>56</sup> The *Arbeitskreis*, where representatives of all branches of social history work together with scholars from related disciplines has been especially successful in pushing ahead research in such areas as the working class, the family, artisans, the *Bildungsbürgertum*, and the social history of the Federal Republic. And despite controversies between different schools of thought and political directions, it has contributed significantly to integrating social history into the discipline of history as a whole.

Several other historians besides Werner Conze contributed to achieving the breakthrough of modern social history in the Federal Republic. One was the economic historian, Wolfram Fischer, who studied, among other things, the relationship between the state and the economy, as well as the social problems of artisans and factory workers in the early period of industrialization.<sup>57</sup> Another was Wolfgang Köllmann, who in the late 1950s became the leading authority on historical demography and urban history as a field of social history.<sup>58</sup> One of the main strengths of modern social history lay in the field of regional and local history, whose practitioners concentrated on analysing the early period of industrialization and its social consequences.<sup>59</sup> In 1960 and 1965 the Swiss cultural anthropologist and social historian Rudolf Braun published his classic works on how life and culture in a rural industrial region near Zurich changed under the impact of industrialization.<sup>60</sup> These works had a delayed impact on social history in Germany, where social historians did not discover the anthropological dimension of social history stressed by Braun until relatively late.

The early 1960s, and especially the bitter controversies precipitated by Fritz Fischer's book *Griff nach der Weltmacht*<sup>61</sup> are often considered by German and non-German historians of Germany as the decisive turning point in German historiography after the

Second World War.<sup>62</sup> However, in my opinion, this view requires modification. It is true that doubt was cast on the key assumptions of an older generation by emphasizing Germany's guilt for the outbreak of the First World War and Imperial Germany's aggressive war aims policy, which in Fischer's opinion had enjoyed broad social and political support. From these propositions was derived the thesis of a continuity in Germany's attempts to gain world power from Wilhelm II to Hitler. In terms of methodology, however, Fischer's study, based on a close reading of the documents and stressing moral and ethical arguments (*gesinnungsethische Argumentation*),<sup>63</sup> hardly goes beyond traditional diplomatic and intellectual history. Fischer incorporated more social and economic factors in his second book, *Krieg der Illusionen* (1968), in which he looks at German policy from 1911 to 1914,<sup>64</sup> but the essence of his morally indignant national self-criticism did not change, and his work has had a rather indirect impact on the further development of German social history. One innovation attributable partly to Fischer's influence was that inquiry into the origins of National Socialism was extended beyond the era immediately preceding it to earlier periods in German history, especially Bismarck's Reich. Fischer also influenced a group of young historians, which included Fischer's own students Helmut Böhme, Dirk Stegmann and Peter-Christian Witt,<sup>65</sup> who became increasingly aware that the questions asked by Fischer called for a much more thorough investigation of the economic, social and political structure of German society and how it changed, using new analytical methods.<sup>66</sup> Yet it needs to be emphasized that neither of the two leaders of the movement that established the new 'critical' social history around 1970, Hans-Ulrich Wehler and Jürgen Kocka, were students of Fritz Fischer. Wehler was long under the influence of Theodor Schieder, while Gerhard A. Ritter supervised Kocka's doctorate and *Habilitation*. Nor were any of the other fourteen editors of the journal *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, the main forum for this movement, students of Fritz Fischer.

Indeed, it is my opinion that the importance of certain historical controversies for the development of German historiography since 1945 has been greatly overestimated. For example, in a polemical, critical essay of 1977, Hans-Ulrich Wehler, ignoring continuities with older traditions and the innovative work of the 1950s, argues that the 1960s, which he claims represent a turning-

point in German historiography, witnessed major controversies on six issues: German war aims in the First World War, the workers' and soldiers' council movement of 1918-19, the nature of National Socialism, the role of social and economic history, the primacy of domestic policy, and a debate on theory.<sup>67</sup> While it cannot be denied that progress often occurs as the result of heated discussion between older and newer interpretations, this is not the only way for progress to be made. Such controversies can also lead up a blind alley, as I believe was the case in the reassessment of the German workers' and soldiers' council movement of 1918-19.<sup>68</sup> Historiography is more often advanced by convincing and generally accepted scholarly achievement in such areas as the discovery of new sources, the application of new methodologies, the posing of new questions, and the investigation of fields which have been neglected. Examples of achievements of this stature in the field of nineteenth-century German history are the works of Theodor Schieder, Werner Conze and Rudolf Braun already mentioned, Heinrich Heffter's seminal work, *Die deutsche Selbstverwaltung im 19. Jahrhundert* (1950), Reinhart Koselleck's major study, *Preußen zwischen Reform und Revolution* (1967), Jürgen Kocka's study of industrial bureaucracy before 1914 using Siemens as an example, Klaus Tenfelde's *Sozialgeschichte der Bergarbeiter-schaft an der Ruhr im 19. Jahrhundert* and Arthur E. Imhof's fascinating research drawing on demography, anthropology and cultural history.<sup>69</sup> And this is by no means an exhaustive list.

### III *The New 'Critical' Social History*

The real mentor of the new 'critical' social history was not Fritz Fischer, but Hans Rosenberg, professor of history in the USA. From the time of his visiting professorship at the Free University of Berlin in 1949/1950 to his death on 26 June 1988, he had an important influence on the German students he taught there, and through them, on later generations of students. His influence derived not only from his books and essays, but mainly from the discussions and hundreds of letters in which he encouraged the efforts of young historians. He was already known to experts for his pioneering study of 1934 on business cycles in the European

and North American economies from 1848 to 1859,<sup>70</sup> his work on the connections between aristocracy, monarchy, and bureaucracy in Prussian absolutism,<sup>71</sup> and his brilliant essay on 'Pseudodemokratisierung der Rittergutsbesitzerklasse'.<sup>72</sup> However it was his book *Große Depression und Bismarckzeit*, published in 1967,<sup>73</sup> but actually based partly on earlier research,<sup>74</sup> that stimulated the development of a theoretically orientated social history. Deliberately written as 'a provocation and an experiment',<sup>75</sup> this study examines connections between changes in the spheres of economics, society, politics and mentalities in Central Europe between 1873 and 1896. Rosenberg, who calls this period the Great Depression, based his study on premisses about long economic cycles taken from the theory of business cycles and theoretical economic history. He proposed a new periodization that was not orientated towards political history. Rosenberg's approach, strongly under the influence of the work done in the 1920s by the Moscow scholar of business cycles, N. D. Kondratieff, was not generally accepted. Economists questioned the existence of long cycles.<sup>76</sup> It was also pointed out that the origins of the Depression had not been explained.<sup>77</sup> Rosenberg himself later wanted to replace the misleading term 'Great Depression' by 'Great Deflation'.<sup>78</sup> It could also be asked whether the clearly visible, short, acute crises from 1873 to 1879, or from 1891 to 1894-5, might not prove to be more fruitful for illuminating connections between economic development, social processes and political decisions than the relatively long cycle from 1873 to 1896, with its periods of boom and bust, proposed by Rosenberg.

Nevertheless, the heuristic importance of this book cannot be overestimated. Those who have used Rosenberg's concept and terminology include Hans-Ulrich Wehler in his study *Bismarck und der Imperialismus* (1969) and in his critical account of Imperial Germany from 1871 to 1918,<sup>79</sup> Jürgen Kocka in *Unternehmensverwaltung und Angestelltenschaft am Beispiel Siemens* mentioned above,<sup>80</sup> Heinrich August Winkler in his study of the political development of artisans and small retailers in the Weimar Republic,<sup>81</sup> and Shulamit Volkov in her work on the German master craftsmen from 1873 to 1896.<sup>82</sup> Rosenberg's call for a 'theoretically oriented history from a new perspective'<sup>83</sup> proved to be more important even than the model that he developed. This call became the trademark of the new 'critical' social history, which saw itself as a historical social science. This school of historiogra-

phy emerged around 1970 and has since found a centre at the University of Bielefeld. It has an important platform in the journal *Geschichte und Gesellschaft. Zeitschrift für historische Sozialwissenschaft*, which has been going since 1975. Its pages are, however, also open to historians of other persuasions. The series *Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft*, which has been published since 1972, provides another important forum for the work of this school.

The practitioners of the 'critical' social history, or the 'Bielefeld School' as they are often simply but incorrectly called,<sup>84</sup> do not form a self-contained group. Jürgen Kocka (who has been at the Free University in Berlin since 1988), Hans-Ulrich Wehler, and Jörn Rüsen have the strongest interest in theory. Only Kocka and Wehler support the idea of a theoretically orientated social history which aims to have a political and educational impact, and to provide comprehensive interpretations of long historical periods. Even their programmes, however, are not identical. They see social history not as a fixed doctrine, but as an invitation to discussion. Many other German historians, such as Hans-Jürgen Puhle, Helmut Berding, Hans Mommsen, Wolfgang J. Mommsen, Heinrich August Winkler, Reinhard Rürup, and Wolfgang Schieder, none of whom teach at Bielefeld except Puhle (who was there until spring 1990), as well as many historians abroad, including Gerald D. Feldman, Charles S. Maier, and Shulamit Volkov, are in close working contact with Kocka and Wehler. They share some, but certainly not all of their views on the methods and functions of modern historiography. Nor are they committed to particular books, or interpretations of, say, Imperial Germany, or the Revolution of 1848.<sup>85</sup> It is striking that only a few of the historians named can be considered social historians in the narrow sense, although all have included social and economic factors in their writing. They are all, first and foremost, historians involved in empirical research, who exert influence via their students, the research projects and publications for which they are responsible, and their own specific research.

An important aspect of the new 'critical' social history's programme, which I have derived primarily from the writings of Kocka and Wehler,<sup>86</sup> was the attempt to go beyond Conze's structural history. While Wehler at first attacked Conze's work,<sup>87</sup> Kocka, in spite of particular objections, on the whole assessed it positively as innovative.<sup>88</sup> Kocka criticized Conze's attempt to

equate social history and structural history.<sup>89</sup> He also found fault with the purely formal character of structural history, and in particular, its lack of substantive theories for selecting relevant facts, for formulating hypotheses on the interdependence between economics, politics and culture, and for identifying important forces of change.<sup>90</sup> This criticism was also directed at Fernand Braudel's history. Braudel was accused of simply juxtaposing details from areas of reality, without synthesizing or offering any connection between them.<sup>91</sup>

The social history advocated by Kocka and Wehler differed from Braudel's structural history in several ways. It was 'much more explicit in its use of theory, and placed greater emphasis on socio-economic and socio-structural causal factors'. It inquired into the connections between the spheres of state and society, which were no longer seen as a single unit, and finally, 'it made express reference to practical social and political goals such as emancipation, enlightenment, and the criticism of tradition and authority'.<sup>92</sup>

The term *historische Sozialwissenschaft* (historical social science) had been used as early as 1916 by Werner Sombart in the second edition of his study of modern capitalism,<sup>93</sup> a fact which appears to have been overlooked by scholars to date. The concept of *Geschichte als historische Sozialwissenschaft*, or history as a social science – used by Wehler in 1973 as the title of a book of three essays on the relationship between history and sociology, economics, and psychoanalysis<sup>94</sup> – has not yet been clearly defined or systematically justified.<sup>95</sup> Its advocates claim that 'historical social science' aims to underline the significance of structures and processes as the 'conditions and consequences of events, decisions, and actions', to bring historiography closer to the systematic social sciences, and to encourage a more thorough consideration of its 'epistemological and methodological prerequisites'.<sup>96</sup> Further, the historian is deemed to be 'morally committed to political and social education with an emancipatory intent'.<sup>97</sup> Criticism of this concept has concentrated mainly on the danger of politicizing history, on the notion of the 'critical' historian sitting in judgement on the past, and on the possibility that history, freed from the cul-de-sac of extreme historicism, will be forced into a new Procrustean bed.<sup>98</sup> Kocka has also admitted that semantically equating 'historiography' with 'historical social science' demands an extremely wide definition of social

science. This involves the risk of misunderstandings, and, he suggests, is therefore better avoided.<sup>99</sup>

An attempt has been made to interpret the emergence of social history, or the reorientation of German historiography after 1960, as a paradigm shift, using a concept borrowed from Thomas Kuhn.<sup>100</sup> In my opinion, however, this does not do justice to the fundamental difference between the way in which the natural sciences and the social sciences advance. While in the natural sciences one side or the other usually achieves a clear victory, many schools of historiography can co-exist in the pluralism of historical schools that we take for granted in free societies. The notion of a paradigm shift has therefore largely been abandoned.

'Critical' social history advocates explicit theories and models for the study of both specific areas and problems of social history in the narrow sense, and of entire societies and their evolution in the wider sense of social history. Wehler and Kocka introduced the term *Gesellschaftsgeschichte* (history of society) to cover this. It had in fact already been used by other historians, but without the theoretical implications attributed to it by Wehler and Kocka.<sup>101</sup> Wehler and Kocka made it clear, however, that *Gesellschaftsgeschichte* did not involve adopting ready-made, general theories and models from the social sciences; rather, these would have to be tested and adapted to suit the special needs of the historian, whose aim is to comprehend phenomena in their time, not to draw up universal laws.<sup>102</sup>

The selection of theories and models is neither solely determined by the subject, nor totally arbitrary. According to Kocka the selection from a group of theories within a certain range defined by the subject itself is also influenced by historians' epistemological goals and by their political and educational aims.<sup>103</sup> These must, however, be rationally justified.<sup>104</sup> Kocka also points out that different theories must be capable of being combined with each other.<sup>105</sup> In concrete terms, Wehler and Kocka have discussed and applied elements of the theories of Karl Marx and Max Weber, as well as of Joseph A. Schumpeter and Alexander Gerschenkron, which, they suggest, are especially useful for historians.<sup>106</sup>

Their critics accuse Kocka and Wehler of a lack of objectivity, pointing out that the preconceptions required for the formulation of theories prevent the impartial reading of historical sources, and that models do not do justice to the complexity of historical

reality and to the importance of individual actions. This criticism is directed mainly against the theory-laden concept of *Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, which is as important as the idea of a *historische Sozialwissenschaft* for the new 'critical' social history.

*Gesellschaftsgeschichte* as an integrative discipline is a further development of ideas that were put forward in 1971 by the British Marxist historian Eric J. Hobsbawm,<sup>107</sup> and which emerged in connection with the controversies concerning a *histoire totale* in France.<sup>108</sup> Its programme is based on the assumptions 'that historical syntheses or outlines of syntheses are possible and necessary, if only from a certain perspective ... [and] that by emphasizing social structures and processes in the narrow sense – that is, "from society itself" – such syntheses are possible, meaningful and often superior to those which use processes from the spheres of government and politics, or from intellectual history as their structuring principle', and finally that syntheses of this kind 'cannot be additive, associative or comprehensive, but can only be constructed from over-arching theories'.<sup>109</sup>

The original notion that ascribed a special historical effectiveness to social-economic factors<sup>110</sup> has since been revised by Wehler. Instead, he suggests, the areas of 'domination' (*Herrschaft*) and 'culture', which, together with 'work' (*Arbeit*) as a comprehensive term covering the social-economic sphere, constitute society must be 'ranked and valued equally'.<sup>111</sup> Wehler also admits that the original concept of *Gesellschaftsgeschichte* was too strongly influenced by the specific problems of German history, and by the nineteenth-century German tradition represented by Hegel, Marx and Lorenz von Stein. Further, he suggests, the importance of the Industrial Revolution as a universal turning point in history was overestimated. In order to make *Gesellschaftsgeschichte* more useful for comparative work and for the study of the period before the end of the eighteenth century, Wehler suggests that it should be modelled more closely on Max Weber's concept of the development of occidental society.<sup>112</sup> In my opinion, several of Otto Hintze's major essays on constitutional history – for example, his comparative analysis of the conditions leading to representative government in universal history, and his study of the nature and spread of feudalism<sup>113</sup> – also contain categories and theories that could be fruitful for a comparative history of society going back to the preindustrial period.

The idea of an integrative *Gesellschaftsgeschichte* has been rejected mainly by the exponents of political history of international relations, who emphasize the autonomy of their own discipline in order to oppose *Gesellschaftsgeschichte*'s claim to a leading position.<sup>114</sup> The vagueness of the term *Gesellschaftsgeschichte* has been criticized, and the possibility of comprehending an entire society by means of an all-encompassing synthesis has been questioned altogether.<sup>115</sup> I believe, however, that the acceptance of *Gesellschaftsgeschichte* will depend less on theoretical issues than on its usefulness in structuring empirical material in actual historical studies.

Hans-Ulrich Wehler has attempted to put *Gesellschaftsgeschichte* into practice in his ambitious plans for a four-volume history of German society from the end of the eighteenth century to the creation of two German states in 1945/49. The first two volumes covering the period to 1845/49 were published in 1987. This work aims to 'describe and ... explain ... the principal features ... of the complicated process by which the agrarian-early-capitalist, aristocratic-patrician, corporate-absolutist forms of domination in *ancien régime* Germany' were transformed into the highly organized industrial capitalism of today, in a society regulated by government intervention and governed by a republican-democratic constitution. Wehler points out that a lack of preliminary work means that his study must be considered only a provisional attempt and not seen as a comprehensive *Gesellschaftsgeschichte*. However, the concept of *Gesellschaftsgeschichte* is indeed its 'guiding principle',<sup>116</sup> and the study has grown far beyond the outline for a project. The work is intended as a handbook, and at the same time wants to give an analysis, guided by a strong theoretical orientation, of social, economic and political structures.

Wehler structures his account around Max Weber's categories of domination, economy, and culture, as equal dimensions of society.<sup>117</sup> The system of social inequality derived from these central areas provides the fourth 'main axis' of his study, and plays an important part in it. This work represents a high degree of reflection and learning. But its main achievement is that it is the first systematic attempt to apply Max Weber's universal-historical thought to the history of an entire society. Other important features are that it brings out the special characteristics of Germany's development without unduly emphasizing the *Sonderweg* thesis, and that it links the history of the Old Empire with recent German history.

By comparison with these merits, the criticism which can be made of this work pales into insignificance. Given the sheer volume of sources and secondary literature he uses, it is not surprising that Wehler does not work at the same high level throughout. Undoubtedly the experts will soon demonstrate his shortcomings in their special fields. Wehler reveals certain weaknesses in the sections on economic history and demographic history, and his treatment of culture in the third major part of the work is in fact essentially an analysis of the social-political framework governing it. Although Wehler's very competent accounts of such social and cultural institutions as churches, schools, universities, publishing and the press are reliable sources of information, they generally do not deal with developments *within* science and scholarship, music, architecture, literature, and painting, as Thomas Nipperdey does in his important works, *Deutsche Geschichte 1800-1866* and *Deutsche Geschichte 1866-1918*.<sup>118</sup> Politics, in the narrower sense of foreign policy and domestic decision-making and events, is overshadowed by the analysis of structures of domination. Catholicism, condemned as the enemy of modernization, is treated in an undifferentiated and often unjust way. And setting Wehler's work against Heinrich Lutz's *Zwischen Habsburg und Preußen. Deutschland 1815-1866*<sup>119</sup> shows that the Austrian component of German history does not receive enough attention by comparison with the Prussian-German aspects.

The whole approach of the work has also been criticized. The account of how domination, economy and culture interact is not fully successful, especially in the first and third parts of the work. As in Wehler's earlier books, one misses vivid, narrative descriptions of the way in which people from various social strata lived, although this is an inevitable consequence of the structure of the book, with its emphasis on structures and processes. The anthropological dimension represented by such topics as childhood, old age, sexuality, and the experience of sickness and death, all emphasized in the new approach of *Alltagsgeschichte* (history of everyday life), is almost totally lacking in Wehler's work. Also, Wehler's often rather clear-cut judgements on historical developments tend to obscure the ambivalence of history, the sometimes inseparable mingling of modern and traditional, positive and negative aspects, and the unpredictability of the direction in which any situation may develop.

Despite this criticism, the work's methodology and intellectual achievement continue to fascinate. A final assessment must await the publication of the last two volumes, but it has already shifted discussion of *Gesellschaftsgeschichte* and *historische Sozialwissenschaft* from the level of theory on to that of practical historiography. Although it is difficult to imagine this work providing a model for similar undertakings by other historians, it will be a reference point for all future discussion.

While Wehler has attempted to deal with an entire society, advocates of the new 'critical' social history have applied theoretical models to the analysis of specific historical problems or shorter periods of history, with variable success. In my view, the most successful application of Max Weber's ideal types to a concrete, historical subject is Jürgen Kocka's 1969 study of business administration and white-collar workers. Using Siemens, the large German electrical firm, as an example, Kocka analyses the general phenomenon of the emergence of white-collar workers, who formed an increasingly important group in industry and society. At the same time he examines the ideal type of bureaucracy, which Max Weber derived from the state civil service. Kocka comes to the conclusion that Weber's thesis of the universality of the phenomenon of bureaucracy needs to be modified for private industry. According to Kocka, essentially unbureaucratic, regulative elements limit the process of bureaucratization: the fact that companies are privately owned, and the emphasis on profit and competition in capitalist companies as opposed to public authorities. This implies a change in the meaning of bureaucracy, which is no longer primarily an instrument of direct domination, but becomes a supplier of certain services.<sup>120</sup> Kocka thus uses the ideal-type model to structure his material as well as, ultimately, to modify the ideal type on the basis of empirical research.

Kocka's book *Klassengesellschaft im Krieg* (1973) is in my opinion less convincing. In it he attempts to analyse German society during the First World War on the basis of 'a model of class society ... ultimately derived from Marxist class theory, but highly stylized and for the most part taken out of the context of Marxist thinking on the philosophy of history, and supplemented by recent work on conflict analysis'.<sup>121</sup> The thesis that society was increasingly being polarized into proletarians and capitalists is especially well illustrated by the distinction be-

tween the 'old' and the 'new' middle classes, and the Revolution of 1918-19 appears as the 'logical consequence'<sup>122</sup> of growing class conflicts. Kocka's study was intended to be a 'methodological experiment'.<sup>123</sup> He concedes that his model could not adequately account for several factors such as the increasing opposition between country and city and the diminishing significance of class structure in the relationship between state and society in Germany during the First World War.<sup>124</sup> I believe that the importance of war-weariness, the desire for peace and the impact of defeat as factors in the outbreak of revolution have also been underestimated. The revolution was generally not fought along class lines, as is illustrated, for example, by the creation just a few weeks after the revolution of the *Zentralarbeitsgemeinschaft*, a partnership between employers' organizations and trade unions. Further, Kocka's model of 'class society' cannot offer any convincing solutions to the admittedly difficult problem of how objective conditions and perceptions of them were translated into actions by contemporaries.

Advocates of 'critical' social history, especially Heinrich August Winkler, Kocka, Wehler, and Hans-Jürgen Puhle, have paid a great deal of attention to the model of 'organized capitalism', which builds on the ideas of Rudolf Hilferding, one of the leading theoreticians of German social democracy before 1933.<sup>125</sup> This model allows the interconnections both between individual sectors of the economy, and between them and the regulating intervention of the governmental apparatus to emerge clearly. It also emphasizes the importance of self-organization in the social and economic sphere, for example, in the spread of interest groups. The model of 'organized capitalism' is an attempt at a comprehensive interpretation of the period from the 'Great Depression' of 1873 to the 'end of the post-war period' in 1923-24, although there is no general agreement as to when 'organized capitalism' ended, and what the following period should be called.<sup>126</sup> In contrast to both *laissez-faire* capitalism and the orthodox Marxist concept of state monopoly capitalism, one of the central ideas of this approach is that capitalism possesses the capacity to direct and correct itself, and to adapt itself to new conditions. A number of aspects of this concept have been criticized, including its lack of precision, and its inability adequately to describe reality.<sup>127</sup> As a result, this term, immediately dubbed the 'paradigmatic superweapon' by Gerald D. Feldman,<sup>128</sup>

and now also rejected by Heinrich August Winkler,<sup>129</sup> has largely been abandoned, although no convincing alternative has yet been proposed. Like Kocka's book, however, this model has advanced the study of the relationship between politics, economics, and society in the Kaiserreich and the Weimar Republic.<sup>130</sup>

#### IV *The 'Sonderweg' Discussion*

General criticism of the new 'critical' social history is closely linked, both in the Federal Republic and abroad, with criticism of Wehler's book, *Das Deutsche Kaiserreich 1871–1918*. As a comprehensive interpretation of Imperial Germany, this book has received a great deal of attention and, since its original publication in 1973, has continued to be re-issued in new editions and translations. Wehler aimed to explain Germany's specific historical development, the so-called German *Sonderweg*, which led to the National Socialist seizure of power in 1933, and he tried to create a freer, more critical awareness of society.<sup>131</sup> He developed a number of interrelated concepts and models to explain what he regarded as a disastrous discrepancy between the progressive economic modernization of Germany on the one hand, and the lack of modernization in social relations and politics on the other.<sup>132</sup> The strong position of the Junkers and the lack of democratization and parliamentarianism in the German Empire and the Prussian state were, in Wehler's view, the main indicators of social and political backwardness.

Most of the concepts and models which Wehler adopted from existing literature were subjected by his critics to thorough critical scrutiny: 'the primacy of domestic policy',<sup>133</sup> 'the feudalization of the bourgeoisie', the view that Bismarck's system of rule was a 'Bonapartist dictatorial regime', the thesis of 'negative integration' as a technique of domination, concepts of 'social militarism', *Sammlungspolitik* and especially 'social imperialism'.<sup>134</sup> Space does not permit further discussion of these issues here. Similarly, the in my opinion justified criticism that Wehler neglects foreign policy and social history in the narrow sense, that he presents a static analysis of a society undergoing great change, and that he overemphasizes conflict in German society, go beyond the scope of this essay.<sup>135</sup>

A group of British historians, primarily Geoff Eley, David Blackbourn, and Richard Evans, have launched an attack on the *Sonderweg* theory, starting from Wehler's book and the acceptance of several of its theses by other German historians, whose uniformity as a group and whose representativeness for German history as a whole they greatly overestimate.<sup>136</sup> The term *Sonderweg* was used positively, but with overtones critical of the West, by political journalists and historians in Germany during the First World War and the Weimar Republic.<sup>137</sup> Since 1945 it has been used negatively in analysing the path to Nazi rule. This term is misleading, argue the critics, because it implies that there is a 'normal path', and does not take into account that each great nation has followed a path of its own. The British historians also objected to what they regarded as an overemphasis on the preindustrial, feudal elements of the society and politics of Imperial Germany, and to the thesis that the masses were manipulated by a ruling élite.<sup>138</sup> Eley replied by putting forward the thesis of 'grass-roots self-organization', which in my opinion is equally exaggerated. Finally, it was pointed out that many of the phenomena which Wehler criticized as specifically 'German', such as the feudalization of the bourgeoisie, had parallels in other European countries. It was shown, correctly, that industrialization can take place under very different political and social conditions, and that there is no such thing as a 'normal' connection between industrialization, liberal bourgeois society, and political democratization – something that Wehler, however, had not suggested.

