

Gender as a Medium of Change in Berlin's Politics of Poverty, 1770–1850

Dietlind Hüchtker

Gender is a discursive construction that can transform the order of society. In this chapter, I analyze changes in the poor relief system during the transition from the eighteenth to the nineteenth centuries with gender as a factor of analysis. Evidence shows that these changes were rooted in discourses and conflicts in everyday activities relating to Berlin's politics of poverty during the *Sattelzeit* and that constructed notions of gender played a central role in structuring the reforms.

Historians have traditionally depicted changes in the poor relief system as top-down structural transformations—that is, as part of a state reform undertaken in response to socioeconomic conditions. Scholars have rarely examined the concrete ways such transformations resulted from the everyday politics of state agencies mandated to deal with poverty. Recent methodologies, such as those used in cultural history, have seldom been applied to research on poverty.¹ However, questions about the cultural practices of the politics pertaining to the poor promise new insight into the process of change, revealing, among other things, the relationship of such practices to shifting notions of gender and sexuality. One cannot speak simply of “old” and “new” gendered understandings of the poor. Evolving conceptions of poverty contained elements of premodern gender constructions as well as constructions that grew out of shifting cultural norms. Continuity and change existed side by side.

Social historians regard the elimination of legal distinctions between the urban and rural populace—thus creating one uniform category of subjects—as an essential prerequisite for the transformations in the management of affairs relating to the poor.² Many scholars maintain that the reform process in Prussia established a governmental adminis-

tration responsible for poverty that treated all subjects in the same way, regardless of their place of origin or place of residence. The reform goals included centralization of the state bureaucracy and the fostering of population mobility. According to this argument, the objectives were fulfilled in 1842–43, when Prussia enacted a regulation that based poor relief on place of residence, thus transferring the responsibility for public assistance for newly arriving impoverished Prussian subjects to the municipality where they resided. This terminated the old-regime practice of granting assistance according to the place of birth. Because indigence no longer provided grounds for sending the poor back to their birthplace, the municipality also lost the right to determine who could settle inside its limits. In 1871, the Prussian residence law was extended, with only minor changes, to all subjects of the new German Empire.³

Researchers who hold this interpretation believe that the changes in law resulted from a fundamental transformation of attitudes: prior to the Enlightenment, charity had been based on moral criteria, which held that support should be granted on the basis of both good conduct and the inability to work. During the Enlightenment, new “rational” standards took into account socioeconomic situations such as low wages and unemployment.⁴

This line of reasoning needs to be reconsidered on several grounds. First, it does not explain how changes in normative cultural values and legal reforms became a part of everyday practice. Second, it is an oversimplification to assume that alterations in attitudes toward the poor constituted a shift from moral to economic standards. Between 1770 and 1850, transformations in attitudes toward the poor emerged from the conflicts surrounding the reform of state laws. Ways of thinking, perceiving, and acting changed through an ongoing discourse, producing new images of poverty, city, and state. Authorities’ conceptions of orderly and disorderly gender relations significantly shaped these shifts. The discourse served as a medium for a new way of understanding the urban social order. New constructions of gender were central in providing a basis for dealing with the urban lower classes. Authorities began to perceive an undifferentiated but socially marginalized lower class in which women and men played different roles from each other and required different actions on the part of government. This replaced the earlier legally founded and geographically based distinction between “justified” and “unjustified” poverty.

To demonstrate how these changes came about, I treat the dis-

courses and conflicts as social reality. Attitudes about poverty did not necessarily result from material conditions, and the conflicts surrounding the poor affairs system were not essentially related to fundamental structural conditions such as population growth or economic crises.⁵ Poverty, like gender, must be analyzed as a complex and changing construction created by municipal policies, not as a historically defined existential condition. The municipal policies relating to the poor gave rise to specific understandings of male and female poverty. This approach stands in contrast to that of most German-language researchers, who have traditionally sought to answer questions about poverty by associating poor women and poor men with certain social and economic conditions and have failed to see these subjects as products of the gendered politics of poverty.⁶ The city limits are a central factor of analysis in this chapter. The elimination of the distinction between city and country significantly impacted the poverty administration system.

The first part of the chapter examines how begging was treated in the city and its environs, based on jurisdictional quarrels over a royal park outside the city limits. The second section analyzes conflicts over early-nineteenth-century state reform policies driven in part by anticipated and dreaded migration to the city. The third section considers the urban-suburban problem of the “family houses,” cheap tenements outside the city gates. The fourth part evaluates the significance of the Poverty Office’s increased intervention during the 1820s in morality policies, which had traditionally fallen under police jurisdiction. The conclusion emphasizes ways in which viewing the poor through gendered lenses shaped ideas of social order. The constructions of poverty and gender intermeshed in the conflicts to create a new discourse on poverty.

Conflicts over Jurisdiction of the Tiergarten Park: “Whores and Beggars”

In 1783 the Kriegs- und Domänenkammer, the central administrative agency of the Kurmark province of Prussia,⁷ instructed the Armen-Directorium, the royal bureau that provided care for the poor, to do something about the “beggars and other degenerate rabble” along the promenades in the Tiergarten. Formerly a royal hunting ground that extended up to Berlin’s city gates, the Tiergarten had been converted into a public park in the first half of the eighteenth century.⁸ A road

crossed the park, connecting the king's court in Berlin with the royal palace in the nearby residential town, Charlottenburg. Consequently, the royal family and other nobles frequently passed through the Tiergarten. The park also contained several restaurants with outdoor seating and dancing facilities frequented by the general population. Authorities treated the park as part of the municipality, although it formally fell under royal jurisdiction. According to the Poverty Ordinance of 1774, the park avenues were to be patrolled twice a week, and suspicious-looking people were to be arrested.⁹ Officers of the Armen-Directorium, however, believed that this charge lay beyond their mandate and refused to do more than the absolute minimum. The royal provincial administration repeatedly issued instructions to arrest beggars in the Tiergarten, but to little avail.

On what basis did Directorium officials believe that they could ignore the recurrent directives from above? Differing conceptions of delinquency reflected jurisdictional conflicts between governmental agencies with respect to arrests of beggars, and the Armen-Directorium used these disputes to defend its position that such cases fell outside its area of responsibility. A gender-specific conception of the social order lay at the base of what became an argument over the nature of poverty and delinquency.

