

NOTES

Preface and Acknowledgments

1. These twin quotations come respectively from George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1949), and George Santayana, *The Life of Reason* (New York: Charles Scribner, 1905). I've taken my versions from Anthony Jay, ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of Political Quotations*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 276, 314.

2. The first quoted phrase is taken from the jacket description of Alun Munslow and Robert A. Rosenstone, eds., *Experiments in Rethinking History* (New York: Routledge, 2004); the second from the title of Richard J. Evans, *In Defence of History* (London: Granta, 1997).

3. Sylvia Thrupp (1903–97) was born in England but migrated to British Columbia with her family at the age of five. She received her Ph.D. from the University of London in 1931, returning to Canada in 1935 where she taught first at the University of British Columbia (1935–44) and then at the University of Toronto (1945). From 1945 to 1961 she taught at the University of Chicago. Together with many articles on guilds and historical demography, she published two major books, *The Worshipful Company of Bakers of London* (London: Galleon Press, 1933), and *The Merchant Class of Medieval London, 1300–1500* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1989; orig. pub. 1948). A collection of her essays was published as Raymond Grew and Nicholas H. Steneck, eds., *Society and History: Essays by Sylvia L. Thrupp* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1977).

4. Stuart Hall, "Notes on Deconstructing 'the Popular,'" in Raphael Samuel, ed., *People's History and Socialist Theory* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981), 239.

Chapter 1

1. To take one small, but telling, example, at the end of my Oxford bachelor's degree program, in summer 1970, my history finals consisted of

eight three-hour sit-down exams covering the entirety of my studies during the previous three years, including a chosen period of European history. By distributing questions on either side of World War I, the examiners for “Europe, 1856–1939” contrived to end the first part of the exam in 1914 and open the second part in 1918, thereby conveniently abolishing the Russian Revolution. Yet I can’t have been the only undergraduate during 1967–70 to have devoted a big part of my studies to understanding the crisis of czarism and the Bolshevik seizure of power. In general, the Oxford history curriculum of those years remained a chipped and crumbling monument to a dusty and cloistered lack of imagination, against which the efforts of the undergraduate History Reform Group, dating from 1961, made absolutely no impact. My proudest undergraduate accomplishment was to have been denounced to the faculty board by Regius Professor Hugh Trevor-Roper (aka Lord Dacre) in 1970 for editing the History Reform Group’s duplicated journal, *The Oxford Historian*. For the forming of the group, see Tim Mason, “What of History?” *The New University* 8 (December 1961), 13–14. The occasion of Mason’s article was a review of E. H. Carr’s *What Is History?*—a key reference point for my generation of historians. See Richard J. Evans’s useful introduction to the new edition, in Edward Hallett Carr, *What Is History?* (Houndmills: Palgrave, 2001), ix–xlvii.

2. Winston Churchill, *The Second World War*, 6 vols. (London: Cassell, 1948–54); Arthur Bryant, *The Years of Endurance, 1793–1892* (New York: Harper, 1942) and *The Years of Victory, 1802–1812* (New York: Harper, 1945). For the Churchill documentary, see *Winston Churchill: The Valiant Years* (Jack Le Vien, BBC, 1961).

3. See A. J. P. Taylor, *Politics in Wartime and Other Essays* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1964) and *From Napoleon to Lenin: Historical Essays* (New York: Harper and Row, 1966). Books by Taylor that formed my first substantial introduction to German history include *The Course of German History: A Survey of the Development of Germany since 1815* (London: Methuen, 1961; orig. pub. 1946), *The Struggle for Mastery in Europe, 1848–1918* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), *Bismarck, the Man and the Statesman* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1955), and *The Origins of the Second World War* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1961).

4. The debate over Geoffrey R. Elton’s *The Tudor Revolution in Government: Administrative Changes in the Reign of Henry VIII* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953) and his edited volume *The Tudor Constitution: Documents and Commentary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960) was launched by G. L. Harriss and Penry Williams, in “A Revolution in Tudor History?” *Past and Present* 25 (July 1963), 3–58, followed by J. P. Cooper (26 [November 1963], 110–12), G. R. Elton (29 [December

1964], 26–49), Harriss and Williams (31 [July 1965], 87–96), and Elton (32 [December 1965], 103–9). The critique of A. J. P. Taylor's *Origins* appeared in Timothy W. Mason, "Some Origins of the Second World War," *Past and Present*, 29 (December 1964), 67–87, with response by Taylor in "War Origins Again" (30 [April 1965], 110–13). The articles on the general crisis of the seventeenth century were collected in Trevor H. Aston, ed., *Crisis in Europe, 1560–1660: Essays from Past and Present* (London: Routledge, 1965).

5. See Fernand Braudel, *La Méditerranée et le monde méditerranéen à l'époque de Philippe II*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Paris: Colin, 1966), translated as *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*, 2 vols. (London: Collins, 1972–73).

6. Valerie Walkerdine, "Dreams from an Ordinary Childhood," in Liz Heron, ed., *Truth, Dare or Promise: Girls Growing Up in the Fifties* (London: Virago, 1985), 77. Walkerdine captures the disjunction perfectly (64): "I didn't have an affair at fourteen, join the Communist Party at sixteen, go off to paint in Paris, or live in an ashram in India. Childhood fantasies of getting out, of being rich and famous abounded, but in the circles I moved in there had been only two ways to turn the fantasy into the dream-lived-as-real of bourgeois life, and they were to marry out or work my way out. It is the latter which, for that first moment of the fifties, lay open to me. For that moment of the postwar educational expansion fueled my puny and innocent little dreams as I grew up, the epitome of the hard-working, conservative and respectable working-class girl." I'm grateful to Frank Mort for reminding me of this essay. For the classic statement of this kind, see also Raymond Williams, "Culture Is Ordinary," *Resources of Hope: Culture, Democracy, Socialism* (London: Verso, 1989), 3–18.

7. Edward P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (London: Gollancz, 1963; paperback ed., Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968).

8. Paul Slack is now professor of early modern social history at Oxford and the principal of Linacre College. He came to play a key role in the journal *Past and Present* (prominently discussed in chapter 2), joining its editorial board in 1978 and acting as its editor from 1986 to 1994; in 2000, he became chairman of its board. See Paul Slack, *The Impact of Plague in Tudor and Stuart England* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985); *Poverty and Policy in Tudor and Stuart England* (London: Longman, 1988); *From Reformation to Improvement: Public Welfare in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999). See also Paul Slack, ed., *Rebellion, Popular Protest, and the Social Order in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); Terence Ranger and Paul Slack, eds., *Epidemics and Ideas: Essays on the Historical Perception of Pestilence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,

1992); Peter Burke, Brian Harrison, and Paul Slack, eds., *Civil Histories: Essays Presented to Sir Keith Thomas* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

9. Of course, this observation does not apply only to historians on the left. Since the 1970s, conservatives of many kinds, including not a few liberals, have spent inordinate time and energy opposing, dismissing, and regretting the arrival of women's history (and often the arrival of women themselves) in the discipline. My favorite example is of a former colleague at the University of Michigan, a relatively young and not terribly conservative full professor, who marked his departure from the department in the early 1990s with a letter to the dean in which the professor attacked his late home for turning into a department of gender history and cultural studies.

10. In making this argument, I'm very conscious of my own social and cultural hybridity, which travels back and forth between a set of lasting Anglo-British or European affiliations and those influences and exigencies far more specific to the United States.

11. See Joan Wallach Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," *American Historical Review* 91 (1986), 1053–75, reprinted in *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 28–50.

12. Many autobiographical reflections by historians might be cited in illustration of my argument here. Recent memoirs by Eric Hobsbawm (*Interesting Times: A Twentieth-Century Life* [New York: Pantheon, 2002]) and Sheila Rowbotham (*Promise of a Dream: Remembering the Sixties* [London: Allen Lane, 2000]) are especially relevant to the contexts described in this book. The interview is likewise an extremely revealing contemporary form: see, for example, Henry Abelove et al., eds., *Visions of History: Interviews with E. P. Thompson, Eric Hobsbawm, Sheila Rowbotham, Linda Gordon, Natalie Zemon Davis, William Appleman Williams, Staughton Lynd, David Montgomery, Herbert Gutman, Vincent Harding, John Womack, C. L. R. James, Moshe Lewin* (New York: Pantheon, 1984). See also the regular "Historical Passions" feature in *History Workshop Journal*, especially Cora Kaplan, "Witchcraft: A Child's Story," 41 (spring 1996), 254–60; Denise Riley, "Reflections in the Archive?" 44 (autumn 1997), 238–42; Joan Thirsk, "Nature versus Nurture," 47 (spring 1999), 273–77. See, above all, Carlo Ginzburg's eloquent and moving reflections in "Witches and Shamans," *New Left Review* 200 (July–August 1993), 75–85.

13. Eric J. Hobsbawm, "From Social History to the History of Society," *Daedalus* 100 (1971), 20–45.

Chapter 2

1. Eric Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movement in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Manchester: Manchester

University Press, 1959) and *Labouring Men: Studies in the History of Labour* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1964); George Rudé, *The Crowd in the French Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959) and *The Crowd in History: A Study of Popular Disturbances in France and England, 1730–1848* (New York: Wiley, 1964); Edward P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (London: Gollancz, 1963; paperback ed., Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968).

2. Eric Hobsbawm and George Rudé, *Captain Swing: A Social History of the Great English Agricultural Uprising of 1830* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1968).

3. See Geoff Eley, “John Edward Christopher Hill (1912–2003),” *History Workshop Journal* 56 (autumn 2003), 287–94.

4. Strictly speaking, this was Britain’s “second New Left,” identified generationally with the group around Perry Anderson, who assumed control of *New Left Review* in the early 1960s. The “first New Left” was an earlier realignment of the mid-1950s, through which a new generation of student leftists (including Stuart Hall, Charles Taylor, Gabriel Pearson, Raphael Samuel, and others) converged with an older cohort of Marxists leaving the Communist Party in 1956–57, among whom were Thompson, Hill, and some other historians. See Michael Kenny, *The First British New Left: British Intellectuals after Stalin* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1995).

5. Alexander Cockburn and Robin Blackburn, eds., *Student Power: Problems, Diagnosis, Action* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969); Trevor Pate-man, ed., *Counter Course: A Handbook in Course Criticism* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972); Robin Blackburn, ed., *Ideology in Social Science: Readings in Critical Social Theory* (London: Fontana, 1972).

6. Gareth Stedman Jones, “The Pathology of English History,” *New Left Review* 46 (November–December 1967), 29–43, reprinted as “History: The Poverty of Empiricism,” in Blackburn, *Ideology in Social Science*, 96–115; Perry Anderson, “Components of the National Culture,” in Cockburn and Blackburn, *Student Power*, 214–84, originally published in *New Left Review* 50 (July–August 1968), 3–57.

7. The first quotation is from Karl Marx, *Early Writings*, ed. Lucio Colletti (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975), 425; the second is from Friedrich Engels to Joseph Bloch, 21–22 September 1890, in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Selected Correspondence* (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965), 417.

8. I remember very well the first time I came out openly as a Marxist during my undergraduate years. In my final year, for a specialized seminar course entitled “Industrialism and the Growth of Governmental Power in the United States, 1865–1917,” I presented an extended essay in which I

applied an explicitly Marxist analysis to Populism. For someone still fresh to Marxist theory, this seemed a very big deal.

9. It should also be acknowledged that the excitement generated by Marxist culture and historiography at this time was also founded on the membership of a relatively closed community. There was relatively little dialogue with the established traditions of history writing, except via stern negative critique.

10. This diffusion of European theory into the English language had a complicated intellectual history, whose details can't be gone into here. Some influences migrated westward from dissident circles in Eastern Europe, including those of the *Praxis* group of philosophers in Yugoslavia, Georg Lukács in Hungary, Leszek Kolakowski and others in Poland, Karel Kosciak in Czechoslovakia, and new Marxist sociologists in Hungary and Poland. Others spread outward from Italy and France, where large Communist parties had secured relatively protected spaces for Marxist thinking inside the universities and the wider public sphere. In those countries without a large Communist Party, Marxism also acquired a few university footholds, as in West Germany with the influence of the Frankfurt School or Ernst Bloch in Tübingen. In much of continental Europe, in contrast to Britain, Communism's centrality for the antifascist resistance struggles of the 1940s had made a long-lasting space for Marxist ideas inside the national intellectual culture, despite the narrowing brought by the Cold War. This could be seen in France through the influence of such writers as Jean-Paul Sartre and such journals as *Les Temps modernes* and *Arguments* or in the wider prestige of structuralism. Trotskyism could also be a source of vitality, as could smaller intellectual networks, such as the French group *Socialisme ou Barbarie*, centered around Cornelius Castoriadis and Claude Lefort.

11. Laura Mulvey, quoted in Jonathan Green, *Days in the Life: Voices from the English Underground, 1961–1971* (London: Heineman Minerva, 1988), 11.

12. For a brief conspectus, see Robert Hewison, *Too Much: Art and Society in the Sixties, 1960–75* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 25–34. See also John R. Cook, *Dennis Potter: A Life on Screen* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), 23–61; Peter Stead, *Dennis Potter* (Bridgend: Seren Books, 1993), 44–73; Stuart Laing, “Banging in Some Reality: The Original ‘Z Cars,’” in John Corner, ed., *Popular Television in Britain: Studies in Cultural History* (London: BFI Publishing, 1991), 125–44.

13. See Perry Anderson, *Considerations on Western Marxism* (London: Verso, 1976).

14. The idea of an “epistemological break” separating Marx's mature thinking contained in *Capital* from the youthful philosophical critiques of the

early 1840s was proposed by the French Marxist philosopher Louis Althusser in his two works of 1965, *Pour Marx* and *Lire le Capital*, whose translation profoundly reshaped British Marxist discussion during the next decade. See Louis Althusser, *For Marx* (London: Allen Lane, 1969); Louis Althusser and Etienne Balibar, *Reading Capital* (London: New Left Books, 1970). Gregory Elliott provides detailed explication in *Althusser: The Detour of Theory* (London: Verso, 1987), 115–85. The pre-Althusserian temper of the times can be gauged from Erich Fromm, ed., *Socialist Humanism: An International Symposium* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965), which divides its thirty-five contributions into five subsections: “Humanism,” “Man,” “Freedom,” “Alienation,” and “Practice.” István Mészáros’s *Marx’s Theory of Alienation* (London: Merlin Press, 1970) remains the classic work of this type.

15. For the British New Left’s efforts at finding a “third space” from which the existing traditions of orthodox Communism and reformist social democracy could be critiqued, see Geoff Eley, *Forging Democracy: The History of the Left in Europe, 1850–2000* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 335–36, 353–56; Stuart Hall, “The ‘First’ New Left: Life and Times,” in Robin Archer et al., eds., *Out of Apathy: Voices of the New Left Thirty Years On* (London: Verso, 1989), 11–38; Michael Kenny, *The First New Left: British Intellectuals after Stalin* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1995); Lin Chun, *The British New Left* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993), 1–64.

16. Stuart Hall, quoted in Ronald Fraser et al., *1968: A Student Generation in Revolt* (New York: Pantheon, 1988), 30.

17. See Raymond Williams, *Culture and Society, 1780–1950* (London: Hogarth Press, 1958) and *The Long Revolution* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1961). The best introductions to Williams are Raymond Williams’s *Politics and Letters: Interviews with New Left Review* (London: New Left Books, 1979) and John Higgins’s *Raymond Williams: Literature, Marxism, and Cultural Materialism* (London: Routledge, 1999). Williams developed his idea of culture as “a whole way of life” initially in *Culture and Society*, 16. For “structures of feeling,” see Higgins, *Raymond Williams*, 37–42, which traces it back to the book Williams published with Michael Orrom in 1954, *Preface to Film* (London: Film Drama Limited). The phrase “the best which has been thought and said” was coined in 1869 by Matthew Arnold in *Culture and Anarchy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), 6. See Williams, *Culture and Society*, 120–36, and Lesley Johnson, *The Cultural Critics: From Matthew Arnold to Raymond Williams* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979), 2–4, 27–34.

18. I was certainly inspired by some individual historians (including several of my immediate teachers), but the strongest impetus—in terms of theory, general interpretation, and examples of best intellectual practice—

owed very little to the official culture of the discipline or the profession, where those interests were, on the contrary, subject to ridicule or disapproval. In large part, my sources of inspiration came entirely from the outside.

19. See especially John McIlroy and Sallie Westwood, eds., *Border Country: Raymond Williams in Adult Education* (Leicester: National Institute of Adult Continuing Education, 1993); Stephen Woodhams, *History in the Making: Raymond Williams, Edward Thompson, and Radical Intellectuals, 1936–1956* (London: Merlin Press, 2001); Williams's first two novels, *Border Country* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1960) and *Second Generation* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1964). This trajectory from early marginality and exclusion to subsequent prestige was replicated during the 1970s and 1980s by the first generation of British feminists, who invented and then helped institutionalize women's history. Before the 1990s (if at all), most of the pioneers—for example, Sheila Rowbotham, Sally Alexander, Anna Davin, and Catherine Hall—did not receive appointments and other forms of recognition within history as a discipline. See Carolyn Steedman, "The Price of Experience: Women and the Making of the English Working Class," *Radical History Review* 59 (spring 1994), 110–11; Terry Lovell, ed., *British Feminist Thought: A Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 21–27.

20. Edward P. Thompson, *The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays* (London: Merlin Press, 1978), 183.

21. Raymond Williams, quoted in Michael Green, "Raymond Williams and Cultural Studies," *Working Papers in Cultural Studies* 6 (autumn 1974), 34.

22. Raymond Williams, "Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory," *New Left Review* 82 (November–December 1973), 3–16; *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977).

23. Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, 82.

24. Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, 99, 82.

25. Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, ed. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971).

26. The reference is to Alfred Cobban's *The Social Interpretation of the French Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964). Cobban's critique rapidly became a general marker for anti-Marxist hostility among historians.

27. See Christopher Hill, review of *The Modern Prince and Other Writings*, by Antonio Gramsci, ed. Louis Marks, *New Reasoner* 4 (spring 1958), 107–30; Eric Hobsbawm, "The Great Gramsci," *New York Review of Books*, 4 April 1974, 39–44, and "Gramsci and Political Theory," *Marxism Today* 31 (July 1977), 205–13; Gwyn A. Williams, "The Concept of 'Egemonia' in

the Thought of Antonio Gramsci: Some Notes in Interpretation," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 21 (1960), 586–99.

28. Robbie Gray, "History," in Pateman, *Counter Course*, 280–93. See also Gray's subsequent monograph *The Labour Aristocracy in Victorian Edinburgh* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976).

29. See Eugene D. Genovese, "Marxian Interpretations of the Slave South," in Barton J. Bernstein, ed., *Towards a New Past: Dissenting Essays in American History* (New York: Pantheon, 1968), 90–125; "On Antonio Gramsci," *Studies on the Left* 7 (March–April 1967), 83–108. Both were reprinted in Genovese's collection *In Red and Black: Marxian Explorations in Southern and Afro-American History* (London: Allen Lane, 1971), 315–53, 391–422. *In Red and Black* was one of the very few books (like Edward P. Thompson's *Making and Hobsbawm's Labouring Men*) that I acquired in hardback in those days. The quotation is taken from *In Red and Black*, 348.

30. See Aileen S. Kraditor, "American Radical Historians on their Heritage," *Past and Present* 56 (August 1972), 136–53. Interestingly, both Genovese and Kraditor eventually ended their careers disavowing Marxism and the Left altogether.

31. One of these new universities, Sussex, generated great intellectual excitement in the second half of the sixties and was my second choice after Oxford when I applied for university entrance in 1966. In fall 1970, after graduating from Oxford, I entered the Sussex graduate program, whose interdisciplinary atmosphere seemed like a bracing gust of fresh air.

32. For a striking instance of such hostility, see Maurice Cowling, "Mr. Raymond Williams," *Cambridge Review*, 27 May 1961, 546–51 (the lead article), denouncing Raymond Williams's appointment to the Cambridge English faculty. The author was a thirty-five-year-old right-wing historian, failed Conservative parliamentary candidate, and former journalist, who had recently moved to Peterhouse from Williams's new college, Jesus. Cowling attacked Williams contemptuously as a leader of the whole "group of English radicals, lapsed Stalinists, academic Socialists, and intellectual Trotskyites" who, "with others from the extra-mural boards, the community centers, and certain Northern universities," were politicizing and degrading national cultural life. Cowling concluded, "It should not be imagined that it is the function of the English scholar to engage in social criticism." Cowling emerged during the 1970s as a kind of *éminence grise* of Thatcherist intellectual Conservatism, helping found the Salisbury Group in 1977 and editing the emblematic volume *Conservative Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978). Among his many publications, see the bizarre, but erudite, *Religion and Public Doctrine in Modern England*, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Cam-

bridge University Press, 1980–2001). See also Maurice Cowling, “Raymond Williams in Retrospect,” *New Criterion* 8 (February 1990).

33. See Steven Lukes, *Émile Durkheim, His Life and Work: A Historical and Critical Study* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972).

34. Eric J. Hobsbawm, “From Social History to the History of Society,” *Daedalus* 100 (1971), 43.

35. The speed of social history’s acceptance can easily be exaggerated. As I experienced, it certainly had little imprint in Oxford in the 1960s and early 1970s. In 1971, a perfectly competent survey of historical studies, Arthur Marwick’s *The Nature of History* (London: Macmillan), avoided giving social history any treatment of its own.

36. *Social History* 1 (1976), 3.

37. Before leaving in 1961 for the new University of Sussex, Asa Briggs (born 1921) taught in Leeds, which was also the base of the Industrial Revolution historian Arthur J. Taylor and the Marxist Edward Thompson. Briggs originally worked on early nineteenth-century Birmingham and edited two volumes of pathbreaking local research, *Chartist Studies* (London: Macmillan, 1959) and (with John Saville) *Essays in Labour History* (London: Macmillan, 1960). The latter was a memorial volume for G. D. H. Cole, one of the earlier pioneers of labor history, going back to the interwar years. See also Adrian Wilson, “A Critical Portrait of Social History,” in Adrian Wilson, ed., *Rethinking Social History: English Society, 1570–1920, and Its Interpretation* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1993), 1–24; Miles Taylor, “The Beginnings of Modern British Social History?” *History Workshop Journal* 43 (spring 1997), 155–76.

38. In what follows, my desire to hold bibliographical citations to manageable proportions is no reflection on the relative importance of the several individuals I’ve omitted. For Christopher Hill, see my obituary essay cited in note 3 above, together with Penelope J. Corfield, “‘We Are All One in the Eyes of the Lord’: Christopher Hill and the Historical Meanings of Radical Religion,” *History Workshop Journal* 58 (autumn 2004), 111–27. For Rodney Hilton, see Peter Coss, “R. H. Hilton,” *Past and Present* 176 (August 2002), 7–10. For Dorothy Thompson, see her *Outsiders: Class, Gender, and Nation* (London: Verso, 1993) and “The Personal and the Political,” *New Left Review* 200 (July–August 1993), 87–100.

39. See Eric Hobsbawm, “The Historians’ Group of the Communist Party,” in Maurice Cornforth, ed., *Rebels and Their Causes: Essays in Honour of A. L. Morton* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1979), 21–47; Bill Schwarz, “‘The People’ in History: The Communist Party Historians’ Group, 1946–56,” in Richard Johnson et al., eds., *Making Histories: Studies in History-Writing and Politics* (London: Hutchinson, 1982), 44–95; Dennis Dworkin,

Cultural Marxism in Postwar Britain: History, the New Left, and the Origins of Cultural Studies (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997), 10–44; David Parker, “The Communist Party and Its Historians, 1946–89,” *Socialist History* 12 (1997), 33–58; Harvey J. Kaye, *The British Marxist Historians: An Introductory Analysis* (Oxford: Polity Press, 1984). For Dona Torr, see her *Tom Mann and His Times* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1956); John Saville, ed., *Democracy and the Labour Movement: Essays in Honor of Dona Torr* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1954); David Renton, “Opening the Books: The Personal Papers of Dona Torr,” *History Workshop Journal* 52 (autumn 2001), 236–45.