The debate<sup>139</sup> suffers from the fact that some of the British historians, who look to the work of the Italian Marxist, Antonio Gramsci, rather than to the more traditional historicism of Wehler's German critics, tend to distort the arguments of their German opponents. They minimize the considerable differences between Germany and Britain by referring to the 'logic of monopoly capitalism'<sup>140</sup> which governed both countries. While the term *Sonderweg* may legitimately be rejected, I believe that the existence of important differences between countries should not be denied. Nor should the comparative study of similarities and differences in their historical development be implicitly outlawed. In many cases Germany's development did not deviate significantly from that of many other European countries. This becomes apparent when the comparison is not limited to Britain

and France, but extended to include Russia, Italy, Spain or the Scandinavian countries. In my opinion, Germany displays no significant, special developments in economic or social history.<sup>141</sup> Although Germany's population increase was higher than that of France or Ireland (whose population actually decreased) in the hundred years before the First World War, it was in line with the European average. Germany industrialized later than Britain, and from the 1890s Germany's economic growth rates clearly outstripped Britain's. However, between 1890 and 1914 they were lower than those of Sweden, Denmark, and Russia, where industrialization started even later than in Germany.

The aristocracy played a large part in the politics and social life of Germany. Yet this is also true of England and, with certain qualifications, of France, and above all of Russia. Here Switzerland is the exception in Europe. However, it is true that the links between the German aristocracy, especially in East Elbia, and agrarian interests were stronger and closer, and lasted for longer than was the case in most other nations.<sup>142</sup> The German *Besitzbürgertum*, the propertied bourgeoisie, as an important social and economic class, was not fundamentally different from the bourgeoisies of other countries. The concept of a *Bildungsbürgertum*, an educated and cultured bourgeoisie whose members were employed by the state or worked in the free professions, is a specifically German phenomenon, and the fact that this group is tied so closely to the state is obviously characteristic of Germany. But similar social groups exist among the professional classes of other countries. The gap between the 'labour aristocracy' of skilled workers and unskilled workers is not as wide in Germany as in Britain, partly because the Social Democratic movement had politically organized all groups of industrial workers from an early date in Germany. However, the differences between the structure of the labour force, and between the social and political behaviour of workers in the two countries, have long been exaggerated. It was not only in Germany that workers' parties played no decisive part in politics before 1914; this was true of all European countries. Before 1914 the change in social and economic structures caused by the decline in agriculture and the growing significance of the service sector was smaller in Germany than in Britain, but greater than in France.

Nevertheless significant political and constitutional differ-

ences between Germany and other European countries do exist. Germany differed from Britain and the USA, for example, in that it possessed a strong state bureaucracy much earlier<sup>143</sup> and established a powerful and important military, linked with the crown. Their positions of power were shaken neither by industrialization nor by the development of parliaments and parties, but endured until 1918 and in some cases until 1933. Another important factor is that in Germany the state, the nation and the people do not coincide as is the case in Britain, France and Spain. The German national state, which encompassed neither the entire nation nor the whole German people, was created late and from above. Other examples of specifically German developments are the strong illiberal elements in political culture, the early separation between the labour movement and liberalism, and the strong distinction between blue-collar and white-collar workers, which was encouraged by legislation.<sup>144</sup>

Not all of these specifically German features, however, reflect the continuing strength of preindustrial structures and traditions, and a lack of social and political modernity. Some may in fact be seen as anticipating general developments in a modern, industrial society. Examples are the early consolidation of powerful, permanent interest groups, the early emergence of mass parties, and the demands of German white-collar workers for privileges similar to those possessed by civil servants, who cannot be dismissed and enjoy generous pension rights. In fact, the tradition of a strong bureaucracy actually assisted the development of an interventionist and welfare state in Germany *before* other European countries. In many respects, Germany was a more 'modern' society than France or England. The rise of National Socialism in Germany cannot be explained only in terms of a lack of modernization. Certain symptoms of crisis associated with modernization, such as demagogical mass politics and placing excessive demands on the state, must also be taken into account.

## V *'Alltagsgeschichte' and its Critics*

In recent years, criticism of the 'critical' social history has come less from traditionalists and opponents of the German *Sonderweg* thesis than from the usually left-wing *Alltagshistoriker*, that is,

'historians of everyday life' or 'people's historians'. Everyday life, defined as the 'points of intersection of socio-cultural processes',<sup>145</sup> is seen as the real subject of a modern cultural and social history 'from below' that studies the lives of ordinary people in their environments. Instead of attempting to analyse total social structures and the objective social, economic and cultural processes that constrain their development, we find a micro-history of the smallest spaces, concerned mainly with the subjective experiences of individual people and small groups. This usually goes along with a rejection of theories, models and general terms not derived directly from the sources. Past worlds are to be reconstructed 'from below and from within',<sup>146</sup> instead of being analysed and dissected by the 'cold', conceptual language of social historians with an interest in theory.

The development of 'people's history' or the 'history of everyday life' in Germany has been decisively influenced by the classic work of the Anglo-Marxist, Edward P. Thompson, *The Making of the British Working Class* (1963).<sup>147</sup> Expanding on Karl Marx's approach, Thompson examines the impact which changes in the processes of production had on the culture and value systems of the lower classes. Unlike previous analyses which emphasized the importance of economic developments for the evolution of the working class,<sup>148</sup> Thompson sees it as growing out of a process of repression and resistance. Despite, or perhaps because of this imprecise treatment of socio-economic structures and his tendency to equate experience and culture, Thompson's book has been highly influential.

The fascination exerted by *Alltagsgeschichte*, however, has more to do with certain trends in society and public opinion in the Federal Republic and other countries than with historiographical debates such as this. *Alltagsgeschichte*, which has a 'green' component that should not be underestimated, often goes together with a critical attitude towards industrial society, mass culture, and the dangers of modern science, and a quest for buried and forgotten alternatives in the supposedly 'intact world' of the past.

Thus it is typical that instead of studying the emancipatory achievements of labour organizations, practitioners of *Alltagsgeschichte* very critically analyse the disciplinary effect that they undoubtedly had on workers.<sup>149</sup> The concept of 'social discipline' (*Sozialdisziplinierung*), developed by Gerhard Oestreich

with reference to the early modern state as an important element of modernization,<sup>150</sup> is now, like the older but less useful notion of ‘social control’ of the lower classes by the élites, being applied critically to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.<sup>151</sup> Finally, the highly descriptive nature of *Alltagsgeschichte*, which also, unlike structural history or social history, permits emotional identification, has contributed considerably to its popularity.

The history of everyday life has given German social history an important boost, and has rejuvenated hermeneutic methods of historical understanding. It also draws more strongly on the findings and methods of cultural anthropology, ethnology and psychology, and to some extent also of geography, biology, and medicine. The topics studied by historians of everyday life – for example, working-class culture, associations, celebrations, housing, eating and dressing habits, the family, the neighbourhood, youth, old age, mentalities, disease, death – had already been studied by social historians and are not now the exclusive preserve of *Alltagsgeschichte*. However, their popularity has certainly increased greatly since its advent.

The history of everyday life has also directed historians to look in a new way at sources such as diaries, memoirs, petitions from ordinary people, sermons and records of church visitations. Historians have been encouraged to look at them from the perspective of those involved. *Alltagsgeschichte* has also drawn our attention to the – often overestimated – potential of oral history, of gaining new sources by interviewing ordinary people about their way of life and their subjective experiences.<sup>152</sup>

However, while acknowledging the achievements of this new approach, we should not overlook its limitations and shortcomings.<sup>153</sup> Firstly, the term *Alltagsgeschichte* is extremely vague. ‘Everyday life’ (*Alltag*), as Klaus Tenfelde rightly notes, ‘is not a useful historical or sociological category, unless it is intended to indicate some type of “*histoire totale*” of the “common people”, which could, of course, be expressed more precisely’.<sup>154</sup>

Secondly, *Alltagsgeschichte* leaves out many dimensions of human life and many social groups. For example, it has little to say about working conditions, which constitute a central aspect of many people’s lives. Further, *Alltagsgeschichte* to date has largely ignored the middle and upper classes.

Thirdly, historians of everyday life have so far hardly asked how the instruments of socialization, that is, school, the military,

the church, and the institutions of state and community social policy, as well as the lower classes' own organizations – affected the people. To answer such questions, it is necessary to examine these institutions and the ideas and goals of their leaders, as well as people's subjective experiences and the ways in which they process them. The power of 'circumstances', that is, of economic and social structures and processes, and the systems and mechanisms of domination in the lives of individuals cannot be denied. But the experience and the awareness of each living person contains only a fragment of historical reality. Therefore, in principle, historical reality cannot be reconstructed from within, and wider concepts not derived exclusively from the sources cannot be dispensed with.<sup>155</sup> History cannot be reduced to a simple narrative of events, colourful descriptions of past worlds, and the reconstruction of people's subjective experiences. It also requires the use of theoretical terms and quantitative data, and the analysis of structures and processes. Moreover, rejecting the question of how representative the results of such micro-history are prevents the acquisition of historical knowledge.

We must therefore be careful about the tendency of *Alltagsgeschichte* to study history exclusively through experience and culture. The actual task of modern social history is to combine structural history, the history of events, and the history of experience and mentalities. This cannot be done without theory and general concepts.<sup>156</sup>

## VI *German and French Social History*

Practitioners of the recent 'critical' social history in Germany need to look at the methodology of the *Annales* school and of French social history in general more seriously than they have yet done, if they want to write the sort of social history defined at the end of the last section. German social historians have tended to look more towards the USA and Britain than to France. However, there are greater similarities between French and German social history than was assumed when Braudel's structural history was criticized in Germany.

The *Annales* school, in the tradition of French positivism, is not as strongly orientated towards theory as the German 'critical'

social history, which thereby deliberately set itself apart from traditional German historiography. Nevertheless, the *Annales* school does in fact draw upon the questions, theories and models of other social sciences.

Braudel clearly approved of theories and models, calling them 'hypotheses' and 'explanatory systems'. He has compared models with ships: 'What interests me is launching the constructed ship and seeing if it stays afloat, then letting it sail up and down the waters of time at my pleasure.' He suggests that historians should 'be directed from social reality towards a model, then vice versa, in an endless exchange which leads ... to a number of changes'.<sup>157</sup> Thus Braudel's assessment of the relationship between model and historical reality is similar to that of the 'critical' social historians. 'Critical' social historians make less of a distinction between structures and processes than Braudel, concentrating more on gradual transitions. Neither approach has yet found a satisfactory solution to the extremely difficult problem of mediating between structures and processes on the one hand, and experiences and events on the other.

While the new 'critical' social history has often fallen into the trap of imposing its own value systems and political preferences on the past, Braudel and many of his colleagues have been crucially aware of the specific quality of historical time, which cleaves to the historian's thoughts 'like earth to the gardener's spade',<sup>158</sup> and of the different phases in which historical developments occur.

The *Annales* historians and those of the *Sixième Section* at the *École Pratique des Hautes Études* (later to become the *École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales*), which since 1947 has been the real centre of the French school of social science-orientated social history,<sup>159</sup> are more advanced than the German 'critical' social historians in incorporating geographical, ecological, and biological conditions, historical demography, and collective mentalities into their analyses, as well as in using methods of linguistics and quantification. Yet the Germans are more aware than their French colleagues of the political dimensions of social questions, of the role of the state in the modernization process, and of the significance of political structures. They have also tried harder, though not always with greater success, to develop a historical theory of social change, and to establish a relationship between economics, culture and politics, whereas the *Annales* historians

have not yet been able to provide a convincing analysis of the transition from the *ancien régime* to the modern age.

Some of the differences between the two approaches can be explained by their choice of subjects. French social historians clearly concentrate on the preindustrial period with its apparently more stable structures, while their German counterparts are more interested in the history of modern society since the end of the eighteenth century. The questions and methods of French social history are therefore more appropriate for studying the history of underdeveloped countries and traditional cultures than are those of German 'critical' social history, which has tended to look at the rise of modern industrial societies and how they change. Europe and North America have been the main fields of research; Japan has so far largely been excluded because of the language barrier.

In recent years French and German social history have moved much closer to each other.<sup>160</sup> In France, social historians have paid more attention to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries,<sup>161</sup> analysing in greater detail the reasons for political decisions and the forces motivating social, economic, and political change.

In the Federal Republic, the trend towards using social history merely in order to explain political developments (for example, as in Wehler's early work) has clearly receded in the face of the increasing diversification of social history and the sophistication of its methods, as well as the growing interest in social life and mentalities, even where they do not possess any immediate political relevance. German social historians are also extending their research into the preindustrial period, looking especially at the phase of so-called protoindustrialization. Although social historians have not completely renounced the need for theoretical reflection and the search for models, the importance of theories drawn from the social sciences has on the whole dwindled, with the significant exception of Wehler's *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte*. These theories have proved difficult to apply in practice, and also go beyond the capacity of most historians to handle theory.

As the interests of social historians have converged on such topics as labour history, strikes, social and geographical mobility, urbanization, family and women's history, the history of childhood and old age, the history of poverty, death and health, and mentalities, their approaches and methods have also converged.

In the Federal Republic of Germany *Alltagsgeschichte* has encouraged this trend, which is also found in European and American social history. German social history is now much more strongly integrated into the international academic community than it was twenty years ago, despite the continuing existence of certain peculiarities arising out of Germany's specific scholarly traditions and political development, especially in the twentieth century.

## VII

### *A Preliminary Balance: Strengths and Weaknesses of the New Social History in Germany*

It is too early to sum up the strengths and weaknesses of the new German social history. While its teething problems have been overcome, it is still constantly developing. At this point, therefore, we can make only a preliminary assessment.

First, emphasizing economic, social, and political structures and processes as well as collective forces, the new social history has supplemented the one-sided, hermeneutic methods of history that concentrated on understanding individual actions.

Second, by scrutinizing the fundamental concepts which can be used to describe the structures and developments of past societies, it illuminated history's need for theory and increased its analytical potential. However, in my opinion, 'critical' social historians exaggerate the need for models, which are often far removed from historical reality.

Third, by analysing political developments and decisions, German social historians have justifiably emphasized economic and social interests, which have often been neglected. Unlike the social historians primarily influenced by Conze, the 'critical' social historians underestimated the importance of situational constraints, and the significance of ideas and power politics. Some of them, for example Wehler, have at times assumed a role which I believe is unsuitable for a historian, namely that of muckraker and public prosecutor. This can be explained partly in terms of the political and educational aims of the 'critical' social historians, who were strongly influenced by the radical reform movements of the late 1960s and early 1970s. Both criticism of traditional history from within the discipline, and the usually

indirect but often extreme criticism of the social and political status quo were intrinsic to this new view of history. The shift in emphasis within the discipline and the new approach were thus partly the result of changes outside historiography. This interaction of factors was not coincidental and undoubtedly encumbered the scholarly discussion. It explains why debates between the different directions of German historiography have sometimes been so heated.

Fourth, all schools of recent social history have built up stronger ties with other social sciences, helping German historiography to overcome the international isolation of the post-war years. At the same time, the link with the forgotten traditions of political economy, historical sociology, comparative constitutional history, and cultural history in the work of Gustav Schmoller, Max Weber, Otto Hintze, and Karl Lamprecht has been revived. More neighbouring disciplines have been accepted as relevant, and the subjective dimension of individual and collective experiences and mentalities is valued more highly than it was.

Fifth, the comparative approach advocated and applied with considerable success by some social historians has established a methodology that, although difficult to use, is extremely fruitful. Of all current approaches it comes closest to the scientific method of verifying results by experimentation.

Sixth, in the first two volumes of his *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte* Wehler attempted to fulfil the ambitious demand made by 'critical' social historians for a history of society synthesizing large historical periods, the driving forces behind change, and the various spheres of reality. The success of this attempt can only be judged when the whole work is finished. It is already clear, however, that certain theoretical shortcomings in the original concept, such as the undue emphasis on the Industrial Revolution as a turning point in history, and the inappropriate use of terminology relating to the period of industrialization, have since been overcome. Correctly understood, the concept of a history of society can combat the constant danger of history falling apart into a large number of unconnected historical subdisciplines.

Seventh, the historiography of Germany was initially dominated by social-economic interpretations of political history rather than by social history in the narrow sense. To this extent, the new German social history is more closely linked to older German

traditions than its practitioners themselves realized. Since then, however, this one-sidedness has been overcome, and social conditions, institutions, and groups have become the subjects of research in their own right, and no longer only in connection with political history.

Eighth, the disastrous consequences of the Nazi victory for the world and for Germany meant that German historiography concentrated on analysing the origins of this victory. As a result, however, the German *Sonderweg* was exaggerated and too simply condemned. Although 1933 will continue to be an important and valid focus for German historiography, after more than forty years of the Federal Republic's existence, it should not be the only point of reference. There are other continuities in German history that are by no means purely negative,<sup>162</sup> for example, German federalism or Germany's leading role in the creation of the modern welfare state.<sup>163</sup>

## VIII

### *The Expansion and Diversification of Social History since 1960*

In attempting to define social history in relation to other historical disciplines and other social sciences, and to specify the subjects and methods that are characteristic of it, we must look beyond the scholarly debate. We must be aware that the subjects and methods of social history are largely determined by the practical, concrete work of the social historian and not by theoretical discussion.<sup>164</sup> The work of social historians displays several typical features. The subject matter is constantly 'expanding',<sup>165</sup> methods are being refined, and it is becoming increasingly specialized and diversified. A number of developments have contributed to this. Specific journals exist for social history – the most important being *Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*,<sup>166</sup> and *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*. Chairs of social and economic history have been established at most German universities, and the number of people engaged in historical research has grown, with an especially large increase between 1960 and the mid-1970s.<sup>167</sup> Since then, the expansion has stopped as a result of relative economic stagnation after 1973, and the declining demand for history

teachers at secondary schools. Social history and *Alltagsgeschichte*, however, have fed into the new historical museums being set up, and they have influenced important historical exhibitions. Compared with Britain and the United States, German social history has separated itself less from other areas of history. It is, in fact, often pursued in combination with other branches of history – typically with economic history and political history, but increasingly also with cultural history.

Agricultural history and historical demography are among the traditional areas of research in social and economic history. In agricultural history, Wilhelm Abel's work has long provided a model of how economic factors, especially the effects of business cycles on prices and incomes, can be taken into account, supplementing the formal analyses of agrarian systems, which used to dominate the subject.<sup>168</sup> Recent research in the Federal Republic, as well as in the former German Democratic Republic, focused on the social consequences of the emancipation of the peasants, and on the changes in rural life caused by an increase in the size of the lower classes, the industrialization of rural regions, and the application of capitalist methods to agriculture.<sup>169</sup>

'Protoindustrialization' is an area of special interest. It is being studied mainly by scholars at the Max Planck Institute for History in Göttingen, who use an original combination of approaches from economic, social and cultural history. Their research, which is strongly influenced by anthropology, ethnology, geography, and historical demography, has suggested that there is a close connection between rural home industries and proletarianization. They point out that the importance of the Industrial Revolution and the factory system for the making of the working class should not be overemphasized.<sup>170</sup>

Historical demography has generally concentrated on the quantitative analysis of population structures and mobility. By combining the study of quantitative and qualitative sources, however, Arthur E. Imhof has extended it to include people's specific experiences and mentalities, mainly concerning the meaning of old age, sickness, and death.<sup>171</sup>

The major migration movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have been the subject of detailed investigation. Research has focused not only on German mass emigration overseas, and the different forms of internal migration (long-distance, local, seasonal), but also increasingly on the immigrations

tion of foreign workers and the conditions under which they live and work.<sup>172</sup>

Internal German migration was mainly, but not exclusively, a movement from the rural agrarian regions to the cities and centres of industry, and was thus one of the causes of rapid urbanization. In the past, urban history in Germany tended to be the preserve of medievalists and early modernists. More recently, however, modern methods of demography and social history have increasingly been used in the study of nineteenth and twentieth-century cities.<sup>173</sup> Related to the growing interest in modern urban history, the history of living conditions, of everyday life, and of the family, is the growing tendency of social historians to look at the development of housing conditions,<sup>174</sup> and nutrition.<sup>175</sup>

One of the most rapidly expanding new fields of research in modern social history is family history. Although the *historische Rechtsschule*, family sociology, and, of course, ethnology have long dealt with the family, historians did not discover the topic until the late 1950s and early 1960s. German research in this field has developed only since the mid-1970s, and it has been influenced mainly by developments in the USA, Britain, and France. Especially in France, but to a certain degree also in Britain, family history is closely related to historical demography. 'Reconstructing' families, that is, tracing the genealogies of families in a parish over several generations from public sources such as parish records, and applying quantifying procedures to them – a highly labour-intensive method – enables precise statements to be made concerning marriage rates, the average age at marriage, fertility and mortality rates for specific age groups, births out of wedlock, etc. for limited local regions.<sup>176</sup> German research, however, has concentrated mainly on gender relations and relations between the generations, the significance of different phases of life, the economic functions of the family, and the issue of its class character,<sup>177</sup> thereby helping to counteract the trend to restrict family history solely to the genealogical family while largely ignoring the family as a social group.

Women's history as a special area of historical research was first established in Germany in the early 1970s. It grew out of the new autonomous women's movement, but was crucially influenced by work in other countries, mainly the USA and Britain, where women's history had developed earlier and had made a

greater impact on the academic profession. At first there was a tendency in Germany to treat women's history in isolation from other historical areas and to some extent this still persists. However, most historians working in the field would now accept that the attempt to make the place of women in history visible, to describe the special experiences of women and to deal with the relationships of different groups of women with each other (housewives and servants, mothers and daughters etc.) and with men will reveal the wide range of women's existences. These have been influenced not only, and possibly not even mainly, by gender, but also by class, religion, ethnicity, and forms of employment and work. Women's history is thus an important part of social history, or, to be more precise, a special way of looking at social history, and also at general history. A large number of studies has been written in particular on the position of women in society, the different forms of women's work, and the experiences of women and the role of women in public and political life.<sup>178</sup>

The historical analysis of social differentiation has in general switched from emphasizing occupation, income, estate, status, social group, and class, to looking at areas such as age, and membership of specific generations, ethnic and religious minorities,<sup>179</sup> as well as gender. Important studies have also recently been written on poverty, sickness, and criminality.<sup>180</sup>

As mentioned above in the discussion of *Alltagsgeschichte*, traditional social history has been expanded to include the history of culture and experience. *Alltagsgeschichte* has also stimulated the study of leisure, rituals, gestures and symbols, festivals, popular piety, mentalities, and concepts of honour.<sup>181</sup> In addition, the social dimension of the history of reading habits and education has recently received more attention.<sup>182</sup>

Quantifying methods and computer analysis are not as widely used in German social history as they are in France or the USA. However, they are commonly used in German historical demography to study the collective biographies of specific groups, such as monastic communities, or parliamentarians, and to examine stratification and social mobility in past societies. The establishment about ten years ago of a workshop for quantification and methodology in historical and social science research (*Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Quantifizierung und Methoden in der historisch-sozialwissenschaftlichen Forschung*), of a publication series,

*Schriftenreihe historisch-sozialwissenschaftlicher Forschungen*, and the journal *Historische Sozialforschung Quantum-Information*, gave quantitative historiography in the Federal Republic of Germany an institutional basis and a platform for the discussion and dissemination of its ideas.<sup>183</sup>

The 'classic' topics of social history – social inequality, social mobility, and social class – are still relevant, despite the recent emphasis on experiences, customs, and mentalities. Indeed, the best work in family history, women's history, disease, and folk culture has shown that a status-group and class-based perspective usually proves to be as fruitful as the examination of regional differences. Social inequality, that is, the unequal 'distribution of scarce material and non-material goods and services within a society',<sup>184</sup> can be expressed in terms of wealth, income, educational opportunities, medical care, working conditions, and protection by law. Social inequality, its intensification and decline, has scarcely been addressed by German historians. So far, the most important work in this field has been done by Hartmut Kaelble. Building on his earlier studies of social mobility and the opportunities for advancement and the threat of decline, Kaelble has increasingly turned to the fundamental issue of equality of opportunity. He has examined the impact on inequality of industrialization, urbanization, shifts in occupational structures, changes in population and family structures, associated changes in mentalities and opinions, as well as business cycles, political upheavals, and economic fluctuations.<sup>185</sup> Kaelble's work stands out because it compares Germany with other Western European countries and with the USA not only in order to explain German peculiarities, but also to establish general trends in the development of modern Western industrial societies.

The literature on the history of estates, classes, status groups, and occupations covers quite a broad range, but it does not include all the important groups in the population. Over the last twenty years, the greatest progress has been made in investigating the working classes. Local and regional history has made an important contribution. By integrating problems of social history, the best work has swept away the predominant one-sided emphasis on organizational and ideological questions in the historiography of the labour movement and the history of socialist ideas and parties.<sup>186</sup> In general, however, recent work on the emergence, internal structures, and position of the working

class in Germany, in individual German cities and regions, and recently also in specific industries,<sup>187</sup> has tended to neglect the organization of workers in political parties and unions. Thus, we still need a comprehensive social history of the working classes and the labour movement that combines the two areas.<sup>188</sup> We also lack a history of the unions which links the still dominant field of organizational history with economic developments in individual industries and professions, specific working conditions, technological changes, and the behaviour of entrepreneurs.<sup>189</sup>

In recent years working-class culture has been the subject of intense study. It is no longer identified almost exclusively with the activities of the labour movement's cultural and leisure organizations. Inspired by cultural anthropology (*Volkskunde*) and *Alltagsgeschichte*, historians have begun to examine workers' festivals, clubs, associations and sociability, the ways in which workers lived, ate, and dressed, as well as their value systems and forms of behaviour.<sup>190</sup>

The study of social conflict and protest has also profited from this new approach. We now know much more about machine breaking and unrest among homeworkers during the early phase of industrialization, and we have a deeper understanding of the motives and actions of protesting workers.<sup>191</sup>

Research on strike movements in Germany is only just beginning.<sup>192</sup> However, several studies suggest that there was a clear correlation between business cycles and strikes as early as the Kaiserreich. Some historians believe that the growth in collective bargaining and movements for improving living and working conditions without resort to strikes is evidence of rationalization and modernization in labour disputes. Others stress the importance of strike waves, of spontaneous strikes, and of the large differences in strike behaviour in the various branches of industry. They question the former interpretation of the development of strikes in Germany before 1945.