Official reports reveal conflicting positions regarding begging in the Tiergarten, and a key factor was the way in which various agencies distinguished between urban and provincial responsibility. On the one hand, although the policing agents of the royal government and the central administration of the Kurmark province reported regularly that begging in the city was increasing and decried the "disgraceful" and "intrusive" appearance of the poor, the Armen-Directorium seldom treated the mere act of begging as a criminal offense. Only beggars who were not needy or who were arrested on multiple occasions were punished. On the other hand, municipal agencies in principle considered beggars outside the city to be dangerous and illegal, as demonstrated, for example, by the joint raids conducted by the Berlin Police and the Poverty Office; nearly all of those arrested were punished as vagrants or "willful" beggars.¹⁰

These perspectives shaped the conflict over patrolling the Tiergarten as well. Although some accounts on begging in the park, like those in the city, simply mentioned the increase in impudent and shameless begging, most of the park reports tended to criminalize poverty in a gender-specific manner. In 1805 a police officer was instructed to be on the

lookout for “loiterers, beggars, vagabonds of every type and class, lewd women, bird catchers, and those who destroy trees and damage property.” The accounts were full of descriptions of “beggars and degenerate rabble.”¹¹ A 1790 report asked what the Armen-Directorium was planning to do to support the Mühlenhof district offices in “apprehending the whores and beggars” in the Tiergarten.¹²

The city reports of the period lacked such explicitly gendered language, even though municipal authorities were of course supposed to pursue “lewd women and loiterers.” These latter terms could be read simply as stereotypes for delinquents of all kinds and as clichéd expressions associating women with prostitution. The listing of offenses for delinquents should not be understood as indicating a special degree of criminality outside the city; rather, the distinction in language reveals an interagency disagreement over responsibility for patrolling the park. The discourse, based on a constructed gender-specific order, was designed to determine which offices had jurisdiction over which people outside the city: “whores” or “lewd women” were the responsibility of the police, while “beggars” were the charge of the Poverty Office. The lists of offenses legitimized raids conducted jointly by the two agencies outside the city limits.

Reports generated by the police and the Kurmark administration were intended to enhance the effectiveness of the Poverty Office’s monitoring of the Tiergarten to bring about more arrests. These reports clearly implied that the Poverty Office had jurisdiction over the park and was lax about fulfilling its responsibilities. The reports’ use of adjectives such as *shameless* and *insolent* had less to do with the conduct of the beggars than with the alleged negligence of the Poverty Office. This agency, however, strove to limit its sphere of responsibility. It referred to beggars as “degenerate rabble” as a way of stressing the need for police intervention, since “the patrol officers of the Poverty Office, who have already been subjected to so many insults when arresting the beggars, cannot, in addition, be assigned . . . responsibility for hunting down thieves.”¹³

The dispute over responsibility for the Tiergarten at the close of the eighteenth century sparked a discourse about groups of offenders, for which the legal boundary between city and outskirts represented a dividing line in perceptions. Beggars in the city were described as “dishonest” and “shameless,” but other offenses were rarely attributed to them. Reports concerning delinquents outside of the city limits, however, regularly referred to “beggars and lewd women” or “beggars and

whores.” The gender-specific polarization of the language and the stereotypical association of female delinquency with prostitution represented a concept of order that shaped the distinction between urban and rural competency and between the Poverty Office and the police.

Raids conducted at more or less regular intervals in the rural areas of the Kurmark province, in contrast, treated all offenders as criminals—beggars and vagrants, impoverished persons and whores, and peddlers without trading licenses. Interests and perceptions of various governmental authorities were thus closely linked to the practices of dealing with the poor within and outside the city limits. In the dispute over jurisdictional authority, the agencies knowingly or unknowingly established a discourse that labeled poor men as beggars and indigent women as whores. Alongside the criminalization of poverty developed the sexualization of female poverty. These categorizations, applied to the Tiergarten and the province, crept into the administrative discourse on the city as well.

Conflicts over the Right of Settlement and Freedom of Movement: “The Husband Who Abandons His Wife and Children”

Following a devastating military defeat by Napoleon in 1806, the Prussian government attempted to modernize its state and society through a series of reforms from above. In the course of debate over the restructuring of state and society, a new concept of gendered poverty became an established element of public discourse. The reform objectives included the elimination of the legal distinctions between urban and rural society as well as the establishment of the rights of Prussian subjects to assume residence wherever they wished. These reform efforts represented a major threat to municipal order. Berlin agencies complained of “the crowding of so many people, so many outsiders from all provinces of the state,” into the royal capital. Officials alleged that many “large families” in Berlin “would go astray, some becoming impoverished.”¹⁴

The Municipal Ordinance of 1809, a component of the state reforms, placed the poverty administration system under municipal control but left the police department a state agency in all major Prussian cities, including Berlin. With the reform era’s introduction of freedom of trade and freedom to move and settle at will, the city lost its traditional privileged position as the royal capital. The reform integrated the

municipality into the state administration, effecting a goal that had been discussed since the late eighteenth century. Berlin could no longer shut its gates to outsiders or to workers who did not belong to a guild, resulting in the loss of the city's character as a closed, corporate society.

The poverty administration system became a battleground between the state reformers and the defenders of municipal privileges. Because the Municipal Ordinance transferred the Poverty Office from royal to local control and because the office was one of the most expensive areas of the municipal administration, great potential for conflict existed. To defend themselves against unfavorable consequences, urban leaders sought to play an active role in state reform politics by claiming that Berlin's privileges as the royal residence were inalienable. These officials feared that the reform legislation would encourage a rush of migration of poor and latent poor to the city. These fears had very little to do with the actual migration figures: in 1809, when the dangers were first evoked, the urban population had declined as a result of the Napoleonic occupation of the city. Only in the 1830s and 1840s would Berlin's population surge.¹⁵

These discussions regarding the relationship between migration and urban poverty were not new. Even some participants in late-eighteenth-century reform efforts had blamed increased indigence in the city on migration to the royal capital. Thomas Philipp von der Hagen, head of the Armen-Directorium, explained in a 1786 proposal to reform the poverty affairs system the perceived relationship between poverty and migration:

The causes for [the increased number of poor and sick], aside from the luxury that has become a habit among all social classes, are:

- (a) Impoverished and ailing individuals and families . . . from the most remote areas, such as West Prussia, have come here and are a burden to the institutions for poor relief.
- (b) Many immigrant, pregnant women come here to deliver their babies because of the free maternity services at the Charité Hospital, and if they die the children have to be fed and raised.
- (c) Many young people from the countryside and small towns move here to become servants or workers. It is not possible for all of them to find employment, so they exhaust their limited resources and end up living wretchedly in poverty. This is true

especially of several hundred young unmarried women without master or mistress, who try to support themselves as best they can. If they become ill or pregnant, they have to be admitted to the Charité and later receive state support for the poor, and if they die, their children are raised in the orphanage.

