

*staat* is no more continuous today than it was prior to the Second World War. As Ritter points out in his thoughtful conclusion, the problems of bringing Eastern Europe up to West European standards after the collapse of Communism, the immense increase in the costs of health care, and the aging of populations in the more advanced countries, present formidable challenges to the viability and future of social insurance and welfare institutions. Since these institutions have been expanded to include growing numbers of risk groups, the public stake in them has grown at times in inverse proportion to their affordability. What this means is that the problems of the democratic *Sozialstaat* are intimately bound up with the reconciliation of the tensions between »freedom and social security.« (p. 220) In the last analysis, the important achievement of Ritter's study is to invite historians and social scientists to study the *Sozialstaat* in liberation from old ideologies and certitudes and in the context of the real world and rational democratic aspirations. It is a crucial point of departure for scholars working in the field today.

Gerald D. Feldman, Berkeley

M. Bulmer/K. Bales/K. K. Sklar (Hrsg.), *The Social Survey in Historical Perspective*, Cambridge UP, Cambridge 1991, 383 S., geb., 45 £.

The industrial revolution first in Britain and then on the Continent and in the United States brought with it numerous social problems. The grievances of factory workers, miners and farm labourers led to social unrest which sometimes culminated in violence. Advocates of reform appreciated the need to secure accurate information on the condition of the workers before steps could be taken to remedy grievances. The introduction of social surveys was one way in which the facts could be established. The 12 contributors to the volume under review discuss various aspects of the development of the social survey. They deal mainly with surveys in Britain and the United States. The pioneer French contribution to the use of the social survey – Le Play and Halbwachs – is mentioned and there is a chapter on German surveys before 1935. The reproduction of some coloured maps made by early investigators is to be welcomed.

The contributors to this volume have ably summarised recent research on the history of social surveys. Some aspects of the development of social surveys to which they have drawn attention may be mentioned. The methods employed by pioneer investigators in the nineteenth century were very varied. James Caird and Henry Mayhew made their own enquiries while Charles Booth and others obtained information from School Board visitors, clergymen, magistrates and poor law officials. The regions examined were also very varied. Sometimes – as when a census was taken – a whole country was covered. More often a small district was examined such as the East End of London, the city of York or the seventh ward of Philadelphia. Again some investigators tried to secure information about every family living in a district while others confined their attention to a particular ethnic group such as negroes.

The pioneers were for the most part amateurs such as journalists and philanthropists. And women – like Beatrice Webb and Helen Bosanquet – were particularly active in the early days of social surveys. But then the professionals gradually took over. In Germany, for example, in the 1880s nearly a third of the members of the Verein für Socialpolitik were university professors. And it were professionals like Arthur Bowley who introduced random sampling as a new way of interpreting the information gathered in social surveys. The contributors to this volume throw light upon these and many other aspects of the history of the social survey.

William Otto Henderson, Hemel Hempstead