German social historians have done a great deal of work on artisans and white-collar employees as well as on workers. In fact, the study of artisans is part of a long tradition; initially artisans were investigated in response to the fear that the skilled crafts were dying out as a result of the rise of factory industries. Yet early inquiries, including those of the *Verein für Sozialpolitik* (Association for Social Policy),<sup>193</sup> suggested that the skilled crafts were not in general decline at all. Rather, it was necessary to

differentiate between new, expanding crafts, and stagnating, shrinking, or dying ones. Recent studies stress the ability of skilled craftsmen as a group to adapt to economic change, and emphasize the new opportunities provided by the expansion of the service sector as a result of population growth, and by the chance to sell, install, and repair mass industrial goods, and to supply industry.<sup>194</sup> The crafts also played an important part in training skilled workers for industry, a role which they still have today.<sup>195</sup> Historians at first tended to concentrate on economic aspects, but over the last twenty years or so, their interests have expanded to include topics such as the culture and politics of artisans, and their relationship with the working classes.<sup>196</sup>

Jürgen Kocka has largely been responsible for advancing the study of a long neglected topic: the emergence of white-collar workers as a group. As one of the occupational groups whose importance has grown constantly in modern industrial society, its structure, political preferences, and relationships with other social groups have been major topics of research in the last fifteen years.<sup>197</sup>

By comparison, the social history of the German *Bürgertum*, which includes the majority of white-collar workers, is still in its infancy. The *Bürgertum* is an extremely complex social class, encompassing many different ways of life and value systems. A special research centre for the study of the 'Social History of the Modern German *Bürgertum* from an International, Comparative Perspective' established by the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*, and a research group working on '*Bürger, Bürgerlichkeit, and bürgerliche Society – the Nineteenth Century from a European Comparative Perspective*', both at the University of Bielefeld, may be able to fill at least some of the existing gaps.<sup>198</sup>

Another field that has made good progress, largely as the result of systematic support by a new society which organizes frequent conferences and publishes its own journal, has been the social history of entrepreneurs.<sup>199</sup> The *Kleinbürgertum* (petty bourgeoisie),<sup>200</sup> the *Bildungsbürgertum* (educated middle classes),<sup>201</sup> the increasing professionalization of such occupational groups as university professors, medical doctors, and engineers,<sup>202</sup> and the German civil service have all become increasingly popular topics of historical research.<sup>203</sup>

The lack of research on the aristocracy in Germany is surprising. We have an excellent study by Heinz Gollwitzer of the high

aristocracy which was mediatised during the period of secularization and nation-building at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Heinz Reif has examined the continued existence and successful adaptation to new economic, social, and political circumstances of the aristocracy in the region of Münster, in a methodologically sound collective biography.<sup>204</sup> However, we have neither a comprehensive survey of the aristocracy in the German states,<sup>205</sup> nor a detailed modern study of the social, political and economic history of the old Prussian aristocracy of East Elbia.<sup>206</sup> As an integral part of the political, military and social élite before 1918, their significance for the development of Prussia and Germany is pointed out in many works on German history.

As I have already mentioned, German social history has not only looked at social structures and processes, and the experiences and lifestyles of former societies, but has also been of benefit to other historical disciplines. For example, it has encouraged political historians to take more account of economic and social interests in their analyses of political decision-making. The best studies in legal history also pay attention to the social context of legal developments.<sup>207</sup> Constitutional and administrative history, and the history of parliamentarism and political parties, have increasingly absorbed the methods and approaches of social history. The study of elections has developed into a separate discipline. Examining voting behaviour, it casts light on the relationship between social, economic, and religious structures, political and social organizations, and practical politics, and provides insights into the social basis of political parties. This approach has proved especially useful for the analysis of the party system in the Kaiserreich, of the NSDAP's rise to become a mass movement by 1933, and of the changes in the electoral support of political parties in the Federal Republic.<sup>208</sup>

Social policy, and in particular its deeper causes and the social, economic, and political consequences of policy decisions, have been the subject of much recent work.<sup>209</sup>

The methods of social history have also proved successful for the study of individual periods, and important issues in modern history. The peasant protest movements of early modern Europe,<sup>210</sup> and the Enlightenment are examples of areas in which they have been applied. As well as analysing the thought of leading men of the Enlightenment, historians have called for a

'social history of the German Enlightenment'.<sup>211</sup> This reveals the amount of attention paid to the social context and the dissemination of the Enlightenment, including the means by which its ideas were propagated, the social position of its supporters, and efforts to enlighten the people. A wide-ranging research project under the direction of Wolfgang Schieder at the University of Trier is examining the social consequences of secularization in the region on the left bank of the Rhine with the help of computer analysis.<sup>212</sup>

An interdisciplinary, large-scale international research project is currently studying 'Inflation and Reconstruction in Germany and Europe, 1914-1924'. By combining the approaches of economic, social, cultural, and political history, it has fundamentally increased our knowledge of the causes and consequences of one of the most important phenomena of the time, inflation, which had previously been studied almost exclusively by economists.<sup>213</sup>

For a long time, research on National Socialism was strongly influenced by the terms and methods of political science, and tended to concentrate on the nature of the system of Nazi rule. The advance of social history has encouraged the study of other issues, such as the structure of the electorate, and of the membership of the NSDAP and its auxiliary organizations, Nazi policies towards different social groups and the impact of these policies on their social position, and everyday life under National Socialism.<sup>214</sup> The social history of the resistance to National Socialism in Germany has recently also begun to be written, with highly interesting results.<sup>215</sup> The issue of continuity or discontinuity is the central theme of a volume of studies dealing with the social history of the years from the Battle of Stalingrad in 1943 to the currency reform of 1948, and another volume of articles summing up research on the social history of the Federal Republic of Germany.<sup>216</sup>

The broad spectrum of research presented here should not lead us to conclude that social history is advancing more quickly than other subdisciplines of history. Since the end of the 1970s the criticism of tradition and the establishment associated with the 'critical' social history, and the trend toward socio-economic analysis of society and politics have more or less given way to the new emphasis on experiences, culture, and the social environment (*Lebenswelt*) associated with *Alltagsgeschichte*. And many political historians have stressed the relative independence of the

sphere of politics, and the significance of alliance systems and power politics, often directing their remarks specifically against social historians.

I believe that it is of great importance for the future development of German historiography for the various schools of thought to overcome their tendency to isolate themselves and to turn the differences in their positions into dogma. The existing pluralism of methods, approaches, and fields of research must be seen as a strength, not as a weakness. Only in this way can German research profit fully from international research, and make its own contribution.

## REFERENCES

- 1 Werner Conze, 'Sozialgeschichte', in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*, vol. 6, 3rd edn, (Tübingen, 1962), col. 169. For a definition of social history, cf. also W. Conze, 'Sozialgeschichte', in Hans-Ulrich Wehler (ed.), *Moderne deutsche Sozialgeschichte* (Cologne and Berlin, 1966), pp. 19-26; Hans Mommsen, 'Sozialgeschichte', *ibid.*, pp 27-34.
- 2 G. M. Trevelyan, *Illustrated English Social History* (London etc., 1951), p. xi.
- 3 Compare Thomas Nipperdey, 'Die anthropologische Dimension der Geschichtswissenschaft', in id., *Gesellschaft, Kultur, Theorie. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur neueren Geschichte* (Göttingen, 1976), pp. 33-58.
- 4 Lorenz von Stein, *Geschichte der sozialen Bewegung in Frankreich von 1789 bis auf unsere Tage*, ed. by Gottfried Salomon, 3 vols (Munich, 1921), vol. 2, esp. pp. 64ff. and 99ff. This work, which was first published in 1850, is an extended version of his earlier *Der Sozialismus und Communismus des heutigen Frankreichs. Ein Beitrag zur Zeitgeschichte*, published in 1842. For the great influence of the 1848 revolution on the development of Stein's ideas, see Felix Gilbert, 'From Political to Social History: Lorenz von Stein and the Revolution of 1848', in F. Gilbert, *History. Choice and Commitment* (Cambridge, Mass., and London, 1977), pp. 411-21.
- 5 Gerhard A. Ritter, *Der Sozialstaat. Entstehung und Entwicklung im internationalen Vergleich* (Munich, 1989), pp. 68-71.
- 6 Cf. Dirk Blasius, 'Lorenz von Stein', in Hans-Ulrich Wehler (ed.), *Deutsche Historiker*, vol. 1 (Göttingen, 1971), pp. 25-38.
- 7 Heinrich von Treitschke, *Die Gesellschaftswissenschaft. Ein kritischer Versuch* (Leipzig, 1859).
- 8 Heinrich von Treitschke, *Deutsche Geschichte im Neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, new edn, 5 vols (Leipzig, 1927).
- 9 Rudolf Vierhaus, *Ranke und die soziale Welt* (Münster, 1957).
- 10 Important for this topic is Gerhard Oestreich, 'Die Fachgeschichte und die Anfänge der sozialgeschichtlichen Forschung in Deutschland', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 208 (1969), pp. 320-63. Cf. also Matti Viikari, *Die Krise der 'historistischen' Geschichtsschreibung und die Geschichtsmethodologie Karl Lamprechts* (Helsinki, 1977); Karl Heinz Metz, *Grundformen historiographischen Denkens. Wissenschaftsgeschichte als Methodologie. Dargestellt an Ranke, Treitschke und Lamprecht. Mit einem Anhang über zeitgenössische Geschichtstheorie* (Munich, 1979); and Luise Schorn-Schütte, *Karl Lamprecht. Kulturgeschichtsschreibung zwischen Wissenschaft und Politik* (Göttingen, 1984).
- 11 Karl Lamprecht, *Deutsche Geschichte*, 12 vols and 2 supplementary vols (Berlin, 1891-1909).

- 12 See Luise Schorn-Schütte, 'Karl Lamprecht und die Internationale Geschichtswissenschaft an der Jahrhundertwende', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, 67 (1985), pp. 417-64. For the international context, see also Ernst Schulin, *Traditionskritik und Rekonstruktionsversuch. Studien zur Entwicklung von Geschichtswissenschaft und historischem Denken* (Göttingen, 1979), pp. 148ff.
- 13 Cf. Jürgen Kocka (ed.), *Max Weber, der Historiker* (Göttingen, 1986).
- 14 Werner Sombart, *Der Moderne Kapitalismus*, vols 1 and 2 (Leipzig, 1902), vol. 3 (Munich and Leipzig, 1927). A reprint of this study, the first two volumes of which were published in a completely revised second edition in 1916, has been published in six volumes (Munich, 1987). For the reception of this work see Bernhard vom Brocke (ed.), *Sombarts 'Moderner Kapitalismus'. Materialien zur Kritik und Rezeption* (Munich, 1987).
- 15 On this point, cf. Theodor Schieder, 'Der Typus in der Geschichtswissenschaft' (1952), in T. Schieder, *Staat und Gesellschaft im Wandel unserer Zeit*, 3rd edn (Munich, 1974), pp. 172-87, and T. Schieder, *Geschichte als Wissenschaft. Eine Einführung*, 2nd edn (Munich and Vienna, 1968).
- 16 Otto Hintze, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, ed. by Gerhard Oestreich, 3 vols, 2nd edn (Göttingen, 1962-1967), foreword by G. Oestreich in vol. 2, pp. 5f. As an introduction, see Jürgen Kocka, 'Otto Hintze', in H.-U. Wehler, *Deutsche Historiker* (see note 6), vol. 3 (Göttingen, 1973), pp. 41-68. On the fate of the manuscript of Hintze's *Allgemeine Verfassungsgeschichte* see Brigitta Oestreich, 'Hedwig und Otto Hintze. Eine biographische Skizze', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 11 (1985), pp. 415-17.
- 17 Wolfram Fischer, 'Sozialgeschichte und Wirtschaftsgeschichte', in Wolfgang Schieder and Volker Sellin (eds), *Sozialgeschichte in Deutschland. Entwicklungen und Perspektiven in internationalem Zusammenhang*, 4 vols, vol. 1 (Göttingen, 1986-87), pp. 53-66. The close connection between social and economic history is reflected in the titles of the discipline's two main handbooks in the Federal Republic: Hermann Aubin and Wolfgang Zorn (eds), *Handbuch der deutschen Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte*, 2 vols (Stuttgart, 1971-1976), and *Handbuch der europäischen Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte*, vols 5 and 6, ed. by Wolfram Fischer (Stuttgart, 1985-1987).
- 18 Hans Herzfeld, 'Staat und Nation in der deutschen Geschichtsschreibung der Weimarer Zeit', in *Veritas, Justitia, Libertas. Festschrift zur 200-Jahr-Feier der Columbia University, New York, überreicht von der Freien Universität und der Deutschen Hochschule für Politik Berlin* (Berlin, 1954), pp. 129-43.
- 19 Helmut Heiber, *Walter Frank und sein Reichsinstitut für Geschichte des neuen Deutschlands* (Stuttgart, 1966).

- 20 For the connections between Otto Brunner's 'politische Volksgeschichte' (political history of the people) of 1943 and the new social history see Winfried Schulze, *Deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft nach 1945* (Munich, 1989), pp. 289-301. See also Otto Gerhard Oexle, 'Sozialgeschichte – Begriffsgeschichte – Wissenschaftsgeschichte. Analysen zum Werk Otto Brunners', *Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 71 (1984), pp. 305-41; Klaus Schreiner, 'Wissenschaft von der Geschichte des Mittelalters nach 1945. Kontinuitäten und Diskontinuitäten der Mittelalterforschung im geteilten Deutschland', in Ernst Schulin and Elisabeth Müller-Luckner (eds), *Deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg (1945-1965)* (Munich, 1989), pp. 87-145, here pp. 136 ff.
- 21 Cf. Hans Schleier, *Die bürgerliche deutsche Geschichtsschreibung der Weimarer Zeit*, vol. 1: *Strömungen – Konzeptionen – Institutionen*; vol. 2: *Die linksliberalen Historiker* (East Berlin, 1975). For Rosenberg see Gerhard A. Ritter, 'Hans Rosenberg 1904-1988', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 15 (1989), pp. 282-302, and Heinrich August Winkler, 'Ein Erneuerer der Geschichtswissenschaft. Hans Rosenberg 1904-1988', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 248 (1989), pp. 529-55.
- 22 Georg G. Iggers, 'Die deutschen Historiker', in Bernd Faulenbach (ed.), *Geschichtswissenschaft in Deutschland. Traditionelle Positionen und gegenwärtige Aufgaben* (Munich, 1974), pp. 97-111.
- 23 Remarks in a letter by Friedrich Meinecke to Gustav Mayer, dated 22 March 1946, in Friedrich Meinecke, *Ausgewählter Briefwechsel*, ed. and introduced by Ludwig Dehio and Peter Classen (Stuttgart, 1962), p. 247; Friedrich Meinecke, *Die deutsche Katastrophe. Betrachtungen und Erinnerungen*, 5th edn (Wiesbaden, 1955).
- 24 In the words of Wolfgang J. Mommsen, 'Gegenwärtige Tendenzen in der Geschichtsschreibung der Bundesrepublik', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 7 (1981), pp. 149-88, here p. 150.
- 25 Cf. Werner Conze, 'Die deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft seit 1945. Bedingungen und Ergebnisse', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 225 (1977), pp. 1-28, here p. 4.
- 26 Gerhard A. Ritter, *Hans Herzfeld. Persönlichkeit und Werk* (Berlin, 1983), esp. pp. 53-6.
- 27 Gerhard Ritter, 'Gegenwärtige Lage und Zukunftsaufgaben deutscher Geschichtswissenschaft', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 170 (1950), pp. 1-22, here pp. 2f.
- 28 Ibid., pp. 8f.
- 29 Ibid., pp. 9, 17.
- 30 Hans Herzfeld, *Die moderne Welt 1789-1945*, 2 vols (Brunswick, 1950-1952).
- 31 Ernst Schulin, 'Zur Restauration und langsamen Weiterentwicklung der deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft nach 1945', in Schulin, *Traditionskritik* (note 12), pp. 133-43, here p. 139.

- 32 Wolfram Fischer published parts of Stadelmann's research after his death. See Rudolf Stadelmann and Wolfram Fischer, *Die Bildungswelt des deutschen Handwerkers um 1800. Studien zur Soziologie des Kleinbürgers im Zeitalter Goethes* (Berlin, 1955).
- 33 Rudolf Stadelmann, foreword to *Soziale und politische Geschichte der Revolution von 1848* (Munich, 1948). Stadelmann's interest in German revolutions (including that of 1933) had already developed during the Third Reich. See Schulze, *Deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft* (note 20), p. 115.
- 34 Hans-Ulrich Wehler, a student of Schieder's, emphasizes his influence. Nearly 50 per cent of dissertations completed under Schieder's supervision were published in book form and approximately 50 per cent of his Ph. D. students pursued academic careers. See 'Geschichtswissenschaft heute', in Jürgen Habermas (ed.), *Stichworte zur 'Geistigen Situation der Zeit'*, 2 vols (Frankfurt/M., 1979), vol. 2, pp. 709-53, here p. 725.
- 35 Wolfgang J. Mommsen, 'Gegenwärtige Tendenzen' (note 24), pp. 156f.
- 36 Karl Dietrich Bracher, *Die Auflösung der Weimarer Republik. Eine Studie zum Problem des Machtverfalls in der Demokratie*, 2nd edn, (Stuttgart and Düsseldorf, 1957).
- 37 See the review by Conze in *Historische Zeitschrift*, 183 (1957), pp. 378-82. Conze withdrew some of his original criticism in a review of the second edition in *Historische Zeitschrift*, 187 (1959), pp. 407f.
- 38 In a 'postscript' to the first edition of his book, *Bureaucracy, Aristocracy and Autocracy. The Prussian Experience 1660-1815* (Cambridge, Mass., 1958), p. 237, Hans Rosenberg called Bracher's study 'the most outstanding contribution' to come from a group of young historians whom he expected to make 'a fresh start in German historiography'. The postscript was omitted in later editions of Rosenberg's book.
- 39 For this suggestion see Schulze, *Traditionskritik* (note 12), p. 140.
- 40 By July 1990 the *Kommission* had brought out 153 publications, some of which consisted of several volumes. Of these, 92 studies are in the series *Beiträge*; 35 were collections of sources. Six volumes were published in the series *Handbuch der Geschichte des deutschen Parlamentarismus*.
- 41 Winfried Schulze, *Deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft* (note 20), pp. 292-96.
- 42 Hans Medick, 'Privilegiertes Handelskapital und "kleine Industrie". Produktion und Produktionsverhältnisse im Leinengewerbe des altwürttembergischen Oberamts Urach im 18. Jahrhundert', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 23 (1983), pp. 267-310, here p. 268.
- 43 This is how Conze puts it in his very personally coloured report 'Der Weg zur Sozialgeschichte nach 1945', in Christoph Schneider

- (ed.), *Forschung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Beispiele, Kritik, Vorschläge* (Weinheim, etc., 1983), pp. 73-81, here p. 74. The difference between Conze's and Braudel's usage of the term 'structural history' and the direct continuity between Conze's sociological concept of 'Volksgeschichte' (history of the people) before 1945 and his use of the concept of 'structural history' after 1950 are discussed by Reinhart Koselleck, 'Werner Conze. Tradition und Innovation', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 245 (1987), pp. 529-43, here pp. 536-37.
- 44 Otto Brunner, 'Das Problem einer europäischen Sozialgeschichte' (1954), in O. Brunner, *Neue Wege der Verfassungs- und Sozialgeschichte*, 2nd expanded edn (Göttingen, 1968), pp. 80-102, quotation on p. 80. For Brunner's concept and its origins in the 1930s see also Oexle, 'Sozialgeschichte – Begriffsgeschichte – Wissenschaftsgeschichte' (note 20).
- 45 On this topic see Jürgen Kocka, 'Sozialgeschichte zwischen Strukturgeschichte und Erfahrungsgeschichte', in Schieder and Sellin (eds), *Sozialgeschichte in Deutschland* (note 17), vol. 1, pp. 67-88, esp. p. 69. On Conze's historiography, see now W. Schieder, 'Sozialgeschichte zwischen Soziologie und Geschichte. Das wissenschaftliche Lebenswerk Werner Conzes', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 13 (1987), pp. 244-66.
- 46 Conze, 'Der Weg zur Sozialgeschichte' (note 43), p. 74.
- 47 Werner Conze, *Die Strukturgeschichte des technisch-industriellen Zeitalters als Aufgabe für Forschung und Unterricht* (Cologne and Opladen, 1957).
- 48 Ibid., p. 18.
- 49 Conze, 'Der Weg zur Sozialgeschichte' (note 43), p. 74.
- 50 Werner Conze, 'Vom "Pöbel" zum "Proletariat". Sozialgeschichtliche Voraussetzungen für den Sozialismus in Deutschland', reprinted in Wehler (ed.), *Sozialgeschichte* (note 1), pp. 111-36.
- 51 Werner Conze (ed.), *Staat und Gesellschaft im deutschen Vormärz 1818-1848*, 2nd edn (Stuttgart, 1970).
- 52 Id., 'Nation und Gesellschaft. Zwei Grundbegriffe der revolutionären Epoche', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 198 (1964), pp. 1-16.
- 53 Otto Brunner, Werner Conze and Reinhart Koselleck (eds), *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, vol. 1 (Stuttgart, 1972), introduction by R. Koselleck, p. xiv. Six volumes were published between 1972 and 1990. On the whole structure of the project see R. Koselleck, 'Richtlinien für das Lexikon politisch-sozialer Begriffe der Neuzeit', *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte*, 11 (1967), pp. 81-99.
- 54 On the relationship between social history and *Begriffsgeschichte*, see Reinhart Koselleck, 'Sozialgeschichte und Begriffsgeschichte', in Schieder and Sellin (eds), *Sozialgeschichte in Deutschland* (note 17), vol. 1, pp. 89-109.

- 55      *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, (note 53), vol. 1, xv.
- 56      For the founding of the *Arbeitskreis* see Schulze, *Deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft* (note 20), pp. 254–62.
- 57      Cf. Wolfram Fischer, *Der Staat und die Anfänge der Industrialisierung in Baden 1800–1850*, vol. 1: *Die staatliche Gewerbepolitik* (Berlin, 1962); id., *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft im Zeitalter der Industrialisierung. Aufsätze – Studien – Vorträge* (Göttingen, 1972); id. (ed.), *Wirtschafts- und sozialgeschichtliche Probleme der frühen Industrialisierung* (Berlin, 1968); id., *Unternehmerschaft, Selbstverwaltung und Staat. Die Handelskammern in der deutschen Wirtschafts- und Staatsverfassung des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1964); id., *Handwerksrecht und Handwerkswirtschaft um 1800. Studien zur Sozial- und Wirtschaftsverfassung vor der industriellen Revolution* (Berlin, 1955); and id. and Georg Bajohr (eds), *Die soziale Frage. Neuere Studien zur Lage der Fabrikarbeiter in der Frühphase der Industrialisierung* (Stuttgart, 1957).
- 58      Cf. Wolfgang Köllmann, *Bevölkerung in der industriellen Revolution. Studien zur Bevölkerungsgeschichte Deutschlands* (Göttingen, 1974); id., *Sozialgeschichte der Stadt Barmen im 19. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen, 1960).
- 59      Great interest was shown in the Berlin Historical Commission's research project, headed by Otto Büsch, on the development of trade and industry in Berlin and the Mark Brandenburg from the beginning of the nineteenth century to 1870. See Otto Büsch (ed.), *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Frühen Industrialisierung vornehmlich im Wirtschaftsraum Berlin/Brandenburg* (Berlin and New York, 1971); Hartmut Kaelble, *Berliner Unternehmer während der frühen Industrialisierung. Herkunft, sozialer Status und politischer Einfluss* (Berlin and New York, 1972); Jürgen Bergmann, *Das Berliner Handwerk in der Frühphase der Industrialisierung* (Berlin, 1973); Ingrid Thiel, *Städtewachstum im Industrialisierungsprozeß des 19. Jahrhunderts. Das Berliner Beispiel* (Berlin and New York, 1973); Peter Lundgreen, *Techniker in Preußen während der frühen Industrialisierung. Ausbildung und Berufsfeld einer entstehenden sozialen Gruppe* (Berlin, 1975); O. Büsch, *Industrialisierung und Gewerbe im Raum Berlin/Brandenburg 1800–1850. Eine empirische Untersuchung zur gewerblichen Wirtschaft einer hauptstadtgebundenen Wirtschaftsregion in früh-industrieller Zeit* (Berlin, 1971); id. (ed.), *Industrialisierung und Gewerbe im Raum Berlin/Brandenburg*, vol. 2: *Die Zeit um 1800 / Die Zeit um 1875* (Berlin, 1977).
- 60      Rudolf Braun, *Industrialisierung und Volksleben*, part I: *Veränderungen der Lebensformen unter Einwirkung der verlagsindustriellen Heimarbeit in einem ländlichen Industriegebiet vor 1800 (Zürcher Oberland)* (Göttingen, 2nd edn 1979; 1st edn 1960); part II: *Sozialer und kultureller Wandel in einem ländlichen Industriegebiet (Zürcher Oberland) unter Einwirkung des Maschinen- und Fabrikwesens im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Erlenbach-Zürich and Stuttgart, 1965).

