Review Article

Robert Justin Goldstein

Political Mobilization in Nineteenth-Century Europe

David Kerr, *Caricature and French Political Culture, 1830–1848: Charles Philipon and the Illustrated Press*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000; xii + 242 pp.; 0198208030, £45/$74
Nancy Bermeo and Philip Nord, eds, *Civil Society before Democracy: Lessons from Nineteenth-Century Europe*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2000; xxxiii + 277 pp.; 0847695506, $26.95 (pbk); 0847696492, $79 (cloth)
Avner Ben-Amos, *Funerals, Politics and Memory in Modern France, 1789–1996*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000; xi + 425 pp.; 0198203284, £55/$95
R.J.W. Evans and Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann, eds, *The Revolutions in Europe, 1848–1849: From Reform to Reaction*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000; xiii + 250 pp.; 0198208405, £35/$60
Dieter Dowe, Heinz-Gerhard Haupt, Dieter Langewiesche and Jonathan Sperber, eds, *Europe in 1848: Revolution and Reform*, New York, Berghahn Books, 2001; xiv + 994 pp.; 1571811648, £55/$79.95
Maria Bucur and Nancy Wingfield, eds, *Staging the Past: The Politics of Commemoration in Habsburg Central Europe, 1848 to the Present*, West Lafayette, IN, Purdue University Press, 2001; xii + 337 pp.; 1557531617, $23.95
Heinrich Best and Maurizio Cotta, eds, *Parliamentary Representatives in Europe, 1848–2000: Legislative Recruitment and Careers in Eleven European Countries*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000; xiii + 549 pp.; 0198297939, £55
Bartolini, Stefano, *The Political Mobilization of the European Left, 1860–1980: The Class Cleavage*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000, xxiv + 637 pp.; 0521650216, £45/$69.95

European History Quarterly Copyright © 2002 SAGE Publications, London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi, Vol. 32(2), 233–250.
[0265-6914(200204)32:2;233–250;022500]

The great nineteenth-century German historian Leopold von Ranke once declared that *the* major conflict of his era centred on the rising tide of demands for popular sovereignty. Curiously, this theme, which today might be termed the struggle for democracy and human rights, was submerged and subsumed in much twentieth-century historiography of the previous century in favour of other themes, notably urbanization, industrialization and nationalism. Within the last three decades, however, perhaps due to an exploding interest in social history, including studies of popular mobilization and 'civil society', the historiographical searchlight on nineteenth-century Europe has increasingly focused on the rise of political opposition and demands for democracy and civil liberties. Each of the eight books reviewed in this article is highly relevant to these topics: three focus on one country (two on France and one on the Habsburg lands), while five include large swaths of Europe; three are single-authored, while five are edited collections of essays by specialists; one focuses on the press, two centre on various forms of popular assembly and organization, three on the 1848 revolutions and their aftermath, one on legislative elections and assemblies, and one on popular mobilization of the left in general.

David Kerr's *Caricature and French Political Culture, 1830–1848* focuses on a story that is well known to specialists in the history of caricature and of nineteenth-century France: the audacious war — in print and especially by prints — waged by Charles Philipon, the founder and guiding genius of France's first important caricature journals *La Caricature* (1830–5) and *Le Charivari* (1832–93) against King Louis-Philippe. According to the English commentator Henry Bulwer-Lytton, writing in 1834, 'no thorn goes deeper into the side of the King of the French' than Philipon's caricatures, which he termed a more potent political force than the two French legislative chambers combined; more recently, a 1994 biography of Louis-Philippe termed Philipon 'without doubt the most feared and troublesome' of the king's adversaries. According to an 1877 account by the French writer Maxime du Camp, the caricatures published by Philipon 'had a very real influence on public opinion' (partly because they were displayed in shop windows and widely available in cafés at a time when most Frenchmen could not afford to buy newspapers) and when 'a lively satire against the government was published in *Le Charivari*, the entire population of Paris knew about it in less than a day'.

During the course of what sometimes was termed the battle of 'Philipon versus Philippe' or the 'campaign of disrespect', Philipon's newspapers were seized over twenty times, Philipon and his associates were repeatedly prosecuted, and Philipon personally served over

a year in jail. *La Caricature* was eventually forced to close after the regime introduced prior censorship of drawings — which was generally believed to have been forever abolished by the 1830 constitutional charter — via the notorious 1835 'September laws'. While the September Laws silenced political caricature in France until the 1848 revolution, such persecution, Kerr suggests, probably only made Philipon's caricatures more notorious than ever, especially his famous depiction of Louis-Philippe as a pear, which led to the sincerest form of flattery in massive form, as thousands of graffiti pears were scrawled across the walls of Paris (in French 'poire' today also means 'fathead', a meaning which Kerr argues derives from its usage in Philipon's caricatures). Thus, Philipon wrote in 1832, 'Many excellent drawings went unappreciated or are today forgotten, while all those who had the honour of being prosecuted are still perfectly remembered.' The exiled German poet and journalist Heinrich Heine wrote during the same year that 'the glory from the King's head has disappeared, as all his enemies see in it is a pear'.

