

The Saga of History 492: The Transformation of Working-Class History in One Classroom

Jim Barrett et Diane P. Koenker

Volume 61, printemps 2008

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/llt61not01>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Canadian Committee on Labour History

ISSN

0700-3862 (imprimé)

1911-4842 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cette note

Barrett, J. & Koenker, D. P. (2008). The Saga of History 492: The Transformation of Working-Class History in One Classroom. *Labour/Le Travailleur*, 61, 181–213.

NOTE AND DOCUMENT / NOTE ET DOCUMENT

The Saga of History 492: The Transformation of Working-Class History in One Classroom

Jim Barrett and Diane P. Koenker

JOURNALS, CONFERENCE PANELS, and on-line newsgroups are filled these days with talk of a crisis (or backlash or decline) in labour and working-class history.¹ This loss of confidence is sometimes linked to the rise of new theories or forms of analysis such as critical race theory, gender analysis, or postmodernism; or to the decline of Communism, Marxist theory, or the organized labour movement. Such scholarly discussions are worthy and can tell us a lot about the writing of working-class history, but we wonder what is going on in labour history classrooms amidst this crisis? How has the teaching of working-class history changed over the past two decades? What are we trying to do in our courses on working-class history? What does this tell us about who “labour historians” are, what they do, and why anyone else should pay attention?

We offer “the saga of History 492” not as a firm answer to these questions, but rather as an effort to open a more self-conscious discussion of the relationship between the re-conceptualization and rewriting of working-class history

1. Ardis Cameron, “Boys Do Cry: The Rhetorical Power of the ‘New’ Labor History,” *Labour: Studies in Working-Class History of the Americas*, 3 (Fall 2004), 97–108; Geoff Eley and Keith Nield, “Farewell to the Working Class?” *International Labor and Working-Class History*, no. 57 (Spring 2000), 1–30; Lewis H. Siegelbaum, “The Late Romance of the Soviet Worker in Western Historiography,” *International Review of Social History*, 51 (December 2006): 463–481; “Backlash against Labor History? Working-Class History, the Job Market, and the State of the Field: A Roundtable Discussion,” Labor and Working-Class History Association/Southern Labor Studies Conference, Duke University, Durham North Carolina, 19 May 2007. See also the long exchanges concerning the idea of a “backlash against labor history” on the H-Labor list serve, <http://www.h-net.org/~labour/>, June to July, 2006 and April to May, 2007.

Jim Barrett and Diane P. Koenker, “The Saga of History 492: The Transformation of Working-Class History in One Classroom,” *Labour/Le Travail*, 61 (Spring 2008), 181–213.

and the ways in which the teaching of the subject has changed over the years. Looking at the question of teaching might even tell us something about where we are headed.

For the past 22 years we have taught a graduate seminar in comparative European and U.S. working-class history. Diane Koenker works in the area of Russian and Soviet working-class history, Jim Barrett in U.S. working-class history. The influence of other scholars in our department and well beyond has pressed us to expand the geographical perspectives a bit. More recently we have included some material on Canada (not too much) and some nods to colonial labour in various settings, but the course has remained largely concerned with Western Europe, Russia, and the United States.

This decision in itself deserves some reflection. Given our own particular interests and the quality of much of the literature on Europe and the United Kingdom, our original focus is not surprising. Yet, as in most other comparative efforts, the extremely promising comparison of the U.S. and Canada is largely overlooked here. While there are undoubtedly some exceptions somewhere, this seems rather typical of working-class history in the United States. Just recently the journal *Labor: Studies in the Working Class History of the Americas* has made a concerted effort to re-conceptualize U.S. working-class history in the broader context of the “Americas,” but most labor historians in the United States are far more likely to reach across the Atlantic for a comparison than across the Detroit River. Given the vibrant quality of work in Canada, the strong tendency of Canadian labor historians to view their own field in relation to studies in the United States, and the obvious points of comparison between the two societies, the apparent indifference in the U.S. is rather striking – even if it is not surprising to our Canadian colleagues.

From the beginning, we have always started the course with several weeks on key concepts, which used to mean various conceptions of proletarianization and class formation, in order to provide an overall framework for discussion. We then focused most of the remaining seminar sessions on work, family and community, unions and strikes, aspects of working-class culture, and characteristic forms of working-class politics, meaning, usually, socialism and communism (see Appendix 1 for the 1986 syllabus). From the start, we thought that the question of “American exceptionalism” provided important heuristic value that helped to focus our comparative analysis. We also focused the readings quite tightly around the early part of the 20th century. In the beginning, our units of comparison were nation-states – initially the United States, Russia, Great Britain, and France – but over time we paid increasing attention to distinctions between capitalist and socialist systems as well.

Over the years, a variety of “subjectivities” – gender, of course, and race, but also sexuality and ethnicity – have elbowed out a lot of the discussion of class per se (see Appendix 2 for the most recent version of the seminar, offered in 2005). These are not just topics added to the syllabus; students tend to embrace them as categories of analysis that help to explain workers’ lives

and behaviour. Much of the seminar discussion takes the form of interrogations of the concept of class with reference to these other forms of identity. Early on in the seminar, lest anyone be given to glib generalizations, we read Joan Scott's wonderful but terrifying article, "Experience," which questions any fundamental assumptions, including the notion of historical experience itself.² Alice Kessler-Harris's article, "Treating the Male as Other," and other readings tend to de-center the workplace and direct students' attention to the domestic sphere. Works by Joan Scott and Sonya Rose encourage students to question categories and assumptions inherent to the field.³ Readings by Diane Koenker, Kathleen Canning, and others consider older problems like class formation, the transformation of work processes, and shop-floor relations in the context of gender.⁴ If there is an archetypal worker in the current version of the seminar, she is as likely to be a domestic or service worker as a miner or steelworker. The far sexier topics of leisure, consumption, and style largely crowd out the frumpy old topic of work. We talk as much about reproduction as production. We still discuss socialism and communism (one session each), but these are handled as much in personal as in collective terms, and they share the stage with the history of emotions, for example "workers in love", and the spatial dimensions of class experience, such as "workers on vacation". We extended the time frame of the course both backward and forward, but mostly forward: in other iterations of the syllabus, the 19th century played an important role (in order to draw on Katznelson and Zolberg's stimulating comparative collection, *Working-Class Formation*⁵), but most recently the course has become pretty much a 20th century affair, focusing on the industrial and post-industrial worlds of labour.

A major departure came about six years ago with a focus on working-class autobiographies and other forms of personal narrative. The narratives are one way to build what Liz Faue sees as the next frontier in labor history – the subjective dimensions of working-class life⁶ After we discuss the production and

2. Joan Scott, "Experience," in Judith Butler and Joan Scott, eds., *Feminists Theorize the Political* (New York 1992), 22–40.

3. Alice Kessler-Harris, "Treating the Male As Other," *Labor History*, 34 (Spring 1993), 190–204; Joan Scott, "On Language, Gender, and Working-Class History," in Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York 1988), 53–67; Sonya Rose, "Class Formation and the Quintessential Worker," in John R. Hall, ed., *Reworking Class* (Ithaca 1997), 133–168.

4. Canning, Kathleen, "Rethinking German Labor History: Gender and the Politics of Class Formation," *American Historical Review*, 97 (June 1992), 736–768; Diane P. Koenker, "Men Against Women on the Shop Floor in Early Soviet Russia," *American Historical Review*, 100 (December 1995): 1438–64; Kevin Boyle, "The Kiss: Racial and Gender Conflict in a 1950s Automobile Factory," *Journal of American History*, 84 (September 1997), 496–523.

5. Ira Katznelson and Aristide R. Zolberg, eds., *Working-Class Formation: Nineteenth-Century Patterns in Western Europe and the United States* (Princeton 1986).

6. Elizabeth Faue, "Retooling the Class Factory: United States Labour History after Marx, Montgomery, and Postmodernism," *Labor History*, 82 (May 2002), 109–19.

functions of personal narrative, students are each asked to choose and analyze a worker's autobiography. The object in this case is to consider the significance of social class – and other forms of identity – at a personal level, and to consider the more subjective dimensions of this experience. It is more difficult, we think, for students to objectify their working-class subjects beyond this point in the semester. The effect is to take the discussion from the global to the personal.

When we sat down to evaluate the course at the end of our last semester teaching it, we realized that this last time around, in a course on working-class history, we had largely neglected to discuss the transformation of unions and the evolution of that characteristic form of working-class protest, the strike. We began thinking a bit more critically about just what it is that labour historians do and what they have to offer other scholars and perhaps even the broader public, a question always worth asking.