- (d) Toleration of the so-called spinning rooms, where the contractors who deliver the spun wool to the factories take in impoverished, desolate people of all kinds. The employers deceive them with a variety of promises, sometimes even with cash advances, so they work for a small wage. . . . Because they have received an advance and cannot pay it back, they are held in slavlike conditions. Most of the young women who are here on their own, having lost all their money in such spinning rooms and lacking the bare essentials, ultimately become a burden to the institutions for the poor due to illness, pregnancy, or venereal disease. . . .
- (e) Large numbers must be treated for venereal diseases. Even if these people come here from other areas, they cannot be left without assistance, because otherwise the disease will infect others, becoming widespread.
- (f) Because of the large garrison, many poor soldier widows must be supported by the poor relief funds. . . .
- (i) Finally, as is known, this city has many small manufacturing establishments, and especially the wool and silk weavers are poor people who have to earn enough each week to cover their needs. If they fall ill or if there is not enough work, then they become a burden to the institutions for the poor.¹⁶

Although indigent females stand out as central in von der Hagen's depiction of the poor, he focused on members of particular groups who became destitute because of specific problems they experienced. With the possible exception of the wool and silk weavers, all of the impoverished were immigrants into the city. The "young women who are here on their own" had clearly migrated to the city from rural areas. Von der Hagen was especially concerned about the single women who became burdens to the Poverty Office after becoming ill or pregnant. A regulation designed to prevent infanticide that was part of Frederick the Great's population policy allowed single, pregnant women in Prussia to give birth at Charité Hospital at no charge.¹⁷ "Colonists" (settlers

from villages and small towns) were brought to the royal capital in accord with mercantilist economic policies of the eighteenth century, and von der Hagen's report called this practice into question. He suggested that one cause of impoverishment was the lack of family bonds or corporate ties, as demonstrated by his reference to young unmarried women "without master and mistress." His reasoning was based on an urban corporate perspective, with which state policies came into conflict. Unlike officials of the early-nineteenth-century reform period, von der Hagen did not view the issue of poverty in gender-specific terms. He clearly did not intend to suggest that single women were a social problem solely on the basis of their gender.

During the early nineteenth century, officials continued to voice concern over what they saw as external problems brought into the city by immigrants from the countryside. However, new lines of conflict caused the focus to shift. One of von der Hagen's successors as head of the Armen-Directorium, Adolf Friedrich von Scheve, also enumerated "problem groups" in an 1809 report that advocated having the Berlin Poverty Office jointly administered by the state and the city as a means of giving a higher profile to the administration of poverty and securing state funding for such operations.¹⁸ In contrast to von der Hagen, von Scheve did not represent impoverishment as a result of social and economic conditions that affected different groups in unique ways: he viewed all urban migrants without distinction as prone to poverty.

[The outsiders] either become impoverished themselves or they leave behind widows or orphans needing assistance. The populous class of manufactory workers and weavers lose their jobs or abandon their wives and children because their trade begins to decline because of political trends or [economic] conditions. Moreover, poorly paid minor royal officials in Berlin agencies leave their widows and orphans in dire need when they die.¹⁹

Unlike von der Hagen, who understood indigence to be caused by group-specific conditions, von Scheve created a new, gender-based classification of impoverishment: abandoned wives and children, who were to be found in all kinds of problem situations. This subtle shift in focus allowed von Scheve to argue for increased funding for the poor relief system. Images of abandoned women and children and of their deserting husbands became very prevalent in the debates over poverty.

Both the Poverty Office and the police administration perpetuated this stereotype for decades.²⁰ As late as 1828, the Armen-Directorium echoed the familiar complaint:

- (a) . . . thousands of silk, cotton, and linen weavers who have previously moved here, not without state influence, and who presently live here, lose their employment because their trade stagnates for a period, because of political or other conditions not caused by . . . the municipality. Such heads of households, unable to support their wives and children, often abandon them, and the women and children then become a burden to the offices for poor relief.
- (b) . . . Recent legislation introduced freedom of trade, which makes it too easy for journeymen and young people, who often do not understand their trade, to establish a business. These people marry very early, produce children, and soon they have no work, and they abandon their families.²¹

Although the report cataloged the oft-repeated specific causes of poverty, its author sought less to register the potential for destitution in the city than to establish the state's responsibility to provide assistance for the poor by representing them as abandoned women and children. Recurring references, continuing over decades, to the feared process of impoverishment demonstrate the intensity of the jurisdictional battles between city and state over competence, power, and influence in municipal politics.

In the interval between von der Hagen's report and that of von Scheve, the images of women had changed. Reports of the reform era depicted two categories of poor women. First came the unmarried women who became clients of the Poverty Office because of their actions in moving to Berlin. Either they came already destitute, or they fell into hard times after their arrival. Second came mothers with children, who were depicted as passive victims of either conditions beyond their control or husbands who left them. In contrast to the single women in the capital as well as to the poor begging for alms, the abandoned mothers were characterized as passive and dependent. People who became impoverished through no fault of their own were considered model Poverty Office clients. While the accounts sought to demonstrate the negative impact of the reform legislation, in time the abandoned mother became a collective symbol²² of impoverishment established in the urban rhetoric and employed repeatedly, long after

the reform period had ended. Descriptions of gender-specific poverty assigned responsibility to the state, for giving outsiders the right to settle in the city, and to the husbands, who took advantage of new freedoms and abandoned their families. The victims of social and economic changes were seen as women and children.

Conflicts over the Tenement Quarters at the City Outskirts: “The Circulating Masses”

Critical of the reform process and fearing its perceived dangers, city authorities associated urban migration and indigence with all sorts of interrelated and seemingly inescapable “vices.” The municipal council alleged in 1817,

These people are usually in a dreadful or even desperate financial situation of their own making, and they think they can find help here [in Berlin]. Some have never known a settled, productive life, and others have lost what they once had, having taken to drink, slovenliness, and other vices. Mismanagement, crude behavior, and excessive demands for wages have caused them to sink to low depths in their previous places of residence and to fall into wretched circumstances. Now they come here, not to start new, industrious, orderly lives, but because they hope to find greater possibilities for irresponsible and possibly fraudulent ways of earning a living.²³

These vices included laziness, sensual pleasures, irregular work habits, and disorderliness. Berlin authorities blamed the migrants for their poverty and attributed the problems to all urban poor as a group. The “immigrant poor” became simply the “lower classes” in government officials’ rhetoric.²⁴ As the poverty of the migrants crossed the city limits, it undermined the old-regime practice of distinguishing between needy almsmen and willful beggars. The rhetoric of poverty increasingly included the notion of immorality.²⁵

The tenement housing in the poor suburban districts—the “family houses”—took on special meaning in this part of the discourse on poverty. Outside the city gates to the northwest, the king had established in the eighteenth century several settlements on undeveloped, sandy territory. In contrast to other settlements outside the city, these developments fell under the jurisdiction of the Berlin Poverty Office. The settlement on Brandenburg sands was not very successful, and by

the end of the century, the residents constituted a significant part of the impoverished urban population. An additional row of houses was built along the road between the city limits and the settlement, forming a suburb outside the city gates that by the 1820s featured cheaply constructed four- and five-story apartment houses with one- to one-and-a-half-room apartments. These new so-called family houses occupied the first area of Berlin inhabited exclusively by the poor.²⁶ These dwellings came to poignantly symbolize the dangers and the misery associated with poverty.