- 61 Fritz Fischer, *Griff nach der Weltmacht. Die Kriegszielpolitik des kaiserlichen Deutschland 1914/18*, 1st edn (1961), 3rd edn (Düsseldorf, 1964), English translation: *Germany's Aims in the First World War* (London, 1967). Of the later, controversial discussion, which assumed enormous proportions, only the following are worth mentioning here: Ernst Wilhelm Graf Lynar (ed.), *Deutsche Kriegsziele 1914-18. Eine Diskussion* (Frankfurt/M. and Berlin, 1964); Wolfgang Schieder (ed.), *Erster Weltkrieg. Ursachen, Entstehung und Kriegsziele* (Cologne, 1969); F. Fischer, *Weltmacht oder Niedergang. Deutschland im Ersten Weltkrieg* (Frankfurt/M., 1965), English translation: *World Power or Decline: the Controversy over Germany's Aims in the First World War* (New York, 1974); James Joll, 'War Guilt 1914. A Continuing Controversy', in Paul Kluge and Peter Alter (eds), *Aspekte der deutsch-britischen Beziehungen im Laufe der Jahrhunderte* (Stuttgart, 1978), pp. 60-80; Egmont Zechlin, *Krieg und Kriegsrisiko. Zur deutschen Politik im Ersten Weltkrieg. Aufsätze* (Düsseldorf, 1979); Wolfgang Jäger, *Historische Forschung und politische Kultur in Deutschland. Die Debatte 1914-1980 über den Ausbruch des Ersten Weltkrieges* (Göttingen, 1984); Gregor Schöllgen, 'Griff nach der Weltmacht? 25 Jahre Fischer-Kontroverse', *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 106 (1986), pp. 386-406; id. (ed.), *Escape into War? The Foreign Policy of Imperial Germany* (New York, Oxford and Munich, 1990). For a well-balanced and up-to-date account of the origins of the war see J. Joll, *The Origins of the First World War* (London and New York, 1984).
- 62 Mommsen, 'Gegenwärtige Tendenzen' (note 24), pp. 159f. Conze, 'Deutsche Geschichtswissenschaft' (note 25), pp. 13f., Wehler, 'Geschichtswissenschaft heute' (note 34), pp. 709f., 723f., 727ff.; Georg G. Iggers, *Neue Geschichtswissenschaft. Vom Historismus zur Historischen Sozialwissenschaft. Ein internationaler Vergleich* (Munich, 198), pp. 109ff.
- 63 Aptly put thus by Mommsen, 'Gegenwärtige Tendenzen' (note 24), p. 161f.
- 64 Fritz Fischer, *Krieg der Illusionen. Die deutsche Politik von 1911 bis 1914* (Düsseldorf, 1969), English translation: *War of Illusions* (London, 1975).
- 65 See especially Helmut Böhme, *Deutschlands Weg zur Großmacht. Studien zum Verhältnis von Wirtschaft und Staat während der Reichsgründungszeit 1848-1881* (Cologne and Berlin, 1966); Dirk Stegmann, *Die Erben Bismarcks. Parteien und Verbände in der Spätphase des Wilhelminischen Deutschlands. Sammlungspolitik 1897-1918* (Cologne and Berlin, 1970); Peter-Christian Witt, *Die Finanzpolitik des Deutschen Reiches von 1903 bis 1913. Eine Studie zur Innenpolitik des Wilhelminischen Deutschland* (Lübeck and Hamburg, 1970).
- 66 The first two substantial studies on interest groups are typical examples: Hans-Jürgen Puhle, *Agrarische Interessenpolitik und*

- preußischer Konservatismus im wilhelminischen Reich (1893-1914). *Ein Beitrag zur Analyse des Nationalismus in Deutschland am Beispiel des Bundes der Landwirte und der Deutsch-Konservativen Partei* (Hanover, 1966); Hartmut Kaelble, *Industrielle Interessenpolitik in der Wilhelminischen Gesellschaft. Centralverband Deutscher Industrieller 1875-1914* (Berlin, 1967).
- 67 Wehler, 'Geschichtswissenschaft heute' (note 34), pp. 709f., 727ff.
- 68 See Gerhard A. Ritter, "'Direkte Demokratie' und Rätewesen in Geschichte und Theorie', in id., *Arbeiterbewegung, Parteien und Parlamentarismus. Aufsätze zur deutschen Sozial- und Verfassungsgeschichte des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen, 1976), pp. 292-316, 389-394, esp., 302-305; Cf. Ritter's review of Reinhard Rürup's *Probleme der Revolution in Deutschland 1918/19* (Wiesbaden, 1968), in *Historische Zeitschrift*, 216 (1973), pp. 713-16.
- 69 Heinrich Heffter, *Die deutsche Selbstverwaltung im 19. Jahrhundert. Geschichte der Ideen und Institutionen* (Stuttgart, 1950), 2nd edn (1969); Reinhard Koselleck, *Preußen zwischen Reform und Revolution. Allgemeines Landrecht, Verwaltung und soziale Bewegung von 1791 bis 1848*, 1st edn (1967), 3rd edn (Stuttgart, 1987); Jürgen Kocka, *Unternehmensverwaltung und Angestelltenschaft am Beispiel Siemens 1847-1914. Zum Verhältnis von Kapitalismus und Bürokratie in der deutschen Industrialisierung* (Stuttgart, 1969); Klaus Tenfelde, *Sozialgeschichte der Bergarbeiterschaft an der Ruhr im 19. Jahrhundert*, 1st edn (1977), 2nd edn (Bonn, 1981). For Imhof's work see note 171.
- 70 Hans Rosenberg, *Die Weltwirtschaftskrise von 1857-1859* (Stuttgart and Berlin, 1934); 2nd edn published as *Die Weltwirtschaftskrise 1857-1859* (Göttingen, 1974).
- 71 Rosenberg, *Bureaucracy* (note 38).
- 72 Hans Rosenberg, 'Die Pseudodemokratisierung der Rittergutsbesitzerklasse', in id., *Machteliten und Wirtschaftskonjunkturen. Studien zur neueren deutschen Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (Göttingen, 1979), pp. 83-101, and 308-312. This essay was first published as "'Die Demokratisierung' der Rittergutsbesitzerklasse', in Wilhelm Berges and Carl Hinrichs (eds), *Zur Geschichte und Problematik der Demokratie. Festgabe für Hans Herzfeld* (Berlin, 1958), pp. 459-86.
- 73 Hans Rosenberg, *Große Depression und Bismarckzeit. Wirtschaftsablauf, Gesellschaft und Politik in Mitteleuropa* (Berlin, 1967).
- 74 Hans Rosenberg, 'Political and Social Consequences of the Great Depression of 1873-1896 in Central Europe', *Economic History Review*, 13 (1943), pp. 58-73; reprinted in id., *Machteliten* (note 72), pp. 161-72 and 318-21.
- 75 Hans Rosenberg, *Große Depression und Bismarckzeit* (note 73), p. vii.
- 76 Cf. S. B. Saul, *The Myth of the Great Depression, 1873-1896* (London etc., 1969); Knut Borchardt, 'Wirtschaftliches Wachstum und Wech-

- sellagen 1800-1914', in *Handbuch der deutschen Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte* (note 17), vol. 2, pp. 198-275, esp. pp 208f., 266-68; and the discussion of Rosenberg's book in Karl Erich Born, *Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte des Deutschen Kaiserreichs (1867/71-1914)* (Stuttgart, 1985), pp. 107-19, and Alexander Gerschenkron, 'The Great Depression in Germany', in id., *Continuity in History and other Essays* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), pp. 405-408.
- 77 Jürgen Kocka, *Sozialgeschichte. Begriff – Entwicklung – Probleme*, 2nd edn (Göttingen, 1986), p. 104.
- 78 Rosenberg, *Die Weltwirtschaftskrise 1857-1859*, 2nd edn (note 70), foreword, p. xxv; id., *Große Depression*, preliminary note to the new edition (Frankfurt/M., Berlin and Vienna, 1976), pp. xii-xiii. Cf. Ritter, 'Rosenberg 1904-1988', (note 21), p. 298.
- 79 Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *Bismarck und der Imperialismus* (Cologne and Berlin, 1969); id., *Das Deutsche Kaiserreich 1871-1918* (Göttingen, 1973).
- 80 Kocka, *Unternehmensverwaltung* (note 69). In an attempt to correlate the history of one firm with general history Kocka divided his study into three sections based on long economic cycles, that is, the boom period to 1873, the subsequent 'Great Depression' that lasted until the beginning of the 1890s, and the following economic upswing lasting until 1914, interrupted only by short crises. In my opinion, however, these dates do not represent convincing turning points because the electrical industry in general, and Siemens in particular, followed their own patterns of development. For example, they experienced a major upswing in the 1880s as a result of technological developments (cf. pp. 200f.).
- 81 Heinrich August Winkler, *Mittelstand, Demokratie und Nationalsozialismus. Die politische Entwicklung von Handwerk und Kleinhandel in der Weimarer Republik* (Cologne, 1972), pp. 44ff.
- 82 Shulamit Volkov, *The Rise of Popular Antimodernism in Germany. The Urban Master Artisans, 1873-1896* (Princeton, 1978).
- 83 Hans Rosenberg, 'Deutsche Agrargeschichte in alter und neuer Sicht', in id., *Probleme der deutschen Sozialgeschichte* (Frankfurt/M., 1969), pp. 81-147, quotation on p. 147. It is no accident that the first theoretical discussion by a member of the 'critical' school of history was published in a Festschrift for Hans Rosenberg. See Hans-Ulrich Wehler, 'Theorieprobleme der modernen deutschen Wirtschaftsgeschichte (1800-1945). Prolegomena zu einer kritischen Bestandsaufnahme der Forschung und Diskussion seit 1945', in Gerhard A. Ritter (ed.), *Entstehung und Wandel der modernen Gesellschaft. Festschrift für Hans Rosenberg zum 65. Geburtstag* (Berlin, 1970), pp. 66-107.
- 84 For an account of the 'empire' of the 'Bielefeld school', see Roger Fletcher, 'Recent Developments in West German Historiography:

The Bielefeld School and its Critics', *German Studies Review*, 7 (1984), pp. 451-80. Fletcher, however, defines the 'Bielefeld school' too broadly and undifferentiatedly. He also over-estimates the influence of Geoff Eley, David Blackbourn, Richard Evans, and Dieter Groh, whom he sees as representatives of a 'radical, new social history', on the discussion in Germany. They have certainly had a great impact on the discussion abroad, partly as a result of the fact that many of the most important articles and works by other historians have not been translated. Fletcher's claim that there is a new, growing trend in Germany 'towards a regional, locally based, and generally neo-Marxist social history which, if Richard Evans is correct, "is leading gradually to a redrawing of the map of modern German history"' (p. 467), can only be accepted if one overlooks the older, well-established tradition of regional and local historical research, supported by regional historical commissions and journals of regional and local history. Their existence has indeed been little noted abroad. Further, only a very small proportion of regional and local history can be classified as neo-Marxist.

- 85 Kocka, *Sozialgeschichte* (note 77), p. 165.
- 86 See the collection of essays by Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *Historische Sozialwissenschaft und Geschichtsschreibung. Studien zu Aufgaben und Traditionen deutscher Geschichtswissenschaft* (Göttingen, 1980); Kocka, *Sozialgeschichte* (note 77) which, with the exception of the last chapter of the second edition, is also based on previously published essays, and Jürgen Kocka's articles on 'Sozialgeschichte', 'Gesellschaftsgeschichte', 'Strukturgeschichte', and 'Historische Sozialwissenschaft', in Klaus Bergmann, Annette Kuhn, Jörn Rüsen and Gerhard Schneider (eds), *Handbuch der Geschichtsdidaktik*, 2 vols, vol. 1 (Düsseldorf, 1979), pp. 130-38.
- 87 Hans-Ulrich Wehler, 'Die Sozialgeschichte zwischen Wirtschaftsgeschichte und Politikgeschichte', in id., *Historische Sozialwissenschaft* (note 86), p. 141.
- 88 Cf. Kocka, 'Sozialgeschichte' (note 45), quotation on p. 70. Kocka had earlier dissociated himself from Wehler's views on this point. See Kocka, *Sozialgeschichte* (note 77), 1st edn (1977), p. 152.
- 89 Kocka, *Sozialgeschichte* (note 77), pp. 73ff.; id., 'Strukturgeschichte' (note 86), pp. 135f.; id., 'Sozialgeschichte' (note 45), pp. 70-73; id., Introduction to id. (ed.), *Sozialgeschichte im internationalen Überblick. Ergebnisse und Tendenzen der Forschung* (Darmstadt, 1989), pp. 4-5.
- 90 Kocka, *Sozialgeschichte* (note 77), pp. 78f.
- 91 Ibid., pp. 79 and 201.
- 92 Kocka, 'Sozialgeschichte' (note 45), p. 72.
- 93 Werner Sombart, *Der moderne Kapitalismus. Historisch-systematische Darlegung des gesamteuropäischen Wirtschaftslebens von seinen Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, vol. 1, part 1: *Die vorkapitalistische*

- Wirtschaft*, reprint of the 2nd edn of 1916 (Berlin, 1969), p. 21: 'If one wants to think about economics and identify its features, they can only be imagined within an existing historical environment, that is, within a specific historical setting. Political economy is a priori a *historical* social science. Therefore all economic terms are also "historical categories"'. The first edition of 1902 states that 'selecting the ordering principle for the social sciences is a historical problem' (*Der moderne Kapitalismus*, vol. 1: *Die Genesis des Kapitalismus*, p. 114).
- 94 Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *Geschichte als historische Sozialwissenschaft* (Frankfurt/M., 1973). The three essays mentioned are reprinted in the book by Wehler cited in note 86.
- 95 See Reinhard Rürup (ed.), *Historische Sozialwissenschaft. Beiträge zur Einführung in die Forschungspraxis* (Göttingen, 1977), p. 5. For a critical assessment of the term see Dieter Ruloff, *Geschichtsforschung und Sozialwissenschaft. Eine vergleichende Untersuchung zur Wissenschafts- und Forschungskonzeption in Historie und Politologie* (Munich, 1984), pp. 260-70; Winfried Schulze, *Soziologie und Geschichtswissenschaft. Einführung in die Probleme der Kooperation beider Wissenschaften* (Munich, 1974), esp. chapter 3: 'Grundprobleme einer historischen Wissenschaft', pp. 178-244; and Arnold Sywottek, *Geschichtswissenschaft in der Legitimationskrise. Ein Überblick über die Diskussion um Theorie und Didaktik der Geschichte in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1969-1973* (Bonn-Bad Godesberg, 1974), esp. part V: 'Historie als Sozialwissenschaft', pp. 49-81.
- 96 Kocka, 'Historische Sozialwissenschaft' (note 86), pp. 136f.
- 97 See Jürgen Kocka, 'Theorien in der Sozial- und Gesellschaftsgeschichte. Vorschläge zur historischen Schichtungsanalyse', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 1 (1975), pp. 9-42, quotation on p. 11. See also id., 'Theorien in der Geschichtswissenschaft', in id., Konrad Repgen and Siegfried Quandt, *Theorieidebatte und Geschichtsunterricht. Sozialgeschichte, Paradigmawechsel und Geschichtsdidaktik in der aktuellen Diskussion*, ed. by Paul Leidinger (Paderborn, 1982), p. 11; Wehler, *Kaiserreich* (note 79), p. 12.
- 98 These criticisms have been expressed by many historians. See especially Thomas Nipperdey's essays on the basic issues of modern historiography, 'Über Relevanz' and 'Historismus und Historismuskritik heute', as well as his review, 'Wehlers "Kaiserreich". Eine kritische Auseinandersetzung', all of which are reprinted in Nipperdey, *Gesellschaft* (note 3), pp. 12-32, 59-73, and 360-89 respectively. See also Karl-Georg Faber's Review Essay in *History and Theory*, 16 (1977), pp. 51-66, esp. pp. 57f. Faber criticizes, in my opinion correctly, Wehler's clear tendency (expressed in his essay 'Geschichtswissenschaft heute', note 34) to equate the process of historical research with political conflicts and to associate histori-

ans' achievements and especially their weaknesses with their 'liberal-progressive' or 'conservative' attitudes to political questions (K.-G. Faber, 'Geschichtswissenschaft als retrospektive Politik. Bemerkungen zu einem Aufsatz von Hans-Ulrich Wehler', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 6 (1980), pp. 574-85). The same tendency is found in Wehler's book *Entsorgung der deutschen Vergangenheit? Ein polemischer Essay zum 'Historikerstreit'* (Munich, 1988). However, many critics of 'historical social science' and 'social history' themselves do not hesitate to use political arguments against others, especially Kocka and Wehler.

<sup>99</sup> Kocka, *Sozialgeschichte* (note 77), p. 76.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Jörn Rüsen, 'Der Strukturwandel der Geschichtswissenschaft und die Aufgabe der Historik', in id., *Für eine erneuerte Historik. Studien zur Theorie der Geschichtswissenschaft* (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt, 1976), pp. 45-54; Hans-Ulrich Wehler, 'Vorüberlegungen zu einer modernen deutschen Gesellschaftsgeschichte', in Dirk Stegmann, Bernd-Jürgen Wendt, and Peter-Christian Witt (eds), *Industrielle Gesellschaft und politisches System. Beiträge zu einer politischen Sozialgeschichte. Festschrift für Fritz Fischer zum siebzigsten Geburtstag* (Bonn, 1978), pp. 3-20, esp. p. 4; H.-U. Wehler, 'Geschichtswissenschaft heute' (note 34), pp. 710f. and 743; Kocka speaks of the 'beginnings of a paradigm shift after 1945', *Sozialgeschichte* (note 77), pp. 67ff.; similarly id., 'Theorien in der Geschichtswissenschaft' (note 97), pp. 10f.; Konrad H. Jarausch, 'Illiberalism and Beyond: German History in Search of a Paradigm', *Journal of Modern History*, 55 (1983), pp. 268-84; id., 'German Social History - American Style', *Journal of Social History*, 19 (1985), pp. 349-59, esp. p. 350. For a criticism of the thesis that historiography advances by means of paradigm shifts see James J. Sheehan, 'Bemerkungen zu den Bemerkungen Karl-Georg Fabers', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 7 (1981), pp. 255-61, esp. pp. 259f.; Konrad Repgen, 'Kann man von einem Paradigmawchsel in der Geschichtswissenschaft sprechen?', in Kocka et al., *Theorieidebatte* (note 97), pp. 29-78. Cf. the controversy between Kocka and Repgen, *ibid.*, pp. 79-84; Irmline Veit-Brause, 'Zur Kritik an der "Kritischen Geschichtswissenschaft": Tendenzwende oder Paradigmawchsel?', *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht*, 35 (1984), pp. 1-24. Kocka has since accepted that neither the emergence of social history, nor the reorientation which has occurred in the historiography of the Federal Republic as a whole since the 1950s or 1960s can be described as a 'paradigm shift'. Rather, he suggests, these phenomena should be seen as a 'change, extension, and pluralization' of an older paradigm, or as supplementing it - Kocka, *Sozialgeschichte* (note 77), pp. 240f. For the concept of paradigm shift, see Thomas S. Kuhn, *Die Struktur wissenschaftlicher Revolutionen* (Frankfurt/M., 1967).

- 101 In the preliminary note to his study *Die Nobilität der Römischen Republik. Die Nobilität der Kaiserzeit*, 1st edn (Stuttgart, 1912), Matthias Gelzer, a historian of Antiquity, for example, speaks of himself as a *Gesellschaftshistoriker* (historian of society) and uses the term *Gesellschaftsgeschichte*. The same term was used by Karl Bosl in 1967 to describe the principle guiding his work on medieval Europe, which aims to understand the whole of medieval society and the position of the individual in it. Bosl's work combines comparative methods, structural analysis, and anthropological concepts. For his programme see Karl Bosl, 'Der Mensch und seine Werke. Eine anthropologisch-humanistische Deutung der Geschichte', in *Wege und Forschungen der Agrargeschichte. Festschrift zum 65. Geburtstag von Günther Franz*, ed. by Heinz Haushofer and Willi A. Boelcke (Frankfurt/M., 1967), pp. 9-17; and id., 'Gesellschaftsgeschichte – Sozialgeschichte. Modellfall Mittelalter', in Herwig Ebner (ed.), *Festschrift für Friedrich Haussmann* (Graz, 1977), pp. 39-57.
- 102 Jürgen Kocka, 'Gegenstandsbezogene Theorien in der Geschichtswissenschaft: Schwierigkeiten und Ergebnisse der Diskussion', in id. (ed.), *Theorien in der Praxis des Historikers. Forschungsbeispiele und ihre Diskussion*, Geschichte und Gesellschaft, Sonderheft 3 (Göttingen, 1977), pp. 178-88.
- 103 Cf. Kocka's reflections on the epistemological problems of a modern social science, in *Sozialgeschichte* (note 77), pp. 9-47, and 178-89.
- 104 Ibid., pp. 40-7.
- 105 J. Kocka, 'Gegenstandsbezogene Theorien' (note 102), pp. 181f.
- 106 H.-U. Wehler, 'Vorüberlegungen' (note 100), pp. 3ff.; id., 'Geschichte und Ökonomie', in id., *Historische Sozialwissenschaft* (note 86), pp. 59-78. For Kocka's practical application of modified Weberian and Marxist concepts see above pp. 29-30.
- 107 Eric J. Hobsbawm's essay 'From Social History to the History of Society' appears in German translation in Hans-Ulrich Wehler (ed.), *Geschichte und Soziologie*, 2nd edn (Königstein/Ts., 1984), pp. 305-30.
- 108 Hans-Ulrich Wehler, 'Sozialgeschichte und Gesellschaftsgeschichte', in Schieder and Sellin (eds), *Sozialgeschichte* (note 17), vol. 1, p. 34.
- 109 Kocka, 'Sozialgeschichte, Gesellschaftsgeschichte' (note 86), p. 133. In his book *Sozialgeschichte* (note 77), Kocka explains that in line with their fundamental approach, social history studies attempt 'to establish connections between the phenomena examined, regardless of the actual sphere of reality to which they belong, and social or social-economic factors, in a way which acknowledges their outstanding effectiveness within general history' (p. 99).
- 110 Kocka, *Sozialgeschichte* (note 77), pp. 150, 160f. Cf. note 109.
- 111 Wehler, 'Sozialgeschichte und Gesellschaftsgeschichte' (note 108), p. 38f.

- 112 Ibid., esp. pp. 40-3. Wehler points out that Weber's preface to the first volume of his sociology of religion contains a classic outline of the problems that a history of occidental society must address (*Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionsoziologie*, 5th photomechanically reproduced edn, vol. 1, Tübingen, 1963, pp. 1-16). Wolfgang Schluchter, *Die Entwicklung des okzidentalnen Rationalismus. Eine Analyse von Max Webers Gesellschaftsgeschichte* (Tübingen, 1978) is also important for Wehler's concept.
- 113 Otto Hintze, 'Weltgeschichtliche Bedingungen der Repräsentativverfassung' (1932) in id., *Abhandlungen* (note 16), vol. 1, pp. 140-85, and 'Wesen und Verbreitung des Feudalismus' (1929), *ibid.*, pp. 84-119.
- 114 Cf. Andreas Hillgruber, 'Politische Geschichte in moderner Sicht', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 216 (1973), pp. 529-52; for an opposing view, see Hans-Ulrich Wehler, 'Moderne Politikgeschichte oder "große Politik der Kabinette"?' , *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 1 (1975), pp. 344-69; replying to Wehler's criticism: Klaus Hildebrand, 'Geschichte oder "Gesellschaftsgeschichte"? Die Notwendigkeit einer politischen Geschichtsschreibung von den internationalen Beziehungen', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 223 (1976), pp. 329-57; cf. also H.-U. Wehler, 'Kritik und kritische Antikritik', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 225 (1977), pp. 347-84, esp., pp. 362 ff. Gustav Schmidt attempts to find a mediating position in 'Wozu noch "politische Geschichte"?' Zum Verhältnis von Innen- und Außenpolitik am Beispiel der englischen Friedensstrategie 1918/1919', *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, B 17/75 (26 April 1975), pp. 21-45.
- 115 Cf. Faber, 'Geschichtswissenschaft als retrospektive Politik?' (note 98), esp. p. 584; Faber, Review Essay (note 98), pp. 61-4.
- 116 Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte*, vol. 1: *Vom Feudalismus des Alten Reiches bis zur defensiven Modernisierung der Reformära 1700-1815*; vol. 2: *Von der Reformära bis zur industriellen und politischen 'deutschen Doppelrevolution' 1815-1845/49* (Munich, 1987), here vol. 1, p. 6.
- 117 Cf. Wehler's explanation of his methodology, epistemological interests, and further intentions in the introduction, vol. 1, pp. 6-31.
- 118 Thomas Nipperdey, *Deutsche Geschichte 1800-1866. Bürgerwelt und starker Staat* (Munich, 1983); id., *Deutsche Geschichte 1866-1918*, vol. 1: *Arbeitswelt und Bürgergeist* (Munich, 1990).
- 119 Heinrich Lutz, *Zwischen Habsburg und Preußen. Deutschland 1815-1866* (Berlin, 1985).
- 120 J. Kocka, *Unternehmensverwaltung* (note 69), esp. pp. 552-59.
- 121 Jürgen Kocka, *Klassengesellschaft im Krieg. Deutsche Sozialgeschichte 1914-1918* (Göttingen, 1973), p. 3; 2nd edn (1978), English translation: *Facing Total War. German Society 1914-1918* (Leamington Spa, 1984).

- 122 Kocka, *Klassengesellschaft* (note 121), p. 136.
- 123 Addition to the 2nd edn (Göttingen, 1978), p. 233.
- 124 Kocka, *Klassengesellschaft* (note 121), pp. 96ff.
- 125 Heinrich August Winkler, 'Einleitende Bemerkungen zu Hilferdings Theorie des Organisierten Kapitalismus', in id. (ed.), *Organisierter Kapitalismus. Voraussetzungen und Anfänge* (Göttingen, 1974), pp. 9-18.
- 126 Hans-Jürgen Puhle suggests that in the future the end of 'organized capitalism' might well be dated to the 1970s, because of stagflation and the crisis of the welfare state. See 'Historische Konzepte des entwickelten Industriekapitalismus. "Organisierter Kapitalismus" und "Korporatismus"', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 10 (1984), pp. 165-84, p. 175.
- 127 Cf. Klaus J. Bade, 'Organisierter Kapitalismus oder: Von den Schwierigkeiten vergleichender Sozialgeschichte', *Neue Politische Literatur*, 20 (1975), pp. 293-307; Udo Bermbach, 'Organisierter Kapitalismus. Zur Diskussion eines historisch-systematischen Modells', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 2 (1976), pp. 264-73; Volker Hentschel, *Wirtschaft und Wirtschaftspolitik im wilhelminischen Deutschland. Organisierter Kapitalismus und Interventionsstaat?* (Stuttgart, 1978), esp. pp. 10ff.; Peter Wulf, 'Staat und Wirtschaft im Übergang vom Kaiserreich zur Weimarer Republik. Zur Anwendbarkeit des Begriffes "Organisierter Kapitalismus" in der Geschichtswissenschaft', in Hartmut Bookmann, Kurt Jürgensen and Gerhard Stoltenberg (eds), *Geschichte und Gegenwart. Festschrift für Karl-Dietrich Erdmann* (Neumünster, 1980), pp. 275-88; K. D. Barkin, '"Organisierter Kapitalismus"', *Journal of Modern History*, 47 (1975), pp. 125-29; for the Marxist criticism cf. Dieter Baudis and Helga Nussbaum, *Wirtschaft und Staat in Deutschland vom Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts bis 1918/19*, vol. 1 of *Wirtschaft und Staat in Deutschland. Eine Wirtschaftsgeschichte des staatsmonopolistischen Kapitalismus vom Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts bis 1945*, 3 vols, ed. by H. Nussbaum and Lotte Zumpé (East Berlin, 1978; published under licence in Vaduz/Liechtenstein, 1978); Hans-Jürgen Steinbach, 'Bürgerliche Historiker und die sozialreformistische Theorie des "organisierten Kapitalismus"', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung*, 20 (1978), pp. 61-73. For a discussion of the concept and a reply to the objections raised, see the essay by Puhle mentioned in note 126, and Jürgen Kocka, 'Organisierter Kapitalismus im Kaiserreich?', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 230 (1980), pp. 613-31.
- 128 Gerald D. Feldman, 'Der deutsche Organisierte Kapitalismus während der Kriegs- und Inflationsjahre 1914-1923', in Winkler (ed.), *Organisierter Kapitalismus* (note 125), p. 153.
- 129 Heinrich August Winkler, 'Organisierter Kapitalismus: Zwischenbilanz einer Diskussion; Organisierter Kapitalismus? Versuch eines

Fazits', in *Liberalismus und Antiliberalismus. Studien zur politischen Sozialgeschichte des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen, 1979), pp. 259-71.