Why has the seminar changed so considerably over the last 22 years? First, like all good graduate courses, our selection of topics represented a combination of our sense of what the “field” of labour history should look like, our own particular research interests, and our desire to encounter new literature by teaching it. Themes in the course have changed because the work of working-class history has changed. Both of us started out with projects that were more or less typical of the “new labour history” of the 1970s and 1980s in terms of subject and methods – workplace/community studies.⁷ In 1986, both of us were engaged in research on labour protest, the meaning of skill, urban communities, and that moment of heightened political crisis surrounding the First World War and the Russian Revolution of 1917.⁸ Our subsequent research trajectories (themselves related to ongoing changes in the “labour history” field) took us to the interplay of work, culture, and politics in the U.S.S.R. and the U.S., to biography, to the role of personal experience, to religion, working-class cosmopolitanism, leisure, and consumption.⁹ Barrett's interests shifted more to issues of racial and ethnic identity and relations, a shift characteristic of many others in U.S. working-class history, and these emerged as stronger themes in the syllabus.¹⁰ As Koenker became more interested in the ways that

7. Diane Koenker, *Moscow Workers and the 1917 Revolution* (Princeton 1981); James R. Barrett, *Work and Community in the Jungle: Chicago's Packinghouse Workers, 1894–1922* (Urbana 1987).

8. Koenker's co-authored book with William G. Rosenberg, *Strikes and Revolution in Russia, 1917* (Princeton 1989) was published three years after our course started.

9. Eduard Dune, *Notes of a Red Guard*, ed. and trans. Diane P. Koenker and S.A. Smith (Urbana 1993); James R. Barrett, *William Z. Foster and the Tragedy of American Radicalism* (Urbana 1999); Hutchins Hapgood, *The Spirit of Labor*, with notes and introduction by James R. Barrett (Urbana 2004), original 1907.

10. David R. Roediger and James R. Barrett, “Irish Hosts' and White Pan-Ethnicity, Or, Who Made the 'New Immigrants' Inbetween?” in Nancy Foner and George Frederickson, eds., *Not Just Black and White: Immigration and Race, Then and Now* (New York 2004); James R.

gender shaped relations at work and in the community, suitable readings and topics emerged.¹¹ The rise of personal narratives and issues of personal identity rose more or less directly out of work that each of us was doing on workers' autobiographies and questions we had about the relationship between personal experience and social movements.¹² Interest in consumption has led to an exploration of the role of leisure in workers' lives.¹³ Indeed, what is going on in the classrooms reflects the changes that are taking place in the field more broadly. As teachers and as scholars, we are engaged in an ongoing conversation about what is important to understand about work and workers, about individuals and society. To explore why we as individual historians have shifted our gaze from strikes to vacations, from the killing floor to the personal lives of communists, perhaps takes us further into the realm of *égo-histoire* than either of us is prepared to travel here.¹⁴ The point is that this, and probably

Barrett and David R. Roediger, "In-Between Peoples: Race, Nationality, and the New Immigrant Workers," *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 16 (May 1997), 3–44; James R. Barrett and David R. Roediger, "The Irish and the 'Americanization' of the 'New Immigrants,' in the Streets and in the Churches of the Urban United States, 1900–1930," *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 24 (Summer 2005), 3–33.

11. Diane P. Koenker, "Introduction," *Republic of Labor: Russian Printers and Soviet Socialism, 1918–1930* (Ithaca 2005); Diane P. Koenker, "Men Against Women"; Diane P. Koenker, "Fathers against Sons/Sons against Fathers: The Problem of Generations in the Early Soviet Workplace," *Journal of Modern History*, 73 (December 2001), 781–810; Ellen Ross, "Fierce Questions and Taunts: Married Life in Working-Class London 1870–1914," *Feminist Studies*, 8 (Fall 1982), 575–602; Belinda Davis, "Food Scarcity and Empowerment of the Female Consumer in World War I Berlin," in Victoria de Grazia with Ellen Furlough, eds., *The Sex of Things: Gender and Consumption in Historical Perspective* (Berkeley 1996), 287–310; Martha May, "The Historical Problem of the Family Wage: the Ford Motor Company and the Five Dollar Day," *Feminist Studies*, 8 (Summer 1982), 399–424.

12. Diane P. Koenker, "Scripting the Revolutionary Worker Autobiography: Archetypes, Models, Inventions, and Markets," *International Review of Social History*, 49 (December 2004), 371–400; James R. Barrett, "Was the Personal Political? Reading the Autobiography of American Communism," manuscript; James R. Barrett, "The Blessed Virgin Made Me a Socialist Historian: An Experiment in Autobiography and the Historiography of Race and Class," in Nick Salvatore, ed., *Faith and the Historian: Catholic Perspectives* (Urbana 2007); James R. Barrett, "Revolution and Personal Crisis: William Z. Foster and the American Communist Personal Narrative," *Labor History*, 43 (Fall 2002), 465–482, reprinted in Kevin Morgan and Gidon Cohen, eds., *Agents of the Revolution: New Biographical Approaches to the History of International Communism in the Age of Lenin and Stalin* (Oxford 2005), 111–132.

13. Diane P. Koenker, "The Proletarian Tourist in the 1930s: Between Mass Excursion and Mass Escape," in Anne E. Gorsuch and Diane P. Koenker, eds., *Turizm: The Russian and East European Tourist under Capitalism and Socialism* (Ithaca 2006), 119–140; and "Soviet Worker Leisure Travel in the 1930s," in Donald Filtzer, Wendy Goldman, Gijs Kessler, and Simon Pirani, eds. *A Dream Deferred: New Studies in Russian and Soviet Labor History* (forthcoming, Peter Lang).

14. See Jeremy D. Popkin, "Historians on the Autobiographical Frontier," *American Historical Review*, 104 (June 1999), 725–48.

other courses in working-class history, are products of both the transformation of the field and also our own personal evolutions as historians.

The length of our most recent syllabus also points to the explosion of outstanding scholarship on many aspects of labour history and to the integration of work that used to be considered marginal to the field. Paradigms (class formation, proletarianization) have shifted and have been challenged, principally but not only by considerations about gender and race. In 1986, historians worked on a variety of topics, but most of them employed similar frameworks and sets of references. Three or four readings on a given topic could provide adequate geographical coverage and pretty successfully convey the range of scholarship at the given time. If the community of working-class historians operated then in a circumscribed realm of shared assumptions, this uniformity is no longer true. The field of labour history has become more complicated, contested, and diffuse. We need to direct our students to widely diverging approaches, methodologies, and voices – and the reading list gets longer every year.

To a lesser extent, the evolution of the syllabus has also reflected the changing composition of graduate students in the department, itself a sign of changes in the department and in the discipline of history more broadly. When we began teaching this course, social history was not well developed at the graduate level at the University of Illinois, and women's and gender history had not yet made their way into the graduate curriculum. In fact, our course was one of the few to offer such topics, albeit under the rubrics of "families" and "community." The modest enrollment in our first offering in 1986 – seven students, four of whom came from outside the history department – perhaps reflected the novelty of our effort. Later offerings of the course drew an average of ten students, with an increasing number from within the history department, among them U.S. historians. Many of these history students had already been exposed to issues in U.S. labor history, allowing us to include a wider range of topics in the seminar. In every seminar, some students, but not a majority, brought with them extracurricular interests in activist politics. The most recent offering of the course in 2005 saw fifteen students enrolled, eleven of whom were graduate students in the history department, and all but one in U.S. history. The students in this course were the most racially diverse and the most evenly divided by gender of any of our offerings since 1986. We do not claim credit for this diversity, which has been the result of concerted departmental efforts, nor did it influence our syllabus, which as always we designed before we knew who would take the course.

In general, the nature of the students enrolled in the course has been less influential in determining the content of our syllabus than our own changing research interests, with perhaps one important exception. In 1999 and again in 2003, women were disproportionately underrepresented in our seminar, at a time when women represented an increasing share of the department's graduate students overall and when purposeful faculty recruiting had created

a vibrant graduate program in women's and gender history. Whether this program was "siphoning" off women into other more gender-specific courses, or whether this drop in enrollment by women was a short-term anomaly, we could not say, but the gender imbalance sometimes produced some awkward class discussions. This, in turn, caused us to consider what we might do to encourage more women to include comparative working-class history in their course programs. The 2005 syllabus indicates some of this thinking, but this emphasis dovetailed well with our own research interests.

At the same time, because the course is a kind of snapshot of our particular interests at any given moment, the "course" is not the "field." Students take this seminar for a variety of reasons, and they come from different backgrounds. Some are preparing to enter research and teaching fields in (mostly U.S.) labour history; others are seeking to complement their coursework in other broad fields; still others come from outside the history department aiming to add a historical (and comparative) dimension to their field work in anthropology or in their studies of the working-class novel. Although the field of labour history has also expanded significantly over the span of this course, a comparison of two sets of preliminary exam questions in comparative working-class history between 1986 and 2006 suggests more continuity than our course syllabi reflect (see Appendices 3 and 4; comparative working-class history has been a regular preliminary exam field of study in our department since 1986). Trade union politics, protest, and revolutionary situations still matter in establishing the parameters of the field: these topics remain central in our own undergraduate courses in U.S. and European working-class history and, we expect, in those of our students who have gone on to careers as labour historians. Continuity as well as novelty is important in establishing the broader parameters of the field. Those specializing in any historical subdiscipline need a good sense of the historiography and evolution of their field. They need to read "classics" and seminal works (E. P. Thompson and Selig Perlman, for example) not only to know where the field has come from, but also to appreciate the continuing methodological relevance of these key works.¹⁵ Such works might not settle easily into the current seminar structure, but they are essential for any specialist. And while our course has become increasingly focused on the 20th century, labour historians must consider the long history of working-class people and movements, extending from pre-industrial settings to the contemporary world.