The family houses were the subject of endless debate among the public agencies. As soon as the first structures were completed, the government concerned itself with the negative impact of such a concentration of poor people. Also the literary and journalistic media reported frequently on the terrible conditions. An extensive report by the physician for the poor caused the police to order house owners to make structural improvements. The attention that the houses received caused the Poverty Office to demand new measures from the police and the interior ministry, such as increased patrols and a general prohibition on renting overnight sleeping quarters.

Descriptions of the poverty in the family houses typically referred to a wide variety of social, moral, sanitary, and medical situations, often emphasizing dirt and disease.²⁷ Authorities took particular offense at the undisciplined cohabitation of the sexes, which was ascribed to diverse notions of immorality. Berlin had several Armen-Commissionen (commissions for the poor), and the chair of the commission responsible for the family houses was one of the most outspoken in this regard:

More and more often the weavers and other kinds of artisans and workers get together daily, with the likes of loose women, living in sin and begetting a crowd of children that become a burden to the city. In addition, the discharging of disabled soldiers from the battalion contributes to an increase in cohabitation and disorderly households. Lazy, slovenly, and highly immoral females take the opportunity to lustily grab some blind or disabled man. Indulging the man's physical desires is the women's way to an idle and happy life, for who would not generously give alms to a cripple who had become disabled in the service of the fatherland, and who supposedly does not receive enough from the state to support his family? The immoral mistress always acts as the wife [so] that both parents and children become accustomed to such unbounded depravity.²⁸

The accusation of deception, already familiar from the campaign against begging, assumed a moral tone. Attributing the active role to the women was a salient characteristic of the discussion about the family houses. Women were portrayed as “lazy,” “wretched,” and “immoral,” taking advantage of the “physical desires” of the disabled soldiers. The women’s actions made the relationships indecent. Because the “slovenly mistress” personified the immoral living situation, she came to symbolize the lower classes’ inescapable combination of vices.

These conditions were considered dangerous not only for the poor but for the city as well, since the poverty traversed the city limits. The Armen-Direction (formerly the Armen-Directorium) declared with alarm in 1824,

In their hustling, the residents of the von Wülknitz houses circulate throughout the city. Thus as living carriers of one contagion or another, they are in a perfect situation to spread communicable diseases. Under these circumstances, there are many reasons to worry about the health of the Berlin residents.²⁹

With such rhetoric, the Poverty Office created a new stereotype of the residents of the family houses: dangerous carriers of contagious disease that might spread throughout the city.

In a letter to the Ministry of the Interior, Direction officials expressed concern that the city was imperiled by the “circulating masses”:

It is obvious that the royal residence could have been dangerously threatened during the time when there was so much movement. Indeed, it continues to be threatened. If similar situations or other unfortunate circumstances should arise, the popular masses could be set in motion or incited to some excess.³⁰

The “time when there was so much movement” refers to the French July Revolution of 1830 and the concurrent unrest in some German cities—that is, riots that threatened to spread to Berlin. Mention of this well-known set of events generalized the fear about the lower classes, adding a new concern. Berlin residents needed to worry not only about the dissemination of disease but also about the spread of revolution. A “mental infection” threatened the city.

The groups that came to the capital, with their particular reasons and interests, became indistinguishable masses that seemed to endanger the city. Like those arrested outside the city gates, all were perceived as foreign and therefore as dangerous, although those targeted usually were the urban lower classes residing in the suburbs. Their presence challenged certain established limits: the “disorderly masses” called into question the border between city and country; the “slovenly mistress” raised questions about the boundary between the sexes. The impoverished district where the family houses stood came to be viewed as particularly crass and embodied the misery and dangers linked to poverty.³¹

Regulations established in 1828 completely prohibited the renting of temporary sleeping space in the family houses. Police patrols were increased, and building owners were required to comply with safety codes for the sake of sanitation and fire prevention. The buildings became an emblem of poverty and immorality in Berlin, a situation widely discussed in entertainment literature and socially critical descriptions of the metropolis. The conflicts over freedom to choose one’s place of residence and over control of migration into the city ended with a compromise set of laws enacted in 1842 and 1843.³² According to the legislation, people could be refused the right to stay in a city or community if they were unable to support themselves, but suspicion that they might become impoverished did not constitute grounds to deny outsiders permission to settle. The city was not obligated to grant assistance to needy persons residing within its borders for less than a year.

The discourse on the rise in poverty in the city brought about new conceptualizations of the poor. Although early-nineteenth-century discussions grew out of the eighteenth-century practice of equating the poor outside the city with delinquency and linking immigration with poverty, the new discourse used old terminology to create new meanings. Poverty, foreignness, and immorality—especially female immorality—became irrevocably associated with one another, and the family houses outside the city became a common symbol for poverty. The conflicts between the municipal and state governments that grew out of the Prussian reform politics added to the old patterns of thought not only the new assumption that poverty itself was immoral but also the gendered perceptions of the abandoned wife and the entrapped man. These gendered images of poverty assumed great importance for policies pertaining to the poor for the remainder of the century.

Intervention of the Poverty Office in Police Morality Policies: “The Sad Circumstances of Cohabitation”

The discourse on the dangers of impoverishment was no mere abstract discussion disconnected from the everyday experience of the politics of poverty; indeed, it continuously shaped these politics. The perceived ties between destitution and immorality were reflected in the 1826 Poverty Ordinance, which abolished the requirement that authorities determine whether arrested beggars had received adequate assistance before they could be sent to the workhouse. In 1838, police received exclusive authority to arrest beggars, effectively making begging generally illegal.