40. See the following works by Hobsbawm: *Labouring Men; Primitive Rebels; Captain Swing* (with George Rudé); *Bandits* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969); “Peasant Land Occupations,” *Past and Present* 62 (February 1974), 120–52; *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); *The Age of Revolution, 1789–1848* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1962); *The Age of Capital, 1848–1875* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1975); *The Age of Empire, 1872–1914* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1987); *The Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914–1992* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1994).

41. Kiernan’s works include *British Diplomacy in China, 1880 to 1885* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1939), *The Revolution of 1854 in Spanish History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), *The Lords of Human Kind: European Attitudes towards the Outside World in the Imperial Age* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969), *Marxism and Imperialism: Studies* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974), *America, the New Imperialism: From White Settlement to World Hegemony* (London: Zed Press, 1978), *State and Society in Europe, 1550–1650* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1980), *The Duel in History: Honour and the Reign of Aristocracy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), and *Tobacco: A History* (London: Radius, 1991).

42. See Rudé, *Crowd in the French Revolution; Wilkes and Liberty: A Social Study of 1763 to 1774* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962); *Crowd in History; Captain Swing* (with Eric Hobsbawm); *Protest and Punishment: The Story of Social and Political Protestors Transported to Australia, 1788–1868* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978).

43. See Raphael Samuel, ed., *Village Life and Labour* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975) and *Miners, Quarrymen, and Salt Workers* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977); Samuel, “History Workshop, 1966–80,” in Raphael Samuel, ed., *History Workshop: A Collectanea, 1967–1991; Documents, Memoirs, Critique, and Cumulative Index to “History Workshop Journal”* (Oxford: History Workshop, 1991). For Edward Thompson, see his *Making of the English Working Class*; Edward Thompson and Eileen

Yeo, eds., *The Unknown Mayhew: Selections from the Morning Chronicle, 1849–1850* (London: Merlin Press, 1971); Thompson, *Whigs and Hunters: The Origin of the Black Act* (London: Allen Lane, 1975); Thompson with Douglas Hay et al., *Albion's Fatal Tree: Crime and Society in Eighteenth-Century England* (London: Allen Lane, 1975); Thompson, *Customs in Common: Studies in Traditional Popular Culture* (London: Merlin Press, 1991).

44. See Arthur Leslie Morton, *A People's History of England* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1938). See also Harvey J. Kaye, "Our Island Story Retold: A. L. Morton and 'the People' in History," in *The Education of Desire: Marxists and the Writing of History* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 116–24; Margot Heinemann and Willie Thompson, eds., *History and Imagination: Selected Writings of A. L. Morton* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1990).

45. See the citations in notes 37–41 above. The easiest general introduction is in Kaye, *British Marxist Historians*.

46. Edward P. Thompson, "The Peculiarities of the English," in *Poverty of Theory*, 35–91. The relevant *New Left Review* articles are Perry Anderson's "Origins of the Present Crisis" (23 [January–February 1964], 26–54) and "The Myths of Edward Thompson, or Socialism and Pseudo-Empiricism" (35 [January–February 1966], 2–42) and Tom Nairn's "The English Working Class" (24 [March–April 1964], 45–57) and "The Anatomy of the Labour Party" (27 [September–October 1964], 38–65; 28 [November–December 1964], 33–62).

47. Both Saville and Harrison were movers of the Society for the Study of Labour History. With Asa Briggs, Saville coedited the volumes *Essays in Labour History* (London: Macmillan, 1960–71; Croom Helm, 1977). Between the 1950s and 1990s, he published prolifically on labor history. He edited the *Dictionary of Labour Biography*, which began in 1972 and reached its tenth volume by 2000 (London: Macmillan). On publishing his first book, *Before the Socialists: Studies in Labour and Politics, 1861–1881* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965), Harrison became a reader in politics at Sheffield University, having previously taught in the Extra-Mural Department. In 1970, he moved to the Warwick Center for the Study of Social History (created five years before by Edward Thompson), where he founded the Modern Records Center. He also became the official biographer for the Webbs, publishing the first volume, *Life and Times of Sydney and Beatrice Webb, 1858–1905: The Formative Years* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000), shortly before he died.

48. Arthur J. Taylor, ed., *The Standard of Living in Britain in the Industrial Revolution* (London: Methuen, 1975).

49. John Saville, *Rural Depopulation in England and Wales, 1851–1951* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957); G. E. Mingay, *English Landed*

Society in the Eighteenth Century (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963); F. M. L. Thompson, *English Landed Society in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1963); Hobsbawm and Rudé, *Captain Swing*.

50. The great works of Beatrice (1858–1943) and Sidney Webb (1859–1947) included the nine-volume *English Local Government from the Revolution to the Municipal Corporations Act* (London: Longmans, 1906–29), *The History of Trade Unionism* (London: Longmans, 1894), and *Industrial Democracy* (London: Longmans, 1897). G. D. H. Cole (1889–1959) published countless works between the early twentieth century and the 1950s, including the multivolume *History of Socialist Thought* (London: Macmillan, 1953–60); he coauthored, with Raymond Postgate, what remained for many years the best general history of British popular movements, *The Common People, 1746–1938* (London: Methuen, 1938). R. H. Tawney (1880–1962) published, among other works, *The Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth Century* (London: Longmans, 1912), the edited volume (with Eileen Power) *Tudor Economic Documents* (London: Longmans, 1924), *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism: A Historical Study* (London: Murray, 1926), *Land and Labour in China* (London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1932), and “The Rise of the Gentry, 1558–1640,” *Economic History Review* 11 (1941), 1–38. Tawney’s hugely influential political tracts include *The Acquisitive Society* (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1920) and *Equality* (London: Unwin, 1931). John (1872–1949) and Barbara Hammond (1873–1961) published a pioneering trilogy of works on the human costs of industrialization. Their *The Village Labourer, 1760–1832* (London: Longmans, 1911), *The Town Labourer, 1760–1832* (London: Longmans, 1917), and *The Skilled Labourer, 1760–1832* (London: Longmans, 1919) exercised enormous influence on Thompson’s project. In general, see David Sutton, “Radical Liberalism, Fabianism, and Social History,” in Johnson et al., *Making Histories*, 15–43.

51. Anne Summers, “Thomas Hodgkin (1910–1982),” *History Workshop Journal* 14 (autumn 1982), 180–82. See especially Thomas Hodgkin, *Nationalism in Colonial Africa* (London: F. Muller, 1956); *Nigerian Perspectives: An Historical Anthology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960); *Vietnam: The Revolutionary Path* (London: Macmillan, 1981).

52. See especially Hobsbawm, *Primitive Rebels; Bandits; “Peasants and Politics,”* *Journal of Peasant Studies* 1 (1973), 1–22.

53. See Christopher Hill, Rodney Hilton, and Eric Hobsbawm, “Past and Present: Origins and Early Years,” *Past and Present* 100 (August 1983), 3–14. In the previous year (1957), the social anthropologist Max Gluckman, the sociologist Philip Abrams, and the agrarian historian Joan Thirsk had also joined the board.

54. Trevor Aston, ed., *Crisis in Europe, 1560–1660* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965).

55. Aston, *Crisis in Europe*, 5.

56. See John H. Elliott, “The Decline of Spain,” *Past and Present* 20 (November 1961), 52–75; *The Revolt of the Catalans* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963); *Imperial Spain, 1469–1716* (London: Edward Arnold, 1963); “Revolution and Continuity in Early Modern Europe,” *Past and Present* 42 (February 1969), 35–56; “Self-Perception and Decline in Early Seventeenth-Century Spain,” *Past and Present* 74 (February 1977), 41–61. For the subsequent course of the general debate, see Geoffrey Parker and Lesly M. Smith, eds., *The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978).

57. See especially Philip Abrams, *Historical Sociology* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982).

58. Worsley’s first book was *The Trumpet Shall Sound: A Study of “Cargo” Cults in Melanesia* (London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1957), in some ways a parallel text to Hobsbawm’s *Primitive Rebels*. He then published *The Third World* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1964), followed two decades later by *The Three Worlds: Culture and Development* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1984), together with diverse other publications, including *Marx and Marxism* (London: Tavistock, 1982). He held the chair of sociology at Manchester since 1964 and was president of the British Sociological Association in 1971–74.

59. Georges Lefebvre, in *Les Paysans du Nord pendant la Revolution française* (Bari: Laterza, 1959; orig. pub. 1924) and *The Great Fear of 1789: Rural Panic in Revolutionary France* (Paris: A. Colin, 1932), and Albert Soboul, in *Les Sans-culottes Parisiens en l’An II* (Paris: Librairie Clavreuil, 1958), produced innovative and inspiring classics of social history.

60. See Ernest Labrousse, *La crise de l’économie française à la fin de l’Ancien Régime et au début de la Revolution* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1944).

61. See Peter Burke, *Sociology and History* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1980), 25.

62. Marc Bloch, *The Royal Touch: Sacred Monarchy and Scrofula in England and France* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973; orig. pub., in French, 1924).

63. Lucien Febvre, *Un destin: Martin Luther* (Paris: Rieder, 1928); *The Problem of Unbelief in the Sixteenth Century: The Religion of Rabelais* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982; orig. pub., in French, 1942).

64. Marc Bloch, *French Rural History: An Essay on Its Basic Characteristics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966; orig. pub., in French,

1931); *Feudal Society* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961; orig. pub., in French, 1939–40).

65. Braudel, *Mediterranean; Civilization and Capitalism, 15th–18th Century*, 3 vols. (New York: Harper and Row, 1981–84; orig. pub., in French, pub. 1979).

66. See Olivia Harris, “Braudel: Historical Time and the Horror of Discontinuity,” *History Workshop Journal* 57 (spring 2004), 161–74.

67. See especially John L. Harvey’s fascinating article “An American *Annales*? The AHA and the *Revue internationale d’histoire économique* of Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch,” *Journal of Modern History* 76 (2004), 578–621.

68. François Furet and Adeline Daumard in 1959, quoted in Georg G. Iggers, *New Directions in European Historiography* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1984), 66.

69. See Peter Burke, ed., *Economy and Society in Early Modern Europe: Essays from “Annales”* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972). For the reception of Braudel’s work, see, above all, John A. Marino, “The Exile and His Kingdom: The Reception of Braudel’s *Mediterranean*,” *Journal of Modern History* 76 (2004), 622–52. Interestingly in light of my own argument about the externality of impulses toward historiographical innovation, Marino stresses Braudel’s time spent in Algeria (1923–32), Brazil (1935–38), and German prisoner-of-war camps (1940–45). See also Howard Caygill, “Braudel’s Prison Notebooks,” *History Workshop Journal* 57 (spring 2004), 151–60.

70. For the details of the reception, see Peter Burke, *The French Historical Revolution: The “Annales” School, 1919–1989* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999); François Dosse, *New History in France: The Triumph of “Annales”* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984); Traian Stoianovich, *French Historical Method: The “Annales” Paradigm* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1976); Stuart Clark, ed., *The “Annales” School: Critical Assessments*, 4 vols. (London: Routledge, 1999); Carole Fink, *Marc Bloch: A Life in History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Matthias Middell, “The *Annales*,” in Stefan Berger, Heiko Feldner, and Kevin Passmore, eds., *Writing History: Theory and Practice* (London: Arnold, 2003), 104–17.

71. See especially the testimony of Eric Hobsbawm’s “British History and the *Annales*: A Note” and “Marx and History,” in *On History* (New York: New Press, 1997), 178–85, 187. Labrousse worked at the school’s core, where Lefebvre’s relationship to *Annales* was more oblique. See especially Labrousse, *La crise de l’économie française*; “1848, 1830, 1789: Comment naissant les révolutions?” in *Actes du congrès historique du centenaire de la Révolution de 1848* (Paris, 1948), 1–21. Simultaneously sympathetic to Marxism and close to *Annales*, Lefebvre held the chair of the history of the French Revolu-

tion at the Sorbonne from 1937 to 1945 and formed the strongest bridge between the two traditions. See Richard Cobb, “Georges Lefebvre,” in *A Second Identity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), 84–100. At the core of the *Annales* school, the medievalist Guy Bois and the Catalan historian Pierre Vilar were also Marxists. See Guy Bois, *The Crisis of Feudalism: Economy and Society in Eastern Normandy c. 1300–1550* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984; orig. pub., in French, 1976); Pierre Vilar, *La Catalogne dans l’Espagne moderne: Recherches sur les fondements économiques des structures nationales* (Paris: S.E.V.P.E.N., 1962) and *A History of Gold and Money, 1450–1920* (London: New Left Books, 1976).

72. Quoted in Martine Bondonio Morris, “Ernest Labrousse, 1895–1988,” in Kelly Boyd, ed., *Encyclopedia of Historians and Historical Writing* (London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1999), 1:677. For the next generation of *Annalistes*, this spelled a belief in social science and quantification every bit as dogmatic as the rigidified Marxism of the Stalinist era—not surprisingly, perhaps, as several of the generation’s leading voices (including François Furet, Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, and Denis Richet) began their adult lives in the French Communist Party in the late 1940s and early 1950s, as loyal Stalinists. See Dosse, *New History in France*, 182–98.

73. See here the reflections of Pierre Vilar, a Marxist member of the *Annales* school, in “Marxist History, a History in the Making: Towards a Dialogue with Althusser,” *New Left Review* 80 (July–August 1973), 65–106. See also Gregor McLennan, *Marxism and the Methodologies of History* (London: Verso, 1981), 129–51; Christopher Lloyd, *Explanation in Social History* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), 243–60. Hobsbawm’s recent restatement of Marxism’s foundational standpoint reflects this materialist convergence with the classical *Annaliste* perspectives: “Such a framework must be based on the one element of directional change in human affairs which is observable and objective, irrespective of our subjective or contemporary wishes and value-judgments, namely the persistent and increasing capacity of the human species to control the forces of nature by means of manual and mental labor, technology, and the organization of production” (“What Can History Tell Us about Contemporary Society?” in *On History*, 31).

74. A good example was the flourishing of Marxology, or the more academic criticism of Marxist thought, which, in these years, escaped from the publishing houses of the Communist parties and the larger ultra-left-wing sects. The most widely circulated anthologies and commentaries were published by non-Marxist or, at least, nonaffiliated progressives, with commercial publishers. See, for example, Lewis B. Feuer, ed., *Marx and Engels: Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy* (London: Fontana, 1969); Arthur P. Mendel, ed., *Essential Works of Marxism* (New York: Bantam, 1961); T. B.

Bottomore and Maximilien Rubel, eds., *Karl Marx: Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963); C. Wright Mills, *The Marxists* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1963); Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*, with an introduction by A. J. P. Taylor (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967). The culmination came with David McLellan's biography *Karl Marx: His Life and Thought* (London: Macmillan, 1973) and the launching of the Pelican Marx Library (in association with *New Left Review*), whose first title was Martin Nicolaus's long awaited edited volume *Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy (Rough Draft)* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973).

75. See Eric Hobsbawm, *Interesting Times: A Twentieth-Century Life* (New York: Pantheon, 2002), 347.

76. See especially Seymour Martin Lipset and Richard Hofstadter, eds., *Sociology and History: Methods* (New York: Basic Books, 1968); Robert F. Berkhofer, Jr., *A Behavioral Approach to Historical Analysis* (New York: Free Press, 1969). One of the best critical surveys of this enduring syndrome is Terrence J. McDonald's "What We Talk about When We Talk about History: The Conversations of History and Sociology," in Terrence J. McDonald, ed., *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), 91–118.

77. Several other journals, such as *Politics and Society* and *Theory and Society* (launched in 1970 and 1974, respectively), had less involvement by historians (by formal disciplinary affiliation) but shared the same intellectual moment.

78. Peter Laslett, *The World We Have Lost*, 2nd ed. (London: Methuen, 1971), 241–52, 20.

79. An excellent example would be Michael Anderson's devastating critique of Neil J. Smelser's influential and impressive *Social Change in the Industrial Revolution: An Application of Theory to the British Cotton Industry* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959). See Michael Anderson, "Sociological History and the Working-Class Family: Smelser Revisited," *Social History* 1 (1976), 317–34.

80. The two biggest monuments to the Cambridge Group's program of "social structural history" were the proceedings of a conference organized by Laslett in 1969, which assembled twenty-two international demographers in Cambridge to assess the idea of progressive nucleation, and the massively erudite general history of British population published by Wrigley and Schofield in 1981, which formed the apogee of the group's achievement. In each case, the broader implications remained unclear. See Peter Laslett, ed., *Household and Family in Past Time: Comparative Studies in the Size and Structure of the Domestic Group over the Last Three Centuries in England, France, Serbia, Japan,*

and Colonial North America, with Further Materials from Western Europe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972); E. A. Wrigley and Roger Schofield, *The Population History of England, 1541–1871: A Reconstruction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

81. Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, *The Peasants of Languedoc* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1974). See Robert Brenner's classic critique "Agrarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-Industrial Europe," *Past and Present* 70 (February 1976), 30–74; "The Origins of Capitalist Development: A Critique of Neo-Smithian Marxism," *New Left Review* 104 (July–August 1977), 25–92; "The Agrarian Roots of European Capitalism," *Past and Present* 97 (November 1982), 16–113. The surrounding debates were collected in Trevor H. Aston and C. H. E. Philpin, eds., *The Brenner Debates: Agrarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-Industrial Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

82. See Edward Shorter, *The Making of the Modern Family* (London: Fontana, 1976); Lawrence Stone, *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500–1800* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1977).

83. See Peter Kriedte, Hans Medick, and Jürgen Schlumbohm, *Industrialization before Industrialization: Rural Industry in the Genesis of Capitalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981; orig. pub., in German, 1977). The term *protoindustry* was a coinage of the economic historian Franklin Mendel: see his "Proto-Industrialization: The First Phase of the Industrialization Process," *Journal of Economic History* 32 (1972), 241–61.

84. Edward P. Thompson, "Under the Same Roof-Tree," *Times Literary Supplement*, 4 May 1973. For Thompson's critique of Lawrence Stone and Edward Shorter, see his "Happy Families," *New Society*, 8 September 1977, reprinted in Thompson, *Making History: Writings on History and Culture* (New York: New Press, 1994), 299–309.

85. See especially David Levine, *Family Formation in an Age of Nascent Capitalism* (New York: Academic Press, 1977) and *Reproducing Families: The Political Economy of English Population History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); Charles Tilly, ed., *Historical Studies of Changing Fertility* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978); Tilly, "Demographic Origins of the European Proletariat," in David Levine, ed., *Proletarianization and Family History* (Orlando: Academic Press, 1984), 1–85; Wally Seccombe, "Marxism and Demography," *New Left Review* 137 (January–February 1983), 22–47; Seccombe, *A Millennium of Family Change: Feudalism to Capitalism in Northwestern Europe* (London: Verso, 1992); Seccombe, *Weathering the Storm: Working-Class Families from the Industrial Revolution to the Fertility Decline* (London: Verso, 1993).

86. For Medick's work, see also "The Proto-Industrial Family Econ-

omy: The Structural Function of Household and Family during the Transition from Peasant Society to Industrial Capitalism,” *Social History* 1 (1976), 291–315; “Plebeian Culture in the Transition to Capitalism,” in Raphael Samuel and Gareth Stedman Jones, eds., *Culture, Ideology and Politics: Essays for Eric Hobsbawm* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983), 84–113.

87. Peter Laslett, *Family Life and Illicit Love in Earlier Generations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).

88. See H. J. Dyos, ed., *The Study of Urban History* (London: Edward Arnold, 1968).

89. See Derek Fraser and Anthony Sutcliffe, eds., *The Pursuit of Urban History* (London: Edward Arnold, 1983); and for Dyos’s posthumously collected essays, David Cannadine and David Reeder, eds., *Exploring the Urban Past: Essays in Urban History by H. J. Dyos* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982). See also the two-volume showcase Dyos edited with Michael Wolff, *The Victorian City: Images and Realities* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973), which assembled scholars from many disciplines to analyze all aspects of nineteenth-century urbanization, from economic, social, political, institutional, and cultural points of view.

90. See Philippe Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1962; orig. pub., in French, 1960). Much pioneering work was subsumed in studies of the family, especially in U.S. history, where demographic and psychoanalytic approaches held early sway: for the former, see John Demos, *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony* (London: Oxford University Press, 1970); for the latter, Lloyd DeMause, ed., *The History of Childhood* (New York: Psychohistory Press, 1974). Early surveys included John R. Gillis, *Youth in History* (New York: Academic Press, 1974); C. John Somerville, “Toward a History of Childhood and Youth,” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 3 (1972), 438–47; and J. H. Plumb, “The New World of Children in Eighteenth-Century England,” *Past and Present* 58 (May 1975), 64–95. For an intermediate taking of stock, see Harry Hendrick, “The History of Childhood and Youth,” *Social History* 9 (1984), 87–96. Current surveys include Hugh Cunningham, *Children and Childhood in Western Society since 1500* (London: Longman, 1995), and Harry Hendrick, *Children, Childhood, and English Society, 1880–1990* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

91. The classic and hugely influential volume was Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson, eds., *Resistance through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain* (London: Hutchinson, 1976). For the sociology of deviance and radical criminology, see Stanley Cohen, ed., *Images of Deviance* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971); Ian Taylor and Laurie Taylor, eds., *Politics and Deviance* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973); Ian Taylor, Paul Walton, and Jock

Young, *The New Criminology* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973). Early historical work included Natalie Zemon Davis, "The Reasons of Misrule: Youth Groups and Charivaris in Sixteenth-Century France," *Past and Present* 50 (February 1971), 41–75; Susan Magarey, "The Invention of Juvenile Delinquency in Early Nineteenth-Century England," *Labour History* 34 (1978), 11–27; Stephen Humphries, *Hooligans or Rebels? An Oral History of Working-Class Childhood and Youth, 1889–1939* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1981); and Dieter Dowe, ed., *Jugendprotest und Generationenkonflikt in Europa im 20. Jahrhundert: Deutschland, England, Frankreich und Italien im Vergleich* (Bonn: Verlag Neue Gesellschaft, 1986).

92. The pioneering work was by Edward Thompson. See Thompson, *Whigs and Hunters*; Hay et al., *Albion's Fatal Tree*. For histories of imprisonment, the key work was Michael Ignatieff's *A Just Measure of Pain: The Penitentiary in the Industrial Revolution, 1750–1850* (London: Macmillan, 1978). For the wider research, see J. S. Cockburn, ed., *Crime in England, 1550–1800* (London: Methuen, 1977); V. A. C. Gatrell, Bruce Lenman, and Geoffrey Parker, eds., *Crime and the Law: The Social History of Crime in Western Europe since 1500* (London: Europa, 1980); John Brewer and John Styles, eds., *An Ungovernable People: The English and Their Law in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1980); Stanley Cohen and Andrew Scull, eds., *Social Control and the State: Historical and Comparative Essays* (Oxford: Robertson, 1983).