If the content and topics we cover in the course have changed over these two decades, so too has our incorporation of "theory": class, of course, but also gender, race (including "whiteness"), post-colonialism, and aspects of language and discourse. Yet the centrality of class remains the organizing principle of our approach to labour history. We believe that class – however

15. E. P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (New York 1963); Selig Perlman, *A Theory of the Labor Movement* (New York 1928).

multiple, however manipulated, but always material – still offers a powerful way to interrogate the constitution of identities and collective behaviours in 20th century settings, whether capitalist, socialist, or post-socialist. The experience of the Soviet Union strongly suggests that “class” continued to exist after the socialist transformation of the economy, even if scholars debate the precise relationship between official and unofficial “class” identities.¹⁶ Class identity is also historical. We might suggest that there were moments in history – including that period of revolutionary ferment around World War I – when class identity trumped all others. The memory of those moments became part of the legacy of labour movements as well as our *field* of labour history. One way to understand our focus on many more dimensions of the working-class – family life, youth culture, consumption and style, even personal identity and relationships – is as an effort to grasp the broader significance of social class. We understand class to be formed and experienced in the various venues of everyday life and not just in the workplace. Likewise, the turn toward the subjective has, in this case, raised the question of how class was experienced on a personal level, how it has shaped relations between individuals within families and communities, and how it has shaped personal identity. So we welcome the idea of thinking of our subjects as suitably complex individuals and not just as “masses.” If our own motivations and consciousness are bewildering amalgams of ideas, experience, and emotions, why should our subjects be assumed to be any more straightforward? The utility of class as a measure of stratification and as source of personal identity remains for us analytically strong. What has changed over the years is where we look for evidence of class identity and how we deal with countervailing sources of social aggregation such as religion and nation.

What does the saga of History 492 suggest? Certainly not that we should go back to our original syllabus. The life of this particular course might be very different from what others here have experienced, but we doubt it. Do we really believe that a focus on work, unions, and strikes provide us with an adequate understanding of workers’ lives? We don’t think so, although understanding the materiality of the world of workers remains crucial. Is it not necessary to leave the factory and go into peoples’ homes, churches, and other more personal sites to understand them? Are we satisfied with knowing how much people earned and how long they worked, or do we also want to know whom they loved and why? Labour historians, with their strong emphasis on material conditions, social movements, and radical politics, have probably done as much as other scholars to objectify working-class people, though perhaps toward different ends. We strive to understand our subjects as individuals as

16. See Koenker, *Republic of Labor*, particularly 207–211 (“The Double Nature of Class in the Proletarian State”); Sheila Fitzpatrick, “Ascribing Class: The Construction of Social Identity in Soviet Russia,” *Journal of Modern History*, 65 (December 1993), 745–770; Mark Edele, “Soviet Society, Social Structure, and Everyday Life: Major Frameworks Reconsidered,” *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 8 (Spring 2007), 349–73.

well as participants in mass social movements, for example. Yet how are we to come to grips with the histories of large numbers of individuals, if not by aggregating them in some way, in many ways, into collectivities, into social groups? The history of societies demands that we use tools of classification in order to understand the object of our study.

And we need to address the question: what is it that justifies our bundling of all these topics into a course called “Comparative Working-Class History”? We ended our most recent seminar with a lively discussion of what the “core unities” of this “field” might be; what should not be considered fair game for a labour historian? A consensus of sorts coalesced around the idea of “life chances” resulting from material inequality. Labour historians study the lives, work, culture, hopes, emotions, and dreams of individuals without privilege. They do not study the rich, well-born, and powerful.

The range of venues for class experience suggested in our current syllabus, the range of identities considered as forming workers’ consciousnesses, the range of possibilities in workers’ behaviours all suggest that there is little danger of our going back to the beginning. But we don’t think we will leave the unions and strikes out next time. The workplace and its attendant conflicts remain vital as sources of identity and centers of politics; we may have set work and conflict aside as we turned to other topics, assuming our students shared our understanding of these fundamental sites of working-class experience. It is perhaps time to bring work and protest back in, though this means difficult choices about what to exclude in future editions of the course.

Many contemporary scholars would not recognize themselves in Liz Faue’s recent observation that they remain “grounded in nineteenth century theories of class” and “have given primacy to productive relations as both the determinant and dominant source of class consciousness and conflict.”¹⁷ On the contrary, the course’s evolution suggests we are still talking about social class but in much more capacious terms than “nineteenth-century theories.” Actually, working-class history seems particularly porous in relation to new themes and theories. Yet the very fact that this course still exists, and the decision to organize it comparatively, suggests that we have not abandoned the concept of social class grounded in material inequality as an important way of understanding the historical experience of poor and working people. The seminar’s comparative approach, a choice we made 22 years ago and have retained, suggests that we still assume characteristics of capitalism, of industrialism, and patterns of working-class life are shared from one society to another, for all their differences. Without common characteristics between social organization and workers’ behaviour, what do we have to compare? Long before we started talking about “transnational history,” assumptions regarding capital-

17. Elizabeth Faue, “Reproducing the Class Struggle: Class, Gender, and Social Reproduction in U.S. Labor History,” in Irmgard Steinisch, ed., *Amerikanische Arbeitergeschichte Heute* (Bochum 2001), 47.

ism and the class experiences it shaped led scholars at Warwick, Pittsburgh, Yale, Michigan, Illinois, and other centers of working-class history to cross national boundaries and make some rather bold comparisons. We are certainly less bold in this regard than we were when we hatched the idea for this course, but we still share some of those assumptions. We might ask our colleagues in working-class history if all of this is also true for them.

APPENDIX 1: COMPARATIVE WORKING-CLASS HISTORY FALL 1986

University of Illinois
Fall 1986
History 492
Thursday 1–3

James Barrett
Diane Koenker

Comparative Working-Class History **Syllabus**

August 28 **Organization**

September 4 **The Old Labor History and the New**

- *David Brody, "The Old Labor History and the New: in Search of an American Working Class," *Labor History*, 20 (Winter 1979), 111–126.
- *David Montgomery, "To Study the People: The American Working Class," *Labor History*, 21 (Fall 1980), 485–512.
- *Tony Judt, "Minerva's Owl and Other Birds of Prey," *International Labor and Working-Class History*, no. 16 (Fall 1979), 18–28.
- Reginald E. Zelnik, "Russian Workers and the Revolutionary Movement," *Journal of Social History*, 6 (Winter 1972–73), 214–236.

September 11 **Proletarianization and Work Process**

- *E. P. Thompson, "Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism," *Past and Present*, no. 38 (December 1967), 56–97.
- *Herbert Gutman, "Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America," in *Work, Culture, and Society in Industrializing America* (New York 1976), 3–78.
- *Christopher Johnson, "Patterns of Proletarianization: Parisian Tailors and Lodeve Woolens Workers," in John M. Merriman, ed., *Consciousness and Class Experience in 19th Century Europe* (New York 1980), 65–84.
- Royden Harrison, ed., *Independent Collier: the Coal Miner as Archetypical Proletarian Reconsidered* (New York 1978).
- Sean Wilentz, *Chants Democratic: New York City and the Rise of the American Working Class 1788–1850* (Oxford 1984), ch. 3.
- Michelle Perrot, "Three Ages of Industrial Discipline in France," in Merriman, ed., *Consciousness and Class Experience*, 149–168.
- Reginald E. Zelnik, *Labor and Society in Tsarist Russia* (Stanford 1971), ch. 6.
- Reginald E. Zelnik, "Russian Bebels: An Introduction to the Memoirs of Semen Kanatchikov and Matvei Fisher," *Russian Review*, 35 (July 1976), 249–289, (October 1976), 417–447.

September 18 **Varieties of Work Experience**

- *Charles More, *Skill and the English Working Class, 1870–1914* (New York 1980), ch. 1, 2, 8.
- *Peter Stearns, “The Unskilled and Industrialization: A Transformation of Consciousness,” *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 16 (1976), 249–282.
- *Andrea Graziosi, “Common Laborers, Unskilled Workers, 1890–1915,” *Labor History*, 22 (Fall 1981), 512–544.
- Diane Koenker and William G. Rosenberg, “Skilled Workers and the Strike Movement in Revolutionary Russia,” *Journal of Social History*, 19 (Summer 1986), 605–629.
- Victoria E. Bonnell, *Roots of Rebellion: Workers’ Politics and Organizations in St. Petersburg and Moscow, 1900–1914* (Berkeley 1983), ch. 1.
- Jonathan Zeitlin, “Engineers and Compositors: A Comparison,” in Royden Harrison and Jonathan Zeitlin, eds., *Divisions of Labour: Skilled Workers and Technological Change in Nineteenth Century England* (Urbana 1985), 185–250.

