

them in a similar social context as the multiplying village offices of mid-eighteenth century Hessen-Kassel just to the north of the Wetterau.² Finally it suggests that intra-village conflict over participation in resistance may have been a conflict between peasant movers and peasant dodgers. Regardless of the approach the book raises the critically important question whether deputies and their kin were hijacking the institutions of public power in village and elsewhere to support a new mediating position between partially integrated villages and different structures of authority. Pursuit of this question might tie peasant political behavior in the Wetterau more firmly to *Ancien Régime* forms of authority which almost always had to operate through brokers. The author himself proceeds suggestively in this direction with his discussion of the advocates who represented peasants before the courts. His next book might well be “Political Movements and Social Experience”.

Peter Keir Taylor

LENGER, FRIEDRICH. *Zwischen Kleinbürgertum und Proletariat. Studien zur Sozialgeschichte der Düsseldorfer Handwerker 1816-1878*. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 1986. 332 pp. DM 68.00.

German writers have had much to say about the history of craftsmen, or *Handwerker*. For a long time attention focused on the demise of the guild system and the decline in craftsmen's economic conditions. Historians such as Wolfram Fischer countered this tendency by looking at the contribution made by craftsmen to economic growth through their adaptation to new circumstances. More recently there has been a series of studies that have followed neither “pessimist” nor “optimist” line, but have offered an increasingly differentiated economic and social history of craftsmen which embraces not only changes in production and distribution but also variables like migration and social mobility. Friedrich Lenger's book on Düsseldorf is an exemplary work within this genre. At the same time he has made a major contribution to our understanding of class formation in nineteenth-century Germany, building on (and sometimes transcending) the work of historians such as Hartmut Zwahr and Jürgen Kocka. Lenger's book also has valuable arguments about *Handwerker* politics between 1848 and the late 1870s, so that the work considered here is one of major importance.

examples of stem family elders wandering far from home using the resources of the estates already passed on to their heirs as a basis for adventure, financial and political speculation during the Thirty-Years-War. It seems as if the deputies are using the lawsuits in very similar ways.

² Peter Keir Taylor, “The Household's Most Expendable People: The Draft and Peasant Society in 18th Century Hessen-Kassel”, unpublished Ph.D. diss., University of Iowa, 1987, and George Thomas Fox, “Studies in the Rural History of Upper Hesse”, unpublished Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt University, 1976, both find substantial evidence for the formation of a peasant elite as the 18th century progressed. The formation of the elite appears to be based both on property relations and on control of village offices which increased substantially in number until later in the 18th century when villages began to complain about the cost.

Lenger begins with an analysis of economic developments in different craft branches, and his most striking finding is the continuing – indeed growing – importance of the putting-out or *Verlag* system through the period of industrialisation that began in the 1850s and 60s. This was most obviously true of the “mass” trades (tailors, shoemakers, joiners); but Lenger also shows how craftsmen in the metal branches were subordinated to larger concerns (or edged into repairs and installation work), while concentration in the building trades had comparable results. In other words, craftsmen neither disappeared under the competition of technically innovative forms of production, nor did most of them “adapt” benignly to new market openings. There was, rather, structural continuity that took the form of a base of small masters who lacked real independence. Given the emphasis of much recent research, Lenger is perhaps inclined to exaggerate the novelty of his findings here. But he does establish the basis for two convincing arguments that run through much of the rest of the book. The first concerns the “persistence” of *Handwerk* in the period under discussion. Over half of the masters and journeymen who lived in Düsseldorf in 1855 were still there in 1867. Lenger’s findings on social mobility reinforce his argument. Masters were very successful in placing their sons in crafts, but large numbers of journeymen were also still able to achieve independence in the 1860s, and remarkably few journeymen’s sons left the craft world for the factory or labouring. This persistence also had a residential dimension. Craftsmen largely stayed in the old city districts and the areas just beyond them; they seldom moved out to the industrial suburbs that housed newly-arrived factory workers. Lenger’s second argument follows on closely from the first: that the division between masters and men was much less than often asserted. Both were victims of the *Verlagssystem*, both inhabited the same areas and paid comparable rents, and the growing numbers of married journeymen eroded one obvious distinction between the two groups.