In their attempts to retain as many prerogatives as possible and preserve their authority, municipal agencies not only sought to obtain state subsidies and to maintain jurisdiction over new urban migrants but also became involved in police work itself. Starting in the 1820s, “immorality” became a point of contention between the police and the Poverty Office. The subject was rooted in the context of a growing, pietistically motivated morality movement in the city. The Armen-Direction, the voluntary *Armen-Commissionen*, and ordinary citizens all demanded the closing of brothels and reported lower-class unmarried women to the police as prostitutes.³³ Authorities and citizens also began to call for Prussia to enact marriage restrictions such as those that existed in southern German states, thereby limiting the number of children and thus preventing the impoverishment of the lower classes.³⁴ In a related move, the Poverty Office initiated an all-out campaign against cohabitation of unmarried men and women.³⁵

The eighteenth-century Prussian General Law Code did not prohibit extramarital intercourse and cohabitation between unmarried people (so-called concubinage), and Berlin ordinances allowed the police only to prohibit cohabitation of people subject to legal marriage restrictions—that is, blood relatives and persons already married to others.³⁶ However, the police were permitted to intervene in cases of public scandal, and on the basis of this provision, members of the Poverty Office reported instances of cohabitation to the police. In one case, for example, “Kohlen the mason slept with his woman in a rented bed for quite some time before the two were married . . . which is the main reason for all these sad circumstances”—the couple’s sick child, a second pregnancy, and the man’s alcoholism.³⁷ In relation to this report, the commission for the poor proposed establishing the rule that

“where women and men are sleeping together in rented beds one [person] be removed.”³⁸ They were clearly using this case to establish a principle, since not the rented bed but rather the man’s low income and/or alcoholism caused the misery, especially since the couple had already married. The commission’s justification for seeking police intervention—that fathers were “not willing to marry the person”³⁹—did not even apply in this case.

The unquestioned assumption that out-of-wedlock relationships were inherently immoral was widespread. In one case in which the Armen-Direction intervened with the police, agency officials alleged that the police had allowed parents with children born out of wedlock to go on “pilgrimages” to “morally corrupting pleasure spots.” The Armen-Direction insisted that “regulations be imposed on smoking pubs and dance halls,”⁴⁰ including the provision that the establishments must refuse service to people accompanied by children. The immorality of sexual relations clearly represented a whole series of other indecencies.

The Armen-Direction not only assumed the task of improving “moral conditions” but also made itself the watchdog over the morals for all of the lower classes. In 1828, for example, the Poverty Office linked “cohabitation” with the controversial issue of prostitution, which fell explicitly under police jurisdiction. In a letter to police headquarters, the Direction urged the establishment of measures for the “improvement of the moral condition of the common lower class.” Officials complained that “general legislation still allows brothels to exist and fails to address the issue of cohabitation between two people for whom there is no legal obstacle to marriage.”⁴¹

The campaign against immoral lifestyles allowed the Armen-Direction to draw the police into the campaign to combat poverty and to assign to the police responsibility for the misery. In intertwining its affairs with those of the police, the office was attempting to elevate the issue of poverty in the city and thus enhance the office’s role in municipal affairs. Accordingly, the Armen-Direction sought to ensure that all institutions, including the police, the municipal council, and the Ministry of the Interior, should act at the behest of the Armen-Direction, thus making it a leading force in the changing times.

The Armen-Direction did not succeed completely in its campaign against cohabitation, since Prussian state agencies viewed the freedom to marry—or to live together unmarried—as a civil liberty belonging to the private sphere and thus not subject to state intervention. How-

ever, in 1828 the Direction achieved a ban on renting beds to men and women at the same time.⁴² In 1832, the Direction put into practice a rule that mothers cohabiting with men would forfeit their orphan benefits, since their “paramours” should help support their children.⁴³ The Poverty Office also used the threat of suspending payments to clients as a way of monitoring subleasing of living spaces.⁴⁴

The Poverty Office was not the only agency to take up the themes of immorality and indecency. The police department also harbored those who shared the strong views on the immorality of the poor. Senior officer F. K. Merker distinguished himself by supporting intervention in the private lives of the lower classes despite reservations by police headquarters and Ministry of the Interior officials.⁴⁵ He described the vices of the lower classes—alcoholism, crime, and “immoral” relations between the sexes—among the ever-present problems causing decay of the social order. The term *immorality* gradually came to mean simply sexual relations.⁴⁶ This shift in vocabulary further legitimized the police intervention into the private affairs of the lower classes, a practice that became increasingly common in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Middle-class notions of the family with the husband-father as breadwinner thus came to shape the discourse on poverty. In the eyes of Berlin authorities, lower-class sexuality and sexual practices became increasingly responsible for the problem.

Creating Order: “Prostitution and Crime”

In descriptions of Berlin poverty, the related themes of the husbands who abandoned their wives, the circulating masses, and the sad circumstances of cohabitation established a connection between reform policies and threats to the municipal order. Images of women and of sexual relations not only signified the immorality of poverty but, like the dual concept of “whores and beggars” in the Tiergarten, also created the understanding that social order was based on governmental powers of regulation.

Differing interpretations of the same event can demonstrate how perceptions of poverty were instrumental in constructing order. In 1831, riots broke out in the family houses when the owner, Heinrich Ferdinand Wiesecke, evicted several families that had not paid their rent. Apparently having expected the tumult, Wiesecke attempted to convince the Armen-Direction to assume the rent payments as a pre-

ventive measure. He accentuated the dangers in a letter addressed to police headquarters and copied to the Direction.

The outraged mob [will] go even further and demand high wages by rioting. One could already hear numerous terrible suggestions of this. There was talk of general rebellion, of all moving into the city and of inciting all workers to take up arms. There were complaints about the harshness of the factory supervisors who filled their pockets with the profits while wages were steadily declining and the workers were going hungry. They were shouting that no laws should be respected, for everyone had to die anyway, and it was hunger that caused cholera, and so forth.⁴⁷

Wiesecke created an image of masses in revolt, spreading social and political demands throughout the city. He used the specter of cholera to epitomize the dangers threatening the family houses and linked it to the fear of revolution. In the late 1820s, a cholera epidemic threatened Berlin from the east, reaching the city and causing numerous deaths in 1831.⁴⁸ Wiesecke portrayed the poverty, hunger, and dirt of the family houses as the source of the inflammation. The dangerous thing about cholera, however, was not that it was a disease of the poor but that it crossed social boundaries. Both cholera and revolution were “contagious” and could quickly spread throughout the city.