September 25 **Migration and Immigration**

- *Ewa T. Morawska, *For Bread With Butter: the Life-Worlds of East Central Europeans in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, 1890–1940* (Cambridge 1985), ch. 1, 2.
- *James R. Barrett, “Unity and Fragmentation: Class, Race, and Ethnicity on Chicago’s South Side, 1900–1922” *Journal of Social History*, 18 (Fall 1984), 37–56.
- *R.E. Johnson, *Peasant and Proletarian: The Working Class of Moscow in the Late Nineteenth Century* (New Brunswick 1979), ch. 2.
- John Bodnar, *The Transplanted: A History of Immigrants in Urban America* (Bloomington 1985).
- William M. Tuttle, Jr., *Race Riot: Chicago in the Red Summer of 1919* (New York 1970), ch. 2.
- Leslie Page Moch, *Paths to the City: Regional Migration in Nineteenth Century France* (Beverly Hills 1986), ch. 5.

October 2 **Working-Class Families**

- *Jane Humphries, “Class Struggle and the Persistence of the Working-Class Family,” *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 1 (September 1977), 241–258.
- *Joan Scott and Louise Tilly, “Women’s Work and the Family in Nineteenth Century Europe,” in Charles E. Rosenberg, ed., *The Family in History* (Philadelphia 1975), 145–178.

- *Tamara Hareven, "Family Time and Industrial Time: Family and Work in a Planned Corporation Town, 1900–1924," *Journal of Urban History*, 1 (May 1975), 365–89.
- R. E. Johnson, "Family Relations and the Rural-Urban Nexus: Patterns in the Hinterland of Moscow 1880–1900," in David L. Ransel, ed., *The Family in Imperial Russia* (Urbana 1978), 263–279.
- John Bodnar, "Immigration, Kinship, and the Rise of Working-Class Realism in Industrial America," *Journal of Social History*, 14 (Fall 1980), 45–65.

October 9 **Community**

- *Lynn Lees, "Metropolitan Types," in H. J. Dyos and Michael Wolff, eds., *The Victorian City: Images and Realities* (London 1973), 413–428.
- *Gareth Stedman Jones, *Outcast London: A Study in the Relationship between Classes in Victorian Society* (London 1971), ch. 3, 4, 8.
- *Michael Hanagan, "The Logic of Solidarity: Social Structure in Le Chambon-Feugerolles," *Journal of Urban History*, 3 (August 1977), 409–426.
- *David Corbin, *Life, Work, and Rebellion in the Coal Fields: the Southern West Virginia Miners, 1880–1922*, (Urbana 1981), ch. 3.
- James R. Barrett, "The Families and Communities of Packerstown, 1984–1922," in *Work and Community in 'The Jungle'*, manuscript, 1986.
- Olivier Zunz, *The Changing Face of Inequality: Urbanization, Industrial Development, and Immigrants in Detroit, 1880–1920* (Chicago 1982).
- Daniel J. Walkowitz, *Worker City, Company Town: Iron and Cotton-worker Protest in Troy and Cohoes, New York, 1855–84* (Urbana 1978), part I.
- Leopold Haimson with Eric Brian, "Changements démographiques et grèves ouvrières à St. Petersburg, 1905–1914," *Annales: Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, 4 (July–August 1985), 781–803.

October 16 **Culture**

- *Eric Hobsbawm, "The Making of the English Working Class, 1870–1914," in *Workers: Worlds of Labor* (New York 1984), 194–213.
- *John Kingsdale, "The 'Poor Man's Club': Social Functions of the Urban Working-Class Saloon," *American Quarterly*, 25 (October 1973), 472–489.
- *David Montgomery, "Workers' Control of Machine Production in the 19th Century," in *Workers' Control in America: Studies in the History of Work, Technology, and Labor Struggles* (Cambridge 1979), 9–31.
- Ross McKibbin, "Working-Class Gambling in Britain, 1880–1939," *Past and Present*, no. 82 (February 1979), 147–178.

- Gareth Stedman Jones, "Working-Class Culture and Working-Class Politics in London 1870–1900: Notes on the Remaking of the Working Class," in *Languages of Class: Studies in English Working-Class History, 1832–1982* (Cambridge 1983), 179–238.
- John Hatch, "The Politics of Mass Culture: Workers, Communists and Proletcult in the Development of Workers' Clubs, 1921–25," *Russian History*, forthcoming.
- Michael Marrus, "Social Drinking in the Belle Epoque," *Journal of Social History*, 7 (Winter 1974), 115–141.

October 23 **Protest**

- *William Rosenberg and Diane Koenker, "The Limits of Formal Protest: Worker Activism and Social Polarization in Russia, March to October 1917," unpublished.
- *James Cronin, "Strikes and Power in Britain, 1870–1920," 1982 paper.
- *David Montgomery, "Machinists, the Civic Federation, and the Socialist Party," in *Workers' Control in America*, 48–90.
- *Edward Shorter and Charles Tilly, "The Shape of Strikes in France 1830–1960," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 13 (January 1971), 60–86.
- Reginald E. Zelnik, *Labor and Society in Tsarist Russia*, ch. 9.
- Charles Tilly, Louise Tilly, Richard Tilly, *The Rebellious Century* (Cambridge, MA 1975), ch. 1, 5, 6.

October 30 **Workers and the State**

- *Selig Perlman, *A Theory of the Labor Movement* (New York 1966), original 1928.
- *Melvyn Dubofsky, "Abortive Reform: The Wilson Administration and Organized Labor, 1913–1920," in James E. Cronin and Carmen Sirianni, eds., *Work, Community, and Power: The Experience of Labor in Europe and America, 1900–1925* (Philadelphia 1983), 197–220.
- *William G. Rosenberg, "Russian Labor and Bolshevik Power After October," *Slavic Review*, 44 (Summer 1985), 213–239.
- David Montgomery, "Labor and the Republic in Industrial America, 1860–1920," *Le Mouvement Sociale*, 10 (April–June 1980), 201–215.
- Reginald E. Zelnik, *Labor and Society in Tsarist Russia*, ch. 7.
- Joan W. Scott, "Mayors versus Police Chiefs: Socialist Municipalities Confront the French State," in John M. Merriman, ed., *French Cities in the Nineteenth Century* (London 1982), 230–246.

November 6 **Socialism**

- *Joan Wallach Scott, *The Glassworkers of Carmaux: French Craftsmen and Political Action in a Nineteenth-Century City* (Cambridge, MA 1974), ch. 5.
- *Victoria E. Bonnell, *Roots of Rebellion*, ch. 4, 10.
- *James Weinstein, *The Decline of Socialism in America, 1912–1925* (New York 1967), pp. 1–118.
- Tony Judt, *Socialism in Provence 1871–1914: A Study in the Origins of the Modern French Left* (Cambridge, 1979).
- E. P. Thompson, “Homage to Tom Maguire,” in Asa Briggs and John Saville, eds., *Essays in Labour History* (London 1967), 276–316.

November 13 **Rationalization and Scientific Management**

- *James R. Barrett, “Immigrant Workers in Early Mass Production Industry: Work Rationalization and Job Control Conflicts in Chicago’s Packinghouses, 1900–1904,” in Hartmut Keil and John B. Jentz, eds., *German Workers in Industrial Chicago, 1850–1910: A Comparative Perspective* (DeKalb 1983), 104–24.
- *Heather Hogan, “Industrial Rationalization and the Roots of Labor Militance in the St. Petersburg Metalworking Industry, 1901–1914,” *Russian Review*, 42 (April 1983), 163–190.
- *David Montgomery, “Whose Standards? Workers and the Reorganization of Production in the U.S., 1900–20,” in *Workers’ Control in America*, 113–138.
- *Richard Price, “The Labour Process and Labour History,” *Social History*, 8 (January 1983), 57–75.
- Gary Cross, “Redefining Workers’ Control: Rationalization, Labor Time, and Union Politics in France, 1900–1928,” in Cronin and Sirianni, eds., *Work, Community, and Power*, 143–172.

November 20 **Syndicalism and Mass Strikes**

- *Bob Holton, *British Syndicalism 1900–1914: Myths and Realities* (London 1975).
- *David Montgomery, “The New Unionism and the Transformation of Workers’ Consciousness in America, 1909–1922,” in *Workers’ Control in America*, 91–112.
- *Larry Peterson, “One Big Union in International Perspective: Revolutionary Industrial Unionism, 1900–25,” in Cronin and Sirianni, eds., *Work, Community, and Power*, 49–87.
- W. Z. Foster, *Syndicalism* (Chicago 1911).