If Kerr's essential narrative is common currency among specialists, he has elaborated it in the fullest manner yet told in any language, and has written a wonderfully researched, beautifully illustrated and well-written book, which never slips into obscurantist academic jargon — the kind of model monograph one always hopes to find but rarely does, even more notable as it originated as a recent Oxford doctoral thesis. Kerr has thoroughly scoured archival materials as well as masses of other contemporary sources and secondary scholarship, and his account is filled with little gems offering insight into the (probably exaggerated) power that observers like Bulwer-Lytton, Heine and the French authorities imputed to the caricatures published by Philipon, many drawn by some of the most noted caricaturists of all time, including Daumier (who was jailed for six months for his notorious 'Gargantua' lampoon of Louis-Philippe) and Grandville. Thus, Kerr reports that *La Caricature* used at least five different lithographic printers in its five years of existence, and that in at least three instances the printers (who had to obtain government licences to ply their trade) abandoned the newspaper due to government pressure, that on at least four occasions other newspapers were prosecuted solely for printing descriptions of Philipon's caricatures, and that one of Philipon's artists, Decamps, was offered and accepted a government decoration in 1831 on the explicit condition that he abandon political caricature.

Kerr is particularly strong in providing details of the organization, finances and audiences of Philipon's caricature journals. He also provides a sophisticated and nuanced discussion of how influential Philipon's caricatures were, suggesting that their importance per se

has usually been exaggerated, but that they did play an important cross-fertilizing role in supporting a widespread culture of opposition to the July Monarchy, along with many other forms of dissent, including the theatre and demonstrations. Along with the press, other important forms of opposition mobilization in nineteenth-century Europe involved varied associations, meetings and demonstrations, which in many instances were formally 'non-political' — due to severe restrictions on political organization in most European countries before about 1870 — but in fact covertly, or often semi-openly, served political ends. Two books under review here have important information on such types of opposition mobilization: *Civil Society before Democracy*, edited by Nancy Bermeo and Philip Nord (both professors at Princeton), and *Funerals, Politics and Memory in Modern France, 1789–1996*, by Avner Ben-Amos, a lecturer at Tel Aviv University.

The term 'civil society', much in vogue in recent years in both academic and journalist circles, is rarely clearly defined. However, it usually suggests a concept essentially equivalent with the 'public sphere' described by German professor Jürgen Habermas in his enormously influential *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (1962, English translation 1989): 'a sphere between society and state, in which the public organizes itself as the bearer of public opinion', or, in less academic terms, non-governmental organizations and manifestations, such as the press, trade unions, civic associations, and demonstrations, which intermediate between citizens and government. The bulk of the 'civil society' literature essentially suggests that this intermediary 'public sphere' is critical to the development of healthy democracies, a concept largely based on the coincident growth of such a 'public sphere' with democratization in nineteenth-century Europe and the typical suppression of such independent activities by totalitarian regimes in the twentieth century.

'Civil society' studies have not been previously lacking for nineteenth-century Europe, but they have generally been monographs on particular countries, usually focusing on the outbursts of associational activities following the collapse of repressive restrictions during revolutionary periods: among the best of such older studies are P.H. Noyes, *Organization and Revolution: Working Class Associations in the German Revolutions of 1848–1849* (1966), Peter Amann, *Revolution and Mass Democracy: The Paris Club Movement in 1848* (1975), and Shmuel Galai, *The Liberation Movement in Russia, 1900–1905* (1973); more recently and more wide-ranging, but still restricted to one country is Alice Freifeld's outstanding *Nationalism and the Crowd in Liberal Hungary, 1848–1914* (2000). Although the Bermeo–Nord volume almost exclusively focuses on

associations (i.e. essentially excluding other manifestations of the 'public sphere' such as the press and demonstrations), it very unusually covers many different countries (albeit in individual separately authored chapters), with introductory and concluding chapters providing literal bookends for essays on nineteenth-century Portugal, Russia, Italy, Germany, Great Britain, France and the Low Countries, plus two chapters applying the civil society concept to the recent collapse of communism in eastern Europe.

These are generally high-quality essays and they provide strong support for the inherently likely supposition that healthy democracy is impossible without a flourishing public sphere, suggesting, for example, that the relative lack of such in nineteenth-century Portugal and Russia helps to explain the long-delayed emergence of democracy in those regions, and, in a chapter by Rutgers political scientist Jan Kubik on civil society in Poland, that it is not coincidental that the sturdiest post-communist democracies have emerged in the Czech republic, Hungary and Poland, where 'the scope and depth of self-organizing as well as the strength of pro-civil and pro-democratic ideologies developed by dissidents under state socialism' far exceeded that elsewhere in east Europe. On the other hand, the essays also make clear that, while a flourishing public sphere, as in nineteenth-century England, can help create the foundations for a tolerant democracy, the mere existence of many private associations does not guarantee such: if, as German professor Klaus Tenfelde points out in his chapter on his homeland, private organizations simply reflect and reinforce deep divisions within a society and effectively teach their members that other components of society are the 'enemy' (i.e. the mutual hostilities rampant in nineteenth-century Germany between Socialists and right-wing militarists, Poles and Germans and Catholics and Protestants), it is possible to have a flourishing 'public sphere' but not what is ordinarily considered a 'civil' society. After all, the Nazis were originally a non-governmental organization that operated in the public sphere.

