Document generated on 04/24/2024 9:26 a.m.

Urban History Review
Revue d'histoire urbaine

URBAN HISTORY REVIEW
REVUE D'HISTOIRE URBAINE

Crew, David F. *Town in the Ruhr: A Social History of Bochum, 1860-1914*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1979. Pp. xiii, 289. Tables, figures

D. K. Buse

Volume 9, Number 1, June 1980

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1019357ar
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7202/1019357ar

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine

ISSN

0703-0428 (print)
1918-5138 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this review

Buse, D. K. (1980). Review of [Crew, David F. *Town in the Ruhr: A Social History of Bochum, 1860-1914*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1979. Pp. xiii, 289. Tables, figures]. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, *9*(1), 157–159. https://doi.org/10.7202/1019357ar

All Rights Reserved © Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine, 1980

This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/

érudit

This article is disseminated and preserved by Érudit.

Érudit is a non-profit inter-university consortium of the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, and the Université du Québec à Montréal. Its mission is to promote and disseminate research.

https://www.erudit.org/en/

operating on gut feeling. His account is logically plausible, but it is just as logically plausible to argue that sheer anger at British oppression motivated the mobs, and they vented their anger at the most visible symbols of British officialdom. After all, John Hancock, the wealthiest merchant in Boston but a patriot, did not have his mansion sacked. And, if the poor looked to Adams and Otis and other elites for leadership in town meetings and extra-legal committees, why should we assume they did not when they formed mobs? Nash's emphasis on economic conditions as the primary determinant of political action is further strained by the flipflop Philadelphia and Boston eventually made on the conservative/radical continuum. Philadelphia, the most prosperous of the three cities, was indeed the most conservative in the 1760s and Boston, the most impoverished, was indeed the most radical. But during the 1770s they exchanged positions and Philadelphia became demonstrably more radical than Boston. Nash argues that various circumstances, such as the presence of the British Army and religious homogeneity in Boston and the absence of the army and the presence of religious heterogeneity in Philadelphia, overcame the economic conditioning of political action. Yet, one is tempted to think that if these economic impulses could be so easily blunted they might not have been so basic.

Notwithstanding its lack of ability to be convincing on its central thesis, this book will no doubt assume a provocative and prominent place in urban and Revolutionary historiography. It is impossible to do its many subtleties justice in a short review, but it provides us with the best economic history we have of the three northern cities, an informed account of their politics and a sophisticated statement of the class-conflict model of the Revolution. It is massively researched, beautifully written and intelligent throughout, but it will settle no major debates.

Bruce C. Daniels
Department of History
University of Winnipeg

* * *

Crew, David F. *Town in the Ruhr: A Social History of Bochum, 1860-1914.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1979. Pp. xiii, 289. Tables, figures.

Urban history has frequently been written within a national historical tradition. David Crew's excellent monograph on industrializing Bochum illustrates the degree to which the questions specific to a national history can influence attempts to analyze social situations. In this case urban history is utilized to examine the uniqueness of German industrialization and its implication for the development of a Third Reich in Germany. Thus while the approach is social, the intention is political and historiographical. Exemplary is the introduction which suggests that the "critical school" of German history identified with Fritz Fischer and H.-U. Wehler sees Imperial Germany "as a society whose essential features were very much determined *from above*" (p.5). This, Crew thinks, provides little information on the "experience and activities of the great mass of the German people" and "contributes little to our

theoretical understanding of the relationship of industrialization to social change" (p.5). With the case of the fastest growing city of 19th century Germany, Crew hopes to provide such an understanding by integrating local and national, even international, "economic, social and political structures and processes of change" (p.6). The book is surprisingly successful in fulfilling this huge task.