93. See especially Charles Tilly, *The Vendée* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964); Charles Tilly and Edward Shorter, *Strikes in France, 1830–1968* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974); Charles Tilly, Louise Tilly, and Richard Tilly, *The Rebellious Century, 1830–1930* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975); Charles Tilly, "Reflections on the History of European Statemaking" and "Food Supply and Public Order in Modern Europe," in Charles Tilly, ed., *The Formation of National States in Western Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), 3–83, 380–455; Tilly, "Getting it Together in Burgundy, 1675–1975," *Theory and Society* 4 (1977), 479–504; Tilly, *From Mobilization to Revolution* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1978); Tilly, "Did the Cake of Custom Break?" in John M. Merriman, ed., *Consciousness and Class Experience in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1979), 17–44.

94. See Charles Tilly, *The Contentious French* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1986); *Popular Contention in Great Britain, 1758–1834* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995).

95. There are signs of recent change. See Charles Tilly, ed., *Citizenship, Identity, and Social History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); *Stories, Identities, and Political Change* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002).

96. Charles Tilly, *Contentious French*, 403–4.

97. See Edward P. Thompson, *William Morris: From Romantic to Revolutionary* (New York: Pantheon, 1976; orig. pub. 1955); Edward P. Thompson and T. J. Thompson, *There Is a Spirit in Europe: A Memoir of Frank Thompson* (London: Gollancz, 1947); Edward P. Thompson, ed., *The Railway: An Adventure in Construction* (London: British-Yugoslav Association, 1948); Thompson, "Socialist Humanism: An Epistle to the Philistines," *New Reasoner* 1, no. 1 (summer 1957), 105–43; Thompson, "Agency and Choice," *New Reasoner* 1, no. 5 (summer 1959), 89–106; Thompson, ed., *Out of Apathy* (London: Stevens and Sons/New Left Books, 1960).

98. See Hobsbawm, *Interesting Times*, 214; Gwyn A. Williams, *Artisans and Sans-Culottes: Popular Movements in France and Britain during the French Revolution* (London: Edward Arnold, 1968), 118.

99. Hobsbawm, *Interesting Times*, 214.

100. See Edward P. Thompson, ed., *Warwick University Ltd.* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970).

101. Edward P. Thompson, *Making of the English Working Class*, 12.

102. Edward P. Thompson, *Making of the English Working Class*, 9.

103. Edward P. Thompson, *Whigs and Hunters*; Hay et al., *Albion's Fatal Tree*.

104. The original sources for Thompson's essays were as follows: "Time, Work-Discipline, and Industrial Capitalism," *Past and Present* 38 (December 1967), 56–97; "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century," *Past and Present* 50 (February 1971), 76–136; "Rough Music: Le charivari anglais," *Annales: E.S.C.* 27 (1972), 285–312. "The Sale of Wives" was published for the first time in Thompson, *Customs in Common*, 404–66.

105. Hay et al., *Albion's Fatal Tree*, 13. For the wider interest in social histories of crime, see Cockburn, *Crime in England*; Gatrell, Lenman, and Parker, *Crime and the Law*; Brewer and Styles, *Ungovernable People*.

106. See Raphael Samuel, "The Social History Group, 1965–1974," in Samuel, *History Workshop: A Collectanea*, 85–91. Having formed among graduate students in British history at Nuffield College, the group moved to St. Antony's in 1968, internationalizing its composition and interests in the process. Original members included Gillian Sutherland, Brian Harrison, Gareth Stedman Jones, Angus Hone, Roderick Floud, Nuala O'Faolain, Peter Lowbridge, Raphael Samuel, Peter Burke (on sabbatical from Sussex), and Patricia Hollis. Also taking an interest was a lone senior member of the university, the eighteenth-century religious historian John Walsh.

107. See Stuart Hall, "Raphael Samuel, 1934–96," and Sheila Rowbotham, "Some Memories of Raphael," *New Left Review* 221 (January–February 1997), 119–27, 128–32.

108. Editorial introduction in Samuel, *History Workshop: A Collectanea*, IV–V.

109. For the inception of women's history in Britain, see Lovell, *British Feminist Thought*, 21–27; see also the reminiscences of Sheila Rowbotham, Anna Davin, Sally Alexander, and Catherine Hall, in Michelene Wandor, ed., *Once a Feminist: Stories of a Generation* (London: Virago, 1990), 28–42, 55–70, 81–92, 171–82. For Sheila Rowbotham's pioneering works, see *Resistance and Revolution* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972); *Hidden from History: 300 Years of Women's Oppression and the Fight against It* (London: Pluto Press, 1973); *Women's Consciousness, Man's World* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973). See also Sally Alexander, *Becoming a Woman and Other Essays in Nineteenth and Twentieth-Century Feminist History* (New York: New York University Press, 1995), xi–xxi, 97–125, 249–53.

110. See Thompson's magisterial review of responses and appropriations of the "moral economy" argument in the two decades after the article's publication: Edward P. Thompson, "The Moral Economy Reviewed," in *Customs in Common*, 259–351. See also Roger Wells, "E. P. Thompson, 'Customs in Common' and 'Moral Economy,'" *Journal of Peasant Studies* 21 (1994), 263–307. For Thompson's influence in India, see, above all, Sumit Sarkar, "The Relevance of E. P. Thompson," in *Writing Social History* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997), 50–81; Rajnarayan Chandavarkar, "The Making of the Working Class: E. P. Thompson and Indian History," *History Workshop Journal* 43 (spring 1997), 177–96. Thompson's personal relationship to India ran through his father, Edward John Thompson (1886–1946). A Methodist missionary and man of Indian letters, the elder Thompson taught in West Bengal during 1910–22; developed close friendships with Rabindranath Tagore, Jawaharlal Nehru, and other Indian intellectuals; and published widely on Indian history and Bengali culture. See Edward P. Thompson, *Alien Homage: Edward Thompson and Rabindranath Tagore* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1993); Sumit Sarkar, "Edward Thompson and India: The Other Side of the Medal," in Sarkar, *Writing Social History*, 109–58. For a careful and well-founded critique of this relationship, see Robert Gregg and Madhavi Kale, "The Empire and Mr. Thompson: Making of Indian Princes and English Working Class," *Economic and Political Weekly* 32, no. 36 (6 September 1997), 2273–88. See also Frederick Cooper, "Work, Class, and Empire: An African Historian's Retrospective on E. P. Thompson," *Social History* 20 (1995), 235–41.

111. By the later meetings, the international range of the invited participation had greatly broadened. The long-term core included David William Cohen, Alf Lüdtke, Hans Medick, and Gerald Sider. The first roundtable, on "work processes" and held in Göttingen in 1978, produced a volume edited

by Robert Berdahl et al., *Klassen und Kultur: Sozialanthropologische Perspektiven in der Geschichtsschreibung* (Frankfurt am Main: Syndikat, 1982); the second met in Paris in 1980, leading to an edited volume by Hans Medick and David Sabean, *Interest and Emotion: Essays on the Study of Family and Kinship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984); the third and fourth, meeting in Bad Homburg in 1982–83, considered issues of “domination/*Herrschaft*” and culminated in Alf Lüdtke’s edited volume *Herrschaft als soziale Praxis: Historische und social-anthropologische Studien* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1991); the fifth and sixth extended through 1985–89 and eventually led to an edited volume by Gerald Sider and Gavin Smith, *Between History and Histories: The Making of Silences and Commemorations* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997). For an account of this particular history, see David William Cohen, *The Combing of History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 1–23.

112. For the less appealing side of this characteristic, see Jonathan Rée, “E. P. Thompson and the Drama of Authority,” *History Workshop Journal* 47 (spring 1999), 211–21.

113. Williams, *Politics and Letters*, 97–98. In this respect, Thompson’s literary interests are especially pertinent. See Edward P. Thompson, *Witness against the Beast: William Blake and the Moral Law* (New York: New Press, 1993); *The Romantics: England in a Revolutionary Age* (New York: New Press, 1997). See also Marilyn Butler, “Thompson’s Second Front,” and Iain A. Boal, “The Darkening Green,” *History Workshop Journal* 39 (spring 1995), 71–78, 124–35.

114. The part of his book with the most impact for me personally in this respect was its extraordinary reading of Methodism—although, after four intervening decades of encounters with psychoanalytic theory, feminism, histories of sexuality, and debates about subjectivity, my response now would doubtless be slightly different. See Barbara Taylor, “Religion, Radicalism, and Fantasy,” *History Workshop Journal* 39 (spring 1995), 102–12.

115. Interview with E. P. Thompson, in Henry Abelove et al., eds., *Visions of History* (New York: Pantheon, 1984), 21.

116. The other contemporary text that deserves to be mentioned in this regard is Richard Hoggart’s *Uses of Literacy: Aspects of Working-Class Life, with Special References to Publications and Entertainments* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1957).

117. Richard Johnson, “Edward Thompson, Eugene Genovese, and Socialist-Humanist History,” *History Workshop Journal* 6 (autumn 1978), 85.

118. Equally inspiring were two essays by Natalie Zemon Davis (with a place of publication that was no accident): “The Reasons of Misrule: Youth Groups and Charivaris in Sixteenth-Century France,” *Past and Present* 50

(February 1971), 41–47 (in the same issue in which Edward P. Thompson's article "Moral Economy" appeared); and "The Rites of Violence: Religious Riot in Sixteenth-Century France," *Past and Present* 59 (May 1973), 51–91. By the mid-1970s things were starting to change. See Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971); Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution* (London: Maurice Temple Smith, 1972). A little later came Natalie Zemon Davis, *Society and Culture in Early Modern France: Eight Essays* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975). See also Keith Thomas, "History and Anthropology," *Past and Present* 24 (April 1963), 3–24. Thomas was a student of Christopher Hill. Edward P. Thompson's own writings on this score include "Rough Music," in *Customs in Common*, 467–538; "Anthropology and the Discipline of Historical Context," *Midland History* 1 (1972), 41–55; *Folklore, Anthropology, and Social History* (Brighton: John L. Noyes, 1979); and "History and Anthropology," in *Making History*, 200–225.

119. See Williams, *Marxism and Literature*, 82; Edward Thompson, "Folklore, Anthropology, and Social History," *Indian Historical Review* 3 (January 1977), 265.

120. Edward P. Thompson, "Introduction: Custom and Culture," in *Customs in Common*, 7.

121. See Kaye, *British Marxist Historians*, 12–13. See also Hobsbawm, "Historians' Group of the Communist Party"; Schwarz, "'The People' in History"; Parker, "The Communist Party and Its Historians"; Dworkin, *Cultural Marxism*, 10–44.

122. See the volume Thompson edited for *New Left Review* at the height of the first New Left, *Out of Apathy*, to which he contributed one of his best polemical essays, "Outside the Whale," a ringing call for the necessity of dissent against the conformities of national and "Natopolitan" culture, framed by the ethics of commitment initiated in the 1930s, in the name of socialist humanism. By the end of the sixties, many within the second New Left viewed apathy as itself a political statement about the rottenness of the political system. Thompson's essay was reprinted in his *Poverty of Theory*, 1–33.

Chapter 3

1. See Geoff Eley and James Retallack, eds., *Wilhelminism and Its Legacies: German Modernities, Imperialism, and the Meanings of Reform, 1890–1930: Essays for Harmut Pogge von Strandmann* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2003).

2. I assiduously read all six volumes of Churchill's war memoirs, for example, as well as the Alanbrooke war diaries and a variety of other memoirs (a confession I'm still slightly embarrassed to make). See Winston

Churchill, *The Second World War*, 2nd ed., 6 vols. (London: Cassell, 1948–54); Arthur Bryant, *The Turn of the Tide, 1939–1943* (London: Collins, 1957) and *Triumph in the West: A History of the War Years Based on the Diaries of Field-Marshal Lord Alanbrooke, Chief of the Imperial General Staff* (London: Collins, 1959). See also Julia Stapleton, *Sir Arthur Bryant and National History in Twentieth-Century Britain* (Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books, 2005).

3. I also thought of working on the social history of English football and even wrote to the Manchester anthropologist Max Gluckman, who'd given a BBC radio talk on the ethnography of football some years before. For a reminiscence of Gluckman and Manchester United, whom I also supported, see Eric Hobsbawm, *Interesting Times: A Twentieth-Century Life* (New York: Pantheon, 2003), 347.

4. I was disposed toward Germany for personal reasons, too. Going to Germany in 1964 was my first trip away from home, an extremely liberating experience. In one way or another, “Germany” framed a large part of my transition to adult life.

5. Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *Bismarck und der Imperialismus* (Cologne: Kiepenheuer und Witsch, 1969).

6. See especially Werner Conze, *Die Strukturgeschichte des technisch-industriellen Zeitalters als Aufgabe für Forschung und Unterricht* (Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1957). See also Irmline Veit-Brause, “Werner Conze (1910–1986): The Measure of History and the Historian’s Measures,” and James Van Horn Melton, “From Folk History to Structural History: Otto Brunner (1898–1982) and the Radical-Conservative Roots of German Social History,” in Hartmut Lehmann and James Van Horn Melton, eds., *Paths of Continuity: Central European Historiography from the 1930s to the 1950s* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 299–343, 263–92.

7. Full and detailed references to even the most important works of these individuals and to their influence would hopelessly overburden these footnotes. The Webbs’s works included, most famously, *The History of Trade Unionism* (1894), *Industrial Democracy* (1897), and the nine-volume *English Local Government from the Revolution to the Municipal Corporations Act* (1906–29); among Tawney’s key works was *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (1926); the Hammonds’s trilogy embraced *The Village Labourer, 1760–1832* (1911), *The Town Labourer, 1760–1832* (1917), and *The Skilled Labourer, 1760–1832* (1919); among Cole’s later works was a multivolume international *History of Socialist Thought* (1953–60). I’ve sketched these intellectual histories in more detail in Geoff Eley, “The Generations of Social History,” in Peter N. Stearns, ed., *Encyclopedia of European Social History: From 1350 to 2000* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 2001), 1:3–29. For full citations, see chapter 2, note 50, in the present book.

8. Eric Hobsbawm (*Interesting Times*, 115) offers a succinct summary: “Founded by the great Fabians Sidney and Beatrice Webb, devoted exclusively to the political and social sciences, led by the later architect of the British social security system, William Beveridge, with a faculty whose most prominent and charismatic teachers were nationally known socialists—Harold Laski, R. H. Tawney—it stood on some kind of left almost *ex officio*. That is what attracted foreigners from inside and outside the empire. If that was not what necessarily attracted its British students, overwhelmingly an elite of first-generation scholarship-winning boys and girls from London families on the borderline between working and lower middle classes, it was likely to influence them once they had arrived.”

9. See especially Tawney’s *The Acquisitive Society* (1921) and *Equality* (1931).

10. Later in the twentieth century, these left-wing political influences became easily effaced by processes of professionalization, which allowed the story of social history’s origins to be written entirely as a sequence of academic developments internal to the universities. Social history’s British pioneers included a number of women who likewise tended to disappear from the main historiographical record, such as the medievalist Eileen Power (1889–1940), the seventeenth-century historian Alice Clark (1874–1934), and the female members of several famous partnerships, including Beatrice Webb, Barbara Hammond, and Alice Stopford Green (1847–1929). The wife of J. R. Green (author of the *Short History of the English People* [London: Macmillan, 1874]), Alice Green published a long series of popular Irish histories after her husband’s early death. Such voices reflected both the social and educational advancement of women in the early twentieth century and the political struggles needed to attain it. They were invariably connected to political activism through Fabianism, the Labour Party, and feminist suffrage politics. See especially Billie Melman, “Gender, History, and Memory: The Invention of Women’s Past in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries,” *History and Memory* 5 (1993), 5–41.

11. See Gustav Mayer, *Radikalismus, Sozialismus und bürgerliche Demokratie*, ed. Hans-Ulrich Wehler (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1969), and *Arbeiterbewegung und Obrigkeitsstaat*, ed. Hans-Ulrich Wehler (Bonn: Verlag Neue Gesellschaft, 1972); Hans Speier, *German White-Collar Workers and the Rise of Hitler* (London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986).

12. See especially M. Rainer Lepsius, ed., *Soziologie in Deutschland und Österreich 1918–1945: Materialien zur Entwicklung, Emigration und Wirkungsgeschichte*, *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, Sonderheft 23/1981 (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1981). See also Volker Meja,

Dieter Misgeld, and Nico Stehr, eds., *Modern German Sociology* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987).

13. This also applied to preuniversity generations yet to enter the profession. Eric Hobsbawm (born 1917) left Berlin in 1933 (at sixteen years old). Sidney Pollard (1925–98), another important figure in the growth of social history during the 1950s and 1960s and a founding member of the Society for the Study of Labour History, left Vienna on a *Kindertransport* in 1938; he trained at the LSE and taught for most of his career at the University of Sheffield. In 1980, he took a position at Bielefeld, the main center of social science history in West Germany, retiring back to Sheffield in 1990. See Colin Holmes, “Sidney Pollard, 1925–1998,” *History Workshop Journal* 49 (spring 2000), 277–78.

14. In painting this picture with a broad brush, I certainly don’t mean to efface the importance of these detailed intellectual and institutional histories. One obvious case would be the extraordinarily ramified influence of Werner Conze, both in his immediate context at the University of Heidelberg and in the wider circuits of research funding and scholarly discussion in the West German profession.

15. Fritz Fischer’s *Germany’s Aims in the First World War* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1967; orig. pub., in German, 1961) was followed by *War of Illusions: German Policies, 1911–1914* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1975; orig. pub., in German, 1969). See also Fritz Fischer, *From Kaiserreich to Third Reich: Elements of Continuity in German History, 1871–1945* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1986); John A. Moses, *The Politics of Illusion: The Fischer Controversy in German Historiography* (London: George Prior, 1975).

16. See the following collections edited by Hans-Ulrich Wehler: Eckart Kehr, *Der Primat der Innenpolitik: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur preußisch-deutsche Sozialgeschichte im 19. Jahrhundert* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1965); Arthur Rosenberg, *Demokratie und Klassenkampf: Ausgewählte Studien* (Frankfurt am Main: Ullstein, 1974); Mayer, *Radikalismus, Sozialismus und bürgerliche Demokratie and Arbeiterbewegung und Obrigkeitsstaat*. See also Hans-Ulrich Wehler, “Staatsgeschichte oder Gesellschaftsgeschichte? Zwei Außenseiter der deutschen Historikerzunft: Veit Valentin und Ludwig Quidde,” in Helmut Berding et al., eds., *Vom Staat des Ancien Régime zum modernen Parteienstaat: Festschrift für Theodor Schieder* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1978), 349–68. Wehler’s writings of this kind are conveniently collected in Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *Historische Sozialwissenschaft und Geschichtsschreibung: Studien zu Aufgaben und Traditionen deutscher Geschichtswissenschaft* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1980). See also Hans-Ulrich Wehler, ed., *Deutsche Historiker*, 9 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1971–82).

17. Hans-Ulrich Wehler, "Historiography in Germany Today," in Jürgen Habermas, ed., *Observations on the Spiritual Situation of the Age* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1984), 230–31.

18. For the most pertinent of innumerable programmatic writings, see Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *Geschichte als historische Sozialwissenschaft* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1973) and *Modernisierungstheorie und Geschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1975); Jürgen Kocka, *Sozialgeschichte: Begriff, Entwicklung, Probleme* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1977) and "Theoretical Approaches to the Social and Economic History of Modern Germany," *Journal of Modern History* 47 (1975), 101–19. For a similar reflection by a leading student of Fritz Fischer, see Arnold Sywottek, *Geschichtswissenschaft in der Legitimationskrise: Ein Überblick über die Diskussion um Theorie und Didaktik der Geschichte in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1969–1973* (Bonn: Verlag Neue Gesellschaft, 1974). See also Jürgen Kocka, ed., *Theorien in der Praxis des Historikers: Forschungsbeispiele und ihre Diskussion* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1977).

19. See Jürgen Kocka, *Unternehmensverwaltung und Angestelltenschaft am Beispiel Siemens 1847–1914: Zum Verhältnis von Kapitalismus und Bürokratie in der deutschen Industrialisierung* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1969); *Facing Total War: German Society, 1914–1918* (Leamington Spa: Berg, 1984; orig. pub., in German, 1973); *White-Collar Workers in America, 1890–1940: A Social-Political History in International Perspective* (London: Sage, 1980; orig. pub., in German, 1977). Kocka's essays relating to his first book have been translated as *Industrial Culture and Bourgeois Society: Business, Labor, and Bureaucracy in Modern Germany* (New York: Berghahn Books, 1999). See also Volker R. Berghahn's helpful portrait in the same volume, "Introduction: The Quest for an Integrative History of Industrial Society," ix–viii.

20. Karl Dietrich Bracher, "The Nazi Takeover," *History of the Twentieth Century* 48 (London: Purnell, 1969), 1339.

21. Wehler, "Historiography in Germany Today," 243–44.

22. By 1976, James J. Sheehan, a leading U.S. German historian, described Wehler's ideas as the "new orthodoxy" in German historiography (review in *Journal of Modern History* 48 [1976], 566–67). At various times, Wehler's supporters have been called "the Kehrites" (after Eckart Kehr, whose ideas they adopted), the "Bielefeld school" (after the new university where Wehler, Kocka, and others were based), or simply the "critical historians." In the mid-1970s, the cohesion and influence of this network were certainly sometimes exaggerated, but it seems foolish to deny its existence altogether. Wehler and his allies definitely shaped perceptions of German history across the Atlantic, for instance, partly by their closeness to such leading U.S. German historians as Sheehan (Northwestern and then Stan-

ford), Gerald Feldman (Berkeley), and Charles Maier (Harvard). The main traffic of people and ideas diversified mainly during the 1990s. One of the best discussions can be found in Robert G. Moeller, “The Kaiserreich Recast? Continuity and Change in Modern German Historiography,” *Journal of Social History* 17 (1984), 655–80. Both the common ground and the relatively diverse points of view can be sampled in Michael Stürmer’s edited volume *Das kaiserliche Deutschland: Politik und Gesellschaft, 1871–1918* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1970).

23. The best example would be Hartmut Kaelble (born 1940), who followed a study of industrial politics before 1914 with long-term research on social mobility and social inequality during industrialization, increasingly on a comparative European footing: see *Industrielle Interessenpolitik in der Wilhelminischen Gesellschaft: Zentralverband Deutscher Industrieller 1895–1914* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1967); *Social Mobility in the 19th and 20th Centuries: Europe and North America in Comparative Perspective* (Leamington Spa: Berg, 1985); *Industrialization and Social Inequality in 19th Century Europe* (Leamington Spa: Berg, 1986); *A Social History of Western Europe, 1880–1980* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1990). See also Hartmut Kaelble et al., *Probleme der Modernisierung in Deutschland: Sozialhistorische Studien zum 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1978).

24. Wolfgang J. Mommsen, the twin brother of the equally influential Hans Mommsen, published a pioneering study of Max Weber’s thought, various works on imperialism, and innumerable studies and commentaries on the historiography of the *Kaiserreich*. Between 1978 and 1985, he became the first full director of the German Historical Institute in London, inaugurating its activities with an international conference in Mannheim in 1978 on the historiography of the *Kaiserreich*. See Wolfgang J. Mommsen, *Max Weber and German Politics, 1890–1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985; orig. pub., in German, 1959); *The Age of Bureaucracy: Perspectives on the Political Sociology of Max Weber* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1974); *The Political and Social Theory of Max Weber: Collected Essays* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).

25. The anthologies *Geschichte und Psychoanalyse* (1971), *Geschichte und Soziologie* (1972), and *Geschichte und Ökonomie* (1973) were edited by Hans-Ulrich Wehler for the Neue Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek series of the Cologne publisher Kiepenheuer und Witsch. In the 1960s and 1970s, the Neue Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek, for which Wehler was also the general history editor, was the premier series of academic anthologies aimed at students. He also edited the anthologies *Moderne deutsche Sozialgeschichte* (1966) and *Imperialismus* (1969) in that series.