The main failings of the Bermeo–Nord volume are simply that it does not cover quite enough: inclusion of essays on Spain, Scandinavia, Switzerland and, especially, the Habsburg empire, would have been a great plus, as would a wider definition of 'civil society' and much more discussion of the legal restrictions on freedom of association that so strongly shaped the nineteenth-century European 'public sphere' and often forced politically relevant organizations to disguise their true nature. Eventually, a single-authored pan-European study of nineteenth-century civil society will, one hopes, emerge, based on such studies as those in this important book.

Just as restrictions on political associations in nineteenth-century Europe led many organizations to disguise their real nature, the general repression of political gatherings in much of Europe before about 1870 often drove dissidents to find means of holding supposedly non-political gatherings that in fact amounted to opposition demonstrations. One of the most common such semi-clandestine means of dissident gatherings was what I have elsewhere termed 'Political Funerals' (in an article of that title published in *Transaction/Society*, March/April 1985), in which the deaths of prominent dissidents led to mass gatherings whose political meaning was clear, even if supposedly the occasion was merely a funeral. Most of Ben-Amos's exhaustively researched and generally well-written book (aside from some intermittent injections of pointless and impenetrable sociological jargon) focuses on the use of 'state' funerals to mobilize public opinion and bolster the legitimacy of the various, always-fragile, regimes in nineteenth-century France, a topic largely outside the scope of this article's focus on *opposition* political mobilization (but discussed in a review of Ben-Amos that I have authored for a forthcoming issue of *French History*, with the permission of that journal as well as *European History Quarterly*). However, Ben-Amos also includes some excellent material on the use of 'political funerals' in nineteenth-century France as vehicles for dissident expression and opposition.

As Ben-Amos correctly points out, such funerals were very common in pre-1880 France, when overt opposition political manifestations were effectively illegal, but, as Napoleon III's prime minister Émile Ollivier complained, revolutionaries profited from 'the immunity that covers grieving processions in order to organize their seditious manifestations'. Among the funerals Ben-Amos discusses are those of General Foy, a leader of the republican opposition to the restored Bourbon regime, which attracted over 40,000 people in 1825; the 1827 ceremonies for republican leader Jacques Manuel, also attended by over 40,000 during a bitterly contested legislative election; the 5 June 1832 funeral of former liberal deputy and Napoleonic soldier General Lamarque, which touched off a violent uprising against King Louis-Philippe; and a mass of funerals held to express opposition to Napoleon III, the most extraordinary of which was for journalist Victor Noir, who had been shot by a dissolute cousin of the Emperor, and which attracted over 100,000 people on 12 January 1870.

Ben-Amos's coverage of the ritualized use of political funerals to manifest political dissent in nineteenth-century Europe is a model of its kind, as is his book generally. Oddly, although his bibliography is massive, he fails to cite Charles Tamason's 1980 article on this

subject ('From Mortuary to Cemetery: Funeral Riots and Funeral Demonstrations in Lille, 1779–1870', *Social Science History*), which includes a striking quotation from an 1853 directive from the police minister to the French prefects, which urged a crackdown on political funerals, because the 'socialist party' was seeking to 'cause agitations' by seeking to 'organize demonstrations which take a purely political character' by grasping 'as a pretext the mortal remains of someone unknown to the crowd to simulate a respect which is only a lie and to make a political demonstration which does not fool anyone'.

The 1998 sesquicentennial of the 1848 revolutions led to a scholarly outpouring on the subject, especially in Germany, where the commemorations fostered literally scores of exhibitions and books. Two sesquicentennial books are reviewed here, *The Revolutions in Europe, 1848–1849*, a slender volume edited by Oxford history professors Robert J.W. Evans and Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann (hereafter the Evans book); and *Europe in 1848*, a massive tome edited by German historian Dieter Dowe and three colleagues (hereafter the Dowe book). The Evans book originated in a series of lectures delivered at Oxford in 1998, while the Dowe book originated in a 1996 seminar held in Würzburg; first appearing in German in 1998, the volume under consideration was heroically translated by David Higgins, who deserves the translation equivalent of a Nobel Prize for excellence and stamina.