In contrast, Mr. Bocquet, chair of the Armen-Commission, had a different perspective on Wiesecke’s evictions:

Your Honor, I must request speedy instructions on how to respond, since Herr Wiesecke evicted 15 to 18 families from their apartments early this morning and has locked all the doors. Some of these families owe 8 and some 10 to 12 Reichstaler. They are lying in the courtyard, and the inspector has demanded that I issue certification that everything has been paid before he unlocks the apartments. What should be done, since these generally large families need a roof over their heads and have nothing but the shirts on their backs? This is why they are storming my apartment and why there is already a major uprising in the family houses. Humbly yours.⁴⁹

Bocquet represented the situation more or less as blackmail. No one knew where the homeless families should go, and the inspector respon-

sible for evictions demanded a certificate that the Poverty Office would pay the rent before he would reopen the apartments. Bocquet portrayed the protests themselves as rather insignificant. His reference to families lying in the courtyard contrasts sharply with Wiesecke's "mob," implying no particular threat to the social order. Bocquet gave no impression of immoral behavior between the sexes, unruliness, or danger but instead emphasized the evictees' distress. He even made the fact that they stormed his residence seem justified in view of their plight. The protesters met with some success, and the evictions were halted. However, Wiesecke did not convince the Armen-Direction to assume rent payments, although his description clearly impressed some of the staff, since this is one of the few examples in Direction records of intra-agency disagreement.⁵⁰

Diverse positions on poverty and the family houses in these conflicts were responsible for the different perceptions of the protesting crowds and the evicted families. Whereas Wiesecke saw the crowd as threatening the city, Bocquet saw the families largely as passive. Bocquet also interpreted the situation to be manageable and orderly, even though there must have been between fifty and one hundred people in the courtyard. Bocquet's description supported the position held by most Armen-Direction officials, who downplayed the scenario of danger as a way to refuse to assume responsibility for paying the rent.

Not only the model of the orderly family, contrasted with the fear of the uncontrollable masses, but also gender-specific conceptualizations shaped the social understanding of poverty:

Almost without exception, it is detrimental when girls who have been confirmed in the church are used to sell fruit, fat pine, chicory, matches, lighters, songs, and cakes and other baked goods, or to carry shopping baskets from the market, and thus become familiar with a sort of bustling idleness and the associated vices. [It is also harmful] when confirmed boys are used to sell cigars, sponges, lighters, and fruit, or to attend coaches and to open church doors and churchyard gates and thus become familiar early on with a vagrant lifestyle, gluttony, and loose living.⁵¹

This almost rhythmically parallel gender-specific categorization of offenses associated with poverty is epitomized by the expression "prostitution and crime," the nadir of the decline caused by misery and

immorality.⁵² This expression clearly represented a variation of the “whores and beggars” theme used in connection with the Tiergarten and applied in a wider context.

The articulation of gender dichotomies enabled observers concerned about the lower classes to construct an order in the city.⁵³ In the face of immorality, such dichotomies represented an ordered and less dangerous poverty than the image of shuffling masses. A basic principle in this scheme was the family; another was a clear, gender-specific parallelism.⁵⁴ At the same time, these dichotomies created new images of poverty, including on the one hand the victims of circumstances (whether abandoned women and children or the passive families who constituted the model Poverty Office clientele) and on the other hand the danger and immorality that necessitated police intervention.

“Poverty” and “Gender”

Policy relating to Berlin’s poor from 1770 to 1850 became an increasingly disputed issue, epitomizing the general controversy over the Prussian reforms and the relationship between municipal and state administrations in the royal capital. This conflict transformed the meaning of poverty. Collective symbols of orderly and disorderly gender relations both expressed and changed the relationship between the poor and the city. Consequently, the politics of poverty also changed in practice. Jurisdictional conflicts between different agencies in the Tiergarten concerning delinquency in the park established in public rhetoric gender-specific notions of the poor—that is, women as whores and men as beggars or criminals. At the same time, these conflicts emphasized the notion that the poor beyond the city limits posed a special threat. The municipal authorities incorporated this facet into their argument as they protested the loss of municipal privileges through the Prussian reforms. City officials envisioned immigrating masses who would become destitute in the urban royal capital. Early on, the image of the journeyman who could work independently of the guilds and who married too early and abandoned his wife and children after becoming impoverished was used to depict the poverty of the new arrivals to the city. Over time, this image became a collective symbol for the urban poor. Poverty from outside the city, like that of the Tiergarten, became associated with all manners of vices and delinquency. Individual social groups among the poor became a mass of dangerous lower classes. By the 1820s the poverty that threatened Berlin was positioned largely in

the family houses outside the city limits, and authorities began to demand increased police control over occupants' lifestyles. Regarding poverty and immorality as equivalent, Poverty Office administrators felt justified in repeatedly involving the agency in police morality policies. The authority to intervene followed from this agency's mandate to create order out of immorality and misery. This order included the gender-specific delinquency of "prostitution and crime," a threat to the concept of the bourgeois family. The mere act of describing the acute immorality conferred authority on the speaker. The Poverty Office's model clients were abandoned mothers and the passive, forbearing families.⁵⁵ In this case, the blame lay with the fathers, who failed to live up to society's ideal of the breadwinner-husband.

Changes in the politics of poverty resulted from continuity and discontinuities in the day-to-day interaction of patterns of thought and action of those involved. Not so much the individual perceptions of begging, poverty, and immorality were new but the context, the cultural practice in which these perceptions were articulated and in which they assumed new meanings.⁵⁶ Poverty, citizenship, and poor people's eligibility for assistance in their place of residence were cultural constructions with far-reaching material impact. Their cultural significance and their place in the municipal order derive, in large part, from the position that changing constructions of gender assumed in government agencies' management of poverty. As constructions of gender changed, a new image emerged of lower classes threatening the city, as did a new form of politics of poverty that made the lifestyle of the poor an object of politics.

Notes

I thank Andrea Bergler, Ulrike Gleixner, Marion Gray, and Meinolf Nitsch for their discussion and corrections. Translated from the German by Allison Brown.

1. Roger Chartier, preface to *Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations*, trans. Lydia Cochrane (Ithaca, 1988).

2. The most important reforms in this regard were the introduction to the 1791 Prussian General Code (*Allgemeines Landrecht*), which centralized and standardized law, and the edicts of Prussian reform that promoted mobility, especially freedom of movement, the elimination of hereditary dependence (1807–10), and the dissolution of peasant dependency (1811–16). See the extensive study by Reinhart Koselleck, *Preußen zwischen Reform und Revolution: Allgemeines Landrecht, Verwaltung, und soziale Bewegung von 1791 bis 1848*, 3rd ed. (Munich, 1989); see also Antje Kraus, "Die rechtliche Lage der Unter-

schicht im Übergang von der Agrar- zur Industriegesellschaft,” in *Vom Elend der Handarbeit: Probleme historischer Unterschichtforschung*, ed. Hans Mommsen and Winfried Schulze (Wuppertal, 1981), 243–58.

3. See Christoph Sachße and Florian Tennstedt, *Geschichte der Armenfürsorge in Deutschland: Vom Spätmittelalter bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg* (Stuttgart, 1980), 195–210. Most regional and local studies of administration of poverty follow Sachße and Tennstedt’s interpretation.

4. Volker Hunecke, “Überlegungen zur Geschichte der Armut im vorindustriellen Europa,” *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 9 (1983): 480–512; Helmut Breuer, “. . . und hat seithero gebetelt”: *Bettler und Bettelwesen in Wien und Niederösterreich zur Zeit Kaiser Leopolds I* (Vienna, 1996).