- 130 One example of this is the excellent study by Klaus Schönhoven, *Expansion und Konzentration. Studien zur Entwicklung der Freien Gewerkschaften im wilhelminischen Deutschland 1890 bis 1914* (Stuttgart, 1980), in which he examines some of the features of 'organized capitalism' while looking at the socialist free trade unions in Germany (esp. pp. 377ff.).
- 131 H.-U. Wehler, *Kaiserreich* (note 79), pp. 11ff.
- 132 *Ibid.*, p. 17.
- 133 *Der Pramat der Innenpolitik* is also the title of a volume of essays by Eckart Kehr edited by Wehler. Its subtitle is *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur preußisch-deutschen Sozialgeschichte im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1965). Wehler borrowed heavily from Kehr's interpretation. Geoff Eley considers Wehler's book to be 'a synthesis and recapitulation of the achievements of the Kehrian school', whose members he does not name ('Die "Kehrites" und das Kaiserreich: Bemerkungen zu einer aktuellen Kontroverse', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 4 (1978), pp. 90-107). The term 'Kehrite', which can be traced back to Wolfgang J. Mommsen ('Domestic Factors in German Foreign Policy before 1914', *Central European History*, 6 (1973), p. 8) is rejected, correctly in my opinion, by Hans-Jürgen Puhle, 'Zur Legende von der "Kehrschen Schule"', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 4 (1978), pp. 108-19.
- 134 See, for example, Otto Pflanze, 'Bismarcks Herrschaftstechnik als Problem der gegenwärtigen Historiographie', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 234 (1982), pp. 561-99; id., '"Sammlungspolitik 1875 bis 1886". Kritische Bemerkungen zu einem Modell', in *id.* and Elisabeth Müller-Luckner (eds), *Innenpolitische Probleme des Bismarck-Reiches* (Munich and Vienna, 1983), pp. 155-93; Lothar Gall, 'Bismarck und der Bonapartismus', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 223 (1976), pp. 618-32; Geoff Eley, 'Sammlungspolitik, Social Imperialism and the Navy Law of 1898', *Militärgeschichtliche Mitteilungen*, 15 (1974), pp. 29-63; G. Eley, 'Defining social imperialism: use and abuse of an idea', *Social History*, 3 (October 1976), pp. 265-90.
- 135 In addition to Nipperdey's critical review of Wehler's book mentioned in note 98, see esp. Hans-Günter Zmarzlik, 'Das Kaiserreich in neuer Sicht', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 222 (1976), pp. 105-26; Reinhard Staats, 'Das Kaiserreich 1871-1918 und die Kirchengeschichtsschreibung. Versuch einer theologischen Auseinandersetzung mit Hans-Ulrich Wehlers "Problemorientierter Historischer Strukturanalyse"', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 92 (1981), pp. 69-96. Volker Berghahn, 'Der Bericht der preußischen Oberrechnungskammer. "Wehlers" Kaiserreich und seine Kritiker', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*,

- 2 (1976), pp. 125-36, replies to Nipperdey's criticism of Wehler. Wehler himself has since conceded that some of the criticisms levelled against his book are justified – H.-U. Wehler, 'Kritik und kritische Antikritik' (note 114), pp. 348-54 – and has withdrawn the thesis of the 'primacy of domestic policy' – H.-U. Wehler, 'Moderne Politikgeschichte' (note 114), pp. 353-55; id., 'Geschichtswissenschaft heute', (note 34), pp. 735f.
- 136 In addition to the essays by Eley mentioned in notes 133 and 134, see David Blackbourn and Geoff Eley, *Mythen deutscher Geschichtsschreibung. Die gescheiterte bürgerliche Revolution von 1848* (Frankfurt/M. etc., 1980). Several of the original assessments have been modified in an extended English edition since published: *The Peculiarities of German History. Bourgeois Society and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Oxford and New York, 1984); Richard J. Evans, 'Introduction: Wilhelm II's Germany and the Historians', in id., (ed.), *Society and Politics in Wilhelmine Germany* (London and New York, 1978), pp. 1-39; id., 'The Myth of Germany's Missing Revolution', *New Left Review*, no. 149, pp. 67-94; G. Eley, *Reshaping the German Right. Radical Nationalism and Political Change after Bismarck* (New Haven and London, 1980); id. and Keith Nield, 'Why does social history ignore politics?', *Social History*, 5 (1980), pp. 249-71. See also the collection of Eley's essays, *From Unification to Nazism. Reinterpreting the German Past* (Boston and London, 1986). Several aspects of the Sonderweg discussion are also touched upon in D. Blackbourn, *Class, Religion and Local Politics in Wilhelmine Germany. The Centre-Party in Württemberg before 1914* (Wiesbaden, 1980); id., 'Peasants and Politics in Germany 1871-1914', *European History Quarterly*, (1984), pp. 47-75; id., 'The Politics of Demagogery in Imperial Germany', *Past and Present*, no. 113 (1986), pp. 152-84; Jan Farr, 'Populism in the countryside: The Peasant League in Bavaria in the 1890s', in R. Evans (ed.), *Society and Politics*, pp. 136-59.
- 137 Bernd Faulenbach, *Ideologie des deutschen Weges: Die deutsche Geschichte in der Historiographie zwischen Kaiserreich und Nationalsozialismus* (Munich, 1980).
- 138 Cf. Wolfgang Mock's criticism of this thesis, "Manipulation von oben" oder Selbstorganisation der Basis? Einige neuere Ansätze der englischen Historiographie zur Geschichte des deutschen Kaiserreiches', *Historische Zeitschrift*, 232 (1981), pp. 358-75, here p. 372f.
- 139 In addition to the essays by Mock (note 138) and Fletcher (note 84), see also Hans-Ulrich Wehler, "Deutscher Sonderweg" oder allgemeine Probleme des westlichen Kapitalismus? Zur Kritik an einigen "Mythen deutscher Geschichtsschreibung", *Merkur*, 35 (1981), pp. 478-87; ibid., pp. 757-60, Eley's reply and Wehler's response to this; Hans-Jürgen Puhle, 'Deutscher Sonderweg.

Kontroverse um eine vermeintliche Legende', *Journal für Geschichte*, no. 4 (1981), pp. 44f.; Heinrich August Winkler, 'Der deutsche Sonderweg: Eine Nachlese', *Merkur*, 35 (1981), pp. 793-804; Jürgen Kocka, 'Der "deutsche Sonderweg" in der Diskussion', *German Studies Review*, 5 (1982), pp. 365-79; *Kolloquien des Instituts für Zeitgeschichte: Deutscher Sonderweg – Mythos oder Realität?* (Munich and Vienna, 1982); Dieter Groh, 'Le "Sonderweg" de l'Histoire Allemande: Mythe ou Réalité?', *Annales*, 38 (1983), pp. 1166-87; Volker Berghahn, 'Politik und Gesellschaft im Wilhelminischen Deutschland', *Neue Politische Literatur*, 24 (1979), pp. 164-95; Dieter Langewiesche, 'Entmythologisierung des "deutschen Sonderwegs" oder auf dem Weg zu neuen Mythen', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 21 (1981), pp. 527-32; Robert G. Moeller, 'The Kaiserreich Recast? Continuity and Change in Modern German Historiography', *Journal of Social History*, 17 (1984), pp. 655-83; Gerhard A. Ritter, *Die deutschen Parteien 1830-1914. Parteien und Gesellschaft im konstitutionellen Regierungssystem* (Göttingen, 1985), p. 95, 99f., 103; Helga Grebing, Doris von der Breite-Lewien and Hans-Joachim Franzen, *Der "deutsche Sonderweg" in Europa 1806-1945. Eine Kritik* (Stuttgart etc., 1986); Jacques Droz, 'Postface', *Mouvement Social*, no. 136 (July-Sept. 1986), pp. 125-35; J. Kocka, 'Bürger und Arbeiter. Brennpunkte und Ergebnisse der Diskussion', in id. and Elisabeth Müller-Luckner (eds), *Arbeiter und Bürger im 19. Jahrhundert. Varianten ihres Verhältnisses im europäischen Vergleich* (Munich, 1986), pp. 325-39, here pp. 335-9.

140 On this point, cf. Kocka, 'Sonderweg' (note 139), p. 371. In his essay 'German History before Hitler: The Debate about the German "Sonderweg"', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 23 (1988), pp. 3-16, Jürgen Kocka presents an assessment of the *Sonderweg* debate with which I to a large extent agree. However, I consider his suggestion of using the concept of Germany's deviation from the West solely to explain the establishment of a totalitarian Nazi state in Germany (p. 10) as inappropriate. Of course the idea of the *Sonderweg* is important for analysing both the rise and victory of National Socialism, and the Nazi social system and system of rule, which remain central concerns of German historiography. But it can also be used to highlight other, not necessarily only negative characteristics of Germany's development. The comparison should not be limited to Western countries, nor should it serve simply to explain German peculiarities; rather it could also lead to a deeper understanding of the developments and characteristics of the countries being compared with Germany. Of course, the difficulty of working comparatively means that comparisons are usually limited to two or three countries.

- 141 On this point, cf. also Wolfram Fischer, 'Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichtliche Anmerkungen zum "Deutschen Sonderweg"', *Tel Avivier Jahrbuch für Deutsche Geschichte*, 16 (1987), pp. 96-116.
- 142 Cf. Shelley Baranowski, 'Continuity and Contingency: Agrarian Elites: Conservative Institutions and East Elbia in Modern German History', *Social History*, 12 (1987), pp. 285-308.
- 143 The continuing strength of the bureaucracy as a special feature of Germany has recently been underlined in connection with the *Sonderweg* debate by Michael John, 'The Peculiarities of the German State: Bourgeois Law and Society in the Imperial Era', *Past and Present*, 119 (May 1988), pp. 105-31.
- 144 Cf. Michael Prinz, *Vom neuen Mittelstand zum Volksgenossen. Die Entwicklung des sozialen Status der Angestellten von der Weimarer Republik bis zum Ende der NS-Zeit* (Munich, 1986).
- 145 Gottfried Korff, 'Kultur', in Hermann Bausinger, Utz Jeggle, G. Korff and Martin Scharfe, *Grundzüge der Volkskunde* (Darmstadt, 1978), pp. 17-80, here p. 80.
- 146 Cf. esp. Hans Medick, 'Vom Interesse des Sozialhistorikers an der Ethnologie', in Hans Süßmuth (ed.), *Historische Anthropologie. Der Mensch in der Geschichte* (Göttingen, 1984), p. 54; H. Medick, "'Missionare im Ruderboot'? Ethnologische Erkenntnisweise als Herausforderung an die Sozialgeschichte', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 10 (1984), pp. 295-319.
- 147 E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (New York, 1963). The work has since been translated into German: *Die Entstehung der englischen Arbeiterklasse* (Frankfurt/M., 1987).
- 148 On this point, cf. Dieter Langewiesche, 'Politik - Gesellschaft - Kultur. Zur Problematik von Arbeiterkultur und kulturellen Arbeiterorganisationen in Deutschland nach dem 1. Weltkrieg', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 22 (1982), pp. 359-402, here pp. 363, 368.
- 149 Cf. ibid., pp. 366-8. An especially typical example of this view: Dieter Groh, 'Base-processes and the problem of organization: outline of a social history research project', *Social History*, 4 (1979), pp. 265-83.
- 150 Gerhard Oestreich, 'Strukturprobleme des europäischen Absolutismus', in id., *Geist und Gestalt des frühmodernen Staates. Ausgewählte Aufsätze* (Berlin, 1969), pp. 187ff. On this term, cf. Stefan Breuer, 'Sozialdisziplinierung. Probleme und Problemverlagerungen eines Konzepts bei Max Weber, Gerhard Oestreich und Michel Foucault', in Christoph Sachße and Florian Tennstedt (eds), *Soziale Sicherheit und soziale Disziplinierung. Beiträge zu einer historischen Theorie der Sozialpolitik* (Frankfurt/M., 1986), pp. 45-69; Winfried Schulze, 'Gerhard Oestreichs Begriff der "Sozialdisziplinierung in der frühen Neuzeit"', *Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung*, 14 (1987), pp. 265-302.

- 151 In addition to the book by Sachße and Tennstedt cited in note 150, see the important study by Detlev J. K. Peukert, *Grenzen der Sozialdisziplinierung. Aufstieg und Krise der deutschen Jugendfürsorge von 1878 bis 1932* (Cologne, 1986).
- 152 Cf. esp. Lutz Niethammer and Werner Trapp (eds), *Lebenserfahrung und kollektives Gedächtnis. Die Praxis der 'Oral History'* (1980) (Frankfurt/M., 1985). The source material for a study of the experiences and attitudes of workers is discussed by Gerhard A. Ritter, 'Arbeiterkultur im deutschen Kaiserreich. Probleme und Forschungsansätze', in id. (ed.), *Arbeiterkultur* (Königstein/Ts., 1979), pp. 15-39, esp. pp. 26-8, 38f.
- 153 For a discussion of *Alltagsgeschichte*, see esp., in addition to the previously cited works by Medick (note 146), Langewiesche (note 148) and Niethammer (note 152); Lutz Niethammer, 'Anmerkungen zur Alltagsgeschichte', in Klaus Bergmann and Rolf Schörken (eds), *Geschichte im Alltag – Alltag in der Geschichte* (Düsseldorf, 1982), pp. 1-29; Jürgen Kocka, 'Worum es geht', in Franz-Josef Brüggemeier and J. Kocka (eds), 'Geschichte von unten – Geschichte von innen'. *Kontroversen um die Alltagsgeschichte* (Frankfurt/M., 1984); J. Kocka, 'Klassen oder Kultur. Durchbrüche und Sackgassen der Arbeitergeschichte', *Merkur*, 36 (1982), pp. 955-65; a critical reply by Martin Broszat, 'Plädoyer für Alltagsgeschichte. Eine Replik auf Jürgen Kocka', *ibid.*, pp. 1244-8; J. Kocka, 'Zurück zur Erzählung? Plädoyer für historische Argumentation', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 10 (1984), pp. 395-408; Kocka, *Sozialgeschichte* (note 77), pp. 162-74, 240-44; Kocka, 'Sozialgeschichte' (note 45), pp. 73-82; Klaus Tenfelde, 'Schwierigkeiten mit dem Alltag', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 10 (1984), pp. 376-94; Detlev Peukert, 'Arbeiteralltag – Mode oder Methode?', in Heiko Haumann (ed.), *Arbeiteralltag in Stadt und Land. Neue Wege der Geschichtsschreibung*, Argument, Sonderband 94 (Berlin, 1982), pp. 8-39; a critical reply by Alf Lüdtke, '"Kolonisierung der Lebenswelten" – oder Geschichte als Einbahnstraße? Zu Detlev Peukerts "Arbeiteralltag – Mode oder Methode?"', *Das Argument*, 25 (1983), pp. 536-41 and Peukert's answer: 'Glanz und Elend der "Bartwichserei". Eine Replik auf Alf Lüdtke', *ibid.*, pp. 542-9; Robert M. Berdahl et al., *Klassen und Kultur. Sozialanthropologische Perspektiven in der Geschichtsschreibung* (Frankfurt/M., 1982); Hans Süßmuth (ed.), *Historische Anthropologie* (note 146) with contributions by Kocka, Peukert, Medick and others; Peter Borscheid, 'Plädoyer für eine Geschichte des Alltäglichen', in P. Borscheid and Hans J. Teuteberg (eds), *Ehe, Liebe, Tod. Zum Wandel der Familie, der Geschlechts- und Generationsbeziehungen in der Neuzeit. Studien zur Geschichte des Alltags*, vol. 1 (Münster, 1983), pp. 1-14; P. Borscheid, 'Alltagsgeschichte – Modetorheit oder neues Tor zur Vergangenheit?', in Schieder and Sellin (eds), *Sozialgeschichte in Deutschland*

- (note 17), vol. 3, pp. 76-100; a Colloquium held by the Institut für Zeitgeschichte: *Alltagsgeschichte der NS-Zeit: Neue Perspektive oder Trivialisierung?* (Munich, 1984); Etienne François, 'L'Allemagne Fédérale se penche sur son passé', *Vingtième Siècle. Revue d'histoire*, July-September 1985, pp. 151-63, esp. pp. 159-61; Ursula A. J. Becher and Klaus Bergmann (eds), *Geschichte – Nutzen oder Nachteil für das Leben?* (Düsseldorf, 1986), part 3: 'Alltag und über den Alltag hinaus', pp. 60-90; Roger Fletcher, 'History from Below comes to Germany: The New History Movement in the Federal Republic of Germany', *Journal of Modern History*, 60 (1988), pp. 557-68. The most representative recent example of the methods and achievements of *Alltagsgeschichte* is a collection of essays by its leading proponents – Alf Lütke (ed.), *Alltagsgeschichte. Zur Rekonstruktion historischer Erfahrungen und Lebensweisen* (Frankfurt and New York, 1989).
- 154 Klaus Tenfelde, 'Anmerkungen zur Arbeiterkultur', in Wolfgang Ruppert (ed.), *Erinnerungsarbeit. Geschichte und demokratische Identität in Deutschland* (Opladen, 1982), pp. 107-34, quotation on p. 125.
- 155 Cf. Kocka, 'Zurück zur Erzählung?' (note 153), p. 399; id., *Sozialgeschichte* (note 77), pp. 170-74.
- 156 Kocka, 'Sozialgeschichte' (note 45), p. 82.
- 157 Cf. Fernand Braudel's famous essay, 'Histoire et Sciences sociales. La longue durée', *Annales*, 13 (1958), pp. 725-53, here p. 746.
- 158 Ibid., p. 748.
- 159 On the research of French historians belonging to the *Annales* circle and the Sixième Section, which, like the new 'critical' social history in Germany, cannot be defined as a 'school' in the strict sense, see: Manfred Wüstemeyer, 'Die "Annales": Grundsätze und Methoden ihrer "neuen Geschichtswissenschaft"', *Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 54 (1967), pp. 1-45; M. Wüstemeyer, 'Sozialgeschichte und Soziologie als soziologische Geschichte. Zur Raum-Zeit-Lehre der *Annales*', in Peter Christian Ludz (ed.), *Soziologie und Sozialgeschichte. Aspekte und Probleme*, Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Sonderheft 16 (Opladen, 1973), pp. 566-83; Dieter Groh, 'Strukturgeschichte als "totale" Geschichte?', *Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 58 (1971), pp. 289-322; Karl Erich Born, 'Neue Wege der Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte in Frankreich: Die Historikergruppe der "Annales"', *Saeculum*, 15 (1964), pp. 298-309; Pierre Léon, 'L'école française et l'histoire économique globale', *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Geschichte*, 20 (1970), pp. 49-70; G. Iggers, *Neue Geschichtswissenschaft* (note 62), pp. 55-96; Maurice Aymard, 'The Annales and French Historiography (1929-1971)', *Journal of European Economic History*, 1 (1972), pp. 491-511; Traian Stoianovich, *French Historical Method. The Annales Paradigm* (Ithaca and London, 1976); Michael Erbe, *Zur neueren französischen Sozial-*

*geschichtsforschung. Die Gruppe um die 'Annales'* (Darmstadt, 1979); M. Erbe, 'Historisch-anthropologische Fragestellungen der Annales-Schule', in Süssmuth (ed.), *Historische Anthropologie* (note 146), pp. 19-31. For an attempt to apply the methods and questions of modern linguistics to the study of mentalities and ways of living see Robert Jütte, 'Moderne Linguistik und Nouvelle Histoire', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 16 (1990), pp. 104-20. (Jütte is one of the pioneers of this approach in German social history.) See also the anthology of writings by the leading *Annales* historians, edited by Claudia Honneger with an excellent introduction: M. Bloch, F. Braudel, L. Febvre, etc., *Schrift und Materie der Geschichte. Vorschläge zur systematischen Aneignung historischer Prozesse* (Frankfurt/M., 1977).

- 160 Cf. Hartmut Kaelble, 'Sozialgeschichte in Frankreich und der Bundesrepublik: Annales gegen historische Sozialwissenschaften?', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 13 (1987), pp. 77-94. Kaelble's article also emphasizes the desirability of more exchange between French and German social historians.
- 161 The contribution made by the *Annales* school to the interpretation of the social and economic history of France in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is stressed in Gilbert Ziebura and Heinz-Gerhard Haupt (eds), *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft in Frankreich seit 1789* (Gütersloh, 1975); H.-G. Haupt, *Sozialgeschichte Frankreichs seit 1789* (Frankfurt/Main, 1989).
- 162 Cf. Thomas Nipperdey, '1933 und die Kontinuität der deutschen Geschichte', in id., *Nachdenken über die deutsche Geschichte. Essays* (Munich, 1986), pp. 186-205.
- 163 Cf. Ritter, *Sozialstaat* (note 5).
- 164 The brief summary that follows mentions titles only in exceptional cases. See Karl Heinrich Kaufhold's reviews of new publications in economic and social history in *Blätter für deutsche Landesgeschichte*, 115 (1979), pp. 272-315 (1975-1977); 118 (1982), pp. 430-97 (1978-1982); 121 (1985), pp. 583-646 (1982-1984); 123 (1987), pp. 643-710 (1985-1986); Eberhard Weis, 'Neue Forschungsrichtungen in der Geschichtswissenschaft, insbesondere der Sozialgeschichte, gezeigt am Beispiel der frühen Neuzeit (16. bis beginnendes 19. Jh)', *Historisches Jahrbuch*, 102 (1982), pp. 390-417; Richard Tilly, 'Soll- und Haben II: Wiederbegegnung mit der deutschen Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte', in id., *Kapital, Staat und sozialer Protest in der deutschen Industrialisierung* (Göttingen, 1980), pp. 228-51 and 300-311; Kocka, *Sozialgeschichte* (note 77), pp. 91-6, 132-76, 206-208 and 217-44. See also the regular research reports on specific problems and areas in *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*.
- 165 Werner Conze, 'Sozialgeschichte in der Erweiterung', *Neue Politische Literatur*, 19 (1974), pp. 501-508.

- 166 This journal was originally dedicated almost exclusively to the history of the labour movement, but since 1971 it has covered the whole field of social history. On its evolution see Gerald D. Feldman, *Sozialgeschichte und Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung*, published by the Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (Bonn, 1985). This is the text of a lecture given on 21 October 1985, the 25th anniversary of the *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*.
- 167 According to Conze, 'Geschichtswissenschaft' (note 25), the number of full professors of history rose from 80 to about 210 between 1960 and 1975, while the number of extraordinary professors (*außerplanmäßige Professoren*) and senior lecturers (*Dozenten*), and from 1960, *wissenschaftliche Räte* (lecturers) increased from about 90 to nearly 230. During the same period the number of *Assistenten* (junior lecturers on contract) rose from 50 to about 380 (pp. 18f.). In October 1976, the number of academic staff employed in history departments (including those in Pädagogische Hochschulen, or colleges of education, which Conze did not count) was listed as 1,060 people in 1,185 positions (Wehler, 'Geschichtswissenschaft heute' (note 34), p. 740). The increase in the number of positions has been a crucial factor in establishing social history as a discipline and in creating an ever growing number of subdisciplines of social history.
- 168 Cf. esp. Wilhelm Abel, *Agrarkrisen und Agrarkonjunktur in Mitteleuropa vom 13. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1935). A radically revised edition of this work entitled *Agrarkrisen und Agrarkonjunkturen* (Hamburg and Berlin, 1978) is already in its third printing; id., *Geschichte der deutschen Landwirtschaft vom frühen Mittelalter bis zum 19. Jahrhundert*, 3rd edn (Stuttgart, 1978); id., *Die drei Epochen der deutschen Agrargeschichte* (Hanover, 1962). On German agrarian historiography before 1968, see Rosenberg, 'Deutsche Agrargeschichte' (note 83), pp. 81-147.
- 169 On the emancipation of the peasants and its consequences see Wolfgang von Hippel, *Die Bauernbefreiung im Königreich Württemberg*, 2 vols (Boppard, 1977); Hanna Schissler, *Preußische Agrargesellschaft im Wandel. Wirtschaftliche, gesellschaftliche und politische Transformationsprozesse von 1763-1847* (Göttingen, 1978); Christof Dipper, *Die Bauernbefreiung in Deutschland 1790-1850* (Stuttgart etc., 1980). On rural life and the changes in rural societies see Josef Mooser, *Ländliche Klassengesellschaft 1770-1848. Bauern und Unterschichten, Landwirtschaft und Gewerbe im östlichen Westfalen* (Göttingen, 1984); Reinhard Schüren, *Staat und ländliche Industrialisierung: Sozialer Wandel in zwei Dörfern einer deutsch-niederländischen Textilgewerberegion 1830-1914* (Dortmund, 1985); Wolfgang Kaschuba and Carola Lipp, *Dörfliches Überleben. Zur Geschichte materieller und sozialer Reproduktion ländlicher Gesellschaften im 19. und frühen 20.*

*Jahrhundert* (Tübingen, 1982); Regina Schulte, 'Das Dorf im Verhör'. *Brandstifter, Kindsmörderinnen und Wilderer vor den Schranken des bürgerlichen Gerichts. Oberbayern 1848-1910* (Reinbek, 1989); Beate Brüggemann and Rainer Riehle, *Das Dorf. Über die Modernisierung einer Idylle* (Frankfurt and New York, 1986). For recent work on farmers see Richard J. Evans and William R. Lee (eds), *The German Peasantry. Conflict and Community in Rural Society from the Eighteenth to the Twentieth Centuries* (London and Sydney, 1986); Robert G. Moeller (ed.), *Peasants and Lords in Modern Germany. Recent Studies in Agricultural History* (Boston, 1986); Christof Dipper, 'Bauern als Gegenstand der Sozialgeschichte', in Schieder and Sellin (eds), *Sozialgeschichte in Deutschland* (note 17), vol. 4, pp. 9-33. On farm workers, see the review article by Jens Flemming, 'Die vergessene Klasse. Literatur zur Geschichte der Landarbeiter in Deutschland', in Klaus Tenfelde (ed.), *Arbeiter und Arbeiterbewegung im Vergleich. Berichte zur internationalen historischen Forschung*, Historische Zeitschrift, Sonderheft 15 (Munich, 1986), pp. 389-418.