December 4 **War and Revolutionary Situations**

- *James E. Cronin, "Labor Insurgency and Class Formation: Comparative Perspectives on the Crisis of 1917–1920 in Europe," in Cronin and Sirianni, eds., *Work, Community, and Power*, 20–48.
- *S. A. Smith, *Red Petrograd: Revolution in the Factories, 1917–1918* (Cambridge 1983), ch. 3,8.
- *Diane Koenker, "Moscow in 1917: The View from Below," in Daniel Kaiser, ed., *The Workers' Revolution in Russia* (Cambridge, forthcoming), preprint.
- Dick Geary, "Radicalism and the Workers: German Metalworkers in Revolution, 1914–1923," in Richard J. Evans, ed., *Society and Politics in Wilhelmine Germany* (New York 1978), 267–286.
- Mary Nolan, "Workers and Revolution in Germany, 1918–1919: The Urban Dimension," in Cronin and Sirianni, eds., *Work, Community, and Power*, 117–142.
- Standish Meacham, "The Sense of an Impending Clash: English Working-Class Unrest before World War I," *American Historical Review*, 77 (December 1972), 1343–1364.
- David Brody, *Steelworkers in America: the Nonunion Era* (New York 1970), ch. 9, 10, 11.
- Paolo Spriano, *The Occupation of the Factories: Italy 1920* (London 1975).

December 11 **American Exceptionalism**

- *Please review whatever reading notes you might have for S. Perlman, *A Theory of the Labor Movement*.
- *Sean Wilentz, "Against Exceptionalism: Class Consciousness and the American Labor Movement, 1790–1920," *International Labor and Working-Class History*, no. 26 (Fall 1984), 1–24.
- *Eric Foner, "Why Is There No Socialism in America?" *History Workshop*, 17 (Spring 1984), 57–80.
- Mike Davis, "Why the U.S. Working Class Is Different," *New Left Review*, no. 123 (September–October 1980), 3–46.
- John Laslett and Seymour Martin Lipset, eds., *Failure of a Dream? Essays in the History of American Socialism* (Garden City, NY 1974).
- Jerome Karabel, "The Failure of American Socialism Reconsidered," *Socialist Register*, 16 (1979), 204–227.

The following books have been ordered and are available for purchase in the local bookstores:

David Montgomery, *Workers' Control in America* (Cambridge 1979), paperback.

James E. Cronin and Carmen Sirianni, eds., *Work, Community and Power* (Philadelphia 1983), paperback.

Selig Perlman, *A Theory of the Labor Movement* (New York 1966), original 1928, paperback.

Other required readings will be available on reserve in the History library.

Readings marked with an asterisk (*) are required for all students.

Additional supplementary readings will be supplied as we go along. These and suggested discussion questions will be distributed to the class the week before the appropriate session.

Requirements:

Two short essays (5–7 pp.) on problems related to the readings. These will be due on Oct. 2 and Dec. 11.

A bibliographical essay, about 20 pages, on a comparative topic of working-class history. A statement of topic is due on October 9, a list of works to be included is due on October 30, and the final essay is due November 20.

Students will take turns leading the discussion of readings in class each week; assignments will be made at the start of the semester. Discussion participation based on readings is required of all students, and will be an important part of the final grade for the course.

APPENDIX 2: COMPARATIVE WORKING-CLASS HISTORY FALL 2005

History 502 Comparative Working-Class History
Section KB James Barrett and Diane Koenker
Mondays 3–4:50 Fall 2005
4 Gregory Hall

Syllabus

Week 1 **Wednesday, August 24: Organization**

Week 2 **August 29: Class and Comparison**

- *Selig Perlman, *A Theory of the Labor Movement* (New York 1928).
- *Diane P. Koenker, "Introduction," in *Republic of Labor: Russian Printers and Soviet Socialism, 1918–1930* (Ithaca 2005), 1–13.
- Ira Katznelson, "Working-class Formation: Constructing Cases and Comparisons," in Ira Katznelson and Aristide Zolberg, eds. *Working-Class Formation: Nineteenth-Century Patterns in Western Europe and the United States* (Princeton 1986), 3–41.
- Sonya Rose, "Class Formation and the Quintessential Worker," in John R. Hall, ed., *Reworking Class* (Ithaca 1997), 133–168.
- William Sewell, "Artisans, Factory Workers, and the Formation of the French Working Class, 1789–1848," in Katznelson and Zolberg, eds., *Working-Class Formation*, 45–70.
- Aristide Zolberg, "How Many Exceptionalisms?" in Katznelson and Zolberg, eds., *Working-Class Formation*, 397–456.

Week 3 **September 12: What Is Work?**

- *E.P. Thompson, "Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism," *Past and Present*, no. 38 (December 1967), 56–97, reprinted in E. P. Thompson, *Customs in Common* (New York 1991).
- *Charles More, *Skill and the English Working Class, 1870–1914* (New York 1980), introduction and chapter 1.
- *Frank Tobias Higbie, *Indispensable Outcasts: Hobo Workers and Community in the American Midwest, 1880–1930* (Urbana 2003), 1–65.
- Charles Sabel and Jonathan Zeitlin, "Historical Alternatives to Mass Production: Politics, Markets and Technology in Nineteenth-Century Industrialization," *Past and Present*, no. 108 (August 1985), 133–176.
- David Montgomery, *Fall of the House of Labor: The Workplace, the State, and American Labor Activism, 1865–1925* (Cambridge 1987), ch. 1–3.
- Richard Price, "The Labour Process and Labour History," *Social History* 8 (January 1983), 57–75.

- Jacques Ranciere, "The Myth of the Artisan," in Steven Laurence Kaplan and Cynthia J. Koepp, eds., *Work in France: Representations, Meaning, Organization, and Practice* (Ithaca 1986), 317–334.
- Joan Wallach Scott, "Glassworkers and Miners: A Contrast" (ch. 3), in *The Glassworkers of Carmaux: French Craftsmen and Political Action in a Nineteenth-Century City* (Cambridge, MA 1974), 53–71.
- Kenneth Lipartito, "When Women Were Switches: Technology, Work, and Gender in the Telephone Industry, 1890–1920," *American Historical Review*, 99 (October 1994), 1074–1111.
- Lewis H. Siegelbaum, "The Making of Stakhanovites" (ch. 4), in *Stakhanovism and the Politics of Productivity in the USSR, 1935–1941* (Cambridge 1988), 145–78.
- Lizabeth Cohen, *Making a New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919–1939* (New York 1991), 159–212.
- John H.M. Laslett, *Colliers across the Sea: A Comparative Study of Class Formation in Scotland and the American Midwest, 1830–1924* (Urbana 2000).
- Venus Green, *Race on the Line: Gender, Labor, and Technology in the Bell System, 1880–1980* (Durham, NC 2000).
- Mercedes Steedman, "Skill and Gender in the Canadian Clothing Industry, 1890–1914," in Laurel Sefton McDowell and Ian Radforth, eds., *Canadian Working-Class History: Selected Readings*, 2nd ed. (Toronto 2000), 450–470.

Week 4 **September 19: Immigration, Migration, Race, and Ethnicity**

- *David Roediger and James Barrett, "'Irish Hosts' and White Pan-Ethnicity, Or, Who Made the 'New Immigrants' Inbetween?" in Nancy Foner and George Frederickson, eds., *Not Just Black and White: Immigration and Race, Then and Now* (New York 2004), 167–196.
- *David Montgomery, "Racism, Immigrants, and Political Reform," *Journal of American History*, 87 (March 2001), 1253–1274.
- *Alf Lüdtke, "The Appeal of Exterminating 'Others': German Workers and the Limits of Resistance," *Journal of Modern History*, 64 (December 1992), S46–S67.
- *Laura Tabili, "Women of a Very Low Type: Crossing Racial Boundaries in Imperial Britain," in Laura Frader and Sonya Rose, eds., *Gender and Class in Modern Europe* (Ithaca 1996), 165–90.
- Zaragoza Vargas, *Proletarians of the North: A History of Mexican Industrial Workers in Detroit and the Midwest, 1917–1933* (Berkeley 1993).
- Daniel Letwin, *The Challenge of Interracial Unionism: Alabama Coal Miners, 1878–1921* (Chapel Hill 1998).
- Michael K. Honey, *Southern Labor and Black Civil Rights: Organizing Memphis Workers* (Urbana 1993).