26. The series title is *Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft*.

Most of the early titles were republished works, collected essays, or conference volumes, but by 1976, the Bielefeld dissertation students were also publishing their own books. By 2003, 160 titles had appeared.

27. See, for example, the volume edited by Heinrich August Winkler, *Organisierter Kapitalismus: Voraussetzungen und Anfänge* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1974), which brought together papers originally prepared for a session at the Regensburg Historians' Conference in October 1972. Among the ten contributors were Wehler, Kocka, and Puhle. The session's discussion of "organized capitalism" was a good example of Wehler's project in operation: the concept was proposed in a "heuristic" spirit in the interests of "theory formation and theory critique" on the new ground of a "comparative social history"; the essays covered France, Italy, Britain, and the United States as well as Germany; and the concept was advanced as an explicit alternative to the rival Marxist-Leninist concept of "state monopoly capitalism." See Winkler's preface to the edited volume (*Organisierter Kapitalismus*, 7).

28. See Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *Das Deutsche Kaiserreich 1871–1918* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1973), translated as *The German Empire, 1871–1918* (Leamington Spa: Berg, 1985). The main responses included Andreas Hillgruber's "Politische Geschichte in moderner Sicht" (*Historische Zeitschrift* 216 [1973], 529–52), Hans-Günther Zmarzlik's "Das Kaiserreich in neuer Sicht" (222 [1976], 105–26), Lothar Gall's "Bismarck und der Bonapartismus" (222 [1976], 618–37), and Klaus Hildebrand's "Geschichte oder 'Gesellschaftsgeschichte': Die Notwendigkeit einer politischen Geschichtsschreibung von den internationalen Beziehungen" (223 [1976], 328–57). A more measured but equally conservative response came from Thomas Nipperdey, "Wehlers Kaiserreich: Eine kritische Auseinandersetzung," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 1 (1975), 538–60.

29. Hans-Ulrich Wehler, ed., *Sozialgeschichte Heute: Festschrift für Hans Rosenberg* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1974).

30. Hans-Ulrich Wehler, ed., *Arbeitsbücher zur modernen Geschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1976–).

31. The outer limits of serious dialogue with Marxism were reached in Kocka's 1973 book on "class society" during World War I. There, to show the relationship between increased class tensions and the political breakdown of 1918, he skillfully used "as a heuristic device" a class-analytic model of social structure and social conflict deriving from Marx. But in so doing, he rejected what he regarded as the Marxist teleology of rising class consciousness, disputing any direct correlation between increasing economic hardship and propensity for political protest. He likewise disputed a simplistic Marxist view of the state as the instrument of the economically dominant classes.

All that was well and good. But the crudest orthodox Marxist-Leninist thinking about those two relationships—class conflict and class consciousness, capitalism and the state—was invoked to dispose of any possible Marxist approach, whereas the early 1970s were actually a time of extremely ramified Marxist debates about precisely these questions. See Kocka, *Facing Total War*. For extended discussion, see Geoff Eley, “Capitalism and the Wilhelmine State: Industrial Growth and Political Backwardness, 1890–1918,” in *From Unification to Nazism: Reinterpreting the German Past* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1986), 42–58.

32. For a succinct example, see Wehler, “Historiography in Germany Today,” 246–49.

33. *Berufsverbot* was the generic name for a range of government decrees and practices that, beginning in 1972, severely compromised civil liberties in West Germany for anyone who had a record of “extremist” political involvement and held or applied for a civil service job. That category of employment included schoolteachers (both at and below the university level), railway and postal workers, and doctors and nurses in state hospitals, as well as civil servants in the narrower sense—in other words, some 16 percent of total West German employment. Thus, the measures became a powerful device for tightening the public ideological climate and delegitimizing Marxist and other radical ideas.

34. Interestingly, Kocka and Wehler embraced some of the British Marxist historians, such as Eric Hobsbawm, whose work was admitted to the repertoire of important influences and with whom close contacts developed. This exception was manageable partly because so much of Hobsbawm’s Marxism was empirically embedded rather than being forcefully explicated as such, whereas such figures as Edward Thompson and Raymond Williams were consistently ignored. Certain East German historians also received genuine recognition, usually where methodological originality provided a suitable alibi—most notably in the case of Hartmut Zwahr. See especially Zwahr’s *Zur Konstituierung des Proletariats als Klasse: Strukturuntersuchung über das Leipziger Proletariat während der industriellen Revolution* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1978).

35. Chris Lorenz, “Jürgen Kocka,” in Kelly Boyd, ed., *Encyclopedia of Historians and Historical Writing* (London: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1999), 1:650. See also Chris Lorenz, “Beyond Good and Evil? The German Empire of 1871 and Modern German Historiography,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 30 (1995), 729–67.

36. Helmut Böhme, *Deutschlands Weg zur Großmacht: Studien zum Verhältnis von Wirtschaft und Staat während der Reichsgründungszeit 1848–1881* (Cologne: Kiepenheuer und Witsch, 1966).

37. Hans Rosenberg, *Große Depression und Bismarckzeit: Wirtschaftsablauf, Gesellschaft und Politik in Mitteleuropa* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1967). Rosenberg first advanced this argument in “Political and Social Consequences of the Great Depression of 1873–1896 in Central Europe,” *Economic History Review* 13 (1943), 58–73.

38. See Hans-Jürgen Puhle, *Agrarische Interessenpolitik und preußischer Konservatismus im wilhelminischen Reich 1893–1914* (Hanover: Verlag für Literatur und Zeitgeschehen, 1966); Kaelble, *Industrielle Interessenpolitik*; Peter-Christian Witt, *Die Finanzpolitik des Deutschen Reiches von 1903–1913* (Lübeck: Matthiesen, 1970); Volker R. Berghahn, *Der Tirpitz-Plan. Genesis und Verfall einer innenpolitischen Krisenstrategie unter Wilhelm II* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1971); Dirk Stegmann, *Die Erben Bismarcks: Parteien und Verbände in der Spätphase des Wilhelminischen Deutschlands; Sammlungspolitik 1897–1918* (Cologne: Kiepenheuer und Witsch, 1970); Eckart Kehr, *Primat der Innenpolitik, and Schlachtflottenbau und Parteipolitik 1894–1901. Versuch eines Querschnitts durch die innenpolitischen, sozialen und ideologischen Voraussetzungen des deutschen Imperialismus* (Berlin: Matthiesen Verlag, 1930).

39. See Helmut Böhme, ed., *Probleme der Reichsgründungszeit 1848–1879* (Cologne: Kiepenheuer und Witsch, 1968); Wehler, *Moderne deutsche Sozialgeschichte*; Stürmer, *Das kaiserliche Deutschland*.

40. Wehler, *Bismarck*, 115.

41. Hans-Ulrich Wehler, “Industrial Growth and Early German Imperialism,” in Roger Owen and Bob Sutcliffe, eds., *Studies in the Theory of Imperialism* (London: Longman, 1972), 89, 87.

42. Wehler, “Industrial Growth,” 88.

43. Wehler, “Industrial Growth,” 89.

44. Hans-Ulrich Wehler, “Probleme des Imperialismus,” in *Krisenherde des Kaiserreichs 1871–1918: Studien zur deutschen Sozial- und Verfassungsgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1970), 131.

45. For example, in December 1906, after protracted conflicts over colonial policy with a parliamentary opposition led by the Catholic Center Party and the SPD, Chancellor Bernhard von Bülow dissolved the Reichstag and called fresh elections, using the slogan “Struggle against Ultramontanes, Guelfs, Socialists, and Poles.” The name *Ultramontane* was the common pejorative used by Protestant nationalists for supporters of the Center Party, implying a primary political allegiance to Rome; Guelfs were the Hanoverian Particularists who wished to reverse the annexation of Hanover by Prussia in 1866. See Witt, *Finanzpolitik*, 152–57.

46. For foundational statements of this argument, see Wolfgang Sauer, “Das Problem des deutschen Nationalstaats,” in Wehler, *Moderne deutsche Sozialgeschichte*, 407–36; Michael Stürmer, “Konservatismus und Revolution

in Bismarcks Politik,” in Stürmer, *Das kaiserliche Deutschland*, 143–67; Wehler, *Das Deutsche Kaiserreich*, 118–31.

47. Wehler, *Das Deutsche Kaiserreich*, 238–39, 226.

48. See Geoff Eley, introduction and “*Sammlungspolitik*, Social Imperialism, and the Navy Law of 1898,” in *From Unification to Nazism*, 8–11, 110–53.

49. See Geoff Eley, “Social Imperialism in Germany: Reformist Synthesis or Reactionary Sleight of Hand?” in *From Unification to Nazism*, 154–67; “Defining Social Imperialism: Use and Abuse of an Idea,” *Social History* 1 (1976), 265–90.

50. See Ralf Dahrendorf, *Society and Democracy in Germany* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1968), 404.

51. Turning on its head a famous anticapitalist aphorism of Max Horkheimer’s (“Whoever does not want to talk about fascism should keep quiet about capitalism”), Kocka argued, “Whoever does not want to talk about pre-industrial, pre-capitalist, and pre-bourgeois traditions should keep quiet about fascism” (“Ursachen des Nationalsozialismus,” *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, 21 June 1980, 11). Winkler agreed: “The reasons why democracy was liquidated in Germany in the course of the world economic crisis and not in the other developed industrial societies have less to do with the course of the crisis itself than with the different pre-industrial histories of these countries. The conditions for the rise of fascism have at least as much to do with feudalism and absolutism as with capitalism” (“Die ‘neue Linke’ und der Faschismus: Zur Kritik neomarxistischen Theorien über den Nationalsozialismus,” in *Revolution, Staat, Faschismus: Zur Revision des Historischen Materialismus* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1978], 83). In this way, the stakes for the *Sonderweg* thesis were set extremely high.

52. For me, the damning early critiques were Noam Chomsky’s *American Power and the New Mandarins* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969) and Andre Gunder Frank’s *Sociology of Development and Underdevelopment of Sociology* (London: Pluto Press, 1971). See also Dean C. Tipps, “Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies: A Critical Perspective,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 15 (1973), 199–266; Anthony D. Smith, *The Concept of Social Change: A Critique of the Functionalist Theory of Social Change* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973); John G. Taylor, *From Modernization to Modes of Production: A Critique of Sociologies of Development and Underdevelopment* (London: Macmillan, 1979). For a cogent defense from this period, see Raymond Grew, “Modernization and Its Discontents,” *American Behavioral Scientist* 21 (1977), 289–312; “More on Modernization,” *Journal of Social History* 14 (1981), 179–87.

53. The forward-moving unity of values implied by this conception of

“modernity” is conveniently expressed, in all its glorious simplicity, by the preface to a Festschrift honoring Lawrence Stone, an influential practitioner of modernization theory among historians: “How and why did Western Europe change itself during the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries so as to lay the social, economic, scientific, political, ideological, and ethical foundations for the rationalist, democratic, individualistic, technological industrialized society in which we now live? England was the first country to travel along this road” (A. L. Beier, David Cannadine, and James M. Rosenheim, eds., *The First Modern Society: Essays in English History in Honour of Lawrence Stone* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989], vii).

54. Hans-Ulrich Wehler, “Geschichte und Zielutopie der deutschen ‘bürgerlichen Gesellschaft,’” in *Aus der Geschichte Lernen? Essays* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1988), 251.

55. Hans-Ulrich Wehler, “Wie ‘bürgerlich’ war das Deutsche Kaiserreich?” in *Aus der Geschichte Lernen?* 199.

56. Wehler, “Geschichte und Zielutopie,” 252.

57. Dahrendorf, *Society and Democracy*, 397.

58. Hobsbawm was always an important supporter of social-structural analysis, economic history, and quantitative methods. Another close collaborator of Kocka and Wehler was the Sheffield economic historian Sidney Pollard, who was briefly a member of the Communist Party Historians’ Group and was Hobsbawm’s colleague in the Economic History and Labour History Societies. Pollard also taught at Bielefeld during the 1980s. Of course, both Hobsbawm and Pollard also had German-speaking origins. Like Williams, Edward Thompson was entirely ignored.

59. Richard J. Evans, “Introduction: Wilhelm II’s Germany and the Historians,” in Richard J. Evans, ed., *Society and Politics in Wilhelmine Germany* (London: Croom Helm, 1978), 23. The volume edited by Evans, to which I contributed, was conceived partly as a specifically British response to the new West German work, drawing explicitly on some distinctive social history perspectives. The image of the puppet theater was used by Zmarzlik in “Das Kaiserreich in neuer Sicht.”

60. As a budding German historian, I consciously resisted my first inclination to study some aspect of the history of the labor movement, on the grounds that left-wing historians seemed drawn too easily to the history of their own tradition. To me, helping illuminate the origins of fascism seemed equally important. My first book was *Reshaping the German Right: Radical Nationalism and Political Change after Bismarck* (London and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980; 2nd ed., Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1991).

61. Erich Matthias, “Kautsky und der Kautskyanismus: Die Funktion

der Ideologie in der deutschen Sozialdemokratie vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg,” *Marxismusstudien*, 2nd ser., vol. 2, 1957, 151–97; Susanne Miller, *Das Problem der Freiheit im Sozialismus: Freiheit, Staat und Revolution in der Programmatik der Sozialdemokratie von Lasalle bis zum Revisionismusstreit* (Frankfurt am Main: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1964); Werner Conze and Dieter Groh, *Die Arbeiterbewegung in der nationalen Bewegung: Die deutsche Sozialdemokratie vor, während und nach der Reichsgründung* (Stuttgart: Klett Cotta, 1966); Guenther Roth, *The Social Democrats in Imperial Germany* (New York: Arno Press, 1963); Gerhard A. Ritter, *Die Arbeiterbewegung im Wilhelminischen Reich: Die Sozialdemokratische Partei und die Freien Gewerkschaften 1890–1900* (Berlin: Colloquium, 1959).

62. See the handsome commemorative volume edited by Georg Eckert, *1863–1963: Hundert Jahre deutsche Sozialdemokratie; Bilder und Dokumente* (Hanover: J. H. W. Dietz Nachf., 1963), in which Conze and one of his earliest students, Frolinde Balsler, were centrally involved. The Conze school was the key scholarly grouping emphasizing the labor movement’s historic affinities with the mid-nineteenth-century “national movement” for German unification. The other key voice of Conze’s generation, Theodor Schieder, was less concerned directly with the SPD but shared the perspective. See *Das deutsche Kaiserreich von 1871 als Nationalstaat* (Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1961). Significantly, Schieder also supervised Wehler’s doctoral thesis on Social Democracy’s attitudes toward nationality questions, which was published in this first wave of academic studies of the pre-1914 SPD. See Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *Sozialdemokratie und Nationalstaat: Die deutsche Sozialdemokratie und die Nationalitätenfragen in Deutschland von Karl Marx bis zum Ausbruch des Ersten Weltkrieges* (Würzburg: Holzner-Verlag, 1962).

63. In addition to his important *Die Strukturgeschichte des technisch-industriellen Zeitalters* (see note 6 above), Conze published a groundbreaking article in 1954 on the relationship between the new language of class and the social changes of industrialization: see Werner Conze, “From ‘Pöbel’ to ‘Proletariat’: The Socio-Historical Preconditions of Socialism in Germany,” in Georg Iggers, ed., *The Social History of Politics: Critical Perspectives in West German Historical Writing since 1945* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1985), 49–80. In 1957, he formed the Arbeitskreis für moderne Sozialgeschichte (Working Group for Modern Social History), which convened regular meetings among a compact interdisciplinary network of historians, sociologists, economists, lawyers, and anthropologists, eventually sponsoring larger-scale conferences. From 1962, it also sponsored the book series *Industrielle Welt*. By the 1970s, these activities were overlapping with those of the Wehler network.

64. See Gustav Mayer, “Die Trennung der proletarischen von der

bürgerlichen Demokratie in Deutschland, 1863–1870,” in *Radikalismus, Sozialismus und bürgerliche Demokratie*, 108–78.

65. Werner Conze, “Der Beginn der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung,” in Waldemar Besson and Friedrich von Gaertringen, eds., *Geschichte und Gegenwartsbewußtsein: Historische Betrachtungen und Untersuchungen; Festschrift für Hans Rothfels zum 70. Geburtstag* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1963), 323–38, quotation from 337–38.

66. Conze and Groh, *Die Arbeiterbewegung in der nationalen Bewegung*, 124.

67. The quote is from Wolfgang Schieder, “Das Scheitern des bürgerlichen Radikalismus und die sozialistische Parteibildung in Deutschland,” in Hans Mommsen, ed., *Sozialdemokratie zwischen Klassenbewegung und Volkspartei* (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuchverlag, 1974), 21. Conze’s causal focus on the split between liberals and labor in Germany rather neglected the opening of comparable divisions elsewhere in Europe during the later nineteenth century. In that respect, Britain was more exceptional than Germany.

68. For example, aside from the monographs, Conze’s *Industrielle Welt* series (published by Klett-Cotta in Stuttgart) published a sequence of thick conference volumes convening small legions of scholars working on relevant themes: Werner Conze and Ulrich Engelhardt, eds., *Arbeiter im Industrialisierungsprozeß: Herkunft, Lage und Verhalten* (1979; conference in 1978); Werner Conze and Ulrich Engelhardt, eds., *Arbeiterexistenz im 19. Jahrhundert: Lebensstandard und Lebensgestaltung deutscher Arbeiter und Handwerker* (1981; conference in 1980); Ulrich Engelhardt, ed., *Handwerker in der Industrialisierung: Lage, Kultur und Politik vom späten 18. bis ins frühe 20. Jahrhundert* (1984; conference in 1982); Klaus Tenfelde, ed., *Arbeiter im 20. Jahrhundert* (1991; conference in 1989).

69. The following volumes have appeared so far, all published by J. H. W. Dietz Nachf. in Bonn: Jürgen Kocka, *Weder Stand noch Klasse: Unterschichten um 1800* (1990) and *Arbeitsverhältnisse und Arbeiterexistenzen: Grundlagen der Klassenbildung im 19. Jahrhundert* (1990); Gerhard A. Ritter and Klaus Tenfelde, *Arbeiter im Deutschen Kaiserreich 1871–1914* (1992); Heinrich August Winkler, *Von der Revolution zur Stabilisierung: Arbeiter und Arbeiterbewegung in der Weimarer Republik 1918 bis 1924* (1984), *Der Schein der Normalität: Arbeiter und Arbeiterbewegung in der Weimarer Republik 1924 bis 1930* (1985), and *Der Weg in die Katastrophe: Arbeiter und Arbeiterbewegung in der Weimarer Republik 1930 bis 1933* (1987); Michael Schneider, *Unterm Hakenkreuz: Arbeiter und Arbeiterbewegung 1933 bis 1939* (1999). Still to be published are two further volumes by Kocka on class formation and the rise of the labor movement up to 1875; one by Ritter on the labor movement between 1875

and 1890; two by Tenfelde on the years up to 1914 and World War I; and a further volume by Schneider on World War II. The series will also be carried past 1945.

70. See also Kocka's book-length essay on the theory and methodologies of writing working-class history for nineteenth-century Germany, *Lohnarbeit und Klassenbildung: Arbeiter und Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland 1800–1875* (Bonn: J. H. W. Dietz Nachf., 1983), which offered a sketch for the full-scale studies to come. The argument was introduced and framed by a critique of East German Marxist-Leninist historiography. For a distilled version of this book, see Jürgen Kocka, "Problems of Working-Class Formation in Germany: The Early Years, 1800–1875," in Ira Katznelson and Aristide R. Zolberg, eds., *Working-Class Formation: Nineteenth-Century Patterns in Western Europe and the United States* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 279–351.

71. This applies somewhat less to the three volumes by Winkler (see note 69 above), which adopt more of an overall narrative frame.

72. Some analytical separation is clearly unavoidable and needn't imply a causal hierarchy. The organizational difficulty of writing a general history from this point of view is handled best by Schneider in the volume on the pre-1939 Third Reich. See Schneider, *Unterm Hakenkreuz*.

73. Ritter, *Die Arbeiterbewegung im Wilhelminischen Reich*.

74. Margaret R. Somers, "Class Formation and Capitalism: A Second Look at a Classic," *Archives européennes de sociologie* 38 (1996), 198. This essay is an incisive critique of Katznelson and Zolberg, *Working-Class Formation*. See also Somers, "Workers of the World, Compare!" *Contemporary Sociology* 18 (1989), 325–29.

75. There was a specifically German language for reconciling these two theoretical worlds. In a commentary on the German historiographical debates about the *Sonderweg* in the early 1980s, a friend and I argued that one solution was "to combine individualizing and hermeneutic methods with systematic analysis of the social structures and processes in which history takes place" (David Blackbourn and Geoff Eley, *The Peculiarities of History: Bourgeois Society and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Germany* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984], 33). A strong argument to this effect was made by Wolfgang J. Mommsen in *Geschichtswissenschaft jenseits des Historismus* (Düsseldorf: Droste, 1971).

76. Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, ed. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971); "Gramsci's Letters from Prison," ed. Hamish Henderson, *New Edinburgh Review* 25 (1974), 3–47, and 26 (1974), 1–44; Lynne Lawner, ed., *Letters from Prison* (New York: Harper and Row, 1975). For the English-language

reception of Gramsci, see Geoff Eley, “Reading Gramsci in English: Observations on the Reception of Antonio Gramsci in the English-Speaking World, 1957–82,” *European History Quarterly* 14 (1984), 441–78.

77. See especially Louis Althusser, “Contradiction and Overdetermination,” in *For Marx* (London: Allen Lane, 1969), 87–128, and “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses,” in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays* (London: NLB, 1971), 121–73; Nicos Poulantzas, *Political Power and Social Classes* (London: NLB, 1973), *Fascism and Dictatorship* (London: NLB, 1974), *Classes in Contemporary Capitalism* (London: NLB, 1975), and *State, Power, Socialism* (London: NLB, 1978).

78. For this important context, see Terry Lovell, ed., *British Feminist Thought: A Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990). By “increasingly unassimilable,” I mean a challenge becoming harder and harder to ignore, defuse, or contain.

79. Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies, ed., “On Ideology,” *Working Papers in Cultural Studies* 10 (1977); Ernesto Laclau, *Politics and Ideology in Marxist Theory* (London: Verso, 1977). See also the works of Göran Therborn: *Science, Class, and Society: On the Formation of Sociology and Historical Materialism* (London: NLB, 1976); *What Does the Ruling Class Do When It Rules? State Apparatuses and State Power under Feudalism, Capitalism, and Socialism* (London: NLB, 1978); *The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology* (London: Verso, 1980).

80. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Eugene Genovese, “The Political Crisis of Social History: A Marxian Perspective,” *Journal of Social History* 10 (1976), 205–20; Gareth Stedman Jones, “From Historical Sociology to Theoretical History,” *British Journal of Sociology* 27 (1976), 295–305.

81. See Richard Johnson, “Thompson, Genovese, and Socialist-Humanist History,” *History Workshop Journal* 6 (autumn 1978), 96–119.

82. The essay appeared in shorter and longer versions. See, respectively, Gareth Stedman Jones, “The Languages of Chartism,” in James Epstein and Dorothy Thompson, eds., *The Chartist Experience: Studies in Working-Class Radicalism and Culture, 1830–60* (London: Macmillan, 1982), 3–58; “Rethinking Chartism,” in Stedman Jones, *Languages of Class: Studies in English Working-Class History, 1832–1982* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 90–178.