- 170 170 Peter Kriedte, Hans Medick and Jürgen Schlumbohm, *Industrialisierung vor der Industrialisierung. Gewerbliche Warenproduktion auf dem Land in der Formationsperiode des Kapitalismus* (Göttingen, 1977); P. Kriedte, 'Protoindustrialisierung und großes Kapital. Das Seidengewerbe in Krefeld und seinem Umland bis zum Ende des Ancien Régime', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 23 (1983), pp. 219-66; H. Medick, 'Privilegiertes Handelskapital' (note 42). See also the debate between the supporters and critics of this notion in H. Medick, 'Die Protoindustrialisierung auf dem Prüfstand der historischen Zunft. Antwort auf einige Kritiker', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 9 (1983), pp. 87-105.
- 171 171 Cf. Peter Hersche, 'Von der Demographie zur Geschichte des Körpers. Zu vier Werken von Arthur E. Imhof', *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Geschichte*, 35 (1985), pp. 306-12. See esp. Arthur E. Imhof, *Die verlorenen Welten. Alltagsbewältigung durch unsere Vorfahren und weshalb wir uns heute so schwer damit tun* (Munich, 1984); id., *Einführung in die Historische Demographie* (Munich, 1977); id., *Die Lebenszeit. Vom aufgeschobenen Tod und von der Kunst des Lebens* (Munich, 1988); id., *Die gewonnenen Jahre. Von der Zunahme unserer Lebensspanne seit dreihundert Jahren oder von der Notwendigkeit einer neuen Einstellung zu Leben und Sterben* (Munich, 1981); id., *Von der unsicheren zur sicheren Lebenszeit. Fünf historisch-demographische Studien* (Darmstadt, 1988).
- 172 172 Cf. Peter Marschalck, *Deutsche Überseeauswanderung im 19. Jahrhundert. Ein Beitrag zur soziologischen Theorie der Bevölkerung* (Stuttgart, 1973); Günter Moltmann (ed.), *Deutsche Amerikaauswanderung im 19. Jahrhundert. Sozialgeschichtliche Beiträge* (Stuttgart, 1976); Hartmut Bickelmann, *Deutsche Überseeauswanderung in der*

- Weimarer Zeit (Wiesbaden, 1980); Wolfgang von Hippel, *Auswanderung aus Südwestdeutschland* (Stuttgart, 1984); Klaus J. Bade (ed.), *Auswanderer – Wanderarbeiter – Gastarbeiter. Bevölkerung, Arbeitsmarkt und Wanderung in Deutschland seit der Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts*, 2 vols, 2nd edn (Ostfildern, 1985); id., *Vom Auswanderungsland zum Einwanderungsland? Deutschland 1880-1980* (Berlin, 1983); id. (ed.), *Population, Labour and Migration in 19th and 20th Century Germany* (Leamington Spa etc., 1987). *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 24 (1984) addresses issues concerning the foreign labour force. On demographic mobility see Dieter Langewiesche, 'Wanderungsbewegungen in der Hochindustrialisierungsperiode. Regionale, interstädtische und innerstädtische Mobilität in Deutschland 1880-1914', *Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 64 (1977), pp. 1-40; Stefan Bleek, 'Mobilität und Seßhaftigkeit in deutschen Großstädten während der Urbanisierung', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 15 (1989), pp. 5-33.
- 173 In addition to the work by Köllmann already mentioned (note 58), see, e.g., Jürgen Reulecke, *Geschichte der Urbanisierung in Deutschland* (Frankfurt/M., 1985); Hans Jürgen Teuteberg (ed.), *Urbanisierung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Historiographische und geographische Aspekte* (Cologne, 1983); id. (ed.), *Stadtwachstum, Industrialisierung, Sozialer Wandel. Beiträge zur Erforschung der Urbanisierung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1986); Horst Mazerath, *Urbanisierung in Preußen 1815-1914* (Stuttgart etc., 1985); id. (ed.), *Stadtewachstum und innerstädtische Strukturveränderungen. Probleme des Urbanisierungsprozesses im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1984); Wolfgang R. Krabbe, *Die deutsche Stadt im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Eine Einführung* (Göttingen, 1989); Heinz Heineberg, *Innerstädtische Differenzierung und Prozesse im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Geographische und historische Aspekte* (Cologne and Vienna, 1987); Lothar Gall (ed.), *Stadt und Bürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1990). The following important studies on individual cities in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries should be mentioned: Ilse Fischer, *Industrialisierung, sozialer Konflikt und politische Willensbildung in der Stadtgemeinde. Ein Beitrag zur Sozialgeschichte Augsburgs 1840-1914* (Augsburg, 1977); Wolfgang Hardtwig and Klaus Tenfelde (eds), *Soziale Räume in der Urbanisierung. Studien zur Geschichte Münchens im Vergleich 1850 bis 1933* (Munich, 1990); Stefan Fisch, *Stadtplanung im 19. Jahrhundert. Das Beispiel München bis zur Ära Theodor Fischer* (Munich, 1988); Henrich Tiessen, *Industrielle Entwicklung, gesellschaftlicher Wandel und politische Bewegung in einer württembergischen Fabrikstadt des 19. Jahrhunderts, Esslingen 1848-1914* (Esslingen am Neckar, 1982); David Crew, *Bochum. Sozialgeschichte einer Industriestadt 1860-1914* (Frankfurt/M., 1980); William H. Hubbard, *Auf dem Weg zur Großstadt. Eine Sozialgeschichte der Stadt Graz 1850-1914* (Munich and

- Vienna, 1984); W. R. Krabbe, *Kommunalpolitik und Industrialisierung. Die Entfaltung der städtischen Leistungsverwaltung im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert. Fallstudien zu Dortmund und Münster* (Stuttgart etc., 1985). See also *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 25 (1985), which features essays on community politics and the reports on recent research by Friedrich Lenger, 'Urbanisierungs- und Stadtgeschichte – Geschichte der Stadt, Verstädterungsgeschichte oder Geschichte in der Stadt?', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 26 (1986), pp. 429–79; and id., 'Neuzeitliche Stadt- und Urbanisierungsgeschichte als Sozialgeschichte', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 30 (1990), pp. 376–422; Horst Mazerath, 'Lokalgeschichte, Stadtgeschichte, Historische Urbansierungsforschung?', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 15 (1989), pp. 62–88; Jürgen Reulecke, 'Moderne Stadtgeschichtsforschung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland', in Christian Engeli and H. Matzerath (eds), *Moderne Stadtgeschichtsforschung in Europa, USA und Japan. Ein Handbuch* (Stuttgart, 1989), pp. 21–36.
- 174 Cf. Lutz Niethammer (ed.), *Wohnen im Wandel. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alltags in der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft* (Wuppertal, 1979); L. Niethammer and Franz Brüggemeier, 'Wie wohnten Arbeiter im Kaiserreich?', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 16 (1976), pp. 61–134; Hans Jürgen Teuteberg (ed.), *Homo Habitans. Zur Sozialgeschichte des ländlichen und städtischen Wohnens in der Neuzeit* (Münster, 1985); id. and Clemens Wischermann, *Wohnalltag in Deutschland 1850–1914. Bilder–Daten–Dokumente* (Münster, 1985); C. Wischermann, *Wohnen in Hamburg vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg* (Münster, 1983); Axel Schildt and Arnold Sywottek (eds), *Massenwohnung und Eigenheim. Wohnungsbau und Wohnen in der Großstadt seit dem Ersten Weltkrieg* (Frankfurt, 1990); A. Schildt, *Die Grindel-Hochhäuser. Eine Sozialgeschichte der ersten deutschen Wohnhochhausanlage Hamburg-Grindelberg 1945–1956* (Hamburg, 1988). See also Peter Kirsch, *Arbeiterwohnsiedlungen im Königreich Württemberg in der Zeit vom 19. Jahrhundert bis zum Ende des Ersten Weltkrieges* (Tübingen, 1982).
- 175 Hans J. Teuteberg and Günter Wiegelmüller, *Der Wandel der Ernährungsgewohnheiten unter dem Einfluß der Industrialisierung* (Göttingen, 1972); eid., *Unsere tägliche Kost. Geschichte und regionale Prägung* (Münster, 1986).
- 176 See the summary of international research on the family in the introduction to Michael Mitterauer and Reinhard Sieder (eds), *Historische Familienforschung* (Frankfurt/M., 1982), pp. 10–39.
- 177 Karin Hausen, 'Familie als Gegenstand historischer Sozialforschung. Bemerkungen zu einer Forschungsstrategie', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 1 (1975), pp. 171–209; Werner Conze (ed.), *Sozialgeschichte der Familie in der Neuzeit Europas. Neue Forschungen* (Stuttgart, 1976); Michael Mitterauer and Reinhard Sieder, *Vom Patriarchat zur Partnerschaft. Zum Strukturwandel der Familie*, 3rd edn (Munich, 1984);

- eid. (eds), *Historische Familienforschung* (note 176); M. Mitterauer, 'Historisch-anthropologische Familienforschung'. *Fragestellungen und Zugangsweisen* (Vienna and Cologne, 1990); R. Sieder, *Sozialgeschichte der Familie* (Frankfurt/M., 1987); Ingeborg Weber-Kellermann, *Die deutsche Familie. Versuch einer Sozialgeschichte* (Frankfurt/M., 1974); Heide Rosenbaum, *Formen der Familie. Untersuchungen zum Zusammenhang von Familienverhältnissen, Sozialstruktur und sozialem Wandel in der deutschen Gesellschaft des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Frankfurt/M., 1982); Heinz Reif (ed.), *Die Familie in der Geschichte* (Göttingen, 1982); Neithard Bulst et al. (eds), *Familie zwischen Tradition und Moderne. Studien zur Geschichte der Familie in Deutschland und Frankreich vom 16. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 1981); Borscheid and Teuteberg (eds), *Ehe, Liebe, Tod* (note 153); Richard J. Evans and William R. Lee (eds), *The German Family. Essays in the Social History of the Family in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Germany* (London, 1981); William H. Hubbard, *Familiengeschichte. Materialien zur deutschen Familie seit dem Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1983); Klaus Saul et al. (eds), *Arbeiterfamilien im Kaiserreich. Materialien zur Sozialgeschichte in Deutschland 1871-1914* (Düsseldorf, 1982); Jens Fleming et al. (eds), *Familienleben im Schatten der Krise. Dokumente und Analysen zur Sozialgeschichte der Weimarer Republik* (Düsseldorf, 1988); Jürgen Kocka, 'Familie, Unternehmer und Kapitalismus. An Beispielen aus der frühen Industrialisierung', *Zeitschrift für Unternehmensgeschichte*, 24 (1979), pp. 99-135; Karin Hausen, 'Familie und Familiengeschichte', in Schieder and Sellin (eds), *Sozialgeschichte in Deutschland* (note 17), vol. 2, pp. 64-89, is a survey of research on family and household conditions in Germany.
- 178 The most important studies include: Karin Hausen (ed.), *Frauen suchen ihre Geschichte. Historische Studien zum 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1982); John C. Fout, 'Current Research on German Women's History in the Nineteenth Century', in id. (ed.), *German Women in the Nineteenth Century. A Social History* (New York and London, 1984), pp. 3-54; Renate Bridenthal, Atina Grossmann and Marion Kaplan (eds), *When Biology Became Destiny. Women in Weimar and Nazi Germany* (New York, 1984); Ursula A. J. Becher and Jörn Rüsén (eds), *Weiblichkeit in geschichtlicher Perspektive. Fallstudien und Reflexionen zu Grundproblemen der historischen Frauenforschung* (Frankfurt/M., 1988); Ute Frevert, *Frauen-Geschichte zwischen bürgerlicher Verbesserung und Neuer Weiblichkeit* (Frankfurt/M., 1986); R. E. Böttcher-Joeres and M. J. Maynes (eds), *German Women in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. A Social and Literary History* (Bloomington, 1986); Herrad-Ulrike Bussemer, *Frauenemanzipation und Bildungsbürgertum. Sozialgeschichte der Frauenbewegung in der Reichsgründungszeit* (Weinheim, 1985); Ute Gerhard, *Verhältnisse und Verhinderungen. Frauenarbeit, Familie und Rechte der Frauen im 19.*

*Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt/M., 1978); Dirk Blasius, *Ehescheidung in Deutschland 1794-1945* (Göttingen, 1987); Ute Daniel, *Arbeiterfrauen in der Kriegsgesellschaft. Beruf, Familie und Politik im Ersten Weltkrieg* (Göttingen, 1989); Gisela Bock, *Zwangssterilisation im Nationalsozialismus. Studien zur Rassenpolitik und Frauenpolitik* (Opladen, 1986); Hans Pohl (ed.), *Die Frau in der deutschen Wirtschaft. Vom Mittelalter bis 1945* (Wiesbaden, 1985); Angelika Willms, *Die Entwicklung der Frauenerwerbstätigkeit im Deutschen Reich* (Nuremberg, 1980); Ulla Knapp, *Frauenarbeit in Deutschland*, 2 vols, 2nd edn (Munich, 1986); Claudia Bischoff, *Frauen in der Krankenpflege. Zur Entstehung von Frauenrolle und Frauenberufstätigkeit im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt/M. and New York, 1984); Dorothee Wierling, *Mädchen für alles. Arbeitsalltag und Lebensgeschichte städtischer Dienstmädchen um die Jahrhundertwende* (Berlin and Bonn, 1987); Elisabeth Plössl, *Weibliche Arbeit in Familie und Betrieb. Bayerische Arbeiterfrauen 1870-1914* (Munich, 1983); Inge Kaltwasser, *Häusliches Gesinde in der Freien Stadt Frankfurt am Main. Rechtsstellung, soziale Lage und Aspekte des sozialen Wandels des häuslichen Gesindes in Frankfurt am Main im 19. Jahrhundert bis zur Annexion durch Preußen* (Frankfurt/M., 1989); Rosmarie Beier, *Frauenarbeit und Frauenalltag im Deutschen Kaiserreich. Heimarbeiterinnen in der Berliner Bekleidungsindustrie 1880-1914* (Frankfurt/M., 1983); Ursula Nienhaus, *Berufsstand weiblich. Die ersten weiblichen Angestellten* (Berlin, 1982); Stefan Bajohr, *Die Hälfte der Fabrik. Geschichte der Frauenarbeit in Deutschland 1914 bis 1945*, 2nd edn (Marburg, 1984); Dörte Winkler, *Frauenarbeit im 'Dritten Reich'* (Hamburg, 1977). Since 1979 women's history has had its own publication series, *Frauen in der Geschichte*. A double issue of the journal *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 7 (1981), is devoted solely to the topic 'Women in the history of the 19th and 20th centuries'. See also the survey articles by Ulrich Engelhardt, 'Frauen in der Sozialgeschichte: Eine ungeschriebene Geschichte', in Schieder and Sellin (eds), *Sozialgeschichte in Deutschland* (note 17), vol. 4, pp. 156-73; Ute Frevert, 'Bewegung und Disziplin in der Frauengeschichte. Ein Forschungsbericht', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 14 (1988), pp. 240-62; Gisela Bock, 'Der Platz der Frauen in der Geschichte', in Herta Nagl-Docekal and Franz Wimmer (eds), *Neue Ansätze in der Geschichtswissenschaft* (Vienna, 1984), pp. 108-27; Gisela Bock, 'Geschichte, Frauen geschichte, Geschlechtergeschichte', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 14 (1988), pp. 364-91.

179 On the meaning of age and the different phases of life, see Hermann Schäfer, 'Die Industriearbeiter. Lage und Lebenslauf im Bezugsfeld von Beruf und Betrieb', in Hans Pohl (ed.), *Sozialgeschichtliche Probleme in der Zeit der Hochindustrialisierung (1870-1914)* (Paderborn etc., 1979), pp. 143-216; Heinz Reif, 'Soziale Lage und Erfahrungen

des alternden Fabrikarbeiters in der Schwerindustrie des westlichen Ruhrgebiets während der Hochindustrialisierung', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 22 (1982), pp. 1-94. Cf. Peter Borscheid, *Geschichte des Alters. 16.-18. Jahrhundert* (Münster, 1987); Christoph Conrad, 'Die Entstehung des modernen Ruhestandes. Deutschland im internationalen Vergleich 1850-1960', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 14 (1988), pp. 417-47; Josef Ehmer, 'Lohnarbeit und Lebenszyklus im Kaiserreich', *ibid.*, pp. 448-71; Hans Joeger, 'Generationen in der Geschichte. Überlegungen zu einer umstrittenen Konzeption', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 3 (1977), pp. 429-52; eight articles in *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 30 (1990) deal with specific problems of relations between the generations and in particular of the history of old age. On the history of youth see Klaus Tenfelde, 'Großstadtjugend in Deutschland vor 1914. Eine historisch-demographische Annäherung', *Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 69 (1982), pp. 182-218; John R. Rillis, *Geschichte der Jugend. Tradition und Wandel im Verhältnis der Altersgruppen und Generationen in Europa von der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts bis zur Gegenwart* (Weinheim and Basel, 1980); Michael Mitterauer, *Sozialgeschichte der Jugend* (Frankfurt/M., 1986); Thomas Koebner et al. (eds), 'Mit uns zieht die neue Zeit'. Der Mythos Jugend (Frankfurt/M., 1985); Dieter Dowe (ed.), *Jugendprotest und Generationenkonflikt in Europa im 20. Jahrhundert: Deutschland, England, Frankreich und Italien im Vergleich* (Bonn, 1986); Peukert, *Grenzen der Sozialdisziplinierung* (note 151); id., *Jugend zwischen Krieg und Krise. Lebenswelten von Arbeiterjungen in der Weimarer Republik* (Cologne, 1987); Andreas Gestrich, *Traditionelle Jugendkultur und Industrialisierung. Sozialgeschichte der Jugend in einer ländlichen Arbeitergemeinde Württembergs 1800-1920* (Göttingen, 1986); Ulrich Hermann, 'Jugend in der Sozialgeschichte', in Schieder and Sellin (eds), *Sozialgeschichte in Deutschland* (note 17), vol. 4, pp. 133-55. On religious and ethnic minorities, see Monika Richarz (ed.), *Jüdisches Leben in Deutschland. Selbstzeugnisse zur Sozialgeschichte*, 3 vols (Stuttgart, 1976-82); Werner E. Mosse and Arnold Paucker (eds), *Juden im wilhelminischen Deutschland 1890-1914* (Tübingen, 1976); Jacob Toury, *Soziale und politische Geschichte der Juden in Deutschland 1847-1871. Zwischen Revolution, Reaktion und Emanzipation* (Düsseldorf, 1977); Reinhard Rürup, *Emanzipation und Antisemitismus. Studien zur 'Judenfrage' der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft* (Göttingen, 1978); Christoph Kleßmann, *Polnische Bergarbeiter im Ruhrgebiet 1870-1945. Soziale Integration und nationale Subkultur einer Minderheit in der deutschen Industriegesellschaft* (Göttingen, 1979); Krystyna Murzynowska, *Die polnischen Erwerbsauswanderer im Ruhrgebiet während der Jahre 1880-1914* (Dortmund, 1979); Arno Herzog, 'Juden und

- Judentum in der sozialgeschichtlichen Forschung', in Schieder and Sellin (eds), *Sozialgeschichte in Deutschland* (note 17), vol. 4, pp. 108-32.
- 180 The following are examples of such studies: Reinhard Spree, *Soziale Ungleichheit vor Krankheit und Tod. Zur Sozialgeschichte des Gesundheitsbereichs im Deutschen Kaiserreich* (Göttingen, 1981); Ute Frevert, *Krankheit als politisches Problem 1770-1880. Soziale Unterschichten in Preußen zwischen medizinischer Polizei und staatlicher Sozialversicherung* (Göttingen, 1984). Richard J. Evans, *Death in Hamburg. Society and Politics in the Cholera Years 1830-1910* (Oxford, 1987) represents a successful combination of the history of health, social history, political, and local history. Christoph Sachße and Florian Tennstedt, *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge in Deutschland*, vol. 1: *Vom Spätmittelalter bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg*, vol. 2: *Fürsorge und Wohlfahrtspflege 1871-1929* (Stuttgart, 1980-1988); Wolfram Fischer, *Armut in der Geschichte. Erscheinungsformen und Lösungsversuche der 'Sozialen Frage' in Europa seit dem Mittelalter* (Göttingen, 1982); Dirk Blasius, *Bürgerliche Gesellschaft und Kriminalität. Zur Sozialgeschichte Preußens im Vormärz* (Göttingen, 1978); Heinz Reif (ed.), *Räuber, Volk und Obrigkeit. Studien zur Kriminalität in Deutschland seit dem 18. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt/M., 1984).
- 181 Cf. Hermann Bausinger, *Volkskultur in der technischen Welt*, revised edn (Frankfurt/M., 1986); id., *Volkskunde. Von der Altertumsforschung zur Kulturanalyse* (Darmstadt, 1979; 1st edn, 1971); Wolfgang Kaschuba, *Volkskultur zwischen feudaler und bürgerlicher Gesellschaft. Zur Geschichte eines Begriffs und seiner gesellschaftlichen Wirklichkeit* (Frankfurt and New York, 1988); Richard van Dülmen (ed.), *Kultur der einfachen Leute. Bayerisches Volksleben vom 16. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1983); id. and Norbert Schindler (eds), *Volkskultur. Zur Wiederentdeckung des vergessenen Alltags (16. bis 20. Jahrhundert)* (Frankfurt/M., 1984); Utz Jeggle, Gottfried Korff, Martin Scharfe and Bernd Jürgen Warneken (eds), *Volkskultur in der Moderne. Probleme und Perspektiven empirischer Kulturforschung* (Reinbek, 1986); Dieter Düding, Peter Friedemann and Paul Münch, *Öffentliche Festkultur. Politische Feste in Deutschland von der Aufklärung bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg* (Reinbek, 1988); Wolfgang Nahrstedt, *Die Entstehung der Freizeit, dargestellt am Beispiel Hamburgs* (Göttingen, 1972); Gerhard Huck (ed.), *Sozialgeschichte der Freizeit. Untersuchungen zum Wandel der Alltagskultur in Deutschland* (Wuppertal, 1980); M. Scharfe, *Die Religion des Volkes. Kleine Kultur- und Sozialgeschichte des Pietismus* (Gütersloh, 1980); R. v. Dülmen, 'Religionsgeschichte in der historischen Sozialforschung', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 6 (1980), pp. 36-59; Wolfgang Schieder (ed.), *Volksreligiosität in der modernen Sozialgeschichte* (Göttingen, 1986); Werner K. Blessing, *Staat und Kirche in*

*der Gesellschaft. Institutionelle Autorität und mentaler Wandel in Bayern während des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen, 1982); Andreas Grießinger, *Das symbolische Kapital der Ehre. Streikbewegungen und kollektives Bewußtsein deutscher Handwerksgesellen im 18. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt / M. etc., 1981). On the state of research, see H. Bausinger, 'Volkskultur und Sozialgeschichte', in Schieder and Sellin (eds), *Sozialgeschichte in Deutschland* (note 17), vol. 3, pp. 32-49; Schieder, 'Religion in der Sozialgeschichte', *ibid.*, pp. 9-31; Volker Sellin, 'Mentalität in der Sozialgeschichte', *ibid.*, pp. 101-121; see also the work by Kaschuba and Lipp cited in note 169.