Both of these 1848 books are solid, quality volumes, but they are clearly aimed at very different audiences, as is evident in their length, style and scope of coverage. The Evans book, easily readable in a day at 250 pages and less than 100,000 words, has at its heart seven chapters on specific regions (the core areas of Germany, the Habsburg Empire, Italy and France, plus on Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States) and how they were impacted by the revolutions; three more general chapters focus on the revolutions as a whole (including a rather nondescript contribution by Oxford historian Robert Gildea on how they were commemorated in 1898, 1948 and 1998, which also appears in the Dowe volume).

The core chapters in the Evans book are gracefully written and highly readable summaries of the latest research, which are generally especially strong on political and nationalist aspects of 1848 but rather superficial on socio-economic aspects. All of them are eminently suitable for a general audience (and, were Oxford University Press to bring this book out in a reasonably priced paperback, for undergraduates), with the exception of co-editor von Strandmann's chapter on Germany, which, wholly unlike the other broad-survey chapters, primarily focuses on the minor German states of

Mecklenburg-Strelitz and Mecklenburg-Schwerin (partly, it seems, because he accidentally discovered that an ancestor had played a leading role there).

Among the other chapters in this book, Oxford historian Denis Mack Smith's essay on Italy and co-editor Evans's contribution on the Habsburg Empire are especially readable, while the chapter by Oxford historian Daniel Howe and Colorado Christian University historian Timothy Roberts effectively points out the enormous United States sympathy for the revolutions, including an April 1848 Congressional resolution congratulating the French people 'upon their success in their recent efforts to consolidate liberty'. Oxford historian Leslie Mitchell well highlights the British feeling of superiority that no serious outbreaks disturbed the English political calm in 1848, as portrayed in a *Punch* cartoon that depicted a British lion sunning itself atop the cliffs of Dover while raising an eyebrow in astonishment at the strange occurrences across the channel, where the European continent was aflame; and University of Newcastle historian David Saunders convincingly argues that the short-term effectiveness of the reactionary Russian response to 1848 (including a censorship crackdown, a 60 percent reduction in university enrolments and a halt to the expansion or further construction of factories in Moscow) was a 'pyrrhic victory' which only further dammed up modernization and discontent there, ultimately facilitating violent Russian outbreaks further down the line. (At the time, *The Economist* declared the Russian quiet reflected that 'the population is not yet civilized enough to feel those yearnings after freedom and self-government which have agitated Europe'.) The usefulness of the Evans volume, especially for a general audience, is enhanced by short, excellent bibliographies at the end of each chapter stressing recent works in English.

The Dowe volume, which at about 600,000 words and almost 1000 pages must be one of the largest scholarly books published in recent memory (congratulations to Berghahn Books for translating the German version unabridged and publishing at an eminently reasonable price), is clearly intended for specialists in mid-nineteenth-century Europe. Packed with informative details, quotations and anecdotes often previously inaccessible to English-language readers, it requires considerable concentration to read, and will likely consume a week in the process, but is absolutely essential reading for anyone with a strong interest in 1848.

The volume includes twelve chapters on individual European regions impacted by 1848 (in addition to the four core regions, on Poland, the Danubian Principalities, the Low Countries, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the Scandinavian countries, although

not on Russia or Iberia), plus another twenty-six chapters on mostly specialized themes, occasionally on a pan-European basis (such as excellent chapters on the role of women by University of Linz historian Gabriella Hauch, on Jews by Berlin Institute of Technology historian Reinhard Rürup, and on religion by University of Missouri historian Jonathan Sperber), but usually (and somewhat disappointingly) on developments in only one or two countries, such as very strong essays on the press in Paris and Berlin by University of Munich communications professor Ursula Koch, and on party formation in Germany by German archivist Michael Wettengel. The specialized chapters generally cover France and Germany (to the detriment of coverage of Italy and the Habsburg Empire), perhaps reflecting that more than half of the thirty-nine contributors are German.

Although a few of the shorter chapters are a bit superficial, in general this collection is of very high quality. Collectively, the chapters are especially good at detailing the massive political mobilization that marked 1848 everywhere, exceptionally so with regard to associations and voting, considerably less so (with the exception of the fine Koch chapter) for the press and labour. University of Wales historian Roger Price's chapter on the development of counter-revolutionary forces in Europe in 1848–9 is very good, but its very presence highlights the lack of a needed parallel chapter on the pervasiveness of repression across Europe during the following decade, a generally neglected subject in the scholarly literature (among the items noted in the Dowe book are that the Hamburg Institute for Higher Learning for the Female Sex was closed down in 1852 as too compromised by democratic ideology, and that, after he was restored to his throne, Pope Pius IX rebuilt the torn-down walls of the Jewish ghetto in Rome). Two other slight drawbacks in the Dowe volume are that, although each chapter has detailed footnotes, the lengthy bibliography at the back is undifferentiated by topic or region, and, oddly, the massive index has no individual country entries.