- Robin D. G. Kelley, "We Are Not What We Seem': Rethinking Black Working-Class Opposition in the Jim Crow South," *Journal of American History*, 80 (June 1993), 75–112; reprinted in Kelley, *Race Rebels: Culture, Politics, and the Black Working Class* (New York 1994).
- Catherine Collomp, "Immigrants, Labor Markets, and the State in France and the USA, 1880–1930," *Journal of American History*, 86 (June 1999), 41–66.
- Nancy A. Hewitt, "The Voice of Virile Labor': Labor Militancy, Community, Solidarity, and Gender Identity among Tampa's Latin Workers," in Ava Baron, ed., *Work Engendered: Toward a New History of American Labor* (Ithaca 1991), 142–167.
- Alejandro de la Fuente, "Two Dangers, One Solution: Immigration, Race, and Labor in Cuba, 1900–1930," *International Labor and Working-Class History*, no. 51 (Spring 1997), 30–49.
- Donna R. Gabaccia and Fraser M. Ottanelli, eds., *Italian Workers of the World: Labor Migration and the Formation of Multiethnic States* (Urbana 2001).
- James R. Barrett and David Roediger, "In-Between Peoples: Race, Nationality, and the New Immigrant Workers," *Journal of American Ethnic History*, 16 (May 1997), 3–44.
- Gunther Peck, "Mobilizing Community: Migrant Workers and the Politics of Labor Mobility in the North American West, 1900–1920," in Eric Arnesen, Julie Greene, and Bruce Laurie, eds., *Labor Histories: Class, Politics, and the Working-Class Experience* (Urbana 1998), 175–200.
- Paul Siu, *The Chinese Laundryman: A Study of Social Isolation*, ed. John Kuo Wei Tchen (New York 1987).
- Gillian Creese, "Exclusion or Solidarity? Vancouver Workers Confront the 'Oriental Problem,'" in McDowell and Radforth, eds., *Canadian Working-Class History*, 293–314.
- Eric Arnesen, "Whiteness and the Historians' Imagination," and responses, *International Labor and Working-Class History*, no. 60 (Fall 2001), 3–92.

Week 5 **September 26: Personal Identity and Class Experience**

- *Kathryn Oberdeck, "Popular Narrative and Working-Class Identity," in Arnesen, Greene, and Laurie, eds., *Labor Histories*, 200–229.
- *James R. Barrett, "Was the Personal Political? Reading the Autobiography of American Communism," manuscript.
- *Diane P. Koenker, "Scripting the Revolutionary Worker Autobiography: Archetypes, Models, Inventions, and Markets," *International Review of Social History*, 49 (December 2004), 371–400.
- *Joan Scott, "Experience," in Judith Butler and Joan Scott, eds., *Feminists Theorize the Political* (New York 1992), 22–40.

- Reginald E. Zelnik, "Introduction to Gerasimov," in *Law and Disorder on the Narova River* (Stanford 1995), 223–69.
- Mary Jo Maynes, *Taking the Hard Road: Life Course in French and German Workers' Autobiographies in the Era of Industrialization* (Chapel Hill 1995), ch. 1, 2.
- David Vincent, *Bread, Knowledge and Freedom: A Study of Nineteenth-Century Working-class Autobiography* (London, 1981).
- George Steinmetz, "Reflections on the Role of Social Narratives in Working-Class Formation: Narrative Theory in the Social Sciences," *Social Science History*, 16 (Fall 1992), 489–516.

Week 6 **October 3: Family Ties**

- *Jacquelyn Hall, Robert Korstad, and James Leloudis, "Cotton Mill People: Work, Community, and Protest in the Textile South, 1880–1940," *American Historical Review* 91 (April 1986), 245–86.
- *Ellen Ross, *Love and Toil: Motherhood in Outcast London, 1870–1918* (New York 1993), ch. 5, 7.
- *Laura Frader, "Engendering Work and Wages: The French Labor Movement and the Family Wage," in Frader and Rose, eds., *Gender and Class in Modern Europe*, 142–64.
- Belinda Davis, "Food Scarcity and Empowerment of the Female Consumer in World War I Berlin," in Victoria de Grazia with Ellen Furlough, eds., *The Sex of Things: Gender and Consumption in Historical Perspective* (Berkeley 1996), 287–310.
- Michael Hanagan, "Proletarian Families and Social Protest: Production and Reproduction as Issues of Social Conflict in Nineteenth-Century France," in Kaplan and Koepp, eds., *Work in France*, 418–56.
- Susan Porter Benson, "Living on the Margin: Working-Class Marriages and Family Survival Strategies in the U.S., 1919–1941," in de Grazia and Furlough, eds., *The Sex of Things*, 212–243.
- Elizabeth H. Pleck, "Two Worlds in One," *Journal of Social History*, 10 (Winter 1976), 178–195.
- Barbara Weinstein, "Unskilled Worker, Skilled Housewife: Constructing the Working-Class Woman in Sao Paulo, Brazil," in John D. French and Daniel James, eds., *The Gendered Worlds of Latin American Women Workers: From Household and Factory to the Union Hall and Ballot Box* (Durham 1997), 72–99.
- John Bodnar, "Immigration, Kinship, and the Rise of Working-Class Realism in Industrial America," *Journal of Social History*, 14 (Fall 1980), 40–65.
- Martha May, "The Historical Problem of the Family Wage: the Ford Motor Company and the Five Dollar Day," *Feminist Studies*, 8 (Summer 1982), 399–424.

Caroline Waldron Merithew, "Anarchist Motherhood: Toward the Making of a Revolutionary Proletariat in Illinois Coal Mining Towns," in Donna R. Gabaccia and Franca Iacovetta, eds., *Women, Gender, and Transnational Lives: Italian Workers of the World* (Toronto 2002), 217–246.

Anne Morelli, "Nestore's Wife? Work, Family, and Militancy in Belgium," in Gabaccia and Iacovetta, eds., *Women, Gender, and Transnational Lives*, 247–298.

Week 7 **October 10: Gender – Conflict and Love**

*Kathleen Canning, "Rethinking German Labor History: Gender and the Politics of Class Formation," *American Historical Review*, 97 (June 1992), 736–768.

*Diane P. Koenker, "Men Against Women on the Shop Floor in Early Soviet Russia," *American Historical Review*, 100 (December 1995), 1438–1464.

*Kevin Boyle, "The Kiss: Racial and Gender Conflict in a 1950s Automobile Factory," *Journal of American History*, 84 (September 1997), 496–523.

*Alice Kessler-Harris, "Treating the Male As Other," *Labor History* 34 (Spring 1993), 190–204.

Ellen Ross, "Fierce Questions and Taunts: Married Life in Working-Class London 1870–1914," *Feminist Studies*, 8 (Fall 1982), 575–602

Joan Wallach Scott, "On Language, Gender, and Working-Class History," in *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York 1988), 53–67.

Ross McKibbin, *Classes and Cultures: England, 1918–1951* (Oxford 1998), ch. 5, part 1.

Francoise Barret-Ducrocq, *Love in the Time of Victoria: Sexuality, Class, and Gender in Nineteenth Century London* (London 1991), 45–122.

Eileen Boris, "'You Wouldn't Want One of 'Em Dancing With Your Wife': Racialized Bodies on the Job in World War II," *American Quarterly*, 50 (March 1998), 77–108.

Suzanne Morton, "The June Bride as the Working-Class Bride: Getting Married in a Halifax Working-Class Neighborhood in the 1920s," in McDowell and Radforth, eds., *Canadian Working-Class History*, 426–449.

Jennifer Guglielmo, "Italian Women's Proletarian Feminism in the New York City Garment Trades, 1890s–1940s," in Gabaccia and Iacovetta, eds., *Women, Gender, and Transnational Lives*, 247–298.

Robert Ventresca and Franca Iacovetta, "Virgilia D'Andrea: The Politics of Protest and the Poetry of Exile," in Gabaccia and Iacovetta, eds., *Women, Gender, and Transnational Lives*, 299–326.

"Labor History after the Gender Turn," various authors, *International Labor and Working-Class History*, no. 63 (Spring 2003), 1–36.

Week 8 October 17: Religion

- *Robert A. Orsi, *The Madonna of 115th Street: Faith and Community in Italian Harlem, 1880–1950* (New Haven 1985 [2d ed 2002]), Introduction and 150–231.
- *Mark D. Steinberg, “Workers on the Cross: Religious Imagination in the Writings of Russian Workers, 1910–1924,” *Russian Review*, 53 (April 1994), 213–239.
- *E. P. Thompson, “The Transforming Power of the Cross,” (ch. 11), in *The Making of the English Working Class* (London 1963), 350–400.
- Kathryn Oberdeck, “Religion, Culture, and the Politics of Class,” *American Quarterly*, 47 (June 1995), 236–279.
- Reginald E. Zelnik, “‘To the Unaccustomed Eye’: Religion and Irreligion in the Experience of St. Petersburg Workers in the 1870s,” *Russian History*, 16 (Spring–Winter 1989), 297–326.
- John T. McGreevy, *Parish Boundaries: The Catholic Encounter with Race in the Twentieth-Century Urban North* (Chicago 1996), 8–53.
- Thomas Walter Laqueur, *Religion and Respectability: Sunday Schools and Working-Class Culture, 1780–1850* (New Haven 1976).
- Wilfred Spohn, “Religion and Working-Class Formation in Imperial Germany, 1871–1914,” *Politics and Society*, 19 (March 1991), 109–32.
- William L. Patch, Jr., *Christian Trade Unions in the Weimar Republic, 1918–1933: The Failure of Corporate Pluralism* (New Haven 1985).
- John Bukowczyk, “‘Mary the Messiah’: Polish Immigrant Heresy and the Malleable Ideology of the Roman Catholic Church in America 1880–1930,” in Obelkevich, Roper, and Samuel, eds., *Disciplines of Faith*, 371–89.