83. William H. Sewell, Jr., *Work and Revolution in France: The Language of Labor from the Old Regime to 1848* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980). Sewell recently reflected, “In 1971 . . . , I was a fresh Ph.D. and a practitioner of what we then called ‘the new social history’; when I left the Institute after a five-year appointment stretching from 1975 to 1980, I had taken the ‘linguistic turn’ and was writing in the style that later came to

be dubbed ‘the new cultural history’” (“Whatever Happened to the ‘Social’ in Social History?” in Joan W. Scott and Debra Keates, eds., *Schools of Thought: Twenty-Five Years of Interpretive Social Science* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001], 209).

84. Lutz Niethammer and Franz Brüggemeier, “Wie wohnten Arbeiter im Kaiserreich?” *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte* 16 (1976), 61–134; “Bedürfnisse, Erfahrung und Verhalten,” special issue, *SOWI* 6 (1977), 147–96 (see especially Alf Lüdtke’s guide to reading, “Fundstellen zur historischen Rekonstruktion des ‘Alltagslebens,’” 188–89); Jürgen Reulecke and Wolfhard Weber, eds., *Fabrik—Familie—Feierabend: Beiträge zur Sozialgeschichte des Alltags im Industriezeitalter* (Wuppertal: Hammer, 1978). See also Detlev Puls, ed., *Wahrnehmungsformen und Protestverhalten: Studien zur Lage der Unterschichten im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1979); Dieter Groh, “Base-Processes and the Problem of Organization: Outline of a Social History Research Project,” *Social History* 4 (1979), 265–83.

85. Alf Lüdtke, “Zur Einleitung,” *SOWI* 6 (1977), 147.

86. For Marx’s famous 1859 preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, see Marx, *Early Writings*, 424–28.

87. See Alain Touraine, *L’après socialisme* (Paris: Grasset, 1983); André Gorz, *Farewell to the Working Class* (London: Pluto Press, 1982); Rolf Ebbighausen and Friedrich Tiemann, eds., *Das Ende der Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland? Ein Diskussionsband zum sechzigsten Geburtstag von Theo Pirker* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1984); Michael Schneider, “In Search of a ‘New’ Historical Subject: The End of Working-Class Culture, the Labor Movement, and the Proletariat,” *International Labor and Working-Class History* 32 (fall 1987), 46–58.

88. Eric Hobsbawm, “The Forward March of Labour Halted?” in Martin Jacques and Francis Mulhern, eds., *The Forward March of Labour Halted?* (London: Verso, 1981), 1–19.

89. See Julius Gould, *The Attack on Higher Education: Marxist and Radical Penetration* (London: Institute for the Study of Conflict, 1977). The Birmingham conference met on 17 September 1977.

90. Chaired by Raymond Williams in King’s College, Cambridge, on 23 February 1978, this meeting was called to protest the politics of *Berufsverbot* in West Germany and to launch a Cambridge branch of the Campaign for Academic Freedom and Democracy.

91. For contemporary analyses that were decisive for me at the time, see Stuart Hall, “Living with the Crisis” and “The Great Moving Right Show” (orig. pub. 1978), in *The Hard Road to Renewal: Thatcherism and the Crisis of the Left* (London: Verso, 1988), 19–38, 39–56.

92. See Richard J. Evans and W. R. Lee, eds., *The German Family: Essays*

on the *Social History of the Family in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Germany* (London: Croom Helm, 1981); Richard J. Evans, ed., *The German Working Class, 1888–1933: The Politics of Everyday Life* (London: Croom Helm, 1982) and “Religion and Society in Germany,” special issue, *European Studies Review* 13 (1982); Richard J. Evans and W. R. Lee, eds., *The German Peasantry: Conflict and Community in Rural Society from the Eighteenth to the Twentieth Centuries* (London: Croom Helm, 1986); Richard J. Evans and Dick Geary, eds., *The German Unemployed: Experiences and Consequences of Mass Unemployment from the Weimar Republic to the Third Reich* (London: Croom Helm, 1987); Richard J. Evans, ed., *The German Underworld: Deviants and Outcasts in German History* (London: Routledge, 1988); David Blackbourn and Richard J. Evans, eds., *The German Bourgeoisie: Essays on the Social History of the German Middle Class from the Late Eighteenth to the Early Twentieth Century* (London: Routledge, 1991).

93. Contrast, for example, the Norwich volume edited by Evans and Lee on *The German Peasantry* and the equally valuable parallel volume edited by Robert G. Moeller, *Peasants and Lords in Modern Germany: Recent Studies in Agricultural History* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1986). Whereas the former drew its collaborators as much from East as West Germany and, in disciplinary terms, as much from ethnology and “empirical cultural studies” as from history per se, the Moeller volume drew only on West Germans from Bielefeld. Likewise, despite its subtitle, Richard J. Evans’s volume *The German Working Class* was surprisingly unalive to the emerging energy and potentials of *Alltagsgeschichte* (see especially Evans’s “Introduction: The Sociological Interpretation of German Labour History,” 31–33).

94. I emigrated to the United States in the summer of 1979 and so was personally absent from most of the group’s later meetings. For the flavor of the first two sessions, see David F. Crew and Eve Rosenhaft, “SSRC Research Group on Modern German Social History, First Meeting: History of the Family, U.E.A., Norwich, 7–8 July 1978,” *Social History* 4 (1979), 103–9; Geoff Eley and Keith Nield, “Why Does Social History Ignore Politics?” *Social History* 5 (1980), 249–71 (for commentary on the discussions in the second meeting, held 12–13 January 1979).

95. The allusions are to Annette Kuhn and AnneMarie Wolpe’s edited volume *Feminism and Materialism: Women and Modes of Production* (London: Routledge, 1978) and Heidi Hartmann’s “The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union,” *Capital and Class* 8 (1979), 1–33.

96. Tim Mason, “Intention and Explanation: A Current Controversy about the Interpretation of National Socialism,” in Mason, *Nazism, Fascism, and the Working Class*, ed. Jane Caplan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 230.

97. Tim Mason, “The Workers’ Opposition in Nazi Germany,” *History Workshop Journal* 11 (spring 1981), 121.

98. See Tim Mason, “Some Origins of the Second World War,” *Past and Present* 29 (December 1964), 67–87, reprinted in *Nazism, Fascism, and the Working Class*, 33–52; “Labour in the Third Reich, 1933–39,” *Past and Present* 33 (1966), 112–41. Mason’s work here was a complex critique of A. J. P. Taylor’s potboiling *The Origins of the Second World War* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1961). Taylor had appealed to me through his controversialism, antiestablishment radicalism, and general pithiness of style. He was known as “the man who likes to stir things up” (A. J. P. Taylor, *A Personal History* [London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1984]).

99. Anne Summers, “Appreciation: Tim Mason. Growing the New History,” *The Guardian*, 13 March 1990.

100. He was also virtually alone in engaging seriously with the East German scholarship of the 1960s. See especially Tim Mason, “The Primacy of Politics: Politics and Economics in National Socialist Germany,” in Stuart J. Woolf, ed., *The Nature of Fascism* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1968), 165–95, reprinted in Mason, *Nazism, Fascism, and the Working Class*, 53–76.

101. See Tim Mason, “Women in Germany, 1925–1940: Family, Welfare, and Work,” parts 1 and 2, *History Workshop Journal* 1 (spring 1976), 74–113, and 2 (autumn 1976), 5–32, reprinted in Mason, *Nazism, Fascism, and the Working Class*, 131–212. This ground-laying essay originated, memorably, in the seventh annual History Workshop, “Women in History,” held at Ruskin College, Oxford, on 4–6 May 1973.

102. See Tim Mason, “The Great Economic History Show,” *History Workshop Journal* 21 (spring 1986), 3–35; “Italy and Modernization,” *History Workshop Journal* 25 (spring 1988), 127–47; “The Turin Strikes of March 1943,” in Mason, *Nazism, Fascism, and the Working Class*, 274–94.

103. Mason, “Workers’ Opposition,” 120.

104. Discussion here is complicated by the difficulties of translation. The usual German word for “resistance” in the sense of the illegal underground is *Widerstand*, which, after 1945, carried connotations of ethical commitment and organized preparation inseparably linked with the myth of the 1944 July assassination plot. Broszat’s concept of *Resistenz* (explicitly distinguished from *Widerstand*) took its meanings from medicine and physics, suggesting elements of “immunity” or a countervailing ability to impede the flow of a current. It signified those elements of social life (actions, practices, structures, relations) “limiting the penetration of Nazism and blocking its total claim to power and control” (Ian Kershaw, *The Nazi Dictatorship: Problems and Perspectives of Interpretation*, 4th ed. [London: Arnold, 2000], 194).

105. Kershaw, *Nazi Dictatorship*, 204. In Kershaw’s exposition, resis-

tance “embraced all forms of limited and partial rejection, whatever the motives, of specific aspects of Nazi rule.” Kershaw explained, “Instead of dealing in images of black and white, resistance was portrayed in shades of grey; as a part of the everyday reality of trying to adjust to, and cope with, life in a regime impinging on practically all aspects of daily existence, posing a total claim on society, but—as a direct consequence—meeting numerous blockages and restrictions in its attempt to make good this claim” (193). Kershaw himself was part of the Bavaria Project. See Ian Kershaw, *Popular Opinion and Political Dissent in the Third Reich, 1933–1945* (Oxford, 1983; new ed., 2002) and *The “Hitler Myth”: Image and Reality in the Third Reich* (Oxford, 1987).

106. See also especially the works of Detlev Peukert, *Die KPD im Widerstand: Verfolgung und Untergrundarbeit an Rhein und Ruhr 1933 bis 1945* (Wuppertal, 1980); *Ruhrarbeiter gegen den Faschismus: Dokumentation über den Widerstand im Ruhrgebiet 1933–1945* (Frankfurt am Main, 1976); *Die Edelweisspiraten: Protestbewegungen jugendlicher Arbeiter im Dritten Reich* (Cologne, 1980); *Inside Nazi Germany: Conformity and Opposition in Everyday Life* (New Haven, 1987).

107. Martin Broszat, “Resistenz und Widerstand: Eine Zwischenbilanz des Forschungsprojekts ‘Widerstand und Verfolgung in Bayern 1933–1945,’” in Broszat, *Nach Hitler: Der schwierige Umgang mit unserer Geschichte; Beiträge von Martin Broszat*, ed. Hermann Graml and Klaus-Dietmar Henke (Munich, 1987), 75–76.

108. See, above all, Ulrich Herbert, *Hitler’s Foreign Workers: Enforced Foreign Labour in Germany under the Third Reich* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998; orig. pub., in German, 1986); Herbert, ed., *Europa und der “Reichseinsatz”: Ausländische Zivilarbeiter, Kriegsgefangene und KZ-Häftlinge in Deutschland 1938–1945* (Essen: Klartext, 1991); Herbert, “Labour and Extermination: Economic Interest and the Primacy of *Weltanschauung* in National Socialism,” *Past and Present* 138 (February 1993), 144–95.

109. Mary Nolan, “Rationalization, Racism, and *Resistenz*: Recent Studies of Work and the Working Class in Nazi Germany,” *International Labor and Working-Class History* 48 (fall 1995), 132. Other studies of industrial “rationalization” emphasize continuities between the Third Reich and similar histories of the 1920s and 1950s, thereby further displacing German workers as agents. Such research stresses their objectification and disempowerment rather than the scope for self-assertion that interested Mason or the room for modest negotiation expressed by *Resistenz*. See especially Tilla Siegel, *Leistung und Lohn in der nationalsozialistischen “Ordnung der Arbeit”* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1989); Rüdiger Hachtmann, *Industriearbeit im “Dritten Reich”: Untersuchungen zu den Lohn- und Arbeitsbedingungen in Deutschland*

1933–1945 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1989); Tilla Siegel and Thomas von Freyberg, *Industrielle Rationalisierung unter dem Nationalsozialismus* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 1991); Dagmar Reese, Eve Rosenhaft, Carola Sachse, and Tilla Siegel, eds., *Rationale Beziehungen? Geschlechterverhältnisse im Rationalisierungsprozeß* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1993).

110. Tim Mason, “Introduction to the English Edition,” in *Social Policy in the Third Reich: The Working Class in the “National Community,”* ed. Jane Caplan (Providence: Berg, 1993), 3–4.

111. Jane Caplan, introduction to Mason, *Nazism, Fascism, and the Working Class*, 5.

112. Tim Mason, epilogue to *Social Policy*, 285. The ninety-four-page epilogue was composed during 1988–89, shortly before Mason died, eleven to twelve years after publication of the original German edition of the book.

113. Mason, epilogue to *Social Policy*, 285.

114. Mason’s central involvement in the History Workshop collective vitally influenced his thinking in these respects. By issue 13 (spring 1982), *History Workshop Journal* had renamed itself “a journal of Socialist and Feminist Historians.” See the Editorial, “History Workshop Journal and Feminism.” The same issue carried an article signaling Mason’s personal shift in that direction: Tim Mason, “Comrade and Lover: Rosa Luxemburg’s Letters to Leo Jogiches,” *History Workshop Journal* 13 (spring 1982), 94–109. I’m grateful to Frank Mort for pushing me to emphasize this point.

115. Mason, epilogue to *Social Policy*, 316.

116. See, for example, Alf Lüdtke, “What Happened to the ‘Fiery Red Glow’? Workers’ Experiences and German Fascism,” in Lüdtke, ed., *The History of Everyday Life: Reconstructing Historical Experiences and Ways of Life* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 198–251; “The Appeal of Exterminating ‘Others’: German Workers and the Limits of Resistance,” in Michael Geyer and John W. Boyer, eds., *Resistance against the Third Reich, 1933–1990* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 53–74. See also Adelheid von Saldern, “Victims or Perpetrators? Controversies about the Role of Women in the Nazi State,” in David Crew, ed., *Nazism and German Society, 1933–1945* (London: Routledge, 1994), 141–65; Atina Grossmann, “Feminist Debates about Women and National Socialism,” *Gender and History* 3 (1991), 350–58.

117. Mason, epilogue to *Social Policy*, 275, 282–83.

118. The proceedings of this conference were edited by Thomas Childers and Jane Caplan as *Reevaluating the Third Reich* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1993). Tim Mason’s written reflections on the conference—in “Whatever Happened to ‘Fascism’?” *Radical History Review* 49 (1991), 89–98, reprinted as an appendix to Childers and Caplan’s *Reevaluating*

(253–62) and in Mason's *Nazism, Fascism, and the Working Class* (323–31)—do not reproduce this particular formulation's centrality to his comments at the conference.

119. Mason, epilogue to *Social Policy*, 285.

Chapter 4

1. All three initiatives were launched in 1976. The twelve-person editorial collective of *History Workshop Journal* was avowedly socialist and feminist. Two members bridged to earlier moments of left-wing British social history: Raphael Samuel (1938–96), a schoolboy member of the Communist Party Historians' Group and a moving spirit in the first New Left, and Tim Mason (1940–90), an assistant editor at *Past and Present* during 1967–71. With a third member of the collective, Gareth Stedman Jones (born 1943), a leading light of the second New Left, they convened the Oxford Social History Seminar in the later 1960s. Anna Davin (born 1940) and Sally Alexander (born 1943) were founders of women's history in Britain. The collective was heavily Oxford-centered, comprising either ex-students of the nonuniversity trade union-sponsored Ruskin College (plus Samuel, who taught there) or academic historians educated in Oxford. The youngest member was in his midtwenties; everyone was under forty. *Social History's* editorial board was entirely academic but less dominated by Oxbridge and London and generally more mixed in complexion, extending from Marxists of various kinds, through non-Marxist specialists in the history of social policy and the history of education, to fervent social science historians. While most board members were in their thirties, a few were older, and the youngest was twenty-seven. In goals, purposes, contents, and potential contributors, the two journals shared many interconnections. For example, Tim Mason had originally been recruited for the *Social History* board until *History Workshop Journal* was conceived, whereupon he left the former and was replaced as the German historian (as it happens) by me. The Social History Society was a straightforward professionalizing initiative, somewhat centered around Harold Perkin (1926–2004), who had been both the first lecturer (at Manchester in 1951) and the first professor (Lancaster in 1967) in social history at British universities. He was the author of *The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780–1880* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969), an early and influential general history written from the social history standpoint.

2. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Eugene Genovese, "The Political Crisis of Social History: A Marxian Perspective," *Journal of Social History* 10 (1976), 205–20. *Marxist Perspectives* was launched in 1978 on an extremely broad and elaborate base of support and with great hopes attached. It envisaged forms of dialogue between Marxists and non-Marxists in the profes-

sion, not dissimilar, *mutatis mutandis*, from the purposes of *Past and Present* in the 1950s. In a remarkable act of self-immolation, it ceased publishing after nine issues, essentially destroyed by its primary creators.

3. Gareth Stedman Jones, “From Historical Sociology to Theoretical History,” *British Journal of Sociology* 27 (1976), 295–305. See also the editorials by Stedman Jones and Raphael Samuel, “Sociology and History” in the inaugural issue of *History Workshop Journal* (1 [spring 1976], 6–8).

4. By “politics,” Judt meant “the means and purposes by which civil society is organized and governed.” See Tony Judt, “A Clown in Regal Purple: Social History and the Historians,” *History Workshop Journal* 7 (spring 1979), 89, 88, 68. The intemperate language of the polemic made constructive discussion among Judt’s fellow French historians in North America unlikely. Judt’s article began: “. . . social history is suffering a severe case of pollution. The subject has become a gathering place for the unscholarly, for historians bereft of ideas and subtlety” (67). It continued in the same vein: “. . . bereft of any social or theoretical value . . . complete epistemological bankruptcy . . . ludicrous . . . fundamentally unscholarly approach . . . mediocrity . . . blind belief . . . twaddle . . . unscholarly, stupid, or historically illiterate . . . shoddy work . . . the slow strangulation of social history.” These phrases are taken from pp. 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 81, 86, 88, 88, 89 respectively. As Judt acknowledged me as having suggested “the theme” of this article, the coincidence of its publication with my arrival in North America made for an interesting induction.

5. By working directly on history *per se*, Foucault offered historians readier access to poststructuralist thinking than did some other theorists (such as Jacques Derrida). Likewise, it was no accident that Foucault’s studies of particular sites and practices—such as the treatment of the insane, the practice of medicine, and especially the changing forms of punishment and incarceration—attracted more interest from historians than the purer epistemological works. Foucault’s *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* (1965), *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception* (1973), and *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1977) fell into the first category; *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (1970) and *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1972) fell into the second (all of Foucault’s works here cited were published by Pantheon in New York). See also Hayden V. White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination of Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1973); Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973).

6. See “Two Interviews with Raymond Williams,” *Red Shift* 2 (1977), 12–17, and 3 (1977), 13–15 (*Red Shift* was a small local journal produced by the Cambridge Communist Party); Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Litera-*

ture (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977); Stuart Hall, “Living with the Crisis” and “The Great Moving Right Show” (both orig. pub. 1978), in *The Hard Road to Renewal: Thatcherism and the Crisis of the Left* (London: Verso, 1988), 19–38, 39–56; Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Random House, 1978). For the Gramsci reception, see David Forgacs, “Gramsci and Marxism in Britain,” *New Left Review* 176 (July–August 1989), 70–88; Geoff Eley, “Reading Gramsci in English: Observations on the Reception of Antonio Gramsci in the English-Speaking World, 1957–1982,” *European History Quarterly* 14 (1984), 441–78.

7. During this time, Taussig also taught an anthropology graduate course based around Edward P. Thompson’s *Making of the English Working Class* (London: Gollancz, 1963; paperback ed., Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), and I spoke to his class.

8. Fox-Genovese and Genovese, “Political Crisis”; Stedman Jones, “From Historical Sociology”; Judt, “Clown in Regal Purple”; Lawrence Stone, “History and the Social Sciences in the Twentieth Century,” in Charles F. Delzell, ed., *The Future of History* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1976), 3–42.

9. Louise and Chuck Tilly, “To Prospective Participants in a Discussion of WHENCE AND WHITHER SOCIAL HISTORY?” Center for Research on Social Organization of the University of Michigan, 7 October 1979. The conference convened on 21 October 1979. I’m quoting from my own file on the subject. The comment on the impact of econometricians referred, in particular, to the huge controversy ignited during the mid-1970s by the publication of Robert William Fogel and Stanley L. Engerman’s *Time on the Cross: The Economics of American Negro Slavery* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1974). The resulting debates concerned not only the substantive claims about the economics of slavery but the relevance of quantitative methods for historians. During the mid-1970s, the general advocacy of the latter, sometimes with evangelical zeal, was at its height. See, for example, William O. Aydelotte, Allen G. Bogue, and Robert William Fogel, eds., *The Dimensions of Quantitative Research in History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972); Roderick Floud, *An Introduction to Quantitative Methods for Historians* (London: Methuen, 1973); Floud, ed., *Essays in Quantitative Economic History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974).

10. Geoff Eley, “The State of Social History,” paper presented at the conference “Whence and Whither History?” University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, October 1979.

11. Richard Johnson, “Edward Thompson, Eugene Genovese, and Socialist-Humanist History,” *History Workshop Journal* 6 (autumn 1978),

79–100; Edward P. Thompson, *The Poverty of Theory and Other Essays* (London: Merlin Press, 1978).

12. See Raphael Samuel's edited volume *People's History and Socialist Theory* (London: Routledge, 1981), 376–408, for the Oxford debate between Stuart Hall ("In Defense of Theory"), Richard Johnson ("Against Absolutism"), and Edward P. Thompson ("The Politics of Theory"). See also Martin Kettle, "The Experience of History," *New Society*, 6 December 1979, reprinted in Raphael Samuel, ed., *History Workshop: A Collectanea, 1967–1991; Documents, Memoirs, Critique, and Cumulative Index to "History Workshop Journal"* (Oxford: History Workshop, 1991), 107; Susan Magarey, "That Hoary Old Chestnut, Free Will and Determinism: Culture vs. Structure, or History vs. Theory in Britain," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 29 (1987), 626–39.

13. The short position papers written for the occasion of the conference were subsequently collected for publication by the Tillys under the rubric "Problems in Social History: A Symposium," in *Theory and Society* 9 (1980), 667–81. They include papers by Louise Tilly, Edward Shorter, Francis G. Couvares, David Levine, and Charles Tilly. The only such paper not solicited was my own. None of the intensity of the event itself or its concluding explosiveness is hinted at in that published account. There is another reference to the occasion in William H. Sewell, Jr., "Whatever Happened to the 'Social' in Social History?" in Joan W. Scott and Debra Keates, eds., *Schools of Thought: Twenty-Five Years of Interpretive Social Science* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 213: "Taking on the anthropological study of culture was therefore an exciting but also profoundly troubling step for an adept of the new social history. In my case (and I think in others as well) taking this step amounted to a sort of conversion experience, a sudden and exhilarating reshaping of one's intellectual and moral world. I can also testify that going over to anthropological methods and theories could attract considerable hostility from one's erstwhile new social history colleagues—especially in my subfield of labor history, where anything smacking of 'idealism' was taken as evidence of political as well as intellectual apostasy."

14. Frances G. Couvares, "Telling a Story in Context; or, What's Wrong with Social History?" *Theory and Society* 9 (1980), 675.

15. Charles Tilly, "Two Callings of Social History," *Theory and Society* 9 (1980), 681.

16. Louise Tilly, "Social History and Its Critics," *Theory and Society* 9 (1980), 67.

17. Louise Tilly and Joan W. Scott, *Women, Work, and Family* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1978); Joan W. Scott, *Gender and the*

Politics of History (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988). The former of these titles appeared the year before the Ann Arbor conference and took a strongly social science approach in offering the first general account of modern European social history from a women's history standpoint; the latter provided benchmark advocacy for the so-called cultural turn, taking an avowedly poststructuralist approach.