After recounting how the industrial revolution came to Bochum, or how the small weaving, textile and artisanal town of the 1840s became the large mining and smelting centre of the 1880s, he graphically shows the shift in ownership and income. Excellent tables illustrate the wealth of archival materials which Crew has unearthed to demonstrate the social structure at various times, as well as to provide comparative figures on other German cities. Significant among Crew's findings is the general and continued insecurity of working class existence due to the number living on the edge of subsistence, the dangers and the boom and slump nature of the coal and steel industries and the dependence on childrens' contributions to family income. In addition, Crew confirms that in Bochum, like other industrializing cities of Europe and North America, continuous and high turnover of the population was normal. He complements this geographic mobility with an astute analysis of Bochum's social mobility based upon a large random sample drawn from city directories. By constant reference to recent findings in studies of industrializing America, Crew puts his statistical results into perspective as he demonstrates less upward mobility but more horizontal shifts in occupations of similar skill or status in Bochum. Despite his own impressive information about poverty, based on the objective criteria of limited savings and home ownership, Crew tries to claim that attitudes or values also were important "in shaping patterns of social mobility" (p. 100). In his view, the cautious attitudes of German workers regarding organization and protest illustrated not backwardness but a strategy for survival.

The last half of the book does not possess as much unity as the first three chapters. The chapter discussing the relationship between the new industrial elites, the older "Mittelstand" and the workers draws upon Herbert Gutman's studies of status and power. Crew substantiates Gutman's findings for this European city. He supplements Gutman by showing how industrialists controlled labour by paternalism, which Crew tries to argue was not backwardness within the context of German industrialization. But this aspect of the study is not well tied to the attempt to account for labour protest, especially the massive strikes of 1889, 1905 and 1912. In accounting for the relatively peaceful history of smelter workers compared with the striking miners, Crew points to the work and living, especially housing, situation of the latter, claiming they formed an "occupational community" (pp. 186ff.). To reach this conclusion Crew reviews the various theories of labour protest and tests each. If one author has already faulted Crew's study in its original dissertation form for focussing only upon the major miners' strikes, it might be added that to explain the inability of the socialists to win a majority of labourers to their party as being

"as much the product of dynamics of the interrelationship among miners, party, state and employers as it was the consequence of the static persistence of ethnic and religious divisions" (p. 220) is neither startling nor precise. Crew's weak conclusion does not draw together an important urban history. However, his history of the "modern" nature of industrialization in Bochum has successfully challenged the theory of uniqueness that Dahrendorf, among others, posited for German industrialization.

D.K. Buse
Department of History
Laurentian University

* * *

Hittle, J. Michael. *The Service City: State and Townsmen in Russia, 1600-1800*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979. Pp. 297.

The townsmen (*posadskie liudi*) of early modern Russia offer a striking contrast to their European counterparts. Few in number, poor, burdened by state fiscal and service obligations and lacking even proper municipal government, they were to play a far less important social and political role than the urban classes of the west. Dr. Hittle's book offers a fresh and revealing perspective on the origin and development of the Russian urban service estate. Historians have often displayed a predeliction for measuring Russian townsmen against non-Russian criteria. Soviet scholars have in recent years produced much valuable research on urban society, but their chief interest has always been in the application of Marxist universals to Russian urban economic life, rather than in the study of the service estate as a uniquely Russian phenomenon. Most western historians have been content to follow the pre-Revolutionary Russian liberal tradition of blaming the autocracy for inhibiting the development of a western-style bourgeoisie. Dr. Hittle describes the situation of the townsmen not as an aberration from foreign norms but as an organic product of forces within the Russian milieu. He argues convincingly that the service relationship between the townsmen and the state was the product of governmental weakness, not strength. The exigencies of state-building in a vast and backward country where trained civil servants were scarce at best required the autocracy to delegate certain local governmental tasks to the service estates; that is, to the gentry in the countryside and the *posadskie liudi* in the cities. For their part, the townsmen were never strong, wealthy or socially cohesive enough to seize control of urban government even against a weak state. In the townsmen's eyes local government was simply an onerous duty which they sought to shirk or avoid.

The late eighteenth century brought the breakdown and ultimate dissolution of the service system, but the old problems persisted. The author describes a modernizing state painfully aware of the inadequacies of the service city, a dilemma that became particularly acute in the aftermath of the Pugachev revolt. Yet the state was still unable to assume direct administrative responsibility for the cities. The solution proffered by Catherine the Great was to establish a form of town government theoretically in the hands of the wealthier strata of urban society.