Week 9 October 24: The Intellectual Life of the Working Class/ “Blue Collar Cosmopolitans”

- *Mark D. Steinberg, “Knowledges of Self” (ch. 2) and “The Proletarian ‘I’” (ch. 3) in *Proletarian Imagination: Self, Modernity, and the Sacred in Russia, 1910–1925* (Ithaca 2002), 62–101, 102–146.
- *Hutchins Hapgood, *The Spirit of Labor* (New York, 1907), Barrett Introduction and 9–20, 35–53, 75–93, 138–166.
- *Marcus Rediker and Peter Linebaugh, *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic* (Boston 2000), 1–7, 211–247.
- Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge, MA 1993).
- Jonathan Rose, *Intellectual Life of the British Working Classes* (New Haven 2001), preface, ch. 7, and ch. 9.
- Jacques Ranciere, *The Nights of Labor: The Workers’ Dream in Nineteenth-Century France* (Philadelphia 1989), vii–xii.

Week 10 **October 31: Working-Class Politics, I: Socialism**

- *Barbara Taylor, "Women and Socialist Culture" (ch. 7), in *Eve and the New Jerusalem: Socialism and Feminism in the Nineteenth Century* (New York 1983), 217–237.
- *William H. Sewell, Jr., "The July Revolution and the Emergence of Class Consciousness" (ch. 9), in *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848* (Cambridge 1980), 194–218.
- *Geoff Eley, *Forging Democracy: The History of the Left in Europe, 1850–2000* (Oxford 2002), Section 1.
- Michael Kazin, "The Agony and Romance of the American Left," *American Historical Review* 100 (December 1995), 1488–1512.
- James Weinstein, *The Decline of Socialism in America, 1912–1925* (New York 1967), 1–176.
- Nick Salvatore, *Eugene V. Debs: Citizen and Socialist* (Urbana 1982) (esp. ch. 8, 9).
- Vernon L. Lidtke, *The Alternative Culture: Socialist Labor in Imperial Germany* (New York 1985).
- Bernard Moss, *The Origins of the French Labor Movement, 1830–1914: The Socialism of Skilled Workers* (Berkeley 1976).
- Victoria Bonnell, "The Radicalization of Labor, 1912–1914" (ch. 10), *Roots of Rebellion: Workers' Politics and Organizations in St. Petersburg and Moscow, 1900–1914* (Berkeley 1983), 390–438.
- Mark D. Steinberg, "Organizing Class Relations, 1905–1907" (ch. 7) in *Moral Communities: The Culture of Class Relations in the Russian Printing Industry, 1867–1907* (Berkeley 1992), 183–210.
- Paolo Spriano, *The Occupation of the Factories* (London, 1975).
- Tim Mason, "The Containment of the Working Class in Nazi Germany," in *Nazism, Fascism, and the Working Class* (Cambridge 1995), 231–73.

Week 11 **November 7: Working-class Politics, II: Communism**

- *James R. Barrett, "Boring from Within and from Without: William Z. Foster, the Communist Party, and American Trade Unions in the 1920s," in Arnesen, Greene, and Laurie, eds., *Labor Histories*, 309–339.
- *Diane P. Koenker, "Class Formation or the Unmaking of the Working Class?" (ch. 9) in *Republic of Labor*, 271–298.
- *Eric D. Weitz, "Contesting Order: Communists in the Workplace" (ch. 4), in *Creating German Communism, 1890–1990: from Popular Protests to Socialist State* (Princeton 1997), 132–59.
- *Ronald Grigor Suny, "Toward a Social History of the October Revolution," *American Historical Review*, 88 (February 1983), 31–53.
- *Bryan Palmer, "Rethinking the History of American Communism," *American Communist History*, 2 (December 2003), 139–173.

- James A. Miller, Susan D. Pennybacker, and Eve Rosenhaft, "Mother Ada Wright and the International Campaign to Free the Scottsboro Boys, 1931–1934," *American Historical Review* 106 (April 2001), 387–431.
- Eric Hobsbawm, "Problems of Communist History," in *Revolutionaries* (New York 1973), 3–10.
- Michael Denning, *The Cultural Front: The Laboring of American Culture in the Twentieth Century* (London 1996), 1–50.
- Geoff Eley, "International Communism in the Hey-Day of Stalin," *New Left Review*, no. 157 (May–June 1986), 90–100.
- Van Gosse, "'To Organize in Every Neighborhood, in Every Home': The Gender Politics of American Communists between the Wars," *Radical History Review*, 50 (Spring 1991), 109–142.
- Richard Hyman and James Hinton, *Trade Unions and Revolution: The Industrial Politics of the Early British Communist Party* (London, 1975).
- Maurice Isserman, "Three Generations: Historians View American Communism," *Labor History* 26 (Fall 1985), 517–45.
- Padraic Kenney, "Social Foundations of the Stalinist System" (ch. 4), in *Rebuilding Poland: Workers and Communists, 1947–1950* (Ithaca 1997), 189–236.
- Elizabeth J. Perry, "Labor's Love Lost: Worker Militancy in Communist China," *International Labor and Working-Class History*, no. 50 (Fall 1996), 64–76.
- Stephen Kotkin, "Coercion and Identity: Workers' Lives in Stalin's Showcase City," in Lewis H. Siegelbaum and Ronald Grigor Suny, eds., *Making Workers Soviet: Power, Class, and Identity* (Ithaca 1994), 274–310.

Week 12 **November 14: Consumption and Style**

- *Victoria de Grazia, "Changing Consumption Regimes in Europe, 1930–1970: Comparative Perspectives on the Distribution Problem," in Susan Strasser, Charles McGovern, and Matthias Judt, eds., *Getting and Spending: European and American Consumer Societies in the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge 1998), 59–84.
- *Joy Parr, "Household Choices as Politics and Pleasure in 1950s Canada," *International Labor and Working-Class History*, no. 55 (Spring 1999), 112–128.
- *Lawrence Glickman, "Inventing the 'American Standard of Living': Race, Gender, and Working-Class Identity, 1880–1925," *Labor History*, 34 (Spring–Summer 1993), 221–235 [also chapter 4 of Glickman, *A Living Wage: American Workers and the Making of Consumer Society* (Ithaca, 1997)].

- *Ina Merkel, "Working People and Consumption under Really-Existing Socialism: Perspectives from the German Democratic Republic," *International Labor and Working-Class History*, no. 55 (Spring 1999), 92–111.
- *Susan Porter Benson, "Gender, Generation, and Consumption in the United States: Working-Class Families in the Interwar Period," in Strasser, McGovern, and Judt, eds., *Getting and Spending*, 223–240.
- Lizabeth Cohen, *Making a New Deal*, 99–158.
- Nan Enstad, *Ladies of Labor, Girls of Adventure: Working Women, Popular Culture, and Labor Politics at the Turn of the Twentieth Century* (New York 1999).
- Lizabeth A. Cohen, "Embellishing a Life of Labor: An Interpretation of the Material Culture of American Working-Class Homes, 1885–1915," in Thomas J. Schlereth, ed., *Material Culture Studies in America* (Nashville 1982), 289–305.
- Kathy Peiss, *Cheap Amusements: Working Women and Leisure in New York City, 1880–1920* (Philadelphia 1986).
- Ellen Furlough, "French Consumer Cooperation, 1885–1930: From the 'Third Pillar' of Socialism to 'A Movement for All Consumers,'" in Ellen Furlough and Carl Strikwerda, eds., *Consumers against Capitalism? Consumer Cooperation in Europe, North America, and Japan, 1840–1990* (Lanham, MD 1999), 173–90.

Thanksgiving break

Week 13 **November 28: Leisure – Sports, Drinking, Vacations**

- *Robert Edelman, "A Small Way of Saying 'No': Moscow Working Men, Spartak Soccer, and the Communist Party, 1900–1945," *American Historical Review*, 107 (December 2002), 1441–75.
- *Madelon Powers, "The 'Poor Man's Friend': Saloonkeepers, Workers, and the Code of Reciprocity in U.S. Barrooms, 1870–1920," *International Labor and Working-Class History*, no. 45 (Spring 1994), 1–15.
- *W. Scott Haine, *The World of the Paris Cafe: Sociability among the French Working Class, 1789–1914* (Baltimore 1996), ch. 3.
- *Victoria de Grazia, "Taylorizing Worker Leisure" (ch. 3), in *The Culture of Consent: Mass Organization of Leisure in Fascist Italy* (Cambridge 1981), 60–93.
- Gary Cross, "Meanings of Free Time: Leisure and Class in the 1920s" (ch. 8), in *A Quest for Time: The Reduction of Work in Britain and France, 1840–1940* (Berkeley 1989), 171–193.