Although neither the Evans nor the Dowe book is likely to revolutionize our understanding of 1848, they both (especially the latter, due to its extraordinary amount of detail) underline a number of key points and provide a wealth of useful details and quotations. Among the strongest, not necessarily new, impressions that they leave or underline are the following: (1) 1848 is itself a misnomer, since the revolutions were only the loudest and most extensive eruption of a volcano that had been building up across Europe throughout the 1840s, marked by revolts in Galicia in 1846, the 1847 Sonderbund war, growing Italian unrest which led to revolts and/or constitutional reforms in Sicily, Naples and Tuscany in early 1848 even before the

February revolution in Paris; moreover, in many of the disturbed areas revolutionary sentiment was not truly fully curbed until 1849 (i.e. Venice, Rome, Hungary, south-western Germany) or even later (i.e. the suppression of massive uprisings in France in the wake of Louis Napoleon's 1851 coup); (2) the extent of popular political mobilization in 1848, reflected by a true explosion in political associations, petitions, newspapers and every imaginable manifestation of public sentiment, clearly suggests how important and effective were the repressive controls that broke down in 1848 and were re-imposed thereafter; (3) often hysterical middle-class fears of serious social reform and 'red' republics in 1848 (a conservative Berlin newspaper complained that the local Club of Democratic Women was 'occupied with setting up soup kitchens if they do not over-salt the soup and put bombs instead of dumplings in the bowls') not only significantly fostered the ultimate repression of the revolts by splitting the original lower middle-class coalitions which marked their early months, but also foresaw the ultimate middle–upper class coalitions against the lower classes which were ultimately to dominate the political history of late nineteenth-century Europe; and (4) as in that aspect, 1848 foreshadowed developments and laid down the political agenda which were to be the major themes of the next fifty years or more (i.e. the rise of the working classes and their demands for further democratization, the unification of Germany and Italy, movements for greater autonomy by Hungarians and other nationalities of the Habsburg Empire). Years later, an aristocrat who had participated in the 1848 anti-Austrian uprising in Milan wrote, 'From that moment on all was rapidly changing, in our household habits as in city life, in our customs and in our thoughts.'

While space considerations preclude attempting any detailed summary of the Dowe and Evans books, some examples of the excellent coverage of political mobilization in 1848 which they (especially the former) provide may be useful to entice readers to delve into them. One German observer asked, 'Where could one find in Europe a clod of earth which has not been shaken, strongly or lightly, by the massive shocks and struggles that rage in the foundations of our society?' Reflecting the general sense of a world turned 'upside down', a German washer woman yelled at her mistress, the wife of a businessmen, 'Now things are going to change! Now you women will have to wash and clean and we'll move into your house.'

During 1848 legislative elections in France and Germany, the first granting universal male suffrage, the turn-out was 84 percent in France (a figure subsequently exceeded only in 1928) and up to 75 percent in some of the German states. With the collapse of restrictions on freedom of association and assembly, over 200 political

clubs attracted an estimated 100,000 members in Paris, while the largest German political organization, the Central March Organization, obtained about 500,000 members belonging to over 900 local affiliates. In Germany the 'association man (*Vereinsmensch*)' became a recognized figure, so much so that one German newspaper remarked that associations had been formed 'for all possible and impossible purposes', and one German democrat boasted to a meeting in Mainz that 'our entire state is a democratic association'. In Berlin alone, about a dozen major demonstrations drew over 10,000 people in 1848; in Bucharest, 30,000 attended a celebration of the revolution there on 27 June 1848.

Newspapers exploded throughout revolutionary Europe, so many that they ran out of distinct names: in Germany, at least forty newspapers featured variants of the term *Volk* in their masthead, while scores of French newspapers used *peuple* or republic. Women in Frankfurt complained in 1848 that 'disastrous politics' had chased 'love' from the hearts of their husbands, and that 'when waking up the first word is newspaper, when going to bed . . . the last word is newspaper'; as if in counterpoint, reflecting the politicization of many women, a Wiesbaden newspaper simultaneously lamented that women were neglecting their housework because 'the major newspapers must be read, regardless of what has to be done in the kitchen and cellar'. Everywhere, demands for political freedom dominated the early days of the revolutions: thus one woman who fought on the barricades in south-western Germany to be with her husband said she was called not only by 'love' but also 'the glowing hate in a fight for one's life against tyranny and suppressers of holy human rights'.

Staging the Past: The Politics of Commemoration in Habsburg Central Europe, 1848 to the Present, edited by Maria Bucur (history, Indiana University) and Nancy Wingfield (history, Northern Illinois University), consists of ten essays authored by specialists in modern east-central European history. Each article centres on how various ceremonies and commemorations, including festivals, holidays, cemeteries and statues, were used — frequently in ways which changed considerably over time, even while focusing on the same historical date or person — for political purposes during the post-1848 Habsburg Empire and after its demise. Two essays focus on Vienna-based imperial ceremonies designed to bolster popular support for the Habsburg dynasty amidst the rising tide of demands for political liberalization and concessions to non-Germanic peoples of the realm during the 1849–1914 period; four centre on the use of commemorations to express regionalist/nationalist sentiments during the same era by peoples ruled by the Habsburgs in the Tyrol, Bohemia and Galicia; and four deal with twentieth-century efforts of

successor-state rulers (Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Hungary and Romania) to use commemorations to interpret and bend history to their political advantages.