- 182 For example, see the studies on the growth of reading material and the reading public in Rolf Engelsing (ed.), *Zur Sozialgeschichte deutscher Mittel- und Unterschichten*, 2nd edn (Göttingen, 1978); *id.*, *Analphabetentum und Lektüre: Zur Sozialgeschichte des Lesens in Deutschland zwischen feudaler und industrieller Gesellschaft* (Stuttgart, 1973); Otto Dann (ed.), *Lesegesellschaften und bürgerliche Emanzipation* (Munich, 1981); see also Peter Lundgreen, 'Schule, Universität und sozialer Wandel. Neue Literatur zur Sozialgeschichte der Bildung', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 17 (1977), pp. 517-37; Rainer Bölling, 'Schule, Staat und Gesellschaft in Deutschland. Neuere Literatur zur Sozialgeschichte der Bildung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 23 (1983), pp. 670-87; Detlev K. Müller, *Sozialstruktur und Schulsystem. Aspekte zum Strukturwandel des Schulwesens im 19. Jahrhundert*, abridged textbook edn (Göttingen, 1981); Peter Lundgreen, *Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Schule im Überblick*, 2 parts (Göttingen, 1980-81); Christiane Schiersmann, *Zur Sozialgeschichte der preußischen Provinzial-Gewerbeschulen im 19. Jahrhundert* (Weinheim and Basel, 1979); Rainer Bölling, *Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Lehrer. Ein Überblick von 1800 bis zur Gegenwart* (Göttingen, 1983); *Handbuch der deutschen Bildungsgeschichte*, vol. 3: *1800-1870. Von der Neuordnung Deutschlands bis zur Gründung des Deutschen Reiches*, ed. by Karl Ernst Jeismann and P. Lundgreen (Munich, 1987); vol. 5: *1918-1945. Die Weimarer Republik und die nationalsozialistische Diktatur*, ed. by Dieter Langewiesche and Heinz-Elmar Tenorth (Munich, 1989). Of the six volumes planned, only these two have as yet been published. Konrad H. Jarausch (ed.), *The Transformation of Higher Learning 1860-1930. Expansion, Diversification, Social Opening and Professionalisation in England, Germany, Russia and the United States* (Stuttgart, 1983).
- 183 On the work of quantifying historians and the methodological problems of quantification, see Heinrich Best and Reinhart Mann (eds), *Quantitative Methoden in der historisch-sozialwissenschaftlichen Forschung* (Stuttgart, 1977); Wolfgang Bick *et al.*, *Quantitative Historische Forschung 1977. Eine Dokumentation der Quantum-Erhebung* (Stuttgart, 1977); Rolf Gundlach and Carl August Lückerath,

- Historische Wissenschaften und elektronische Datenverarbeitung* (Frankfurt/M. etc., 1977); G. Potz et al., 'Was gewinnt die Geschichtsforschung durch die Quantifizierung?', in Nagl-Docekal and Wimmer (eds), *Neue Ansätze* (note 178), pp. 48-107; Konrad H. Jarausch et al., *Quantitative Methoden in der Geschichtswissenschaft* (Darmstadt, 1985); Gerhard Botz et al. (eds), *Qualität und Quantität. Zur Praxis der Methoden der Historischen Sozialwissenschaften* (Frankfurt and New York, 1988); Karl Heinrich Kaufhold and Jürgen Schneider (eds), *Geschichtswissenschaft und elektronische Datenverarbeitung* (Stuttgart, 1988). For further reading on the potential and limits of quantitative research, see Jürgen Kocka, 'Theories and Quantification in History', *Social Science History*, 8 (1984), pp. 169-78. For particularly successful examples of the application of quantitative methods and modern data processing, see Karl Schmid et al. (eds), *Die Klostergemeinschaft von Fulda im frühen Mittelalter*, 3 vols in 5 parts (Munich, 1978). *Biographisches Handbuch für das Preußische Abgeordnetenhaus 1867-1918*, compiled by Bernhard Mann et al. (Düsseldorf, 1988); Heinrich Best, *Die Männer von Bildung und Besitz. Struktur und Handeln parlamentarischer Führungsgruppen in Deutschland und Frankreich 1848/49* (Düsseldorf, 1990); Wilhelm Heinz Schröder (ed.), *Sozialdemokratische Reichstagsabgeordnete und Reichstagskandidaten 1898-1918. Biographisch-Statistisches Handbuch* (Düsseldorf, 1986). For collective biographies, see id. (ed.), *Lebenslauf und Gesellschaft. Zum Einsatz von kollektiven Biographien in der historischen Sozialforschung* (Stuttgart, 1985).
- 184 See the definition of 'social inequality' by Hartmut Kaelble, *Industrialisierung und soziale Ungleichheit. Europa im 19. Jahrhundert. Eine Bilanz* (Göttingen, 1983), p. 13.
- 185 On the history of social mobility, equality of opportunity and social inequality see also Hartmut Kaelble, *Historische Mobilitätsforschung. Westeuropa und die USA im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Darmstadt, 1978); id. (ed.), *Geschichte der sozialen Mobilität seit der industriellen Revolution* (Königstein/Ts., 1978); id., *Soziale Mobilität und Chancengleichheit im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Deutschland im internationalen Vergleich* (Göttingen, 1983); id., 'Arbeiter und soziale Ungleichheit in Westeuropa 1850-1930', in Tenfelde (ed.), *Arbeiter* (note 169), pp. 137-78; Hans-Ulrich Wehler, 'Vorüberlegungen zur historischen Analyse sozialer Ungleichheit', in id. (ed.), *Klassen in der europäischen Sozialgeschichte* (Göttingen, 1979), pp. 9-32. The 'system of social inequality' is also the subject of Wehler, *Deutsche Gesellschaftsgeschichte* (note 116). Jürgen Kocka, 'Stand - Klasse - Organisation. Strukturen sozialer Ungleichheit in Deutschland vom späten 18. bis zum frühen 20. Jahrhundert im Aufriss', in Wehler (ed.), *Klassen*, pp. 137-65; J. Kocka et al., *Familie und soziale Plazierung. Studien zum Verhältnis von Familie, sozialer Mobilität und Heiratsverhalten an*

*westfälischen Beispielen im späten 18. und 19. Jahrhundert* (Opladen, 1980); Albert Jeck, *Wachstum und Verteilung des Volkseinkommens. Untersuchungen und Materialien zur Entwicklung der Einkommensverteilung in Deutschland 1870-1913* (Tübingen, 1970); Gerhard Schildt, 'Wachstum und Stagnation der sozialen Mobilität im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Überlegungen zu mobilitätsfördernden und -hemmenden Faktoren', *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 39 (1977), pp. 702-30. See also the study by Spree cited in note 180.

- 186 On the historiography of the working class and the labour movement, see the substantial introduction in Klaus Tenfelde and Gerhard A. Ritter (eds), *Bibliographie zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterschaft und Arbeiterbewegung 1863 bis 1914. Berichtszeitraum 1945 bis 1975. Mit einer forschungsgeschichtlichen Einleitung* (Bonn, 1981), pp. 39-132; K. Tenfelde, 'Wege zur Sozialgeschichte der Arbeiterschaft und Arbeiterbewegung. Regional- und lokalgeschichtliche Forschungen (1945-1975) zur deutschen Arbeiterbewegung bis 1914', in Hans-Ulrich Wehler (ed.), *Die moderne deutsche Geschichte in der internationalen Forschung 1945-1975*, Geschichte und Gesellschaft, Sonderheft 4 (Göttingen, 1978), pp. 197-225; Tenfelde (ed.), *Arbeiter* (note 169); G. A. Ritter, 'Probleme der Erforschung von Arbeiterschaft und Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland vom Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg', *Tel Aviv Jahrbuch für deutsche Geschichte*, 16 (1978), pp. 369-97.
- 187 A large amount of literature exists on this topic. I mention only the following surveys: Jürgen Kocka, *Lohnarbeit und Klassenbildung. Arbeiter und Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland 1800-1975* (Berlin and Bonn, 1983); id., *Traditionsbildung und Klassenbildung. Zum sozial-historischen Ort der frühen deutschen Arbeiterbewegung* (Munich, 1986); id., *Weder Stand noch Klasse. Unterschichten um 1800* (Bonn, 1990); id., *Arbeitsverhältnisse und Arbeiterexistenzen. Grundlagen der Klassenbildung im 19. Jahrhundert* (Bonn, 1990). The last two books are volumes one and two respectively of *Geschichte der Arbeiter und Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland seit dem Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts*, ed. by Gerhard A. Ritter. For the concept behind the work see the editor's introduction in Kocka, *Weder Stand noch Klasse*, pp. 11-21. Josef Mooser, *Arbeiterleben in Deutschland 1900-1970. Klassenlagen, Kultur und Politik* (Frankfurt/M., 1984); Werner Conze and Ulrich Engelhardt (eds), *Arbeiter im Industrialisierungsprozeß. Herkunft, Lage und Verhalten* (Stuttgart, 1979); eid. (eds), *Arbeiterexistenz im 19. Jahrhundert. Lebensstandard und Lebensgestaltung deutscher Arbeiter und Handwerker* (Stuttgart, 1981); Dieter Langewiesche and Klaus Schönboven (eds), *Arbeiter in Deutschland. Studien zur Lebensweise der Arbeiterschaft im Zeitalter der Industrialisierung* (Paderborn, 1981); Hans Pohl (ed.), *Forschungen zur Lage der Arbeiter im Industria-*

lisierungsprozeß (Stuttgart, 1978); Wolfgang Ruppert (ed.), *Die Arbeiter. Lebensform, Alltag und Kultur von der Frühindustrialisierung bis zum "Wirtschaftswunder"* (Munich, 1986); Gerhard A. Ritter, 'Gewerbliche Zusammensetzung und innere Schichtung der industriellen Arbeiterschaft im Kaiserreich', in *Industrialisierung, sozialer Wandel und Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland und Polen bis 1914*, Schriftenreihe des Georg-Eckert-Instituts für Internationale Schulbuchforschung, 22/VII (Brunswick, 1983), pp. 91-115. The history of labour and of the labour movement are combined in id., *Die Sozialdemokratie im Deutschen Kaiserreich in sozialgeschichtlicher Perspektive* (Munich, 1989); id. and Elisabeth Müller-Luckner (eds.), *Der Aufstieg der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung. Sozialdemokratie und Freie Gewerkschaften im Parteiensystem und Sozialmilieu des Kaiserreichs* (Munich, 1990). On relations between the working class and the Bürgertum, the middle class, mainly but not exclusively in Germany, see Kocka (ed.), *Arbeiter und Bürger* (note 139). For local and regional studies of labour, some of which also deal with the labour movement, see, in addition to Tenfelde's important work on the mine workers of the Ruhr (note 69), Arno Herzig, D. Langewiesche and Arnolt Sywottek (eds), *Arbeiter in Hamburg. Unterschichten, Arbeiter und Arbeiterbewegung seit dem ausgehenden 18. Jahrhundert* (Hamburg, 1983); Helga Kutz-Bauer, *Arbeiterschaft, Arbeiterbewegung und bürgerlicher Staat in der Zeit der Großen Depression. Eine regional- und sozialgeschichtliche Studie zur Geschichte der Arbeiterbewegung im Großraum Hamburg 1873 bis 1890* (Bonn, 1988); Gerhard Schildt, Tagelöhner, Gesellen, Arbeiter. *Sozialgeschichte der vorindustriellen und industriellen Arbeiter in Braunschweig 1830-1880* (Stuttgart, 1986); Karl Ditt, *Industrialisierung. Arbeiterschaft und Arbeiterbewegung in Bielefeld 1850-1914* (Dortmund, 1982); Peter Borscheid, *Textilarbeiterschaft in der Industrialisierung. Soziale Lage und Mobilität in Württemberg (19. Jahrhundert)* (Stuttgart, 1978); Michael Grüttner, *Arbeiterwelt an der Wasserkante. Sozialgeschichte der Hamburger Hafenarbeiter 1886-1914* (Göttingen, 1984); Friedhelm Boll, *Massenbewegungen in Niedersachsen 1906-1920. Eine sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu den unterschiedlichen Entwicklungstypen Braunschweig und Hannover* (Bonn, 1981); Merith Niehuss, *Arbeiterschaft in Krieg und Inflation. Soziale Schichtung und Lage der Arbeiter in Augsburg und Linz 1910 bis 1925* (Berlin and New York, 1985). Some of the best regional and local studies have been produced by non-German scholars: Lawrence Schofer, *Die Formierung einer modernen Arbeiterschaft. Oberschlesien 1865-1914* (Dortmund, 1983); Mary Nolan, *Social Democracy and Society. Working-class Radicalism in Düsseldorf, 1890-1920* (Cambridge etc., 1981). See also the pioneering study published in the former GDR, which is not covered in this survey, by Hartmut Zwahr, *Zur Konstituierung des Proletariats als Klasse*.

*Strukturuntersuchungen über das Leipziger Proletariat während der Industriellen Revolution* (Berlin, 1978). On the history of the work force in specific factories, see Heilweg Schomerus, *Die Arbeiter der Maschinenfabrik Esslingen. Forschungen zur Lage der Arbeiterschaft im 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1977); Hermann-Josef Rupieper, *Arbeiter und Angestellte im Zeitalter der Industrialisierung. Eine sozialgeschichtliche Studie am Beispiel der Maschinenfabrik Augsburg und Nürnberg (MAN) 1837-1914* (Frankfurt and New York, 1982); Günther Schulz, *Die Arbeiter und Angestellten bei Felten & Guilleaume. Sozialgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Kölner Industrieunternehmens im 19. und beginnenden 20. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden, 1979); Rudolf Vetterli, *Industriearbeit, Arbeiterbewußtsein und gewerkschaftliche Organisation. Dargestellt am Beispiel der Georg Fischer AG (1890-1930)* (Göttingen, 1978). Vetterli's study also looks at labour conflicts and union organizations.

- 188 This is the concept behind the project *Geschichte der Arbeiter und der Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland seit dem Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts*, already mentioned in note 187. In addition to the two volumes by Kocka, three further volumes by Heinrich August Winkler have also been published: *Von der Revolution bis zur Stabilisierung; Der Schein der Normalität; Der Weg in die Katastrophe* (Berlin and Bonn, 1984-87; 2nd edn, 1985-1990). All three volumes are subtitled *Arbeiter und Arbeiterbewegung in der Weimarer Republik*. They deal respectively with the years 1918-1924, 1924-1930 and 1930-1933.
- 189 Examples of social and economic histories of trade unions are: Wilhelm Heinz Schröder, *Arbeitergeschichte und Arbeiterbewegung. Industriearbeit und Organisationsverhalten im 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt/M. and New York, 1987); Karl Gustav Werner, *Organisation und Politik der Gewerkschaften und Arbeitgeberverbände in der deutschen Bauwirtschaft* (Berlin, 1968); Rudolf Boch, *Handwerker-Sozialisten gegen Fabrikgesellschaft. Lokale Fachvereine, Massengewerkschaft und industrielle Rationalisierung in Solingen 1870 bis 1914* (Göttingen, 1985); Wolfgang Renzsch, *Handwerker im Reichsgründungsjahrzehnt* (Göttingen, 1986); Christiane Eisenberg, *Deutsche und englische Gewerkschaften. Entstehung und Entwicklung bis 1878 im Vergleich* (Göttingen, 1986) – this study looks mainly at tailors. See also the fine study by the Italian historian Marina Cattaruzza, *Arbeiter und Unternehmer auf den Werften des Kaiserreichs* (Stuttgart, 1988), and Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Hans-Gerhard Husung (eds), *Auf dem Wege zur Massengewerkschaft. Die Entwicklung der Gewerkschaften in Deutschland und Großbritannien 1880-1914* (Stuttgart, 1984). See esp. the articles by Klaus Tenfelde and Detlev J. K. Peukert in Tenfelde et al., *Geschichte der deutschen Gewerkschaften von den Anfängen bis 1945*, ed. by Ulrich Borsdorf and Gabriele Weiden (Cologne, 1987).

- 190 On this see Ritter (ed.), *Arbeiterkultur* (note 152); *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 5 (1979), special issue ed. by Jürgen Kocka, *Arbeiterkultur im 19. Jahrhundert*; Vernon Lidtke, 'Recent Literature on Workers' Culture in Germany and England', in Tenfelde (ed.), *Arbeiter* (note 169), pp. 337-62; as well as the collection of essays edited by Albrecht Lehmann, *Studien zur Arbeiterkultur. Beiträge der 2. Arbeitstagung der Kommission "Arbeiterkultur" in der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde in Hamburg ... 1983* (Münster, 1984). This volume is largely influenced by research in cultural anthropology in this field for the period from the end of the nineteenth century to 1933. On the culture of Social Democratic workers cf. the study by the American historian Lidtke, *The Alternative Culture. Socialist Labor in Imperial Germany* (New York and Oxford, 1985), and the local study by Stefan Goch, *Sozialdemokratische Arbeiterbewegung und Arbeiterkultur im Ruhrgebiet. Eine Untersuchung am Beispiel Gelsenkirchen 1848-1975* (Düsseldorf, 1990). Important aspects of workers' culture in Austria are treated by Dieter Langewiesche, *Zur Freizeit des Arbeiters. Bildungsbestrebungen und Freizeitgestaltung österreichischer Arbeiter im Kaiserreich und in der Ersten Republik* (Stuttgart, 1979).
- 191 Charles Tilly, Louise Tilly and Richard Tilly, *The Rebellious Century 1830-1930* (Cambridge, Mass., 1975); R. Tilly and Gerd Hohorst, 'Sozialer Protest im 19. Jahrhundert. Skizze eines Forschungsansatzes', in Konrad H. Jarausch (ed.), *Quantifizierung in der Geschichtswissenschaft. Probleme und Möglichkeiten* (Düsseldorf, 1976), pp. 232-78. For literature on the study of protest, see the work by Grießinger cited in note 181; *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, nos. 2 and 3 (1977), edited by R. H. Tilly and devoted to the topic of 'Social Protest', as well as Heinrich Volkmann and Jürgen Bergmann (eds), *Sozialer Protest. Studien zu traditioneller Resistenz und kollektiver Gewalt in Deutschland vom Vormärz bis zur Reichsgründung* (Opladen, 1984); Hans-Gerhard Husung, *Protest und Repression im Vormärz. Norddeutschland zwischen Restauration und Revolution* (Göttingen, 1983); Arno Herzig, *Unterschichtenprotest in Deutschland 1790-1870* (Göttingen, 1988); Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Gerhard Hirschfeld (eds), *Sozialprotest, Gewalt, Terror. Gewaltanwendung durch gesellschaftliche Randgruppen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1982), also available in English as *Social Protest, Violence and Terror in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Europe* (London, 1982); Helga Grebing, *Arbeiterbewegung. Sozialer Protest und kollektive Interessenvertretung bis 1914*, 2nd edn (Munich, 1987). On the state of research, see Werner Giesselmann, 'Protest als Gegenstand sozialgeschichtlicher Forschung', in Schieder and Sellin (eds), *Sozialgeschichte in Deutschland* (note 17), vol. 3, pp. 50-77.

- 192 On research to 1980, see Klaus Tenfelde and Heinrich Volkmann (eds), *Streik. Zur Geschichte des Arbeitskampfes in Deutschland während der Industrialisierung* (Munich, 1981); for the most recent research, see Dick Geary, 'Protest and Strike: Recent Research on "Collective Action" in England, Germany and France', in Tenfelde (ed.), *Arbeiter* (note 169), pp. 363-87; Friedrich Boll, 'Streiks, Streikwellen, Organisationsprobleme. Zu neueren Trends in der Streikforschung', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 26 (1986), pp. 495-512. The concept of the rationalization and modernization of labour disputes is developed by Hartmut Kaelble and H. Volkmann, 'Konjunktur und Streik während des Übergangs zum organisierten Kapitalismus in Deutschland', *Zeitschrift für Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften*, 92, II (1972), pp. 513-44; H. Volkmann, 'Modernisierung des Arbeitskampfes? Zum Formwandel von Streik und Aussperrung in Deutschland 1864-1975', in Hartmut Kaelble et al. (eds), *Probleme der Modernisierung in Deutschland. Sozialhistorische Studien zum 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Opladen, 1978), pp. 110-70; id., 'Organisation und Konflikt. Gewerkschaften, Arbeitgeberverbände und Entwicklung des Arbeitskonflikts im späten Kaiserreich', in Conze and Engelhardt (eds), *Arbeiter* (note 187), pp. 422-38. For criticism of this concept see the article by Boll mentioned above, esp. pp. 497-502; F. Boll, 'Changing forms of labor conflict: secular development or strike waves?', in Leopold Haimson and Charles Tilly (eds), *Strikes, Wars and Revolutions in an International Perspective. Strike Waves in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries* (New York etc., 1989); Ilse Costas, *Auswirkungen der Konzentration des Kapitals auf die Arbeiterklasse in Deutschland (1880-1940)* (Frankfurt and New York, 1981); Gerald D. Feldman, 'Streiks in Deutschland 1914-1933. Probleme und Forschungsaufgaben', in Tenfelde and Volkmann (eds), *Streik*, pp. 271-86. The discussion of strikes in Germany has also absorbed some of the arguments put forward by the British social historian James E. Cronin in his study, *Industrial Conflict in Modern Britain* (London, Totowa, 1979), against the theory of a modernization of strikes in Britain.
- 193 *Untersuchungen über die Lage des Handwerks in Deutschland mit besonderer Rücksicht auf seine Konkurrenzfähigkeit gegenüber der Großindustrie*, Schriften des Vereins für Socialpolitik, vols 62-70 (Berlin 1895-1897); on this see Hans Grandke, 'Zusammenfassende Darstellung der Ergebnisse dieser Enquête', *Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung, Verwaltung und Volkswirtschaft*, 21 (1897), pp. 265-322.
- 194 Cf. Adolf Noll, *Sozio-ökonomischer Strukturwandel des Handwerks in der zweiten Phase der Industrialisierung unter bes. Berücksichtigung der Regierungsbezirke Arnsberg und Münster* (Göttingen, 1975); Wolfram Fischer, 'Die Rolle des Kleingewerbes im wirtschaftlichen Wachstumsprozeß in Deutschland 1850-1914', in id., *Wirtschaft und Ge-*

- sellschaft* (note 57), pp. 338-48; Karl Heinrich Kaufhold, 'Das Handwerk zwischen Anpassung und Verdrängung', in Pohl (ed.), *Sozialgeschichtliche Probleme* (note 179), pp. 103-42; Friedrich Lenger, *Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Handwerker seit 1800* (Frankfurt/M., 1988).
- 195 Hans Pohl (ed.), *Berufliche Aus- und Weiterbildung in der deutschen Wirtschaft seit dem 19. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden, 1979); Bernhard Jauch, *Das gewerbliche Lehrlingswesen in Deutschland seit dem Inkrafttreten des Handwerkersetzes vom 26. Juli 1897 mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Badens* (Freiburg, 1911); K. Abraham, *Der Strukturwandel des Handwerks in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts und seine Bedeutung für die Berufserziehung* (Cologne, 1955); Reinhold Reith, 'Zur beruflichen Sozialisation im Handwerk vom 18. bis ins frühe 20. Jahrhundert. Umrisse einer Sozialgeschichte der Lehrlinge', *Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 76 (1989), pp. 1-27; Karl-Jürgen Rinneberg, *Das betriebliche Ausbildungswesen in der Zeit der industriellen Umgestaltung Deutschlands* (Cologne and Vienna, 1985); Wolfgang Muth, *Berufsausbildung in der Weimarer Republik* (Stuttgart, 1985).
- 196 Ulrich Engelhardt (ed.), *Handwerker in der Industrialisierung. Lage, Kultur und Politik vom späten 18. bis ins frühe 20. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1984); Friedrich Lenger, *Zwischen Kleinbürgertum und Proletariat. Studien zur Sozialgeschichte der Düsseldorfer Handwerker 1816-1878* (Göttingen, 1986). See also the studies mentioned above by Volkov (note 82), Grießinger (note 181), Boch and Renzsch (note 189), and the collection of articles edited by Conze and Engelhardt (note 187).
- 197 In addition to the study by Jürgen Kocka cited in note 69, see *id.*, *Die Angestellten in der deutschen Geschichte, 1850-1980. Vom Privatbeamten zum angestellten Arbeitnehmer* (Göttingen, 1981); *id.* (ed.), *Angestellte im europäischen Vergleich. Die Herausbildung angestellter Mittelschichten seit dem späten 19. Jahrhundert*, Geschichte und Gesellschaft, Sonderheft 7 (Göttingen, 1981); Helmuth Trischler, *Steiger im deutschen Bergbau. Zur Sozialgeschichte der technischen Angestellten 1815-1945* (Munich, 1988); Rolf Engelsing, 'Die wirtschaftliche und soziale Differenzierung der deutschen kaufmännischen Angestellten im In- und Ausland 1690-1900', in *id.*, *Sozialgeschichte* (note 182), pp. 51-111; Günter Hartfiel, *Angestellte und Angestelltengewerkschaften in Deutschland. Entwicklung und gegenwärtige Situation von beruflicher Tätigkeit, sozialer Stellung und Verbandswesen der Angestellten in der gewerblichen Wirtschaft* (Berlin, 1961); Hans Speyer, *Die Angestellten vor dem Nationalsozialismus. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der deutschen Sozialstruktur 1918-1933* (Göttingen, 1977); Hannes Siegrist, *Vom Familienbetrieb zum Managerunternehmen. Angestellte und industrielle Organisation am Beispiel der Georg Fischer AG*

- in Schaffhausen 1797-1930* (Göttingen, 1981); Ellen Lorentz, *Aufbruch oder Rückschritt? Arbeit, Alltag und Organisation weiblicher Angestellter in der Kaiserzeit und Weimarer Republik* (Bielefeld, 1989). See also the studies by Günther Schulz and Hermann-Josef Rupieper cited in note 187 above, and by Michael Prinz (note 144).
- 198 For information on the research group's programme, see Kocka's outline of the project, as well as id., 'Bürgertum und Bürgerlichkeit als Probleme der deutschen Geschichte vom späten 18. zum frühen 20. Jahrhundert', in id. (ed.), *Bürger und Bürgerlichkeit im 19. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 1987), pp. 21-63. For the results of the project see J. Kocka and U. Frevert (eds), *Bürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert. Deutschland im europäischen Vergleich*, 3 vols (Munich, 1988); U. Frevert (ed.), *Bürgerinnen und Bürger. Geschlechtsverhältnisse im 19. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen, 1988); Dieter Langewiesche (ed.), *Liberalismus im 19. Jahrhundert. Deutschland im europäischen Vergleich* (Göttingen, 1988); Hannes Siegrist (ed.), *Bürgerliche Berufe. Beiträge zur Sozialgeschichte der Professionen, freien Berufe und Akademiker im internationalen Vergleich* (Göttingen, 1988). On the history of the Bürgertum cf. the story of one of the famous *bürgerliche* families – the Bassermanns – from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries, as told by Lothar Gall, *Bürgertum in Deutschland* (Berlin, 1989). Utz Haltern, *Bürgerliche Gesellschaft. Sozialtheoretische und sozialhistorische Aspekte* (Darmstadt, 1985); Rudolf Vierhaus (ed.), *Bürger und Bürgerlichkeit im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Heidelberg, 1981); Manfred Riedel, 'Bürger, Stadtbürger, Bürgertum', in Brunner, Conze and Koselleck (eds), *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* (note 53), vol. 1, pp. 672-725; M. Rainer Lepsius, 'Bürgertum als Gegenstand der Sozialgeschichte', in Schieder and Sellin (eds), *Sozialgeschichte in Deutschland* (note 17), vol. 4, pp. 61-80.
- 199 Jürgen Kocka, *Unternehmer in der deutschen Industrialisierung* (Göttingen, 1975); Friedrich Zunkel, *Der rheinisch-westfälische Unternehmer 1834-1879* (Cologne, 1962); Hans J. Teuteberg, *Westfälische Textilunternehmer in der Industrialisierung. Sozialer Status und betriebliches Verhalten im 19. Jahrhundert* (Dortmund, 1980); Toni Pierenkemper, *Die westfälischen Schwerindustriellen 1852-1913. Soziale Struktur und unternehmerischer Erfolg* (Göttingen, 1979); Hansjoachim Henning, 'Soziale Verflechtungen der Unternehmer in Westfalen 1860-1914. Ein Beitrag zur Diskussion um die Stellung der Unternehmer in der Gesellschaft des deutschen Kaiserreiches', *Zeitschrift für Unternehmensgeschichte*, 23 (1978), pp. 1-30; Hans Hesselmann, *Das Wirtschaftsbürgertum in Bayern 1890-1914. Ein Beitrag zur Analyse der Wechselbeziehungen zwischen Wirtschaft und Politik am Beispiel des Wirtschaftsbürgertums im Bayern der Prinzregentenzeit* (Stuttgart, 1985); Hans Jaeger, *Unternehmer in der deutschen Politik (1890-1918)* (Bonn, 1976); Hartmut Kaelble, 'Wie