Lenger’s deftly constructed arguments about the persistence of *Handwerk* provide powerful evidence for what historians are coming to speak of as the “long eighteenth century”. Indeed one of the strengths of his book, whether dealing with economic development or patterns of migration, is the emphasis on structural continuity. Lenger also has valuable points to make about the role played by craftsmen in the revolution of 1848-9. He establishes that they were the essential carriers of the revolutionary movement – in democratic and liberal organisations, in the *Volksclub* and civil guard. He offers two further and very important arguments. The first is a spirited attack on those who have seen the allegedly “backward-looking” demands of the masters contributing to their alleged swing away from support of the revolution. Lenger convincingly casts doubt on these stubbornly persistent views. Secondly, Lenger argues once more that there was no significant break between masters and men in 1848-9. Journeymen signed the famous masters’ petition to the Frankfurt Parliament, while the demands of the journeyman-dominated *Arbeiterverein* for a “dam against exploitation by money-capital” attracted many masters.

This theme recurs in the last chapter on *Handwerker* in associational life, trade unions and political parties. Masters and men sang in the same choral societies, master and journeymen tailors organised together industrially. Lenger’s final sections on the political parties present a differentiated picture of a shifting landscape. He shows a liberal movement whose policies on cooperatives and credit attracted

better-off craftsmen in the food and construction branches; support among some “mass” crafts for Social Democracy, which was nevertheless divided and grew slowly; and the growing strength of Political Catholicism, which successfully mobilised both craftsmen and the new industrial working class. Lenger argues thoughtfully that it was Political Catholicism which first bridged the gulf between a persistent *Handwerker* milieu and the new proletarian suburbs – although the SPD was later to benefit. The last two chapters lack some of the verve of the earlier ones, where Lenger is both scrupulous and masterly in using difficult data to establish his arguments. Overall, though, this is a beautifully researched and imaginative book with an importance that goes beyond its title.

David Blackburn

SAVILLE, JOHN. 1848. *The British state and the Chartist movement*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, London, New York 1987. ix, 310 pp.

This is a thoroughly researched and lucidly argued study of Britain during the revolutionary year of 1848. Its subtitle – the British State and the Chartist Movement – is indicative of the author’s determination to avoid the almost obsessive localism and parochialism that have tended to characterise studies of Chartism in recent years. His intention is clearly to re-consider Chartism as a national political movement in the wider context of the continental upheavals of 1848, and which by implication addresses the major question as to why events in Britain took a different course to the experience of many of her European neighbours.

Saville begins with a wide-ranging survey of conditions in England, Ireland and France at the beginning of 1848, where the centralised efficacy of the British state is contrasted with the chronic instability of its French counterpart, and where its overwhelming coercive presence in disaffected Ireland is convincingly demonstrated. Although not elaborated theoretically, the author’s conception of the state is something more than merely “government”. Rather, the latter is seen as a continuum of administrative legal, bureaucratic and coercive systems that attempts not only to establish acceptable relationships between civil society and public authority, but also to establish acceptable relationships *within* civil society, including economic relations. Indeed, a particular strength of this book is its documentation based on Home Office papers, in addition to other state papers, which highlight the purposive mobilization of state power in the service of the interests of law and order. Yet Saville stresses that this would have been impossible without the mass support of “solid men” who extended far down the social scale from the narrow retinue of patrician aristocrats directly responsible for initiating government strategy. As he is at pains to emphasize, it was the possible conjuncture in 1848 of Irish insurgency and Chartist insurrection, which combined with possible intervention from a potentially sympathetic provisional government in Paris, succeeded in mobilizing most of the *petite* as well as *haute bourgeoisie* in mainland Britain in the defence of property, in a striking demonstration of unity in the face of what was