These are generally well-researched and well-written essays, and the volume will be of considerable interest to specialists in east-central Europe and in the study of historical memory and its manipulation. Some of the contributions, however, are extraordinarily specialized, even for a scholarly collection, largely consisting of detailed descriptions of a few commemorative activities and thus rather narrowly circumscribed in time and space. More useful are the essays which cover a larger geographical range and/or longer time periods. For example, the article by Jeremy King (history, Mt Holyoke), while focused on the Czech town of Budějovice (Budweis in German, the original home of Budweiser Beer), covers 150 years of history, enough to note along the way that the great town square there, now named for the thirteenth-century Czech King Ottokar II, was formerly named for Habsburg Emperor Franz Joseph, then it was named for liberty with Czech independence in 1919, then (in 1924) for the first Czech president Tomas Masaryk, and, after the 1938 German occupation, for Hitler. Similarly, co-editor Wingfield demonstrates that while during the 1880s Bohemian Germans put up a mass of statues of the centralizing and German-language promoting Emperor Joseph II (1765–90), in connection with their rivalry with the Czechs (so many were erected — including one in Budějovice — that producing them became a small cottage industry), after Czech independence nationalists took to ritually attacking, insulting and destroying them (by 1924 the Czech government had removed almost all of them).

Other especially interesting contributions are by co-editor Bucur, on changing Romanian commemorations of 1 December 1918 (the date that Transylvanian Romanians voted to unite with the existing kingdom), and by Alice Freifeld (history, University of Florida), on Hungarian celebrations of 15 March (the date that revolution erupted in Pest in 1848). Freifeld's article, largely drawn from her excellent book mentioned above, highlights many of the points stressed in other books reviewed in this article. Thus, the focus on civil liberties in 1848 is underlined in that the key refrain of Hungarian poet Sandor Petofi's poem 'The National Song', which stirred the 15 March revolt in Pest, was 'We swear we won't be slaves any longer!'; the first of the famous 'twelve points' demanded there was freedom of the press; and when 7000 demonstrators forced the authorities to free a jailed political prisoner, his wife embraced him while declaring, 'There is no more censorship!' For the next ten years, Habsburg authorities repeatedly sought to suppress com-

memorations of 15 March; when university students in Pest demonstrated on 15 March 1860, police responded with arrests and gun shots, killing one student and setting the stage for a 'political funeral' that attracted over 30,000 people two weeks later. During fiftieth anniversary celebrations on 15 March 1898, socialists mocked the claims of Hungarian leaders to have gained press freedom in the aftermath of the 1867 *Ausgleich* with Austria by marching to a statue of Petofi and circulating hundreds of copies of their newspaper, which had been confiscated a few weeks earlier. To frustrate socialists, the Hungarian government essentially banned all public celebrations on 15 March 1906. Once again, during the Second World War, 15 March became a national day of protest against the Hungarian alliance with Nazi Germany; similarly under the communist regime (almost 6000 protesters were arrested during the period surrounding 15 March 1957, the year after the Russian suppression of the 1956 uprising, but the authorities were forced to recognize it as an official national holiday in 1989 due to major protests during the two previous years).

Clearly the most effective form of institutionalized political mobilization in nineteenth-century Europe was voting — where such was allowed — especially as an increasing percentage of the male population was enfranchised, although throughout southern and eastern Europe this formal liberalization was severely compromised by rigged elections (most countries allowed only a small fraction of the adult male population to vote before about 1870, although by the First World War universal or near-universal male suffrage had become the norm). *Parliamentary Representatives in Europe, 1848–2000*, edited by German Professor Heinrich Best (sociology, University of Jena) and Italian Professor Maurizio Cotta (political science, University of Siena) consists of separately authored chapters by about twenty specialists on eleven European countries, sandwiched between introductory and concluding chapters by the editors, which focus on the changing socio-economic (SES) characteristics of elected national parliamentary representatives as Europe modernized and as electoral rules changed after 1848. Standardized data sets on such SES variables as education, political experience, region, occupation, age, gender and religion are utilized for seven countries (Finland, Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy, the Netherlands and Norway); less complete data is utilized for Denmark, Hungary, Portugal and Spain. Some of the essays also include a varied scattering of other interesting information, for example very complete data on post-1848 period enfranchisement in Hungary and the Netherlands, and information on election turnouts for some countries (in Denmark between 1849 and 1866 only about 30 percent of those

eligible voted, while in Spain between 1878 and 1890 and in Finland between 1907 and 1919 turnouts averaged about 70 percent, subsequently decreasing in Spain as the suffrage expanded but vote-rigging increased).