- feudal waren die deutschen Unternehmer im Kaiserreich? Ein Zwischenbericht', in Richard Tilly (ed.), *Beiträge zur quantitativen vergleichenden Unternehmensgeschichte* (Stuttgart, 1985), pp. 148-74; see also the study by Kaelbe cited in note 66.
- 200 In addition to the work by Winkler (note 81), see Heinz-Gerhard Haupt (ed.), 'Bourgeois und Volk zugleich?' *Zur Geschichte des Kleinbürgertums im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt/M., 1978); H.-G. Haupt, 'Kleinhändler und Arbeiter in Bremen zwischen 1890 und 1914', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 22 (1982), pp. 95-132; id. (ed.), *Die radikale Mitte. Lebensweise und Politik von Handwerkern und Kleinhändlern in Deutschland seit 1848* (Munich, 1985); id., 'Zur gesellschaftlichen Bedeutung des Kleinbürgertums in west-europäischen Gesellschaften des 19. Jahrhunderts', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 16 (1990), pp. 296-317; Robert Gellately, *The Politics of Economic Despair. Shopkeepers and German Politics 1890-1914* (London and Beverley Hills, 1979); Thea Braatz, *Das Kleinbürgertum in München und seine Öffentlichkeit 1830-1870. Ein Beitrag zur Mentalitätsforschung* (Munich, 1977); Annette Leppert-Fögen, *Die deklassierte Klasse. Studien zur Geschichte und Ideologie des Kleinbürgertums* (Frankfurt/M., 1974). For research on the Kleinbürgertum (petty bourgeoisie) in the Weimar Republic, see H.-G. Haupt, 'Mittelstand und Kleinbürgertum in der Weimarer Republik. Zu Problemen und Perspektiven ihrer Erforschung', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 26 (1986), pp. 217-38.
- 201 Hansjoachim Henning, *Das westdeutsche Bürgertum in der Epoche der Hochindustrialisierung 1860-1914. Soziales Verhalten und soziale Strukturen*, vol. 1: *Das Bildungsbürgertum in den preußischen Westprovinzen* (Wiesbaden, 1972); Rudolf Vierhaus, 'Umrisse einer Sozialgeschichte der Gebildeten in Deutschland', *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*, 60 (1980), pp. 395-419; Werner Conze and Jürgen Kocka (eds), *Bildungsbürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert*, Part I: *Bildungssystem und Professionalisierung im internationalen Vergleich* (Stuttgart, 1985); Jürgen Kocka (ed.), *Bildungsbürgertum im 19. Jahrhundert*, Part IV: *Politischer Einfluß und gesellschaftliche Formation* (Stuttgart, 1989); Ulrich Engelhardt, 'Bildungsbürgertum'. Begriffs- und Dogmengeschichte eines Etiketts (Stuttgart, 1986); Ulrich Hermann (ed.), *Die Bildung des Bürgers. Die Formierung der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft und die Gebildeten im 18. Jahrhundert* (Weinheim and Basel, 1982); Klaus Vondung (ed.), *Das Wilhelminische Bildungsbürgertum. Zur Sozialgeschichte seiner Ideen* (Göttingen, 1976).
- 202 Cf. Charles E. McClelland, 'Zur Professionalisierung der akademischen Berufe in Deutschland', in Conze and Kocka (eds), *Bildungsbürgertum* (note 201), pp. 233-47; Fritz K. Ringer, *Die Gelehrten. Der Niedergang der deutschen Mandarine 1890-1933*

(Stuttgart, 1983); Rüdiger vom Bruch, *Wissenschaft, Politik und öffentliche Meinung. Gelehrtenpolitik im wilhelminischen Deutschland (1890-1914)* (Husum, 1980); Claudia Huerkamp, *Der Aufstieg der Ärzte im 19. Jahrhundert. Vom gelehrtenden Stand zum professionellen Experten: Das Beispiel Preußens* (Göttingen, 1985); Annette Drees, *Die Ärzte auf dem Weg zu Prestige und Wohlstand. Sozialgeschichte der württembergischen Ärzte im 19. Jahrhundert* (Münster, 1989); Hannes Siegrist (ed.), *Bürgerliche Berufe. Zur Sozialgeschichte der freien und akademischen Berufe im internationalen Vergleich. Acht Beiträge* (Göttingen, 1988); see also Lundgreen's study on technicians cited in note 59.

- 203 In addition to the study by Rosenberg cited in note 38, and the work of the American historian John R. Gillis, *The Prussian Bureaucracy 1840-1860* (Stanford, 1965), see Bernd Wunder, *Privilegierung und Disziplinierung. Die Entstehung des Berufsbeamtentums in Bayern und Württemberg 1780-1825* (Munich, 1978); Hans Hattenhauer, *Geschichte des Beamtentums* (Cologne, 1980); Hansjoachim Henning, *Die deutsche Beamtenchaft im 19. Jahrhundert. Zwischen Stand und Beruf* (Wiesbaden, 1984); Wilhelm Bleek, *Von der Kameralausbildung zum Juristenprivileg. Studium, Prüfung und Ausbildung der höheren Beamten des allgemeinen Verwaltungsdienstes in Deutschland im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1972); Tibor Süle, *Preußische Bürokratietradition. Zur Entwicklung von Verwaltung und Beamtenchaft in Deutschland 1871-1918* (Göttingen, 1988); Andreas Kunz, *Civil Servants and the Politics of Inflation in Germany, 1914-1924* (Berlin and New York, 1986); Kurt G. A. Jeserich, Hans Pohl and Georg-Christoph von Unruh (eds), *Deutsche Verwaltungsgeschichte*, 6 vols (Stuttgart, 1983-1988) also contains a great deal of information on civil servants.
- 204 Heinz Gollwitzer, *Die Standesherren. Die politische und gesellschaftliche Stellung der Mediatisierten 1815-1918* (Göttingen, 1964); Heinz Reif, *Westfälischer Adel 1770-1860. Vom Herrschaftsstand zur regionalen Elite* (Göttingen, 1979).
- 205 See, however, Hellmuth Rössler (ed.), *Deutscher Adel*, vol. 1: 1430-1555, Büdinger Vorträge 1963, vol. 2: 1555-1740, Büdinger Vorträge 1964 (Darmstadt, 1965); Hans Hubert Hofmann, *Adlige Herrschaft und souveräner Staat. Studien über Staat und Gesellschaft in Franken und Bayern im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1962); Joachim Lampe, *Aristokratie, Hofadel und Staatspatriziat in Kurhannover. Die Lebenskreise der höheren Beamten an den kurhannoverischen Zentral- und Hofbehörden 1714-1760*, 2 vols (Göttingen, 1963); Hans-Ulrich Wehler (ed.), *Europäischer Adel 1750-1950. Dreizehn Beiträge, Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, Sonderheft 13 (Göttingen, 1990); Armgard von Reden-Dohna and Ralph Melville (eds), *Der Adel an der Schwelle des bürgerlichen Zeitalters 1780-1860* (Stuttgart, 1988).

- 206 However, for the period to 1815, see the book by Rosenberg cited in note 38, and for the nineteenth and twentieth centuries see his important essay cited in note 72. On the *Junker*, the East-Elbian landed aristocracy, see also the recent survey by Francis L. Carsten, *Geschichte der preußischen Junker* (Frankfurt/M., 1988), now available in English as *A History of the Prussian Junkers* (Aldershot, 1989), and Hanna Schissler, 'Die Junker. Zur Sozialgeschichte und historischen Bedeutung der agrarischen Eliten in Deutschland', in Hans-Jürgen Puhle and Hans-Ulrich Wehler (eds), *Preußen im Rückblick* (Göttingen, 1981), pp. 89-122. On historical research on the German nobility, see Heinz Reif, 'Der Adel in der modernen Sozialgeschichte', in Schieder and Sellin (eds), *Sozialgeschichte in Deutschland* (note 17), vol. 4, pp. 34-60; Karl-Georg Faber, 'Mittel-europäischer Adel im Wandel der Neuzeit', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 7 (1981), pp. 276-96; Christoph Dipper, 'L'aristocrazia tedesca nell'epoca borghese. Adattamento e continuità', *Quaderni Storici*, 21 (1968), pp. 361-92.
- 207 See, for example, Dieter Grimm, 'Die verfassungsrechtlichen Grundlagen der Privatrechtsgesetzgebung' in Helmut Coing (ed.), *Handbuch der Quellen und Literatur der neueren europäischen Privatrechtsgeschichte*, vol. 3, part I (Munich, 1982), pp. 17-173; Harald Steindl (ed.), *Wege zur Arbeitsrechtsgeschichte* (Frankfurt/M., 1984); Wolfgang Hromadka, *Das Recht der leitenden Angestellten im historisch-gesellschaftlichen Zusammenhang* (Munich, 1979).
- 208 Questions of social history are incorporated in the project *Handbuch der Geschichte des deutschen Parlamentarismus*, ed. by Gerhard A. Ritter on behalf of the *Kommission für Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien*. Six volumes have been published to date (Düsseldorf, 1977-1987). For election studies see Karl Rohe (ed.), *Elections, Parties and Political Traditions. Social Foundations of German Parties and Party Systems, 1867-1987* (New York, Oxford and Munich, 1990); G. A. Ritter and Merith Niehuss, *Wahlgeschichtliches Arbeitsbuch. Materialien zur Statistik des Kaiserreichs 1871-1918* (Munich, 1980) with an extensive bibliography; Jürgen W. Falter, Thomas Lindenberger and Siegfried Schumann, *Wahlen und Abstimmungen in der Weimarer Republik. Materialien zum Wahlverhalten 1919-1933* (Munich, 1986); J. W. Falter and Dirk Hänisch, 'Die Anfälligkeit von Arbeitern gegenüber der NSDAP bei den Reichstagwahlen 1928-1933', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 25 (1986), pp. 179-216; Rudolf Heberle, *Landbevölkerung und Nationalsozialismus. Eine soziologische Untersuchung der politischen Willensbildung in Schleswig-Holstein 1928-1932* (Stuttgart, 1962); Richard F. Hamilton, *Who voted for Hitler?* (Princeton, 1982); Thomas Childers, *The Nazi-Voter. The Social Foundations of Fascism in Germany 1919-1933* (Chapel Hill, 1983). Childers and Hamilton are

- historians from the USA, where a number of other studies of the social basis of the NSDAP vote have been produced by social scientists. G. A. Ritter and M. Niehuss, *Wahlen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Bundestags- und Landtagswahlen 1946-1987* (Munich, 1987).
- 209 Florian Tennstedt, *Sozialgeschichte der Sozialpolitik in Deutschland vom 18. Jahrhundert bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg* (Göttingen, 1981); Gerhard A. Ritter, *Social Welfare in Germany and Britain. Origins and Developments* (Leamington Spa and New York, 1986); id., *Der Sozialstaat* (note 5); Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Wolfgang Mock (eds), *Die Entstehung des Wohlfahrtsstaates in Großbritannien und Deutschland 1850-1950* (Stuttgart, 1982); Jens Alber, *Vom Armenhaus zum Wohlfahrtsstaat: Analysen zur Entwicklung der Sozialversicherung in Westeuropa* (Frankfurt/M. and New York, 1982); id., *Der Sozialstaat in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1950-1983* (Frankfurt and New York, 1989); Hans Günter Hockerts, *Sozialpolitische Entscheidungen im Nachkriegsdeutschland. Alliierte und deutsche Sozialversicherungspolitik 1945 bis 1957* (Stuttgart, 1980).
- 210 Peter Blickle et al., *Aufruhr und Empörung? Studien zum bäuerlichen Widerstand im Alten Reich* (Munich, 1980); Winfried Schulze (ed.), *Europäische Bauernrevolten der frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt/M., 1982); id. (ed.), *Aufstände, Revolten, Prozesse. Beiträge zu bäuerlichen Widerstandsbewegungen im frühneuzeitlichen Europa* (Stuttgart, 1983).
- 211 Cf. esp. Franklin Kopitzsch, *Grundzüge einer Sozialgeschichte der Aufklärung in Hamburg und Altona*, 2 vols (Hamburg, 1982); id. (ed.), *Aufklärung, Absolutismus und Bürgertum in Deutschland. Zwölf Aufsätze* (Munich, 1976); Helmut Kiesel and Paul Münch, *Gesellschaft und Literatur im 18. Jahrhundert. Voraussetzungen und Entstehung des literarischen Markts in Deutschland* (Munich, 1977); Rudolf Vierhaus (ed.), *Wissenschaften im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Göttingen, 1985) and id., *Bürger* (note 198); Richard van Dülmen, *Die Gesellschaft der Aufklärer. Zur bürgerlichen Emanzipation und aufklärerischen Kultur in Deutschland* (Frankfurt/M., 1986).
- 212 Cf. Christoph Dipper, 'Probleme einer Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte der Säkularisation in Deutschland (1803-1813)', in Armgard von Reden-Dohna (ed.), *Deutschland und Italien im Zeitalter Napoleons* (Wiesbaden, 1979), pp. 123-70; Alfred Kube, 'Der Einsatz der Datenerfassung mit EDV bei Forschungen zur Besitzumschichtung als Folge der Säkularisation', in Eberhard Weis and Elisabeth Müller-Luckner (eds), *Reformen im rheinbündischen Deutschland* (Munich, 1984), pp. 7-21; Michael Müller, 'Das Problem der Weiterverkäufe säkularisierten Kirchengutes', ibid., pp. 23-32. See also the pilot study by M. Müller, *Säkularisation und Grundbesitz. Zur Sozialgeschichte des Saar-Mosel-Raumes 1794-1813* (Boppard, 1980), and Wolfgang Schieder and A. Kube, *Säkularisation und*

*Medialisierung. Die Veräußerung der Nationalgüter im Rhein-Mosel-Departement 1803-1813* (Boppard a. Rh., 1987). Harm Klüting, *Die Säkularisation im Herzogtum Westfalen 1802-1834. Vorbereitung, Vollzug und wirtschaftlich-soziale Auswirkungen der Klosterauflösung* (Cologne, 1980) was prepared independently of this project.

- 213 See the report on the project, with extensive bibliographical references, by Carl-Ludwig Holtfrerich, 'Inflation und Wiederaufbau in Deutschland und Europa 1914-1924. Ein Projekt der Historischen Kommission zu Berlin und der Stiftung Volkswagenwerk', in *Jahrbuch der historischen Forschung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Berichtsjahr 1983* (Munich etc., 1984), pp. 40-50, and the research reports by Michael Schneider, 'Deutsche Gesellschaft in Krieg und Währungskrise, 1914-1924. Ein Jahrzehnt Forschungen zur Inflation', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 26 (1986), pp. 301-19 and William H. Hubbard, 'The New Inflation History', *Journal of Modern History*, 62 (1990), pp. 550-69. By 1990 eleven monographs and four collections of articles had been published. Eight further monographs are in preparation. At least two further collections of articles and other books have been significantly influenced by the project.
- 214 On the membership of the Nazi organizations, see Michael Kater, *The Nazi Party: A Social Profile of Members and Leaders, 1919-1945* (Oxford, 1983); Mathilde Jamin, *Zwischen den Klassen. Zur Sozialstruktur der SA-Führerschaft* (Wuppertal, 1984). On the electorate, see the studies by Heberle, Hamilton, Childers and Falter cited in note 208. Many studies of social classes and groups in the National Socialist period have been published. The following deserve special mention: Timothy W. Mason, *Sozialpolitik im Dritten Reich. Arbeiterklasse und Volksgemeinschaft*, 2nd edn (Opladen, 1978); Rüdiger Hachtmann, *Industriearbeit im "Dritten Reich". Untersuchungen zu den Lohn- und Arbeitsbedingungen in Deutschland 1933-1945* (Göttingen, 1989); Adelheid von Saldern, *Mittelstand im 'Dritten Reich'. Handwerker - Einzelhändler - Bauern* (Frankfurt/M. and New York, 1979); Hans Mommsen, *Beamtentum im Dritten Reich. Mit ausgewählten Quellen zur nationalsozialistischen Beamtenpolitik* (Stuttgart, 1966). On popular reaction to National Socialism, see Detlev Peukert, Jürgen Reulecke and Adelheid Gräfin zu Castell-Rüdenhausen (eds), *Die Reihen fast geschlossen. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Alltags unterm Nationalsozialismus* (Wuppertal, 1981), as well as the report on recent research by D. J. K. Peukert, 'Das "Dritte Reich" aus der "Alltags"-Perspektive', *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 26 (1986), pp. 533-56.
- 215 On this see Martin Broszat, 'Zur Sozialgeschichte des deutschen Widerstandes', *Vierteljahrsshefte für Zeitgeschichte*, 34 (1986), pp. 293-309. The new approach, which has led to a modification of the concept of resistance, has clearly influenced the six volumes pro-

duced by the project 'Widerstand und Verfolgung in Bayern 1933-1945', and published as *Bayern in der NS-Zeit* by the Institut für Zeitgeschichte in conjunction with the Bavarian state archives (Munich and Vienna, 1977-83). See also the study by the British historian Ian Kershaw, *Popular Opinion and Political Dissent in the Third Reich: Bavaria 1933-1945* (Oxford, 1983).

- 216 Martin Broszat, Klaus-Dietmar Henke and Hans Woller (eds), *Von Stalingrad zur Währungsreform. Zur Sozialgeschichte des Umbruchs in Deutschland* (Munich, 1988); Werner Conze and M. Rainer Lepsius (eds), *Sozialgeschichte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Beiträge zum Kontinuitätsproblem* (Stuttgart, 1983).

# PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

- Vol. 1: Wilhelm Lenz (ed.), *Archivalische Quellen zur deutsch-britischen Geschichte seit 1500 in Großbritannien; Manuscript Sources for the History of Germany since 1500 in Great Britain* (Boppard a. Rh.: Boldt, 1975)
- Vol. 2: Lothar Kettenacker (ed.), *Das "Andere Deutschland" im Zweiten Weltkrieg. Emigration und Widerstand in internationaler Perspektive; The "Other Germany" in the Second World War. Emigration and Resistance in International Perspective* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1977)
- Vol. 3: Marie-Luise Recker, *England und der Donauraum, 1919-1929. Probleme einer europäischen Nachkriegsordnung* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1976)
- Vol. 4: Paul Kluge and Peter Alter (eds), *Aspekte der deutsch-britischen Beziehungen im Laufe der Jahrhunderte; Aspects of Anglo-German Relations through the Centuries* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1978)
- Vol. 5: Wolfgang J. Mommsen, Peter Alter and Robert W. Scribner (eds), *Stadtbürgertum und Adel in der Reformation. Studien zur Sozialgeschichte der Reformation in England und Deutschland; The Urban Classes, the Nobility and the Reformation. Studies on the Social History of the Reformation in England and Germany* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1979)
- Vol. 6: Hans-Christoph Junge, *Flottenpolitik und Revolution. Die Entstehung der englischen Seemacht während der Herrschaft Cromwells* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1980)
- Vol. 7: Milan Hauner, *India in Axis Strategy. Germany, Japan, and Indian Nationalists in the Second World War* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1981)
- Vol. 8: Gerhard Hirschfeld and Lothar Kettenacker (eds), *Der "Führerstaat": Mythos und Realität. Studien zur Struktur und Politik des Dritten Reiches; The "Führer State": Myth and Reality. Studies on the Structure and Politics of the Third Reich* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1981)
- Vol. 9: Hans-Eberhard Hilpert, *Kaiser- und Papstbriefe in den Chronica majora des Matthaeus Paris* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1981)

- Vol. 10: Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Gerhard Hirschfeld (eds), *Sozialprotest, Gewalt, Terror. Gewaltanwendung durch politische und gesellschaftliche Randgruppen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)
- Vol. 11: Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Wolfgang Mock (eds), *Die Entstehung des Wohlfahrtsstaates in Großbritannien und Deutschland 1850-1950* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)
- Vol. 12: Peter Alter, *Wissenschaft, Staat, Mäzene. Anfänge moderner Wissenschaftspolitik in Großbritannien 1850-1920* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)
- Vol. 13: Wolfgang Mock, *Imperiale Herrschaft und nationales Interesse. 'Constructive Imperialism' oder Freihandel in Großbritannien vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)
- Vol. 14: Gerhard Hirschfeld (ed.), *Exil in Großbritannien. Zur Emigration aus dem nationalsozialistischen Deutschland* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)
- Vol. 15: Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Hans-Gerhard Husung (eds), *Auf dem Wege zur Massengewerkschaft. Die Entwicklung der Gewerkschaften in Deutschland und Großbritannien 1880-1914* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1984)
- Vol. 16: Josef Foschepoth (ed.), *Kalter Krieg und Deutsche Frage. Deutschland im Widerstreit der Mächte 1945-1952* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985)
- Vol. 17: Ulrich Wengenroth, *Unternehmensstrategien und technischer Fortschritt. Die deutsche und britische Stahlindustrie 1865-1895* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986)
- Vol. 18: Helmut Reifeld, *Zwischen Empire und Parlament. Zur Gedankenbildung und Politik Lord Roseberys (1880-1905)* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987)
- Vol. 19: Michael Maurer, *Aufklärung und Anglophilie in Deutschland* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987)
- Vol. 20: Karl Heinz Metz, *Industrialisierung und Sozialpolitik. Das Problem der sozialen Sicherheit in Großbritannien 1795-1911* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988)

- Vol. 21: Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Wolfgang Schwentker (eds), *Max Weber und seine Zeitgenossen* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988)
- Vol. 22: Lothar Kettenacker, *Krieg zur Friedenssicherung. Die Deutschlandplanung der britischen Regierung während des Zweiten Weltkrieges* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989)
- Vol. 23: Adolf M. Birke and Günther Heydemann (eds), *Die Herausforderung des europäischen Staatensystems. Nationale Ideologie und staatliches Interesse zwischen Restauration und Imperialismus* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989)
- Vol. 24: Helga Woggon, *Integrativer Sozialismus und nationale Befreiung. Politik und Wirkungsgeschichte James Connollys in Irland* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990)
- Vol. 25: Kaspar von Greyerz, *Vorsehungsglaube und Kosmologie. Studien zu englischen Selbstzeugnissen des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990)
- Vol. 26: Andreas Wirsching, *Parlament und Volkes Stimme. Unterhaus und Öffentlichkeit im England des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990)
- Vol. 27: Claudia Schnurmann, *Kommerz und Klüngel. Der Englandhandel Kölner Kaufleute im 16. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991)

## STUDIES OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON – OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Eckhart Hellmuth (ed.), *The Transformation of Political Culture: England and Germany in the Late Eighteenth Century* (Oxford, 1990)

Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke (eds), *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility. The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age c. 1450-1650* (Oxford, 1991)

## FURTHER PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Wolfgang Mock (eds), *The Emergence of the Welfare State in Britain and Germany* (London: Croom Helm, 1981)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Gerhard Hirschfeld (eds), *Social Protest, Violence and Terror in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Europe* (London: Macmillan, 1982)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Lothar Kettenacker (eds), *The Fascist Challenge and the Policy of Appeasement* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1983)

Gerhard Hirschfeld (ed.), *Exile in Great Britain. Refugees from Hitler's Germany* (Leamington Spa: Berg Publishers, 1984)

Kaspar von Greyerz (ed.), *Religion, Politics and Social Protest. Three Studies on Early Modern Germany* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1984)

Kaspar von Greyerz (ed.), *Religion and Society in Early Modern Europe 1500-1800* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1985)

Josef Foschepoth and Rolf Steininger (eds), *Die britische Deutschland- und Besatzungspolitik 1945-1949* (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1985)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Hans-Gerhard Husung (eds), *The Development of Trade Unionism in Great Britain and Germany, 1880-1914* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1985)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Jürgen Osterhammel (eds), *Imperialism and After. Continuities and Discontinuities* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1986)

Gerhard Hirschfeld (ed.), *The Policies of Genocide. Jews and Soviet Prisoners of War in Nazi Germany* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1986)

Ralph Uhlig, *Die Deutsch-Englische Gesellschaft 1949-1983. Der Beitrag ihrer "Königswinter-Konferenzen" zur britisch-deutschen Verständigung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Jürgen Osterhammel (eds), *Max Weber and his Contemporaries* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1987)

Peter Alter, *The Reluctant Patron. Science and the State in Britain 1850-1920* (Leamington Spa: Berg Publishers, 1987)

Stig Förster, Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Ronald Robinson (eds), *Bismarck, Europe, and Africa. The Berlin Africa Conference 1884-1885 and the Onset of Partition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988)

## HOUSE PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

Lothar Kettenacker and Wolfgang J. Mommsen (eds), *Research on British History in the Federal Republic of Germany 1978-1983* (London, 1983)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen, *Two Centuries of Anglo-German Relations. A Re-appraisal* (London, 1984)

Adolf M. Birke, *Britain and Germany. Historical Patterns of a Relationship* (London, 1987)

Frank Rexroth (ed.), *Research on British History in the Federal Republic of Germany 1983-1988. An Annotated Bibliography* (London, 1990)

### *Annual Lectures of the German Historical Institute London*

- 1979    Samuel Berrick Saul, *Industrialisation and De-Industrialisation? The Interaction of the German and British Economies before the First World War* (London, 1980)
- 1980    Karl Dietrich Erdmann, *Gustav Stresemann: The Revision of Versailles and the Weimar Parliamentary System* (London, 1981)
- 1981    A. J. P. Taylor, *1939 Revisited* (London, 1982)
- 1982    Gordon A. Craig, *Germany and the West: The Ambivalent Relationship* (London, 1983)
- 1983    Wolfram Fischer, *Germany in the World Economy during the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1984)
- 1984    James Joll, *National Histories and National Historians: Some German and English Views of the Past* (London, 1985)

- 1985 Wolfgang J. Mommsen, *Britain and Germany 1800 to 1914. Two Developmental Paths Towards Industrial Society* (London, 1986)
- 1986 Owen Chadwick, *Acton, Döllinger and History* (London, 1987)
- 1987 Hagen Schulze, *Is there a German History?* (London, 1988)
- 1988 Roger Morgan, *Britain and Germany since 1945. Two Societies and Two Foreign Policies* (London, 1989)
- 1989 Thomas Nipperdey, *The Rise of the Arts in Modern Society* (London, 1990)

*Bulletin of the German Historical Institute London, Issue 1 (Spring, 1979)-*