18. This reflected British feminists' crucial reassessment of Freud and the psychoanalytic tradition, undertaken during the later 1970s and early 1980s by way of Jacques Lacan. Key texts included Juliet Mitchell, *Psychoanalysis and Feminism* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974); Juliet Mitchell and Jacqueline Rose, eds., *Feminine Sexuality* (London: Macmillan, 1982); Jacqueline Rose, "Femininity and Its Discontents," *Feminist Review* 14 (1983), 5–21, reprinted in *Sexuality in the Field of Vision* (London: Verso, 1986), 83–103. For a succinct introduction, see Terry Lovell, ed., *British Feminist Thought: A Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), 187–94. See also Sally Alexander, "Women, Class, and Sexual Difference in the 1830s and 1840s: Some Reflections on the Writing of a Feminist History," *History Workshop Journal* 17 (spring 1984), 125–49, reprinted in *Becoming a Woman and Other Essays in Nineteenth and Twentieth-Century Feminist History* (New York: New York University Press, 1995), 97–125.

19. Note also the retrospective editorial "Ten Years After" (*History Workshop Journal* 20 [autumn 1985], 1–4), which situated the journal's development politically in relation to Thatcherism. A similar trajectory occurred at *Radical History Review*, running from the theme issue on British Marxist history (19 [winter 1978–79]), through the issue entitled "The Return of Narrative" (31 [1985]), to one entitled "Language, Work, and Ideology" (34 [1986]). One key early article was Donald Reid's "The Night of the Proletarians: Deconstruction and Social History" (28–30 [1984], 445–63), a discussion of Jacques Rancière. Interestingly, *Radical History Review's* issue entitled "Sexuality in History" (20 [spring–summer 1979]) contained very little evidence of the new perspectives. By the time the follow-up volume was published ten years later, however, that field was already being transformed. See Kathy Peiss and Christina Simmons, eds., *Passion and Power: Sexuality in History* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989). See also John C. Fout and Maura Shaw Tantillo, eds., *American Sexual Politics: Sex, Gender, and Race since the Civil War* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), which includes articles from the *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, newly founded in 1991.

20. This was hardly less true of Tilly and Scott's *Women, Work, and Family* than of Carl Degler's synthetic survey "Women and the Family," in

Michael Kammen, ed., *The Past before Us* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980), 308–26.

21. It's impossible to provide very extensive references here. For the history of work in Britain, see especially Sally Alexander, "Women's Work in Nineteenth-Century London" (orig. pub. 1974) and "Women, Class, and Sexual Difference," in *Becoming a Woman*, 3–55, 97–125; Sonya O. Rose, "Gender at Work: Sex, Class, and Industrial Capitalism," *History Workshop Journal* 21 (spring 1986), 113–31, and *Limited Livelihoods: Gender and Class in Nineteenth-Century England* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991); "Gender and Employment," special issue, *Social History* 13 (1988). Two key works on middle-class formation were Mary P. Ryan's *Cradle of the Middle Class: Family and Community in Oneida County, New York, 1780–1865* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981) and Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall's *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the Middle Class, 1780–1850* (London: Hutchinson, 1987). Impetus for new thinking about popular culture came through the range of new journals in cultural studies, including *Media, Culture, and Society* (1978–), *Block* (1979–89), *Social Text* (1982–), *Representations* (1983–), *Cultural Critique* (1985–), *Cultural Studies* (1987–), and *New Formations* (1987–). For a feminist critique of Edward Thompson, Raymond Williams, and the British "culturalist" classics, see Julia Swindells and Lisa Jardine, *What's Left? Women in Culture and the Labour Movement* (London: Routledge, 1990). Of course, we shouldn't exaggerate the speed of the impact of gender analysis in the 1980s. Among twenty mainly thematic essays in one imposing handbook of international research in labor history, Klaus Tenfelde's edited volume *Arbeiter und Arbeiterbewegung im Vergleich. Berichte zur internationalen historischen Forschung* (Historische Zeitschrift Sonderheft 15 [Munich: Oldenbourg, 1986]), there is not a single entry on women. Aside from a lame exculpatory footnote on the second page of the introduction, gender relations are likewise glaringly absent from Ira Katznelson and Aristide R. Zolberg's edited volume *Working-Class Formation: Nineteenth-Century Patterns in Western Europe and the United States* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986).

22. The first of Foucault's works, *Madness and Civilization*, was translated in 1965, followed by *The Order of Things* in 1970 and *Archaeology of Knowledge* in 1972. By the end of the 1970s, all his works were available in English except volumes 2 and 3 of *The History of Sexuality*, which were yet to be published in France: see *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1, *An Introduction*; vol. 2, *The Use of Pleasure*; and vol. 3, *The Care of the Self* (New York: Random House, 1978–1986). See also Michel Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. D. F. Bouchard (Oxford: Blackwell,

1977); Colin Gorden, ed., *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*, by Michel Foucault (Brighton: Harvester, 1980). For the early social histories of crime and imprisonment in Britain, see chapter 2, note 92, in the present book. The West German reception of Foucault followed similar tracks, initially occurring very much on the margins of the academy. See Uta Schaub, “Foucault, Alternative Presses, and Alternative Ideology in West Germany,” *German Studies Review* 12 (1989), 139–53. One early text that registered Foucault’s influence, via Gaston Bachelard and the French history and philosophy of science, is Keith Tribe’s *Land, Labour, and Economic Discourse* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978).

23. Peter Linebaugh, *The London Hanged: Crime and Civil Society in the Eighteenth Century* (London: Allen Lane, 1991); V. A. C. Gatrell, *The Hanging Tree: Execution and the English People, 1770–1868* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994); Richard J. Evans, *Rituals of Retribution: Capital Punishment in Germany, 1600–1987* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).

24. See Richard J. Evans, ed., *The German Underworld: Deviants and Outcasts in German History* (London: Routledge, 1988). For another general collection lacking Foucault’s influence, see Francis Snyder and Douglas Hay, eds., *Labour, Law, and Crime: An Historical Perspective* (London: Tavistock, 1987).

25. Michel Foucault, “Nietzsche, Genealogy, History,” in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, 146. Foucault also states, “The end of a genealogically directed history is not to rediscover the roots of our identity but, on the contrary, to strive to dissipate them; it does not attempt to locate the unique home from whence we come, that first homeland to which, the metaphysicians promise us, we will return; it attempts to reveal all the discontinuities that traverse us” (162). I’ve used a different translation of this passage.

26. Michel Foucault, “A Question of Method: An Interview with Michel Foucault,” *Ideology and Consciousness* 8 (1981), 6.

27. Robert Darnton, “Intellectual and Cultural History,” in Kammen, *Past Before Us*, 332.

28. See Samuel Kinsler, “Annaliste Paradigm? The Geohistorical Structure of Fernand Braudel,” *American Historical Review* 86 (1981), 63–105; Patrick Hutton, “The History of Mentalities: The New Map of Cultural History,” *History and Theory* 20 (1981), 413–23; Gregor McLennan, “Braudel and the *Annales* Paradigm,” in *Marxism and the Methodologies of History* (London: Verso, 1981), 129–51; Stuart Clark, “French Historians and Early Modern Popular Culture,” *Past and Present* 100 (August 1983), 62–99; Michael Gismondi, “‘The Gift of Theory’: A Critique of the *histoire des mentalités*,” *Social History* 10 (1985), 211–30; Dominick LaCapra, “Is Everyone a *Mentalité* Case? Transference and the ‘Culture’ Concept,” in *History and Crit-*

icism (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985), 71–94; Lynn Hunt, “French History in the Last Twenty Years: The Rise and Fall of the *Annales* Paradigm,” *Journal of Contemporary History* 21 (1986), 209–24. For a key critique from inside the tradition, see Roger Chartier, “Intellectual History or Socio-Cultural History? The French Trajectories,” in Dominick LaCapra and Steven L. Kaplan, eds., *Modern European Intellectual History: Reappraisals and New Perspectives* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982), 13–46.

29. See Tony Bennett, *Formalism and Marxism* (London: Methuen, 1979); Robert Stam, “Mikhail Bakhtin and Left Cultural Critique,” in E. Ann Kaplan, ed., *Postmodernism and Its Discontents: Theories, Practices* (London: Verso, 1988), 116–45; Peter Stallybrass and Alon White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986).

30. In the new histories of consumption, there was an older strand of social history descending from J. H. Plumb and his students, which kept a powerful progressivist understanding of economic development and social improvement in Britain since industrialization. See especially Neil McKendrick, John Brewer, and J. H. Plumb, *The Birth of a Consumer Society: The Commercialization of Eighteenth-Century England* (London: Europa, 1982). Pioneering works with similar social history derivation in other fields include Michael B. Miller’s *The Bon Marché: Bourgeois Culture and the Department Store, 1869–1920* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981), Rosalind Williams’s *Dream Worlds: Mass Consumption in Late Nineteenth-Century France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), and Richard Wightman Fox and T. Jackson Lears’s edited volume *The Culture of Consumption: Critical Essays in American History, 1880–1980* (New York: Pantheon, 1983).

31. See Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula Treichler, eds., *Cultural Studies* (New York: Routledge, 1992). Of the four historian contributors, two (James Clifford and Lata Mani) taught in the History of Consciousness Program at the University of California, Santa Cruz; Catherine Hall was a senior lecturer in cultural studies at the Polytechnic of East London; and Carolyn Steedman was a senior lecturer in arts education at the University of Warwick.

32. Geertz, “Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture,” in *Interpretation of Cultures*, 3–30; Edward P. Thompson, “Anthropology and the Discipline of Historical Context,” *Midland History* 1 (1972), 41–55.

33. Sherry B. Ortner, introduction to Ortner, ed., *The Fate of “Culture”: Geertz and Beyond* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 11. For a critical explication of Geertzian ethnography, see, in the same volume, William H. Sewell, Jr., “Geertz, Cultural Systems, and History: From Synchrony to Transformation,” 35–55.

34. See especially Sherry B. Ortner, “Theory in Anthropology since the Sixties,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 26 (1984), 126–66. Compare the later discussion of culture in the introduction to the anthology in which Ortner’s article was republished ten years later: Nicholas B. Dirks, Geoff Eley, and Sherry B. Ortner, eds., *Culture/Power/History: A Reader in Contemporary Social Theory* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), especially 3–6, 22–27, 36–39 (see 372–411 for Ortner’s article).

35. Quoted by Nicholas B. Dirks, “Introduction: Colonialism and Culture,” in Dirks, ed., *Colonialism and Culture* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992), 1. See the brilliant reflections in Fernando Coronil’s “Beyond Occidentalism toward Nonimperial Geohistorical Categories” (*Cultural Anthropology* 11 [1996], 51–87) and Couze Venn’s “Occidentalism and Its Discontents” (in Phil Cohen, ed., *New Ethnicities, Old Racisms?* [London: Zed Books, 1999], 37–62), which may stand in for the huge literatures involved.

36. James Clifford and George E. Marcus, eds., *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986); James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988); Clifford Geertz, *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988).

37. The quotations are from Dirks, Eley, and Ortner, “Introduction,” in *Culture/Power/History*, 37.

38. See Fernando Coronil, *The Magical State: Nature, Money, and Modernity in Venezuela* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997); Deborah Poole, *Vision, Race, and Modernity. A Visual Economy of the Andean Image World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997); E. Valentine Daniel, *Charred Lullabies: Chapters in an Anthropology of Violence* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996); Liisa H. Malkki, *Purity and Exile: Violence, Memory, and National Cosmology among Hutu Refugees in Tanzania* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995); Roger Rouse, “Thinking through Transnationalism: Notes on the Cultural Politics of Class Relations in the Contemporary United States,” *Public Culture* 7, no. 2 (winter 1995), 353–402, and “Questions of Identity: Personhood and Collectivity in Transnational Migration to the United States,” *Critique of Anthropology* 15 (1995), 353–80; Susan Harding, “The Born-Again Telescandals,” in Dirks, Eley, and Ortner, *Culture/Power/History*, 539–57, and *The Book of Jerry Fallwell: Fundamentalist Language and Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Sherry B. Ortner, “Reading America: Preliminary Notes on Class and Culture,” in Richard G. Fox, ed., *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present* (Santa Fe: School of American Research Press, 1991), 163–89, and *New Jersey Dreaming:*

Capital, Culture, and the Class of '58 (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003). With the exception of Poole, each of these authors has been associated with the Anthropology and History Program and the Program in the Comparative Study of Social Transformations at the University of Michigan.

39. See David R. Roediger, *The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class* (London: Verso, 1991), 7. In the passage quoted in text, Roediger paraphrases the argument of an essay by Barbara J. Fields, “Ideology and Race in American History” (in J. Morgan Kousser and James M. McPherson, eds., *Region, Race, and Reconstruction: Essays in Honor of C. Vann Woodward* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982], 143–77)—an argument reiterated in Fields, “Slavery, Race, and Ideology in the United States of America,” *New Left Review* 181 (May–June 1990), 95–118. Roediger’s own critique of this standpoint pioneered the case for histories of “whiteness.” An analogous syndrome occurred in South African historiography, where social historians broadly “schooled in the traditions of historical materialism” likewise found it hard to deal with race per se: see Saul Dubow, *Scientific Racism in Modern South Africa* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), ix–x, 1–5, 284–91. For one U.S. historian who has always maintained analysis of class and race brilliantly together, see the various works of Robin D. G. Kelley, beginning with his remarkable study of Communism in Alabama: *Hammer and Hoe: Alabama Communists during the Great Depression* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990); *Race Rebels: Culture, Politics, and the Black Working Class* (New York: Free Press, 1994); *Yo’ Mama’s Disfunktional! Fighting the Culture Wars in Urban America* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1997); *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2002).

40. Fields, “Ideology and Race,” 165.

41. Fields, “Slavery, Race, and Ideology,” 118. Fields also stated: “The ritual repetition of the appropriate social behavior makes for the continuity of ideology, not the ‘handing down’ of the appropriate ‘attitudes.’ There, too, lies the key to why people may suddenly appear to slough off an ideology to which they had appeared subservient. Ideology is not a set of attitudes that people can ‘have’ as they have a cold, and throw off the same way. Human beings live in human societies by negotiating a certain social terrain, whose map they keep alive in their minds by the collective, ritual repetition of the activities they must carry out in order to negotiate the terrain. If the terrain changes, so must their activities, and therefore so must the map” (113).

42. Roediger, *Wages of Whiteness*, 7.

43. See Barbara J. Fields, “Whiteness, Racism, and Identity,” *International Labor and Working-Class History* 60 (fall 2001), 54.

44. See Roediger, *Wages of Whiteness* and *Towards the Abolition of Whiteness: Essays on Race, Politics, and Working-Class History* (London: Verso, 1994). The concept of whiteness sparked burgeoning interest across the interdisciplinary field of American studies. Another historical work, Alexander Saxton's *The Rise and Fall of the White Republic: Class Politics and Mass Culture in Nineteenth-Century America* (London: Verso, 1990), appeared just before Roediger's book. There followed anthropologist Ruth Frankenberg's *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993) and Toni Morrison's *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992). Later monographs included Noel Ignatiev's *How the Irish Became White* (New York: Routledge, 1995), Neil Foley's *The White Scourge: Mexicans, Blacks, and Poor Whites in Texas Cotton Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), and Matthew Frye Jacobson's *Whiteness of a Different Color: European Immigrants and the Alchemy of Race* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998). For the wider cross-disciplinary literature, see Mike Smith, ed., *Whiteness: A Critical Reader* (New York: New York University Press, 1997); Michael Rogin, *Blackface, White Noise: Jewish Immigrants in the Hollywood Melting Pot* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996); Richard Dyer, *White* (London: Routledge, 1997). The usefulness of the concept was assailed by Eric Arnesen in "Whiteness and the Historians' Imagination," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 60 (fall 2001), 3–32, with responses by James R. Barrett, David Brody, Barbara J. Fields, Eric Foner, and Adolph Reed, Jr. (33–80), and a rejoinder from Arnesen, "Assessing Whiteness Scholarship" (81–92).

45. The quote is from David Roediger's afterword to the revised edition of *Wages of Whiteness* (London: Verso, 1999), 188. Eric Foner has remarked that this new interest in whiteness "cannot be separated from perceived white working-class conservatism from George Wallace voters of the 1960s to Ronald Reagan Democrats, or from the persistence of racial inequality despite the dismantling of the legal structure of discrimination" ("Response to Eric Arnesen," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 60 [fall 2001], 59).

46. The key work criticized by Roediger is Sean Wilentz, *Chants Democratic: New York City and the Rise of the American Working Class, 1788–1850* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984). See also Sean Wilentz, "Against Exceptionalism: Class Consciousness and the American Labor Movement," *International Labor and Working-Class History* 26 (fall 1984), 1–24, with responses by Nick Salvatore (25–30) and Michael Hanagan (31–36). For Roediger's critique of Wilentz, see *Wages of Whiteness*, 43–92; *Towards the Abolition*, 27–34.

47. Roediger, *Wages of Whiteness*, 13.

48. Roediger's book closed with an analysis of racism's contribution to the formation of the Irish-American working class, who laundered their own stigmatizing as an inferior race ("Irish niggers") into an ideology of superiority over blacks, vilifying the latter as their own ticket into whiteness. See *Wages of Whiteness*, 133–63.

49. See Gary Gerstle, "Liberty, Coercion, and the Making of America," *Journal of American History* 79 (1987), 556–57.

50. See Stuart Hall, "A Torpedo Aimed at the Boiler-Room of Consensus," *New Statesman*, 17 April 1998, 14–19, which also reproduces the text of Enoch Powell's speech.

51. Stuart Hall, Chas Critcher, Tony Jefferson, John Clarke, and Brian Roberts, *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order* (London: Macmillan, 1978).

52. Of course, the intellectual history of CCCS was far more elaborate than that. The best introduction is through the retrospective anthology edited by Stuart Hall, Dorothy Hobson, Andrew Lowe, and Paul Willis, *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972–79* (London: Hutchinson, 1980), especially Stuart Hall's introduction, "Cultural Studies and the Center: Some Problematics and Problems" (15–47).

53. Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies, ed., *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in 70s Britain* (London: Hutchinson, 1982). The book's opening sentence read: "The central theme of this book is that the construction of an authoritarian state in Britain is fundamentally intertwined with the elaboration of popular racism in the 1970s." See, in the same volume, John Solomos, Bob Findlay, Simon Jones, and Paul Gilroy, "The Organic Crisis of British Capitalism and Race: The Experience of the Seventies," 9.

54. Paul Gilroy, "One Nation under a Groove: The Cultural Politics of 'Race' and Racism in Britain," in Geoff Eley and Ronald Grigor Suny, eds., *Becoming National: A Reader* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 367.

55. In a sustained series of writings beginning in the late 1970s, Stuart Hall worked this argument into a theory of "Thatcherism." By this, he meant a new form of "authoritarian populism" built on the ruins of the postwar social democratic consensus, which established itself during the 1980s (and three successive election victories). A quite virulent discourse of the nation, sharpened via the Falklands/Malvinas War in 1982 and then turned against the striking coal miners during 1984–85 as the "enemy within," was vital to the cementing of that achievement. Constant evocations of Englishness, drawing on older imperial memories as well as the racist antagonisms of the postimperial present, were crucial. See especially Hall, *Hard Road to Renewal*.

56. See, for example, Paul Gilroy, “Nothing But Sweat inside My Hand: Diaspora Aesthetics and Black Arts in Britain,” in Institute for Contemporary Arts, ed., *Black Film, British Cinema*, ICA Document 7 (London: ICA, 1988), 44–46, and “It Ain’t Where You’re From, It’s Where You’re At,” *Third Text* 13 (winter 1990–91), 3–16; Kobena Mercer, “Diasporic Culture and the Dialogic Imagination: The Aesthetics of Black Independent Film in Britain,” in Mbye Cham and Claire Andrade-Watkins, eds., *Blackframes: Critical Perspectives on Black Independent Film* (Boston: MIT Press, 1988), 50–61. See also Benita Parry, “Overlapping Territories and Intertwined Histories: Edward Said’s Postcolonial Cosmopolitanism,” in Michael Sprinker, ed., *Edward Said: A Critical Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992), 23.

57. See the preface to Robert Colls and Philip Dodd, eds., *Englishness: Politics and Culture, 1880–1920* (London: Croom Helm, 1986): “Because we could not find a suitable or willing contributor, there is no account of what ‘the Empire,’ or a part of it, thought of the English.” See also Bill Schwarz, “Englishness and the Paradox of Modernity,” *New Formations* 1 (spring 1987), 147–53. There were some exceptions to historians’ neglect. For example, John MacKenzie began a long series of studies of the popular culture of imperialism, which approached “Englishness . . . as a complex of historical, moral and heroic values which justified the possession of an empire” (quoted in Parry, “Overlapping Territories,” 42 n. 7). As Parry argues, the study of “ephemeral writing such as popular fiction, text-books for use in non-elite schools, advertizing, as well as official works on colonial policy . . . would enable one to construct a language of ascendancy in self-definitions of Englishness, valorizing masculinity, encouraging notions of ‘supermen,’ inflecting patriotism with racism, and underwriting both exercise of and deferral to authority.” First published in 1972, Parry’s own *Delusions and Discoveries: India in the British Imagination, 1880–1930* (London: Verso, 1998), was an early pioneering study from a literary standpoint (see her new preface, 1–28). See John M. MacKenzie, *Propaganda and Empire: The Manipulation of British Public Opinion, 1880–1960* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984); MacKenzie, ed., *Imperialism and Popular Culture* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984). See also John A. Mangan, *The Games Ethic and Imperialism* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986); Michael Rosenthal, *The Character Factory: Baden-Powell and the Origins of the Boy Scout Movement* (New York: Pantheon, 1986).

58. Parry, “Overlapping Territories,” 23.

59. Parry, “Overlapping Territories,” 24.

60. The classic works are by the historical anthropologist Ann Laura Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002) and *Race and the Educa-*

tion of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995). The essays incorporated into *Carnal Knowledge* extend back to the late 1980s. While they presuppose all the intellectual radicalism summarized under the rubric of the "cultural turn," including an intense running conversation with sympathetic historians, Stoler's analysis is meticulously grounded in the kind of archival research and dense empirical knowledge celebrated during the heyday of social history. In fact, Stoler's earlier book *Capitalism and Confrontation in Sumatra's Plantation Belt, 1870–1979* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985) was organized around a strongly materialist political economy perspective. See also Lora Wildenthal, *German Women for Empire, 1884–1945* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2001).

61. The six founding members of the Subaltern Studies collective were Shahid Amin, David Arnold, Partha Chatterjee, David Hardiman, Gyanendra Pandey, and Guha (who edited the first six volumes, between 1982 and 1989). For *Subaltern Studies II* (1983), Dipesh Chakrabarty and Gautam Bhadra joined the collective. With the exception of Sumit Sukar, a member in 1984–94, the collective remained the same until 1996, when the editorial group considerably expanded. From *Subaltern Studies VII* (1992), editorship of the volumes rotated among the collective. Until *Subaltern Studies XI: Community, Gender, and Violence* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), edited by Partha Chatterjee and Pradeep Jenagathan, all the volumes were published by Oxford University Press in Delhi. For detailed histories of the project, see Vinayak Chaturvedi, ed., *Mapping Subaltern Studies and the Postcolonial* (London: Verso, 2000); David Ludden, ed., *Reading Subaltern Studies: Critical History, Contested Meaning, and the Globalization of South Asia* (London: Anthem Press, 2002). For Guha, see Shahid Amin and Gautam Bhadra, "Ranjit Guha: A Biographical Sketch," in David Arnold and David Hardiman, eds., *Subaltern Studies VIII: Essays in Honour of Ranjit Guha* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1994), 222–25; Dipesh Chakrabarty, "Ranjit Guha, 1922–," in Kelly Boyd, ed., *Encyclopedia of Historians and Historical Writing* (London: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 1999), 1:494.

