

ein. Grundlage der Untersuchung bilden Quellen aus deutschen und amerikanischen Archiven, so etwa auf deutscher Seite Aktenbestände der Merseburger Abteilung des ehemaligen Zentralen Staatsarchivs der DDR-Bestände, die zwischenzeitlich in das Geheime Staatsarchiv Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin, verbracht worden sind. Darüber hinaus hat die Verfasserin eine Fülle gedruckter Quellen sowie – sehr ausführlich – die einschlägige Fachliteratur herangezogen.

In ihrer Arbeit zeigt Dunlavy, wie die beiden sehr unterschiedlich geprägten politischen Systeme Einfluß nahmen auf Geschwindigkeit und Dynamik des Entstehungsprozesses der ersten Eisenbahnen. Ihre Analyse ergibt, daß der Einfluß der politischen Institutionen ganz und gar nicht so aussah, wie man sich das auf den ersten Blick hin gedacht hätte. Paradoxierteilweise bezog das vergleichsweise autoritäre Preußen in Eisenbahnangelegenheiten eine offenere Haltung als die USA, während das liberalere Nordamerika das neue Verkehrsmittel zwar entschieden unterstützte, aber auch deutlicher reglementierte. So entstand in Preußen ein flächendeckendes Bahnsystem, was auf die zentralistisch angelegten Behördenstrukturen zurückgeführt werden darf, während in den Vereinigten Staaten föderalistische Sonderinteressen den Aufbau eines Gesamtsystems verhinderten. Das Buch gibt auch Aufschluß darüber, inwieweit die Entwicklung der Eisenbahnen ihrerseits die politischen Strukturen in beiden Staaten beeinflusste. In Deutschland etwa trug die neue Mobilität bekanntermaßen mit zur Überwindung der Kleinstaaterei bei. Auch wurde der Staat mehr und mehr gefordert: Fragen von Planung und Kontrolle des neuen Verkehrsträgers fielen ihm als neue Aufgabe zu. Bismarcks Konzept einer Reichseisenbahn steht für Dunlavy am Ende einer Entwicklung, in deren Verlauf die Verwaltung der Bahn zunehmend als staatliche Aufgabe begriffen wurde. Ein sorgfältig angelegtes Register erleichtert den Zugriff auf Teilaspekte der Arbeit, deren Übersetzung ins Deutsche zu wünschen bleibt. *Thomas A. Bartolosch, Siegen*

Stefan Leiner, Migration und Urbanisierung. Binnenwanderungsbewegungen, räumlicher und sozialer Wandel in den Industriestädten des Saar-Lor-Lux-Raumes 1856-1910, Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag, Saarbrücken 1994, X + 443 S., brosch., 48 DM.

In this carefully researched comparative study, Stefan Leiner offers a timely exploration of the connections between industrial change, migration, and urban growth in the Saar, German-annexed Lorraine, and Luxembourg from 1856 to 1914. Drawing on a wealth of previously untapped statistical sources – including municipal registration files (*Melderegister*) and census data – archival records, and contemporary sociological studies, Leiner's central thesis suggests that industrialization and large-scale immigration created interlocking social, economic, and demographic structures that fostered regional »social integration« (*soziale Vernetzung*) and the formation of a discrete Saar-Lor-Lux »border region« that overlapped national-state boundaries.

Leiner explores the relationship between industry and migration in this region by means of a comparative focus on three principle urban centers: Malstatt-Burbach in the Saar, Diedenhofen (Thionville) in Lorraine, and Esch-an-der-Alzette in Luxembourg. In the middle of the nineteenth century, Malstatt-Burbach and Esch were small rural villages and Diedenhofen was a walled fortress town; by 1910 population had increased elevenfold in Malstatt-Burbach, twofold in Diedenhofen, and more than sevenfold in Esch. Leiner demonstrates that these figures were the result of industrial growth and attendant labor migration (not »natural« gains resulting from higher birthrates and/or

lower deathrates) and fluctuated according to the business fortunes of heavy industry (not the seasonal rhythms of agriculture). Moreover, the social profile of most immigrants reveals distinctive urban-industrial patterns of migration: the large majority of immigrants in Malstatt-Burbach, Diedenhofen, and Esch were young (in their early twenties) and male; a narrow majority were single; most were employed in unskilled and semi-skilled industrial jobs and, over time, in service and technical-administrative occupations (relatively few were formerly engaged in agricultural work). Most immigrants came from urban (not rural) areas and from cities other than their place of birth, cities located within an eighty kilometer radius of their destination and often located in the Saar-Lor-Lux region. By the turn of the century, however, the regional migratory population included growing numbers of foreign – primarily Italian – laborers.

Large-scale migration resulted in the development of complex urban social and spatial geographies and prompted growing fears among local administrative elites about the presence of *Ausländer* throughout this border region. Leiner traces the evolution of discrete, though highly transient, working-class communities (as well as lower and upper-middle class districts), the high degree of occupational variation in workers' neighborhoods, and the formation of ghettos comprised of foreign laborers in Malstatt-Burbach, Diedenhofen, and Esch. Generally speaking, officials and local social elites reacted with mistrust and hostility toward the growing numbers of immigrants and *Ausländer*; they decried the living conditions and lifestyles among the laboring poor, particularly the massively overcrowded workers' housing, the pervasive presence of lodgers (*Schlafgänger*), the increasing rates of non-marital unions (the so-called *wilde Ehen*), and the lack of hygienic conditions in working-class households. Leiner argues that these complaints fell most heavily on Italian, Belgian, and French immigrants, who were criticized as agents of poverty and lower wages, increasing prices and taxation, unbounded sexuality, the dissolution of »morals« and the family, prostitution, criminal behavior, social disorder, and declining national security. Rather than devise social policy measures to address the complex origins and consequences of migration, however, most regional and municipal officials in the Saar-Lor-Lux region either simply ignored critical problems associated with immigration (such as overcrowded housing) or relied on ultimately ineffectual legal restrictions and coercive administrative practices – including identity cards, increased police surveillance, and expulsion – in order to contain the »plague« of immigration.

This study provides new archival and statistical information about previously under-researched areas and an important discussion of the social consequences of industrial change and labor migration in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. While Leiner privileges statistical methods at the expense of cultural and political analysis – and therefore neglects discussion of the institutions and rhythms of local social life and the development of urban and regional politics (especially in the form of region-wide employers' and workers' organizations), both of which figured centrally in the evolution of economic and social structures in this region, he does provide a much-needed contribution to current historiographical debates about the centrality of national boundaries in the past. Leiner has challenged historians to consider the massive geographic mobility that characterized Europe during the period of rapid industrialization and to move beyond the national focus of most existing historiography toward the study of inter-connecting regions of socio-economic development. In the process, he provides a thoughtful reflection on the economic and social complexity of migration and the marginalized status of *Ausländer*, as well as the failure of coercive legal measures to solve the »problems« of uneven economic growth and immigration.

Dennis Sweeney, Trenton/New Jersey