

vielfältigen Aufgaben, die Historiker im Rahmen der interdisziplinären Stadtforschung übernehmen könnten und sollten, sondern auch außerhalb des Expertenkreises für die Realisierung solcher Aufgaben zu werben.

Dieter Langewiesche

Heinz-Gerhard Haupt (Hrsg.), »Bourgeois und Volk zugleich«? Zur Geschichte des Kleinbürgertums im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert (= Campus Sozialgeschichte), Campus Verlag, Frankfurt/New York 1978, 184 S., kart., 22 DM.

»Das Kleinbürgertum hat gegenwärtig Konjunktur«, writes the editor of this volume in his introduction. This is undoubtedly true, even if we are rightly reminded of the gaps which continue to exist in our knowledge of this difficult class. Recent years have seen the publication of valuable monographs on German artisans and shopkeepers by Gellately, Noll, Sedatis and Volkov, and comparable research now appears to be underway in France and Belgium. Nor has recent work been restricted to monographs. Since Arno J. Mayer wrote of »The Lower Middle Class as Historical Problem« (*Journal of Modern History*, 1975), Annette Leppert-Fögen has produced an ambitious if flawed general book on »Die deklassierte Klasse«, while Geoffrey Crossick has edited a valuable collection of essays on the British lower middle class. Heinz-Gerhard Haupt himself, moreover, is one of the principal instigators of a series of European conferences on the petty bourgeoisie, the first fruits of which have been published in a 1979 issue of *Le Mouvement Social*. We can indeed talk of Konjunktur: historical shares in the petty bourgeoisie continue to rise, and the present volume may be regarded as an investor's guide for the uninitiated. To alter the metaphor, this reader attempts to provide both a sample of recent writing on the subject, and to offer an agenda for future research.

It is only partially successful in the first of these tasks. The articles and excerpts reprinted here (only the *editor's* own contribution is an Originalbeitrag) vary considerably in quality, although none is without interest. They are grouped into three main categories, of which the first — on the concept and theory of the petty bourgeoisie — is perhaps the least satisfying. The short extract from a 1954 bibliographical essay by *Léo Moulin* und *Luc Aertz*, for example, has both a passé air and seems to be addressed to the rather different problem of the *classes moyennes*. *Ernest Labrousse*, on the other hand, advances some stimulating thoughts on the internal divisions covered by the overall designation »Handwerk«, an approach which is developed with characteristic clarity and will be especially useful to a German audience still accustomed to being presented with a *Handwerkerstand*. The final contribution to this section, from *Christian Baudelot u. a.* is both lucid and ironical in its efforts to reassemble the appropriate tools for a marxist class analysis of the petty bourgeoisie. But the passages have been rather awkwardly excerpted and lack a clear focus. In general, these opening contributions reinforce, even if they scarcely advance on, the editor's own thoughtful discussion in the introduction of »die fließenden Grenzen der objektiven Lage des Kleinbürgertums«.

The meat of this volume is contained in the second section on the socio-economic development and function of the petty bourgeoisie within developing capitalist relations of production, an angle of approach which is clearly central to the *editor's* own thinking on the subject. His article on French Kleinhandel at the beginning of the 20th century is sensitively and fruitfully based on the proposition that capitalism giveth and capitalism taketh away. It shows a 19th-century expansion in Kleinhandel, coupled however with low trade margins, slow turnover of stock, credit problems, dependence on wholesalers and a high degree of both family- and self-exploitation. This is a nuanced account of both French Kleinhandel and of its role within French capitalism, although one regrets that the author's remarks on the significance of his findings for the relationship between Kleinhandel and the French political

left were not extended, if only speculatively. The excerpt from *Jeanne Gaillard's* work on Second-Empire Paris provides a comparable analysis of the expansion of artisan concerns in those years. In a richly-textured account, she indicates how this was variously achieved by a retreat to the back streets, by the application of new techniques of production, and a constant specialisation. Yet it was precisely these means of survival which, as Gaillard shows, laid Parisian Handwerk open to crisis in subsequent years. On an outwardly similar theme, *Adolf Noll* analyses the development of Handwerk in Westphalia, concluding that it weathered the crisis of the years 1882-95 by shedding non-competitive and one-man concerns, that it stabilised itself in the period after 1895, and that this process was more evident in the relatively industrialised Bezirk Arnsberg than in the less economically developed Bezirk Münster. Empirically dense but rather lacking in flesh and blood, Noll's refutation of the Niedergangstheorie of Handwerk tends to equate Handwerk with Kleinbetrieb; it also rests on a misleading traditional/modern typology of concerns. This allows the comfortable conclusion that Handwerk was purged and strengthened by the market mechanism of challenge and response, but leaves aside questions about the role played, and the costs borne, by those Handwerker who »failed« to respond. Unlike Haupt or Gaillard, therefore, Noll does less than full justice to the long-term pattern of formation, dissolution and re-formation to which the petty bourgeoisie as a whole was subject. Interestingly enough, Noll's approach (which is by no means uncommon) simply inverts the teleology of the book by Leppert-Fögen mentioned earlier. In his account the petty bourgeoisie goes from bad to better; in hers from bad to worse: in both cases one has a strong sense of a petty bourgeoisie being hurried inexorably towards a destination of the historian's choosing. If we are to see the petty bourgeoisie in its full complexity, however, we must take seriously the Janus-faced reality of this internally divided class, indicated in the well-chosen title of this collection. This involves not only taking account of those Handwerker and Kleinhändler (the tonangebend elements?) who possessed features of economic and social substance, however threatened, which lent plausibility to the petty bourgeois claim to represent a central pillar in society. It also requires that proper attention be paid to those marginal members of the petty bourgeoisie whose formal status disguised a semi-proletarian existence.