5. On this concept, see Dietlind Hüchtker, “Elende Mütter” und “liederliche Weibspersonen”: *Geschlechterverhältnisse und Armenpolitik in Berlin (1770–1850)* (Münster, 1999), 9–23.

6. Of course, this does not mean that poverty was not an economic or material problem.

7. See [Magnus Friedrich Bassewitz], *Die Kurmark Brandenburg, ihr Zustand, und ihre Verwaltung unmittelbar vor dem Ausbruche des französischen Krieges im Oktober 1806* (Leipzig, 1847), 1:55–58.

8. Felix Escher, *Berlin und sein Umland: Zur Genese der Berliner Stadtlandschaft bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1985), 105.

9. *Königlich-preußische Verordnung wegen Verpflegung der Armen und des gänzlich abzustellenden Bettelns auf Strassen und in Häusern in Berlin* (December 1774), in Sachße and Tennstedt, *Geschichte*, 146–47.

10. For example, the Landesarchiv Berlin (Stadtarchiv) [State Archives of Berlin (city archives); hereafter cited as LAB (STA)], Rep. 03/357, bl. 152, 156–59 (1790); Brandenburgisches Landeshauptarchiv [Brandenburg Main State Archives (hereafter cited as BLHA)], Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin A 371, bl. 9 ff. (1790).

11. BLHA, Pr. Br. Rep. 7 Amt Mühlenhof 1876, bl. 34 (1788).

12. LAB (STA), Rep. 03/357, bl. 159 (1790).

13. LAB (STA), Rep. 03/358, bl. 17 (1805). The Armen-Directorium was responding to the instructions of the police authorities “to arrest . . . suspicious-looking people at the wood market” in the Tiergarten, since “soldiers’ wives and their children” in particular were suspected of stealing wood; the police obviously saw this as the responsibility of the Poverty Office.

14. On the reforms in general, see Marion W. Gray, *Prussia in Transition: Society and Politics under the Stein Reform Ministry of 1808* (Philadelphia, 1986); BLHA, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin B 38, bl. 66 (1818).

15. See Karin Weimann, “Bevölkerungsentwicklung und Frühindustrialisierung in Berlin, 1800–1850,” in *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der frühen Industrialisierung vornehmlich im Wirtschaftsraum Berlin/Brandenburg*, ed. Otto Büsch (Berlin, 1971), 150–90. These findings are not meant to imply any statistical connection between poverty and migration.

16. Thomas Philipp von der Hagen, "Plan zur bessern Einrichtung der Armen-Casse und der Vertheilung der Allmosen in Berlin," *Magazin für die neue Historie und Geographie*, pt. 21 (1787), 455–57. Von der Hagen also wrote that the interest rates had gone down, causing the income of the state coffers to drop, and that the price of wood for heating had gone up.

17. On the prevention of infanticide, see Kerstin Michalik, *Kinds-mord: Zur Sozial- und Rechtsgeschichte der Kindstötung im 18. und beginnenden 19. Jahrhundert am Beispiel Preußen* (Pfaffenweiler, 1996), 210–58.

18. This mixed commission was established as a temporary institution; it existed until 1819, when the Poverty Office came under municipal control. On the conflicts over the reform of the Poverty Office, see LAB (STA), Rep. 03/130 (1809).

19. LAB (STA), Rep. 03/130, bl. 60–63 (1809).

20. S.G., "Zur practischen Armenpolizei," *Beiträge zur Erleichterung des Gelingens der praktischen Polizei* 13 (1835): 287; 14 (1836): 34.

21. Armen-Direction von Berlin, *Die öffentliche Armenpflege in Berlin: Mit besonderer Beziehung auf die vier Verwaltungs-Jahre 1822 bis 1825* (Berlin, 1828), 227–29.

22. On the concept of collective symbols, see Axel Drews, Ute Gerhard, and Jürgen Link, "Moderne Kollektivsymbolik: Eine diskurstheoretisch orientierte Einführung mit Auswahlbibliographie," *Internationales Archiv für Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur* 1 (1985): 289.

23. BLHA, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin B 54, bl. 5 (1817).

24. BLHA, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin B 54, bl. 6 (1817).

25. On the growing moral judgment of poverty, see Ute Frevert, *Krankheit als politisches Problem, 1770–1880: Soziale Unterschichten in Preußen zwischen medizinischer Polizei und staatlicher Sozialversicherung* (Göttingen, 1984), 136–48.

26. The architecture and the name *family houses* were in keeping with prevailing housing policies for the poor. The style was modeled after the eighteenth-century barracks for soldier families to reduce the unpopular quartering in the houses of Berlin citizens. From the outset, the barracks thus housed primarily poor families, since the soldier families were generally poor. The houses fell under military supervision. By the end of the eighteenth century, the king had transferred two or three barracks no longer in use to the Armen-Directorium to provide housing for poor families in good standing. The lifestyles of the families were monitored, and occasional opportunities for employment existed. However, the families could be evicted for improper conduct. These barracks, which came to be called family houses, therefore provided an alternative to the workhouse. In contrast to these projects, accommodations in the family houses of the 1820s were rented on the "free housing market," without governmental supervision. See Johann Friedrich Geist and Klaus Kürvers, *Das Berliner Mietshaus, 1740–1862: Eine dokumentarische Geschichte der "von Wülcknitzschen Familienhäuser" vor dem Hamburger Tor*,

der Proletarisierung des Berliner Nordens und der Stadt im Übergang von der Residenz zur Metropole (Munich, 1980), 167.

27. See, for example, LAB (STA), Rep. 03/1055, bl. 77–78 (1827).

28. LAB (STA), Rep. 03/637, bl. 28–29 (1832).

29. LAB (STA), Rep. 03/1055, bl. 4 (1824).

30. LAB (STA), Rep. 03/1055, bl. 204 (1831).

31. The monthly bulletins of the Directorate of the Administration for the Poor (*Monatsblatt der Armen-Direction*), for example, regularly printed statistics on the poor district where the family houses were located. See *Monatsblatt der Armen-Direction zu Berlin* 4 (1834): esp. 2–6, 38–39. See also the statements by the head of the Commission for the Poor in the district with the family houses: [Krahmer], “Bemerkungen über das Armenwesen und die öffentliche Armenpflege in Berlin, gesammelt bei einer 13jährigen Ausübung des Amtes, als Vorsteher einer Armen-Commission,” in J. P. Kux, *Berlin: Eine aus zuverlässigen Quellen geschöpfte genaue und neueste Charakteristik und Statistik dieser Residenz und ihrer Umgebung: Nebst einer ausführlichen Abhandlung über das Berliner Armenwesen und dessen Mängel, von einem vieljährigen Armenpfleger* (Berlin, 1842), 249–342.