62. For details, see Chaturvedi, introduction to *Mapping Subaltern Studies*, viii–ix. See also Aijaz Ahmad, "Fascism and National Culture: Reading Gramsci in the Days of *Hindutva*," in *Lineages of the Present: Ideology and Politics in Contemporary South Asia* (London: Verso, 2000), 129–66.

63. For the "wrestling" with theory, see Hall's answer to a question about the nature of "theoretical gains" following his talk to the April 1990 Urbana-Champaign Cultural Studies Conference, "Cultural Studies and Its Theoretical Legacies," in Grossberg, Nelson, and Treichler, *Cultural Studies*, 289.

64. Aside from Hall et al., *Policing the Crisis*, see especially the following essays by Hall: “Race, Articulation, and Societies Structured in Dominance,” in United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, ed., *Sociological Theories: Race and Colonialism* (Paris: UNESCO, 1980), 305–45; “The Whites of Their Eyes: Racist Ideologies and the Media,” in George Bridges and Ros Brunt, eds., *Silver Linings* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1981), 28–52; “Gramsci’s Relevance for the Study of Race and Ethnicity,” *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10 (1986), 5–27. In 1988–89, Hall began publishing intensively on the subject of migration, identity, “new ethnicities,” and diaspora, including his own relationship to the Caribbean. See especially “Diasporic Questions: ‘Race,’ Ethnicity, and Identity,” in David Morley and Kuan-Hsing Chen, eds., *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* (London: Routledge, 1996), 411–503 (Morley and Chen’s volume contains essays on and by Hall); “When Was ‘the Post-Colonial’? Thinking at the Limit,” in Iain Chambers and Lidia Curti, eds., *The Post-Colonial Question: Common Skies, Divided Horizons* (London: Routledge, 1996), 242–60. The shifts in Hall’s writings can be tracked through the detailed bibliography in Morley and Chen, *Stuart Hall*, 504–14.

65. For an early instance, see Francis Barker et al., eds., *Europe and Its Others: Proceedings of the Essex Conference on the Sociology of Literature, July 1984* (Colchester: University of Essex, 1985), including Edward Said’s “Orientalism Reconsidered” (14–27).

66. To take a telling example, Partha Chatterjee’s *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse?* (London: Zed Books, for the United Nations University, 1986), though conceived in direct dialogue with current Western theorists of the subject (notably, Anthony J. Smith, Ernest Gellner, and Benedict Anderson), was barely noticed by European historians; in contrast, his later *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993) became a central item of discussion. The shift of publishers was in itself symptomatic.

67. At the University of Michigan, this happened under the aegis of the Program in the Comparative Study of Social Transformations, a new interdisciplinary program launched in September 1987 and initially based on history, anthropology, and sociology. The cross-disciplinary constituency quickly broadened toward humanities departments, with a growing stress on cultural studies. Equally crucial was a strong international commitment drawing on most non-Western parts of the world. I’ve discussed this local history in Geoff Eley, “Between Social History and Cultural Studies: Interdisciplinarity and the Practice of the Historian at the End of the Twentieth Century,” in Joep Leerssen and Ann Rigney, eds., *Historians and Social Values* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2000), 96–98.

68. Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge; Harvard University Press, 1993); Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London: Routledge, 1992); “Colonial and Post-Colonial History,” special issue, *History Workshop Journal* 36 (autumn 1993); Andrew Parker, Mary Russo, Doris Sommer, and Patricia Yeagar, eds., *Nationalisms and Sexualities* (New York: Routledge, 1992); Michael Sprinker, ed., *Edward Said: A Critical Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992); Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Knopf, 1993).

69. We should never underestimate the earlier separation of discussions and their discrete circuits of influence or how slowly they managed to come together. To take Stuart Hall as an example, I remember standing in a group of highly well-informed sociologists at Michigan in spring 1986, none of whom had heard of Hall, then professor of sociology at the British Open University; within several years, his name had entered full U.S. currency. Hall exemplifies the shift in thematics I’m describing: when he spoke at Michigan under the auspices of the Program in the Comparative Study of Social Transformations in 1990, his topic was theories of power from Althusser through Gramsci to Foucault; when he spoke in 1999, his topic was the problem of “the postcolonial.”

70. See the Latin American Subaltern Studies Group’s “Founding Statement,” *Boundary 2*, no. 20 (fall 1993), 110–21, and the journal *Nepantla: Views from the South* (2000–2003), whose first issue contains a forum entitled “Cross-Genealogies and Subaltern Knowledges” (1 [2000], 9–89), with contributions by Dipesh Chakrabarty, John Beverley, Ileana Rodriguez, and Lawrence Grossberg. See also Florencia E. Mallon, “The Promise and Dilemma of Subaltern Studies: Perspectives from Latin American History,” and Frederick Cooper, “Conflict and Connection: Rethinking Colonial African History,” *American Historical Review* 99 (1994), 1491–1515, 1516–45.

71. See Sanjay Seth, *Marxist Theory and Nationalist Politics: The Case of Colonial India* (London: Sage, 1995).

72. Antonio Gramsci, “Notes on Italian History,” in Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, eds. and trans., *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971), 55, quoted by Ranajit Guha in his preface to Guha, ed., *Subaltern Studies I: Writings on South Asian History and Society* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1982), vii.

73. See Ranajit Guha, *A Rule of Property for Bengal: An Essay on the Idea of Permanent Settlement* (Paris: Mouton, 1963); “Neel Darpan: The Image of a Peasant Revolt in a Liberal Mirror,” *Journal of Peasant Studies* 2 (1974), 1–46; *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983); “The Prose of Counter-Insurgency,” in Guha, ed., *Sub-*

altern Studies II (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1983), 1–42, reprinted in Dirks, Eley, and Ortner, *Culture/Power/History*, 336–71.

74. Chakrabarty, “Ranajit Guha,” 494.

75. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, “Can the Subaltern Speak?” in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, eds., *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 271–313. This volume’s thirty-nine contributors had assembled for a conference at the University of Illinois in Urbana-Champaign in the summer of 1983. That conference’s successor was the still larger Cultural Studies Conference in the spring of 1990, the proceedings of which appeared as Grossberg, Nelson, and Treichler’s *Cultural Studies*. The shifting tenor and thematics of these two conferences were themselves an allegory of the movement from “the social” to “the cultural.”

76. These disagreements reflected acrimonious political divisions, themselves linked to the so-called culture wars of the early 1990s, centered around “postmodernism.” See the following attacks by Sumit Sarkar: “The Decline of the Subaltern in *Subaltern Studies*,” in *Writing Social History* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1996), 82–108, reprinted in Chaturvedi, *Mapping Subaltern Studies*, 300–323; and “Orientalism Revisited: Saidian Frameworks in the Writing of Modern Indian History,” in Chaturvedi, *Mapping Subaltern Studies*, 239–55. Careful rejoinders can be found in Dipesh Chakrabarty’s “Radical Histories and Question of Enlightenment Rationalism: Some Recent Critiques of *Subaltern Studies*” and Gyanendra Pandey’s “Voices from the Edge: The Struggle to Write Subaltern Histories,” in Chaturvedi, *Mapping Subaltern Studies*, 256–80, 281–99. Sarkar was a member of the Subaltern Studies collective from 1984 to 1994; Pandey was a founding member; Chakrabarty joined soon after the launch. See also David Ludden, “A Brief History of Subalternity,” in *Reading Subaltern Studies*, 1–39.

77. See Ranajit Guha, *An Indian Historiography of India: A Nineteenth-Century Agenda and Its Implications* (Calcutta: K. P. Bagchi, 1988), given as the S. G. Deuskar Lectures on Indian History in 1987; “Chandra’s Death,” in Guha, ed., *Subaltern Studies V* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1987), 135–65. This general point may be illustrated in many particular ways. See, for instance, the reconfigured problematic linking Shahid Amin’s “Small Peasant Commodity Production and Rural Indebtedness: The Culture of Sugarcane in Eastern UP, c. 1880–1920” (in Guha, *Subaltern Studies I*, 39–87) with his “Gandhi as Mahatma: Gorakhpur District, Eastern UP, 1921–2” (in Guha, ed., *Subaltern Studies III: Writings on South Asian History and Society* [Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1984], 1–61) and “Approver’s Testimony, Judicial Discourse: The Case of Chauri Chaura” (in Guha, *Subaltern Studies V*, 166–202).

78. See Edward W. Said, “Narrative, Geography, and Interpretation,” *New Left Review* 180 (March–April 1990), 81–85 (containing Said’s remarks from the first Raymond Williams Memorial Lecture, London, 10 October 1989); “Intellectuals in the Post-Colonial World,” *Salmagundi* 70–71 (spring–summer 1986), 44–64; “Jane Austen and Empire,” in Terry Eagleton, ed., *Raymond Williams: Critical Perspectives* (Oxford: Polity Press, 1989), 150–64. See also Gauri Viswanathan, “Raymond Williams and British Colonialism: The Limits of Metropolitan Cultural Theory,” in Dennis L. Dworkin and Leslie G. Roman, eds., *Views beyond the Border Country: Raymond Williams and Cultural Politics* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 217–30.

79. Nor was he particularly interested in poststructuralist thinkers, such as Derrida or Foucault. Williams remained firmly implanted in an extremely catholic range of more-centered Marxist traditions.

80. See especially “When Was Modernism?” “Metropolitan Perceptions and the Emergence of Modernism,” and “The Politics of the Avant-Garde,” in Raymond Williams, *The Politics of Modernism: Against the New Conformists*, ed. Tony Pinkney (London: Verso, 1989), 31–36, 37–48, 49–63.

81. Raymond Williams, *The Country and the City* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1973). See also Raymond Williams and Edward Said, “Media, Margins, and Modernity,” in Williams, *The Politics of Modernism*, 177–97; Edward W. Said, “Traveling Theory,” in *The World, the Text, and the Critic* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983), 226–47.

82. See especially Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000) and *Habitations of Modernity: Essays in the Wake of Subaltern Studies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002); Gyan Prakash, *Another Reason: Science and the Imagination of Modern India* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999); Ranajit Guha, *History at the Limit of World History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003) and *Dominance without Hegemony: History and Power in Colonial India* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997); Partha Chatterjee, *Nation and Its Fragments* and *A Possible India: Essays in Political Criticism* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1997). See also, in general, the contents of the two most recent Subaltern Studies volumes: Gautam Bhadra, Gyan Prakash, and Susie Tharu, eds., *Subaltern Studies X: Writings on South Asian History and Society* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1999), and Partha Chatterjee and Pradeep Jeganathan, eds., *Subaltern Studies XI: Community, Gender and Violence* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000).

83. Said, *Orientalism*, 14.

84. Said, *Orientalism*, 19.

85. For an incisive reflection on contemporary postcoloniality, see Nicholas B. Dirks, “Postcolonialism and Its Discontents: History, Anthro-

pology, and Postcolonial Critique,” in Scott and Keates, *Schools of Thought*, 227–51. For a brilliant demonstration of the profound implications for writing the history of the metropolis, see the following essays by Bill Schwarz: “Not Even Past Yet,” *History Workshop Journal* 57 (spring 2004), 101–15; “Crossing the Seas,” in Schwarz, ed., *West Indian Intellectuals in Britain* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003), 1–30; and “Becoming Postcolonial,” in Paul Gilroy, Lawrence Grossberg, and Angela McRobbie, eds., *Without Guarantees: In Honour of Stuart Hall* (London: Verso, 2000), 268–81. See also Schwarz’s interview with Stuart Hall, “Breaking Bread with History: C. L. R. James and *The Black Jacobins*,” *History Workshop Journal* 46 (autumn 1998), 17–31.

86. I should perhaps give myself more credit in this respect. For example, I learned a great deal directly from the work of my first doctoral student at the University of Michigan in the early 1980s, who explored the influence of popular perceptions of empire inside English society in the nineteenth century: see Susan Thorne, *Congregational Missions and the Making of an Imperial Culture in Nineteenth-Century England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999). Lora Wildenthal’s *German Women for Empire* also began as a dissertation in the mid-1980s.

87. “Nostalgia for the Present” is the title of a chapter focused around film in Fredric Jameson’s *Postmodernism, or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991), 279–96.

88. See Pierre Nora, *Les lieux de mémoire*, 7 vols. (Paris, 1984–92), translated as *The Realms of Memory: The Construction of the French Past*, 3 vols. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997–), and *Rethinking France*, 4 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001–). For the genesis of a German counterpart, see Etienne François, Hannes Siegrist, and Jakob Vogel, eds., *Nation und Emotion: Deutschland und Frankreich im Vergleich 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1995). For a searching critique, see Peter Carrier, “Places, Politics, and the Archiving of Contemporary Memory in Pierre Nora’s *Les lieux de mémoire*,” in Susannah Radstone, ed., *Memory and Methodology* (Oxford: Berg, 2000), 37–57.

89. This paragraph is deliberately composed from the buzzwords of contemporary social theory and cultural commentary. See, in particular, David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989); Roland Robertson, *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture* (London: Sage, 1992); Alain Lipietz, *Towards a New Economic Order: Post-Fordism, Ecology, and Democracy* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992). The phrase “the post-modern condition” originates with Jean-François Lyotard (*The Postmodern Condition* [Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1984]); the phrase “the end of history” was launched into public discourse by Francis Fukuyama (*The*

End of History and the Last Man [New York: Free Press, 1992]); the phrase “cultural logic” comes from Jameson (*Postmodernism, or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*). The best early handbook of commentary on these transitions is still Stuart Hall and Martin Jacques’s edited volume *New Times: The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990s* (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1991). See also Ash Amin, ed., *Post-Fordism: A Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1994).

90. See Jameson’s important argument about “cognitive mapping,” in *Postmodernism*, 45–54, 408–18.

91. See especially Steven L. Kaplan, *Farewell Revolution: Disputed Legacies, France, 1789/1989* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995) and *Farewell, Revolution: The Historians’ Feud, France, 1789/1989* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995); Geoff Eley, “Finding the People’s War: Film, British Collective Memory, and World War II,” *American Historical Review* 105 (2001), 818–38.

92. See especially Martin Evans and Ken Lunn, eds., *War and Memory in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford, 1997).

93. Raphael Samuel, *Theatres of Memory*, vol. 1, *Past and Present in Contemporary Culture* (London: Verso, 1994), 443–44. This understanding of history as an organic form of knowledge is again anticipated by Raymond Williams, who was also a nonhistorian by discipline.

94. See, in particular, Lynn Hunt’s edited volume *The New Cultural History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989) and the later retrospective edited by Victoria E. Bonnell and Lynn Hunt, *Beyond the Cultural Turn: New Directions in the Study of Society and Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999). If the first of these volumes expressed what seems in retrospect far more a set of local Berkeley preoccupations, the second opens a very partial window onto the intervening discussions.

95. See Charles Tilly, *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons* (New York: Russell Sage, 1984).

96. The best-known representative of this group is Carlo Ginzburg: see *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980; orig. pub., in Italian, 1976); *The Night Battles: Witchcraft and Agrarian Cults in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983; orig. pub., in Italian, 1966); *Clues, Myth, and the Historical Method* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1989; orig. pub., in Italian, 1986); *Ecstasies: Deciphering the Witches’ Sabbath* (New York: Pantheon, 1991; orig. pub., in Italian, 1989); *The Judge and the Historian: Marginal Notes on a Late Twentieth-Century Miscarriage of Justice* (London: Verso, 1999). Other representatives include Eduardo Grendi, Carlo Poni, and Giovanni Levi. See Giovanni Levi, “On Micro-History,” in Peter Burke, ed., *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*

(University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992), 93–113; Edward Muir and Guido Ruggiero, eds., *Microhistory and the Lost Peoples of Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1991).

97. For an excellent showcase of this work, see Alf Lüdtke, ed., *The History of Everyday Life: Reconstructing Historical Experiences and Ways of Life* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995); for my own commentary, see Geoff Eley, “Labor History, Social History, *Alltagsgeschichte*: Experience, Culture, and the Politics of the Everyday; A New Direction for German Social History?” *Journal of Modern History* 61, no. 2 (June 1989), 297–343.

98. See Natalie Zemon Davis, *Society and Culture in Early Modern France* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975); *The Return of Martin Guerre* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983); *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and Their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987). See also Robert Darnton, *The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History* (New York: Basic Books, 1984).

99. Beginning with *The Making of the English Working Class* (London: Gollancz, 1963; paperback ed., Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), Thompson conducted a running debate with historical sociologies of various kinds, as well as angry polemics against the ahistorical varieties. For an excellent example, see Edward P. Thompson, “On History, Sociology, and Historical Relevance,” *British Journal of Sociology* 27 (1976), 387–402.

100. Joan W. Scott, “Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis,” *American Historical Review* 91 (1986), 1053–75. This essay was reprinted two years later in the same author’s hugely influential volume *Gender and the Politics of History* (28–50). The specific quote is taken from *Gender and the Politics of History*, 42.

101. For instance, debate surrounded Joan W. Scott’s “On Language, Gender, and Working-Class History,” which appeared in *International Labor and Working-Class History* 31 (spring 1987), 1–13, with responses by Bryan D. Palmer (14–23), Christine Stansell (24–29), and Anson Rabinbach (30–36); see also Scott’s “Reply to Criticism” (32 [1987], 39–45). Unfortunately, Scott initiated much of the acrimony accompanying these discussions. See her debate with Laura Lee Downs over Downs’s “If ‘Woman’ Is Just an Empty Category, Then Why Am I Afraid to Walk Alone at Night? Identity Politics Meets the Postmodern Subject,” *Comparative Study in Society and History* 35 (1993), 414–37; Joan W. Scott, “The Tip of the Volcano,” 438–43; Downs, “Reply to Joan Scott,” 444–51. See also Bryan D. Palmer, *Descent into Discourse: The Reification of Language and the Writing of Social History* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990), 172–86. For the key constructive response, see Kathleen Canning, “Gender and the Politics of

Class Formation: Rethinking German Labor History,” *American Historical Review* 97 (1992), 736–68, and “Feminist History after the Linguistic Turn: Historicizing Discourse and Experience,” *Signs* 19 (1994), 368–404.

102. An important exception during this period was Judith R. Walkowitz, whose *City of Dreadful Delight: Narratives of Sexual Danger in Late-Victorian London* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992) carefully negotiated the challenges of culturalism, building on her earlier *Prostitution and Victorian Society: Women, Class, and the State* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980), which was firmly located in social history. See also her early articles, which managed to register the possibilities of the cultural turn without repudiating social history: “Male Vice and Feminist Virtue: Feminism and the Politics of Prostitution in Nineteenth-Century Britain,” *History Workshop Journal* 13 (spring 1982), 79–93, with Jane Caplan’s Introduction, “The Politics of Prostitution,” 77–78; and “Science, Feminism and Romance: The Men and Women’s Club 1885–1889,” *History Workshop Journal* 21 (spring 1986), 37–59.

103. See also Eley, “Finding the People’s War,” 818. Although it has clear affinities, this is not the same as the other distinction, often attributed to “postmodernists” but actually an axiom of self-conscious historical writing for many years, which separates “history as the past” from “history as the processes through which historians endow the past with meaning.” Where the one comprises the never attainable reservoir of everything that has ever happened, the other encompasses the rules and methods, narratives and interpretations, and theories and intuitions required to give it shape. My own point is that professional historians are by no means the only people engaging in that task.

104. One of the best short descriptions of this feminist intellectual history in Britain is Lovell’s introduction to *British Feminist Thought*, especially 21–22. See also Michele Barrett’s new introduction to the revised 1988 edition of her *Women’s Oppression Today: Problems in Marxist Feminist Analysis* (London, 1980), whose subtitle was changed to *The Marxist/Feminist Encounter*. The author’s intervening reflections marked the challenge of poststructuralisms of various kinds to the earlier certainties of materialism, while foregrounding the profoundly differing political context of the 1980s as opposed to the 1970s, especially the now inescapable salience of “race,” racism, and ethnicity. In the meantime, the specifically British coordinates of the discussion have become clearer. See Imelda Whelehan, *Modern Feminist Thought: From the Second Wave to “Post-Feminism”* (New York: New York University Press, 1995).

105. Ginzburg, *The Cheese and the Worms*; Jacques Rancière, *The Nights of*

Labor: The Workers' Dream in Nineteenth-Century France (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989); Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *The Railway Journey: Trains and Travel in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: Urizen Books, 1979).

106. Ginzburg was taken up extremely quickly in *History Workshop Journal*. See Carlo Ginzburg, "Morelli, Freud, and Sherlock Holmes: Clues and Scientific Method," *History Workshop Journal* 9 (spring 1980), 5–36; Keith Luria, "The Paradoxical Carlo Ginzburg" and (with Romulo Gandolfo) "Carlo Ginzburg: An Interview," *Radical History Review* 35 (1986), 80–111. I remember my friend and coauthor David Blackburn enthusing about Schivelbusch in the early 1980s: see David Blackburn and Geoff Eley, *The Peculiarities of German History: Bourgeois Society and Politics in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), 186, 214. For Rancière, see Reid, "The Night of the Proletarians."

107. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983); Ronald Fraser, *In Search of a Past: The Manor House, Amnersfield, 1933–1945* (London: Verso, 1984); Patrick Wright, *On Living in an Old Country: The National Past in Contemporary Britain* (London: Verso, 1985); Stallybrass and White, *The Politics and Poetics of Transgression*; Carolyn Steedman, *Landscape for a Good Woman: A Story of Two Lives* (London: Virago, 1986); Denise Riley, "Am I That Name?" *Feminism and the Category of "Women" in History* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988).

108. Said, *Orientalism*; Guha, *Subaltern Studies I*; Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies, *The Empire Strikes Back*; Paul Gilroy, "There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack": *The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation* (London: Hutchinson, 1987); Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?"; Homi Bhabha, "The Other Question: The Stereotype and Colonial Discourse," *Screen* 24 (1983), 18–36; Hall, "Race, Articulation, and Societies," "Whites of Their Eyes," and "Gramsci's Relevance"; James C. Scott, *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985) and *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990); Said, *Culture and Imperialism*.

109. For early instances of more densely grounded historical accounts, see especially Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Race and the Education of Desire*; Catherine Hall, *White, Male, and Middle-Class: Explorations in Feminism and History* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992); Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Conquest* (New York: Routledge, 1995). Significantly, none of these three authors was a historian in the full disciplinary sense: Stoler is an anthropologist, McClintock is a literary scholar, and Hall is a historian who taught successively in departments of cultural studies and sociology until 1998.

110. Strictly speaking, Steedman's book comes in three parts: "Stories" is a single chapter setting out the overall approach; "Exiles" assembles two chapters of autobiographical materials (or stories) about her memories of her mother and father, for use as the case study; and "Interpretations" situates those materials through a set of five historical reflections ("Living outside the Law," "Reproduction and Refusal," "Childhoods," "Exclusions," and "Histories").

111. Elton believed, bizarrely, that aspirant historians could go naked into the archive. See Geoffrey R. Elton, *The Practice of History* (London: Fontana, 1967); see also his later diatribe against the linguistic turn, *Return to Essentials: Some Reflections on the Present State of Historical Study* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991). To affirm the importance of the historian's apprenticeship is another matter entirely. Cf. Carolyn Steedman, "History and Autobiography," in *Past Tenses: Essays on Writing, Autobiography, and History* (London: Rivers Oram Press, 1992), 45–46: "I really do believe, as a result of my education and socialization as a historian, that nothing can be said to have happened in the past until you have spent three years at it (three years at least), got on many trains, opened many bundles in the archives, stayed in many flea-bitten hotels. This is the craft-romance of historical practice, and I fall for it all the way." I agree.