This has an obvious significance for the political behaviour of the petty bourgeoisie, although research is only now beginning to take account of such considerations. The third section of this reader, devoted to the political and ideological alignment of the petty bourgeoisie, reflects this fact. The most substantial contribution here is a thoughtful article in which *Heinrich August Winkler* sets in comparative perspective the stages whereby the German petty bourgeoisie came to embrace National Socialism in such significant numbers. The major themes dealt with have already become familiar, not least through Winkler's own pioneering work on *Mittelstand, Demokratie und Nationalsozialismus*, but the range, detail and balance of the article amply justify its inclusion. The piece can be criticised, however, for its over-mechanical treatment of petty-bourgeois political allegiance (»Die Novemberrevolution zwang die Handwerker und Kleinhändler, ihre politischen Optionen zu überprüfen«), and for a related tendency, even more marked in the earlier book, to identify the politics of the petty bourgeoisie with the political noises made by its Verbandsfunktionären. This is also true of Gellately's recent study on German shopkeepers, and it is no slight on the valuable work done by each of these authors to suggest that future research might fruitfully concentrate on burrowing beneath the organisational crust of the Verbände, and on breaking down, both socially and politically, categories like Kleinhandel, Handwerker and Mittelstand. One way of imaginatively entering the real world of petty bourgeois politics is through the internal contradictions revealed in the language of its Verbände. *Pascale Delfosse* purports to attempt this for the case of Belgian shopkeepers at the end of the 19th century, but her contribution is a disappointingly conventional account to which an inflated and largely unrelated

apparatus of linguistic analysis has been added. The general potential of such an approach was demonstrated recently by the more lucid passages of Klaus Theweleit's extraordinary book; it is demonstrated in this volume by the short but scintillating occasional piece by *Roland Barthes*, which mercilessly explores the structure of sentiment revealed by the language of Poujadism.

The *editor* of this timely reader disarms the reviewer by stressing the gaps in research which he faced in making this selection. But he also indicates the problems which future research might consider: the importance, both real and rhetorical, of the family for the petty bourgeoisie; the differences between the rural and urban petty bourgeoisie; the extent to which the political parties and Verbände coloured the expectations of the petty bourgeoisie, as well as the reverse process; and the reciprocal relationship between petty bourgeoisie and state. The importance of associational life, and the particular (and changing) role of the petty bourgeoisie within it should certainly be added to the agenda. At one level therefore, Heinz-Gerhard Haupt very properly talks of the need for more detailed research, exhorting us to proceed »mit einem Seziermesser und nicht mit einem Beil«. Equally important, he draws attention to the need for a theoretical armoury adequate to grasp the complexity of the petty bourgeoisie. His own illuminating introduction to this volume is a useful starting point.

David Blackburn

Karl Heinrich Kaufhold, *Das Gewerbe in Preußen um 1800* (= Göttinger Beiträge zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte, Bd. 2), Verlag Otto Schwartz, Göttingen 1978, VIII, 557 S., kart., 36 DM.

Das preußische Gewerbe um 1800, am Vorabend der Industriellen Revolution, wird von Kaufhold in einer statistisch-empirischen Untersuchung, einer Habilitationsschrift aus dem Jahre 1974, umfassend analysiert. Ziel der Untersuchung ist eine Beschreibung und Erklärung der wirtschaftlichen und sozialen Lage des Gewerbes. Die Frage nach dem »Übergang zur kapitalistischen Produktionsweise im Gewerbe und deren Rückwirkungen auf die traditionellen vorkapitalistischen Betriebsformen des Gewerbes« stellt dabei den leitenden Gesichtspunkt.

Untersuchungen des gewerblichen Produktionssektors in vorindustrieller Zeit sind bisher überwiegend vom Handwerk, genauer vom Zunft Handwerk, ausgegangen. Dieser Ausgangspunkt, der seine Unterstützung in zeitgenössischen Darstellungen und Erörterungen fand, hat, z. T. bis heute, den Eindruck entstehen lassen, als sei der sekundäre Produktionssektor voll vom Handwerk ausgefüllt worden. Einzelne Manufakturunternehmungen als Produkt merkantilistischer Gewerbeförderung schienen als Ausnahme nur die Alleinherrschaft des Handwerks zu bestätigen. Die schleppende Änderung der gewerberechtlichen Regeln in Deutschland — die »Einführung der Gewerbefreiheit« zog sich in den deutschen Bundesstaaten über viele Jahrzehnte hin — hat diese Überbetonung des Handwerks verstärkt. Daraus folgte nicht nur, daß die Geschichtsschreibung über Verlag und Manufaktur unter dem allgemeinen gewerbewirtschaftlichen Aspekt vernachlässigt wurde, sondern auch, daß die Vorstellung von strenger wirtschaftlicher Arbeitsteilung zwischen Stadt und Land (Gewerbe in den Städten — Agrarwirtschaft auf dem platten Lande) für die vorindustrielle Wirtschaftsstruktur prägend blieb. Die Verbreitung der Fabrikindustrie erschien vor diesem Hintergrund als ein Verdrängungsprozeß des Handwerks. Die These vom Niedergang des Handwerks infolge der Industriellen Revolution ist inzwischen widerlegt worden; die These von der intakten Handwerkswirtschaft am Vorabend der Industrialisierung wird auch zunehmend in Frage gestellt, aber zu ihrer endgültigen Zurückweisung fehlen Analysen des Gewerbesektors.