32. The package included the Law on the Acceptance of Recently Arriving Persons (Gesetz über die Aufnahme neu anziehender Personen), the Law on the Obligation to Care for the Poor (Gesetz über die Verpflichtung zur Armenpflege), and the Law on Acquiring and Losing the Status of a Prussian Subject and on Entering Foreign Civil Services (Gesetz über die Erwerbung und den Verlust der Eigenschaft als Preußischer Unterthan so wie über den Eintritt in fremde Staatsdienste), all 31 December 1842, and the Law on Punishing Vagrants, Beggars, and the Idle (Gesetz über die Bestrafung der Landstreicher, Bettler, und Arbeitsscheuen), 6 January 1843; see *Monatsblatt für die Armen-Verwaltung zu Berlin* 6, supplement (1843): 26–37. On the nature of the compromise, see Dieter Langewiesche, “‘Staat’ oder ‘Kommune’: Zum Wandel der Staatsaufgaben in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert,” *Historische Zeitschrift* 248 (1989): 628; Harald Schinkel, “Armenpflege und Freizügigkeit in der preußischen Gesetzgebung vom Jahre 1842,” *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 50 (1963): 459–79.

33. In 1846, the brothels in Berlin were closed; however, in 1852 the police reinstated the policy of toleration (Dietlind Hüchtker, “Prostitution und städtische Öffentlichkeit: Die Debatte über die Präsenz von Bordellen in Berlin, 1792–1846,” in *Ordnung, Politik, und Geselligkeit der Geschlechter im 18. Jahrhundert*, ed. Ulrike Weckel, Claudia Opitz, Claudia Hochstrasser, and Birgitte Tolkemitt [Göttingen, 1998], 345–64).

34. See Klaus-Jürgen Matz, *Pauperismus und Bevölkerung: Die gesetzlichen Ehebeschränkungen in den süddeutschen Staaten während des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart, 1980).

35. Similar campaigns also existed at that time in other cities. See Karin Gröwer, “‘Wilde Ehen’ in den hanseatischen Unterschichten, 1814–1871,”

Archiv für Sozialgeschichte 38 (1998): 1–22; see also Helga Zöttlein, “‘Unzüchtige’ Frauen—‘Unzüchtige’ Männer: Nichteheliche Paarbeziehungen in der kurhessischen Landstadt Zierenberg im Vormärz,” *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 38 (1998): 23–40.

36. LAB (STA), Rep. 03/637, bl. 9 (1822). Not until the passage of the cabinet ordinance of 4 October 1810 were the police allowed to intervene in cases of extramarital intercourse and cohabitation (Carl Röhrmann, *Der sittliche Zustand von Berlin nach Aufhebung der geduldeten Prostitution des weiblichen Geschlechts* [1846; Leipzig, 1987], 22).

37. LAB (STA), Rep. 03/641 bl. 2 (1828).

38. *Ibid.*

39. *Ibid.*

40. LAB (STA), Rep. 03/357, bl. 2 (1821).

41. BLHA, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C 16924, bl. 7 (1828). Police headquarters responded that everything the Direction of the Poverty Office proposed had long since been prohibited (BLHA, Pr. Br. Rep. 30 Berlin C 16924, bl. 9 [1828]). The Direction’s reference to “people for whom there is no legal obstacle to marriage” simply acknowledges that cohabitation was illegal for blood relatives and for individuals married to others.

42. See, for example, LAB (STA), Rep. 03/641, bl. 2–8 (1828).

43. LAB (STA), Rep. 03/637, bl. 30 (1832).

44. LAB (STA), Rep. 03/637, bl. 81 (1835).

45. F. K. Merker, *Die Hauptquellen der Verbrechen gegen die Eigenthums-Sicherheit in Berlin, mit Hindeutung auf die Möglichkeit der Verminderung derselben* (Berlin, 1839), 11–13.

46. See Isabel V. Hull, “Sexualstrafrecht und geschlechtsspezifische Normen in den deutschen Staaten des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts,” in *Frauen in der Geschichte des Rechts: Von der frühen Neuzeit bis zur Gegenwart*, ed. Ute Gerhard (Munich, 1997), 225; see also Beate Harms-Ziegler, “Außereheliche Mutterschaft in Preußen im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert,” in *Frauen*, ed. Gerhard, 341; Dietlind Hüchtker, “‘Unsittlichkeit’ als Kristallisationspunkt von Unsicherheit: Prostitutionspolitik in Berlin (1800–1850),” in *Unsichere Großstädte—Vom Mittelalter bis zur Postmoderne*, ed. Martin Dinges and Fritz Sack (Constance, 2000), 175–96.

47. LAB (STA), Rep. 03/362, bl. 20 (1831).

48. Geist and Kürvers, *Berliner Mietshaus*, 150–63; Richard J. Evans, *Tod in Hamburg: Stadt, Gesellschaft, und Politik in den Cholera-Jahren, 1830–1910* (Reinbek, 1990), 294–329.

49. LAB (STA), Rep. 03/362, bl. 13 (1831).

50. LAB (STA), Rep. 03/1055, bl. 209 (1831).

51. *Bekanntmachung der Armen-Direction*, quoted in C.S., “Berliner Armenwesen,” *Beiträge zur Erleichterung des Gelingens der practischen Polizei* 14 (1836): 287.

52. See the similar description by Kraher, “Bemerkungen,” 292–93,

which leads to the assumption that girls fall prey to prostitution and boys to theft. See also Ernst Dronke, *Berlin* (1846; Darmstadt, 1987); on the persistence of the stereotype, see also Walter Benjamin, *Berliner Kindheit um Neunzehnhundert* (Frankfurt, 1991), 127.

53. On the dichotomy of the social order in general, see, for example, Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York, 1979), 3–7; Peter Stallybrass and Allon White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (London, 1986), 3–6.

54. On the family as an early modern principle of order, see Susan Dwyer Amussen, *An Ordered Society: Gender and Class in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1988), 1–7.

55. See, for example, Karin Stammner, “Die hilflose Frau: Die Neudefinition der Geschlechterverhältnisse in den Sozialreform-Diskussionen in Deutschland um 1850,” in *Orte der Geschlechtergeschichte: Beiträge zur 7. Schweizerischen Historikerinnentagung*, ed. Franziska Jenny, Gudrun Piller, and Barbara Rettenmund (Zurich, 1994), 253–68.

56. See Jürgen Schlumbohm, “Gesetze, die nicht durchgesetzt werden—ein Strukturmerkmal des frühneuzeitlichen Staates?” *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 23 (1997): 647–63.