As Cotta and Best correctly write in their concluding essay, this book 'provides a first comprehensive overview of variations in the profile of parliamentary elites across countries and across time, in a significant portion of Europe', and therefore is an extremely valuable scholarly contribution. It must be added, however, that most of the reported findings are not terribly surprising: for example, as the suffrage expanded, the dominant socio-political role of the nobility declined and as Europe became increasingly urban and industrial, the percentage of elected legislators from rural and noble backgrounds decreased; the percentage of female legislators slowly increased as women were gradually enfranchised after 1900; and, during the period of severely restricted electorates (often compounded by even more severe restrictions on legislative eligibility), the educational attainments of legislators was enormously higher than the general population (in almost all of the countries studied, about 60 percent of legislators elected between 1848 and 1890 had university degrees at a time when less than 1 percent of general populations did). Perhaps more surprising is that after about 1890 the educational attainments of legislators dipped — while still vastly over-representing the highly educated — not regaining earlier levels until the last quarter of the twentieth century, apparently reflecting first the increasing election of representatives chosen by the working classes, and subsequently expanding access to higher education and growing professionalization and bureaucratization of political elites, even among Socialists.

As with the Bermeo–Nord book, the main deficiencies of the Cotta–Best volume relate to its omissions, especially the lack of coverage of Sweden, Switzerland, Belgium and the Austrian lands of the Habsburg Empire (not to mention Russia and the Balkans), and the rather peculiar decision to start coverage with 1848, on the grounds that, as the co-editors state in their introductory essay, that revolutionary year 'marks symbolically the birth of representative democracy in many areas of Western and Central Europe'. To be charitable, this contention is simply wrong. Representative national parliaments, albeit usually with severely limiting suffrage and eligibility restrictions, preceded 1848 in a clear majority of countries included in this study: Spain, Portugal, France, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Norway and Finland; of these, except in France and the Netherlands, not even the electoral systems changed in 1848 (admittedly, in France, the introduction of universal male suffrage

was a landmark but it was severely attenuated thereafter by twenty years of rigged elections under Napoleon III). In Hungary, an elected national parliament emerged in 1848, but thereafter was suppressed until the 1860s, and although parliamentary elections were introduced in 1848 and survived thereafter in Prussia and Piedmont, they were not national parliaments, which are the focus of this book. Of all of the countries studied in this volume (aside, perhaps, from France) only Denmark truly had a national parliamentary earthquake in 1848, with the emergence of an elected legislature chosen by a broad suffrage. This criticism might seem merely churlish, given the wide scope of this book and its very important contribution, save that SES data on pre-1848 parliaments are available and could easily have been incorporated into the relevant essays, making them the only source necessary to consult: for example, for France, in Thomas Beck, *French Legislators, 1800–1834* (1974); for Spain, in Carlos Marichal, *Spain, 1834–1844* (1977); and even for pre-1848 German state legislatures, in Caterina Paolucci, 'Between Körperschaften and Census: Political Representation in the German Vormärz', in Raffaele Romanelli, ed., *How Did They Become Voters: The History of Franchise in Modern European Representation* (1998).

The final book herein reviewed, and the only one that focuses entirely on the post-1848 era, is *The Political Mobilization of the European Left, 1860–1980*, by Stefano Bartolini, a professor of comparative politics at the European University Institute, Florence. Bartolini's volume is a massive, sprawling and hugely ambitious attempt to explain the comparative strength, ideologies and organizational dynamics of European left parties in thirteen countries (Scandinavia, including Finland, the Low Countries, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, Ireland, Germany, France, Italy and the non-Hungarian part of the Austrian Empire) over a 120-year period. His primary goal is to relate such comparative aspects of left (i.e. socialist and communist) party development to the social, economic and political environment: i.e. rates of urbanization and industrialization; working-class homogeneity/heterogeneity; potentially competing/co-operating class, ethnic, linguistic, religious, regional and sectoral formations (such as anti-left Catholic-based parties and unions, agrarian movements, and various forms of middle-class groupings); and regime responses, ranging from outright repression to conciliation and integration.

Much of Bartolini's analysis is quantitative, based on multivariate analysis of data relating left-party voting levels to various measures of structural factors listed above (although the quantitative approach gradually fades away in the book's second half). Unlike some quantitatively oriented political scientists, Bartolini is very well

versed in the appropriate historical literature and his judgements are generally sound and reasonable, if rarely truly surprising: for example, that left-party strength was favourably affected by increasing urbanization and industrialization; adversely affected by workforce and general cultural heterogeneity, such as widely varying skill levels and divergent religious beliefs; and profoundly impacted by various forms of regime repression and discrimination (i.e. suffrage discrimination reduced left voting but also radicalized the disenfranchised). Because this volume covers considerable material of great importance, and because it is liberally sprinkled with often difficult-to-obtain quantitative and qualitative data on extremely varied aspects of post-1860 European political, social and economic history potentially related to left-party strength (sometimes generated from data sets and sometimes liberally borrowed from secondary sources), all scholars with serious interests in the history of the European left must read this book.