- Roy Rosenzweig, "The Rise of the Saloon," "The Struggle over the Saloon," and "The Struggle Over Recreational Space," in *Eight Hours for What We Will: Workers and Leisure in an Industrial City, 1870–1920* (Cambridge 1983), 35–64, 93–126, 127–152.
- Ross McKibbin, "Work and Hobbies in Britain 1880–1950," in Jay Winter, ed., *The Working Class in Modern British History: Essays in Honour of Henry Pelling*, (Cambridge 1983), 127–46.
- Glenn Adler, "Shop Floors and Rugby Fields: The Social Basis of Auto Worker Solidarity in South Africa," *International Labor and Working-Class History*, no. 51 (Spring 1997), 96–128.
- Cindy S. Aron, "Vacations do not appeal to them': Extending Vacations to the Working Class" (ch. 7), in *Working at Play: A History of Vacations in the United States* (Oxford 1999), 183–205.
- Ellen Furlough, "Making Mass Vacations: Tourism and Consumer Culture in France, 1930s to 1970s," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 40 (April 1998), 247–86.

Week 14 **December 5: Colonial and Postcolonial Labour Regimes**

- *Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Rethinking Working-class History: Bengal 1890 to 1940* (Princeton 1989), xi–xv, 3–13, 155–85, 219–230.
- *Frederick Cooper, *Decolonization and African Society: The Labor Question in French and British Africa* (Cambridge 1996), 1–20, 273–76, 323–360, 457–72.
- *Christopher Joon-Hai Lee, "Uses of the Comparative Imagination: South African History and World History in the Political Consciousness and Strategy of the South African Left, 1943–1959," *Radical History Review*, 92 (Spring 2005), 31–61.

Other suggested readings to be added.

Readings marked with an asterisk (*) are required for all students.

WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS, PARTICIPATION IN THE SEMINAR, AND ASSESSMENT

We will base our assessment of your performance in the course on three elements:

1. Seminar Discussions

- a. Your role in weekly discussions. Historical conversations are like a foreign language: you learn a lot more when you try to express your ideas and engage in discussion rather than sit back and simply absorb what is going on around you. Participation comes more easily for some than others, but learning to

speak (and learning to listen) are important elements of the historian's craft. Any such assessment is somewhat subjective, but we will assign grades. We will try to give you some idea of how you are doing in this regard about halfway through the term.

b. Your presentation of a particular session. Here we will consider your integration of some of the collateral readings, the interpretive questions you present for discussion, and your role in the discussion itself.

Questions for discussion should be prepared and distributed to the class and to us by the Thursday before your scheduled class session. You can do this in either or both of two ways: e-mail to each class member; or putting paper copies of the questions in the mailboxes of each student by 5 p.m. on Thursday. Your object in leading the discussion is not to summarize readings but, rather, to stimulate and if necessary to direct the discussion. You propose questions that you think will stimulate discussion and encourage students to distill the essential from each of the readings; you help us to make connections between the various readings; you help us to distill from the discussion important interpretive points. The two of us will help with this process, while trying not to get in your way. You should also be prepared to engage the corollary readings for the benefit of the students in the class who may not have read all of them. In the interest of fairness, we will assign topics to individual students at our first meeting. We will provide you with an assessment within a week of your session.

2. Personal Narrative Essay

An essay (8–10 pages) on a personal narrative relating the narrative to themes of working-class history, including but not limited to problems of autobiography per se. We will circulate a list of possible narratives from which to choose. This paper will be due Friday, October 7.

3. A historiographical essay on a comparative topic of labour history.

By “comparative,” we intend that you include the secondary literature on the topic for at least three countries. By “historiographical,” we mean a paper that explores how historians have examined the particular topic under study. A **statement of topic** is due Friday, **October 14**. You will need to consult with us well before that date: we expect to meet with you early in the process and again toward the time the list of works is due. A **list of works** you will evaluate is due Friday, **November 11**. The **final paper**, which should be about 20 pages, is due Friday, **December 9**.

Because the papers will explore themes and sources beyond those in the course, we think it would be useful for the class to share their findings with

each other. Therefore, we will schedule an evening meeting of the seminar on a date to be announced, 6:30–9:30 p.m. Over pizza we will ask each of you to summarize your paper in **NO MORE THAN 10 MINUTES** in a way that conveys some of the issues you have dealt with. We will also ask you to make an electronic copy of the paper available to the class, so that students with a particular interest in some of these topics can learn more about the relevant literature.

Your work will be weighed as follows in the determination of your grade:

Seminar discussion and presentation:	One-third
Personal narrative essay	One-third
Historiographic essay	One-third

APPENDIX 3: COMPARATIVE LABOUR PRELIM SPRING 1986

Comparative Labour/Social History
Preliminary Examination
Spring 1986

Answer any 2 comparative questions and any two others – total 4.

COMPARATIVE

1. How would you differentiate the “new working-class history” of the 1960s–1980s from older examples of labour scholarship? Can you identify important groupings, or schools of historians based on their differing focuses, interpretations, methodologies? What do you think are the most promising directions for future working-class historians?
2. Why do artisans and skilled workers play such a leading role in labour activism? Are there types of activism more likely to involve skilled workers? Cite some examples.
3. How does the concept of a labour aristocracy help to explain the character and development of the labor movement in England and the United States during the latter half of the 19th century?
4. Compare the changing nature of working-class organization and protest in relation to broader economic and political change between the 1890s and the 1930s for two of the following: Germany, England, Russia, and the United States.

EUROPEAN

5. Compare the importance of Marxism in European labour movements, concentrating on two countries of the following: Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Luxemburg. What accounts for the differences?
6. Discuss the concept of proletarianization by describing the process in two of the following periods:

England	1790–1830
France	1830–1870
England	1890–1914

Who are the proletarians? Where do they come from?

AMERICAN

7. Discuss the following: “class conflict reached a crescendo in the U.S. during the late 19th century, but between 1900 and 1920 the American working-class was effectively integrated into the emerging corporate political economy. There is little if any evidence of working-class influence in either the industrial or political sphere.”

8. From a position of extreme weakness in the early 1930s, American workers built by the end of World War II a strong and influential labour movement with an expansive, progressive conception of its role as a movement for social reform. By the 1970s, this movement had been greatly weakened from within and without and had retreated from its advanced political views. Discuss the economic, political, and social factors that contributed to the rise and fall of “progressive labour” between the mid-1930s and the 1970s.

APPENDIX 4: COMPARATIVE WORKING-CLASS PRELIM JANUARY 2006

Comparative Working-Class History Prelim

Professors Koenker and Barrett
January 31, 2006

Choose one question from each of the following three sections and write an essay to answer it. Take some time to think about your answer. Write your outline. Then answer. Good luck!

I. EUROPE:

A. What is the relationship in 19th-century Europe between an artisanal mode of production, the rise of capitalism, and the development of labour politics? In other words, in what ways does the structure of production influence the ideas artisans bring to understanding their position in the society and economy? To what extent do gender roles and gender politics in this artisanal culture influence political and social ideas and actions?

B. Compare the tactics of resistance and the modes of accommodation of industrial workers in authoritarian societies in 20th-century Europe, focusing on the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany (but you may use more examples if you choose). To what extent do the authoritarian ideologies structure, produce, or mitigate resistance and accommodation? To what extent is worker behavior in these societies similar in form to that in capitalist societies in twentieth-century Europe?

II. COMPARATIVE:

A. Studies of autobiography emphasize the important role of childhood as a key moment in working-class formation. Using examples from at least two continents, discuss the role played by family, including the years of childhood and the relations between parents and children, in the production of "working-class consciousness." What sources do historians use to explore this question? Be sure to define your terms and to provide specific examples. Does the role of family in the formation of working-class culture change over time?

B. Define the concept of working-class formation and apply it to two of the following societies – England, France, and the U.S.A. Discuss the cultural and political dimensions of this process and suggest a chronological framework for each case. To what extent, if at all, is the U.S.A. exceptional?

III. USA:

A. To what extent and why were U.S. workers able to build a strong labour movement and achieve some measure of political influence between the bleak situation of the early 1930s and the heady atmosphere of the post-World War II period? Was this in some sense a social democratic labour movement, and what happened to these aspirations between the end of World War II and the late 1950s?

B. How do you and other labour historians explain the catastrophic decline of the U.S. labour movement between the 1950s and the 1980s?