Nonetheless, there are some serious problems with Bartolini's massive tome (which features an equally massive and extremely impressive bibliography). The least serious is that, as is inevitable with any work of this size and complexity, a few errors have crept in. For example, Bartolini consistently underestimates both the repressive nature of the pre-First World War Belgian regime and the militancy of Belgian socialists during this period (on page 86 even classifying Belgian socialists as equally reformist as Swiss and British socialists and less militant than Dutch, Swedish and Danish socialists). And, although on page 335 Bartolini says that Russian policy towards pre-independence Finland was 'not one of intense socialist movement repression', on page 395 he states that 'Finland has a pre-1918 history of significant socialist movement repression', a difference which, when quantitatively operationalized, becomes quite significant.

A second, more serious, problem with this book is that Bartolini frequently lapses into arcane, almost impenetrable, social-science jargon-speak. This is not because he is trying to show off but because he genuinely thinks in such terms, yet this simply makes the problem more severe, often increasing the book's length while decreasing its intelligibility. For example, on pages 192–3, apparently intending to say something like 'the growth of literacy and technological breakthroughs in the printing industry that lowered reliance on manpower and newspaper prices helped to foster the long-run rise of private mass media', Bartolini writes, 'The spread of decoding capacities has marked the beginning of a long-term process of "privatization" of political information and propaganda, leading to a progressive reduction of human capital in the face of a growing capital-intensive

technique based on mass media messages.' Or, on page 550, he writes that, 'In the continental city-belt zone [a concept first introduced on this page and never explained!], the structuring of internal conflicts and voice opportunities depended very much on the inheritance and survival of the traditions of consociational ties within and among cities.' The frequent use of such circumlocutions (I can use big words too!) makes long stretches of this lengthy book a true ordeal to read. Bartolini's editors have not done their job (nor have they in compiling the index, which has no entries for individual countries).

Finally, and most seriously, there are some very serious methodological problems with this book, which Bartolini is clearly aware of (perhaps leading to a cryptic remark on page 7, after a reference to such difficulties, that the book is a 'project I will never consider undertaking again in my future work'). One problem, which given the breadth of the book is perhaps unfair to mention, is the exclusion of Russia, Hungary and Spain, which means Bartolini cannot compare the most repressive regimes. Another is the almost totally exclusive concern with structural factors in the shaping of left-party development; therefore the role of individual leaders, such as August Bebel in Germany and Victor Adler in Austria, is never considered, and the *appeal* of various kinds of left ideologies to the general public, as opposed to how those ideologies were *shaped* by structural factors, is similarly ignored.

Moving to more technical methodological concerns, it is hard to understand why Bartolini uses almost exclusively as his dependent variable left electoral strength, rather than also incorporating measures such as left-party membership and trade unions, which he has at his disposal. This is especially so because, as Bartolini is well aware, using left electoral strength for the pre-First World War period is fraught with problems due to electoral laws that excluded or severely discriminated against the poor (not to mention the massive vote-rigging and pressures that were common in at least parts of Italy, Germany and Austria). Even more serious is that, despite Bartolini's methodological sophistication, in calculating left electoral strength he simply *averages percentages* of voting support in about 360 national elections between 1880 and 1989 (although, puzzlingly, the book title indicates 1980 as its terminus), so that countries that held more elections than others are over-represented, as are countries with small populations, since there is *no correction* for population! This sometimes leads to extreme distortions. For example, on pages 149–50, Bartolini reports a strong negative pre-First World War correlation (–0.326) between industrial working-class size and left electoral strength, based on eighty-two elections,

but concedes that if Finland (with a strong socialist party, numerous elections and low levels of industrialization and population) and the United Kingdom (with high levels of industrialization and population but a weak socialist party) were omitted, the correlation would drastically change to a weakly positive 0.166.

There are many other examples of dubious methodology: for example, as on page 318, Bartolini is fond of structuring quantitative indexes of such concepts as 'stateness' for the 1880s–1920s, which he creates by combining, with equal weighting, five measures of taxation, bureaucratization and police forces. Even aside from the dubiousness of measuring 'stateness' this way — according to this measure, the most 'statelike' states were the most unstable, such as Germany and Italy, while the most stable regimes, like the Scandinavian countries, were the least 'statelike' — there is no sound basis for equally weighting such measures to create an index. This problem is only compounded later when this index is subsequently combined with other similarly dubious indexes and/or used to generate correlations with measures such as left electoral strength.

Robert Justin Goldstein is Professor of Political Science at Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan, USA. He is the author of numerous books concerning the history of civil liberties in modern western democracies, including *Political Repression in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (1983), editor of *The War for the Public Mind: Political Censorship in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (2000) and *Political Repression in Modern America* (2001, 2nd edn).