112. See Carolyn Steedman, *Dust: The Archive and Cultural History* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2002), especially chapter 4, "The Space of Memory: In an Archive" (66–88).

113. Steedman, *Dust*, 68.

114. Thomas Richards, *The Imperial Archive: Knowledge and the Fantasy of Empire* (London: Verso, 1993), 11.

115. Steedman, *Dust*, 81.

116. For further pushing of the envelope, see Natalie Zemon Davis, *Women on the Margins: Three Seventeenth-Century Lives* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995); *Slaves on Screen: Film and Historical Vision* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000).

117. Rather than calling this new area of work "biography" in the received sense, a better way of posing the possibilities would be to focus on the treatment of lives as complex and fragmentary texts, whose reading requires placement in a rich variety of settings. For brilliant reflections to this effect, see Kali Israel, *Names and Stories: Emilia Dilke and Victorian Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999). Three superb examples of "un-biography" in this sense are Regina Morantz-Sanchez's *Conduct Unbecoming a Woman: Medicine on Trial in Turn-of-the-Century Brooklyn* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), Carolyn Steedman's *Childhood, Culture, and Class in Britain: Margaret McMillan, 1860–1931* (London: Virago, 1990), and Israel's

Names and Stories. For further reflections, see Carolyn Steedman, “Forms of History, Histories of Form,” in *Past Tenses*, 159–70; Steedman, *Dust*, 149–50; Luisa Passerini, “Transforming Biography: From the Claim of Objectivity to Intersubjective Plurality,” *Rethinking History* 4 (2000), 413–16.

118. See my detailed commentary in Geoff Eley, “Is All the World a Text? From Social History to the History of Society Two Decades Later,” in Terrence J. McDonald, ed., *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), 193–243.

119. The quotation is from Olivia Harris, “Of All His Exploring,” *History Workshop Journal* 20 (autumn 1985), 176 (a review of Ronald Fraser’s *In Search of a Past*).

120. Timothy G. Ashplant, “Fantasy, Narrative, Event: Psychoanalysis and History,” *History Workshop Journal* 23 (spring 1987), 168.

121. This point was made by Jacqueline Rose in “A Comment,” *History Workshop Journal* 28 (autumn 1989), 152.

122. For a fascinating illustration of the new interest in psychoanalytic theory, both as a vector for the new cultural history and in sharp contrast to the kind of questions it was possible to ask thirty years ago, during the height of the social history wave, see Saul Dubow and Jacqueline Rose’s new edition of Wulf Sachs’s *Black Hamlet* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996; orig. pub. 1937). This book was the record of a psychoanalytic encounter during 1933–35 between Sachs, a Jewish South African psychiatrist, and John Chavafambira, a Manyika *nganga* (healer-diviner), who arrived in Johannesburg in 1927. Based formally on the mutual exchange of contrasting medical expertise, but predicated around obvious disparities of power and position, Sachs’s account now stands as a remarkable sociocultural document. In their preface, Dubow and Rose describe a “modern readership with interests in the construction of social identity, the relationship between knowledge and power, and the interconnections between psychoanalytic, literary, and historical thought” (x–xi). This readership could not have been postulated until recently. It is entirely an artifact of the period since the 1980s.

123. Steedman, *Landscape*, 21.

124. Carolyn Steedman, *Policing the Victorian Community: The Formation of English Provincial Police Forces, 1856–80* (London: Routledge, 1984).

125. *Landscape* was published in 1986. It was preceded by *The Tidy House: Little Girls Writing* (London: Virago, 1982), which received the Fawcett Society Book Prize for 1983, and by Carolyn Steedman, Cathy Urwin, and Valerie Walkerdine, eds., *Language, Gender, and Childhood* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985), a volume of papers originating in the “Lan-

guage and Learning” stream of the fourteenth History Workshop, which was entitled “Language and History” and held at Brighton in November 1980. Then came *The Radical Soldier’s Tale: John Pearman, 1819–1908* (London: Routledge, 1988); *Childhood, Culture, and Class*; and *Past Tenses*. The *Language, Gender, and Childhood* volume bears revealingly on the themes of this chapter in two respects. First, the fourteenth History Workshop was conceived very much with the aim of healing the divisiveness of the previous workshop (the last one held in Oxford, in November 1979). As the three editors remark, the latter had been “a dividing place for more than the Workshop itself.” They explain: “It brought a tradition of people’s history and workers’ writing into direct confrontation with new sources of socialism from Europe, and there was a dramatic enactment of this confrontation in the darkness of a deconsecrated church in Walton Street, where titanic figures of the left boomed the struggle in imperious male voices; and the only woman on the platform stood up to say that, excluded from the form and rhetoric of the debate, she could only stay silent” (7). (For the thirteenth History Workshop, see note 12 above.) Second, the affiliations of the eight contributors illustrate yet again the provenance of innovative historical work coming from outside the discipline during the 1980s: only one contributor was in a history department; one came from English, one from child care and development, two from education, and three from cultural studies. In the meantime, three now hold professorial appointments in history.

126. In the fall of 1992, she taught in the History Department at the University of Michigan. In 1993, she was appointed to a readership in the Warwick Center for the Study of Social History, founded by Edward Thompson in 1965 and since closed down.

127. Steedman, *Landscape*, 7.

128. Steedman, *Landscape*, 5.

129. Mary Chamberlain, “Days of Future Past,” *New Socialist*, April 1986, 43.

130. Steedman, “History and Autobiography,” 47.

131. Steedman, “History and Autobiography,” 50.

132. Steedman, introduction to *Past Tenses*, 10.

133. Steedman, “History and Autobiography,” 48–49. Cf. Carolyn Steedman, “Culture, Cultural Studies, and the Historians,” in Grossberg, Nelson, and Treichler, *Cultural Studies*, 614: “This is to say that history is the most impermanent of written forms: it is only ever an account that will last a while. The very practice of historical work, the uncovering of new facts, the endless reordering of the immense detail that makes the historian’s map of the past, performs this act of narrative destabilization, on a daily basis. The written history does, of course, reach narrative closure all the time, for man-

uscripts have to be delivered to publishers and papers given; but that is only its formal closure. Soon, the written history rejoins—has to rejoin—the insistent, tireless, repetitive beat of a cognitive form that has no end”; “the written history is not just *about* time, doesn’t just *describe* time, or *take time as its setting*; rather, it embeds time in its narrative structure.”

134. Steedman, introduction to *Past Tenses*, 11. Elsewhere, Steedman describes “a large-scale cultural shift in understanding of the self that had to do with ideas and theories of development and growth in the human subject and a new relationship to time.” According to Steedman, “‘The child’ (that is, real children and child-figures) embodied this understanding that was conceptualized across a wide variety of public forms at the turn of the [twentieth] century.” Steedman similarly maintains that “the state of childhood came to be understood as an extension of the self: an extension in time, into the future, and an extension of depth and space, of individual interiority—a way of describing the space lying deep within the individual soul; always a lost place, but at the same time, *always there*.” See Carolyn Steedman, “*La Théorie qui n’en est pas une*; or, Why Clio Doesn’t Care,” in Ann-Louise Shapiro, ed., *Feminists Revision History* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1994), 86, 88.

135. Steedman, *Childhood, Culture, and Class*, 259.

136. See Carolyn Steedman, “The Watercress Seller,” in *Past Tenses*, 193–202.

137. The opening of her brief essay “Women’s Biography and Autobiography: Forms of History, Histories of Form” (in Helen Carr, ed., *From My Guy to Sci-Fi: Genre and Women’s Writing in the Postmodern World* [London: Pandora, 1989], 99) provides a useful prospectus for this aspect of her work: “This essay, then, involves a discussion of literary form, of what literary forms permit and what they prevent in particular historical contexts.”

138. The Punjabi girl, named Amarjit, was an English-born nine-year-old whose family came originally from rural Punjab. Steedman taught her sometime in the late 1970s, in a group needing extra help with reading and writing. After taking home a particular book the previous day, Amarjit made up a song from a considerable portion of the text. Steedman recorded the song. For Steedman’s reflections on the reaction of the school and the wider cultural, historical, and theoretical meanings of the story, see the remarkable essay “‘Listen, How the Caged Bird Sings’: Amarjit’s Song,” in Steedman, Urwin, and Walkerdine, *Language, Gender, and Childhood*, 137–63, reprinted, in a shortened version, in Steedman, *Past Tenses*, 90–108. See also Steedman’s commentary on the *Memoir of John Pearman*, in *The Radical Soldier’s Tale*, 1–106. *The Tidy House* was Steedman’s account of a story composed by three working-class eight-year-old girls in 1976 about the lives they expected themselves to lead. Apart from the acuteness of its reading of the

emergent imaginary of the small child, in all its gendered and class-ridden complexities, this book contains a brilliant sustained reflection on the relationship between cognition and writing.

139. This is one of the major themes of Steedman's *Childhood, Culture, and Class*. For a reconsideration, see Carolyn Steedman, "Fictions of Engagement: Eleanor Marx, Biographical Space," in John Stokes, ed., *Eleanor Marx (1855–1898): Life—Work—Contacts* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), especially 35–39.

140. See Carolyn Steedman, "A Weekend with Elektra," *Literature and History*, 3rd ser., 6 (1997), 25.

141. Steedman, "Weekend with Elektra," 18.

142. Steedman, "Weekend with Elektra," 26. See Steedman's related discussions in "Culture, Cultural Studies, and the Historians" and "The Price of Experience: Women and the Making of the English Working Class," *Radical History Review* 59 (spring 1994), 109–19.

143. As Steedman notes, this telling "happened somewhere else, in a piece of writing that Thompson published two years after *The Making . . .* came out." In a short story called "The Rising Cost of Righteousness," published in 1965 in the short-lived New Left magazine *Views* (1963–66), Thompson "does appear to use the suffering self embodied in a woman to tell of social and political relationships." Set in contemporary Yorkshire, the story centers on a young woman's bid for independence, her defeated return to a loveless lower-middle-class marriage, and the act of marital rape that ensues. Steedman's reading of this text allows her to "place Thompson more securely than anything else could, within the radical tradition that was inaugurated in the early eighteenth century, of telling the story of political power and political relations, as sexual domination and exploitation." See Steedman, "Weekend with Elektra," 26, 28.

144. Steedman, "Culture, Cultural Studies, and the Historians," 613–14. The quotation inside the quotation is from a W. H. Auden poem, "Musée Des Beaux Arts," which, as it happens, was chosen by Stuart Hall to be read at Raphael Samuel's funeral. See W. H. Auden, *Collected Shorter Poems, 1927–1957* (London: Faber and Faber, 1966), 123; "Raphael Samuel, 1938–1996," *History Workshop Journal* 43 (spring 1997), vi–vii.

145. Steedman admits, "I see now that I have spent all my life resisting the account of class formation that I was given in that teaching, *not* because it excludes women, but because it is a heroic tale, which most experiences do not fit (which even most of the experiences of the men named in the epic do not fit)" ("Price of Experience," 108).

146. Joseph Bristow, "Life Stories: Carolyn Steedman's History Writing," *New Formations* 13 (1991), 114.

147. Carolyn Steedman, “Englishness, Clothes, and Little Things,” in Christopher Breward, Becky Conekin, and Caroline Cox, eds., *The Englishness of English Dress* (Oxford: Berg, 2002), 29–44; “What a Rag Rug Means,” in *Dust*, 112–41.

148. See Carolyn Steedman, “Lord Mansfield’s Women,” *Past and Present* 176 (August 2002), 105–43; “The Servant’s Labour: The Business of Life, England, 1760–1820,” *Social History* 29 (2004), 1–29.

Chapter 5

1. See Alf Lüdtke, *The History of Everyday Life: Reconstructing Historical Experiences and Ways of Life* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995); Geoff Eley, “Labor History, Social History, *Alltagsgeschichte*: Experience, Culture, and the Politics of the Everyday; A New Direction for German Social History?” *Journal of Modern History* 61, no. 2 (June 1989), 297–343.

2. For evidence of greater pluralism, see Winfried Schulze, ed., *Sozialgeschichte, Alltagsgeschichte, Mikro-Historie. Eine Diskussion* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1994). For a recent anthology, which constructs the German genealogies of cultural history largely without the battles of the 1980s, while effacing the pioneering contribution of *Alltagsgeschichte*, see Ute Daniel, *Kompendium Kulturgeschichte: Theorien, Praxis, Schlüsselwörter* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2001), which also ignores Raymond Williams and the British-American lines of cultural studies. I reviewed these partialities in Geoff Eley, “Problems with Culture: German History after the Linguistic Turn,” *Central European History* 31 (1998), 197–227.

3. See Joan Wallach Scott, “Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis,” *American Historical Review* 91 (1986), 1053–75, reprinted in *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 28–50; Lawrence Stone, “History and Post-Modernism,” *Past and Present* 131 (May 1991), 217–18, with later responses by Patrick Joyce and Catriona Kelly (133 [November 1991], 204–9, 209–13), Stone and Gabrielle M. Spiegel (135 [May 1992], 189–94, 194–208; David Mayfield and Susan Thorne, “Social History and Its Discontents: Gareth Stedman Jones and the Politics of Language,” *Social History* 17 (1992), 165–88, with responses from Jon Lawrence and Miles Taylor (18 [1993], 1–15), Patrick Joyce (18 [1993], 81–85; 20 [1995], 73–91; 21 [1996], 96–98), Mayfield and Thorne (18 [1993], 219–33), Anthony Easthope (18 [1993], 235–49), James Vernon and Neville Kirk (19 [1994], 81–97, 221–40), Kelly Boyd and Rohan McWilliam (19 [1994], 93–100), Geoff Eley and Keith Nield (19 [1994], 355–64), and Marc W. Steinberg (19 [1994], 193–214).

4. For this wider context, see Paul Berman’s edited volume *Debating P.C.: The Controversy over Political Correctness on College Campuses* (New York:

Laurel, 1992), which anthologizes the primary commentaries, and Sarah Dunant's edited volume *The War of the Words: The Political Correctness Debate* (London: Virago, 1994), which collects British reactions. See also Christopher Newfield and Ronald Strickland, eds., *After Political Correctness: The Humanities and Society in the 1990s* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1995); Cary Nelson and Dilip Parameshwar Gaonkar, eds., *Disciplinary and Dissent in Cultural Studies* (New York: Routledge, 1996); Amitava Kumar, ed., *Class Issues: Pedagogy, Cultural Studies, and the Public Sphere* (New York: New York University Press, 1997); Michael Berubé, *Public Access: Literary Theory and American Cultural Politics* (London: Verso, 1994). Interestingly, with the singular exception of Joan Scott, historians by discipline were virtually never involved in these wider debates.

5. Bryan D. Palmer, *Descent into Discourse: The Reification of Language and the Writing of Social History* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990), 188.

6. In my own view, that crisis of “class-political understanding” bespoke an actually occurring sociopolitical transition of genuinely epochal dimensions. In other words, together with the larger political and theoretical rethinking it connoted, the cultural turn represented a necessary struggling with contemporary problems, for which the loyal reaffirming of classical materialist positions afforded little help. For further discussion, see Geoff Eley and Keith Nield, “Farewell to the Working Class?” *International Labor and Working-Class History* 57 (spring 2000), 1–30; Geoff Eley, *Forging Democracy: The History of the Left in Europe, 1850–2000* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), especially 341–504. The current status of the class concept in historiography, theory, and politics will be addressed by Keith Nield and myself in our forthcoming book on the subject (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).

7. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001). For critical responses, see also Gopal Balakrishnan, ed., *Debating Empire* (London: Verso, 2003). Among the burgeoning self-analytical literatures generated by the antiglobalization movement, one of the most suggestive is Joel Schalit's edited volume *The Anti-Capitalism Reader: Imagining a Geography of Opposition* (New York: Akashic Books, 2002).

8. For Bryan Palmer's own subsequent recognition of this, see his *Culture of Darkness: Night Travels in the Histories of Transgression* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2000), an eloquent and imaginative tour de force of historiographical synthesis, deploying the insights and findings of the new cultural histories across a dazzling variety of settings between the medieval era and now.

9. My implicit reference here is to Richard J. Evans, *In Defence of History* (New York: Norton, 2000).

10. Edward P. Thompson, “Anthropology and the Discipline of Historical Context,” *Midland History* 1 (1972), 41–55.

11. Charles Tilly, *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons* (New York: Russell Sage, 1984). For a good insight into one field of contemporary debate, see Keith Jenkins, ed., *The Postmodern History Reader* (London: Routledge, 1997).

12. Eric J. Hobsbawm, “From Social History to the History of Society,” *Daedalus* 100 (1971), 20–45.

13. Such superb studies as those of Chakrabarty, Prakash, and other Subaltern Studies historians aren’t immune from this tendency. Likewise, in Harootunian’s sophisticated reflections on the understandings of history shaping Japanese and European conceptions of modernity, some remarkably simplified allusions to the West do service. But I mean neither to diminish the importance of these works nor to question the need for abstract theorizing of the West. See Gyan Prakash, *Another Reason: Science and the Imagination of Modern India* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999); Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000); Harry Harootunian, *History’s Disquiet: Modernity, Cultural Practice, and the Question of Everyday Life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000). For careful and levelheaded reflections on these matters, see Nicholas B. Dirks, *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 303–15; “Postcolonialism and Its Discontents: History, Anthropology, and Postcolonial Critique,” in Joan W. Scott and Debra Keates, eds., *Schools of Thought: Twenty-Five Years of Interpretive Social Science* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 227–51.

14. Dipesh Chakrabarty, “Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History,” in *Provincializing Europe*, 27.

15. Among the most useful of the proliferating discussions of Europe’s meanings, see Anthony Pagden, ed., *The Idea of Europe from Antiquity to the European Union* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

16. The quotation comes from Terry Eagleton, *Ideology: An Introduction* (London: Verso, 1991), 28. See also Raymond Williams, “Culture is Ordinary,” in *Resources of Hope: Culture, Democracy, Socialism* (London: Verso, 1989), 3–18. This barely scratches the surface of the full range of definitions and usages of the term *culture*. Thus, social science historians tend to treat culture as a separable domain of study (as in forms of systems theory, including Habermasian conceptions of the “lifeworld”) or else approach it discretely as “values” via consumer preferences, rational actor models, neo-institutional approaches, and so forth. See, for instance, Joseph Melling and

Jonathan Barry, eds., *Culture in History: Production, Consumption, and Values in Historical Perspective* (Exeter: Exeter University Press, 1992).

17. Carolyn Steedman, "Culture, Cultural Studies, and the Historians," in Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula A. Treichler, eds., *Cultural Studies* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 617.

18. Steedman, "Culture, Cultural Studies, and the Historians," 616–17. For the source of the joke (at Robert Darnton's expense), see Dominick LaCapra, "Is Everyone a *Mentalité* Case? Transference and the 'Culture' Concept," in *History and Criticism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985), 71–94. See also LaCapra, "Chartier, Darnton, and the Great Symbol Massacre," in *Soundings in Critical Theory* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989), 67–89. An important essay that addresses the unease expressed here is Richard Biernacki's "Method and Metaphor after the New Cultural History," in Victoria E. Bonnell and Lynn Hunt, eds., *Beyond the Cultural Turn: New Directions in the Study of Society and Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 62–92.

19. Early influential texts were Vron Ware's *Beyond the Pale: White Women, Racism, and History* (London: Verso, 1992) and the essays collected in Ann Laura Stoler's *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002). For a key recent anthology, see Antoinette Burton, ed., *After the Imperial Turn: Thinking with and through the Nation* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003). For British history, the pioneering essays were by Catherine Hall, in *White, Male and Middle Class: Explorations in Feminism and History* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 205–95. See also Susan Thorne, *Congregational Missions and the Making of an Imperial Culture in Nineteenth-Century England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999); Clare Midgley, ed., *Gender and Imperialism* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998); Bill Schwarz, *Memories of Empire in Twentieth-Century England* (forthcoming); Antoinette Burton, "Who Needs the Nation? Interrogating 'British' History," in Catherine Hall, ed., *Cultures of Empire: Colonizers in Britain and the Empire in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. A Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 138–39, and "Thinking Beyond the Boundaries: Empire, Feminism, and the Domains of History," *Social History* 26 (2001), 6–71; Simon Gikandi, *Maps of Englishness: Writing Identity in the Culture of Colonialism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996); Raphael Samuel, "Empire Stories: The Imperial and the Domestic," in *Theatres of Memory*, vol. 2, *Island Stories: Unravelling Britain* (London: Verso, 1998); Kathleen Wilson, *The Sense of the People: Politics, Culture, and Imperialism in England, 1715–1785* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Catherine Hall, "The Nation Within and Without," in Catherine Hall, Keith

McClelland, and Jane Rendall, *Defining the Victorian Nation: Class, Race, Gender, and the Reform Act of 1867* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 179–233; Catherine Hall, *Civilizing Subjects: Colony and Metropole in the English Imagination, 1830–1867* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002). For France, see Gary Wilder, “Unthinking French History: Colonial Studies beyond National Identity,” in Burton, *After the Imperial Turn*, 125–43; Sue Peabody and Tyler Stovall, eds., *The Color of Liberty: Histories of Race in France* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003). For Germany, see Lora Wildenthal, “Notes on a History of ‘Imperial Turns’ in Modern Germany,” in Burton, *After the Imperial Turn*, 144–56; H. Glenn Penny and Matti Bunzl, eds., *Wordly Provincialism: German Anthropology in the Age of Empire* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2003); H. Glenn Penny, *Objects of Culture: Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002).

20. The foundational study is Amy Kaplan and Donald Pease’s edited volume *Cultures of United States Imperialism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993). Key genealogies include the new historiography of the West and internal colonialism: for example, Patricia Nelson Limerick, *The Legacy of Conquest: The Unbroken Past of the American West* (New York: Norton, 1988); Tomas Almaguer, *Racial Fault Lines: The Historical Origins of White Supremacy in California* (Berkeley: University of California, 1994). See also Robert R. Rydell, *All the World’s a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876–1916* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984). For key recent monographs, see Louise Michelle Newman, *White Women’s Rights: The Racial Origins of Feminism in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Laura Wexler, *Tender Violence: Domestic Visions in an Age of U.S. Imperialism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000); Mary A. Renda, *Taking Haiti: Military Occupation and the Culture of U.S. Imperialism, 1915–1940* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001); Laura Briggs, *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Maria E. Montoya, *Translating Property: The Maxwell Land Grant and the Conflict over Land in the American West, 1840–1900* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Susan Bernadin et al., *Trading Gazes: Euro-American Women Photographers and Native North Americans, 1880–1940* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2003).

21. Much of this seeks to reformulate the impact of empire, to contain and defuse its significance. This is true, in different ways, of both David Cannadine’s simpleminded study *Ornamentalism: How the British Saw Their Empire* (London: Macmillan, 2001) and Linda Colley’s more sophisticated work *Captives: Britain, Empire, and the World, 1600–1850* (New York: Random

House, 2002). See also Peter Mandler, “The Problem with Cultural History,” *Cultural and Social History* 1 (2004), 94–117; Mandler’s study purports to acknowledge the importance of the cultural turn in this respect, while proceeding to dismiss any effective contribution.

22. Among the vast and variegated recent literatures on empire, see Stephen Howe’s *Empire: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002) and *Ireland and Empire: Colonial Legacies in Irish History and Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University, 2000), each exemplary in their respective ways. See also Anthony Pagden, *Peoples and Empires: A Short History of European Exploration, Migration, and Conquest from Greece to the Present* (New York: Modern Library, 2001); Jürgen Osterhammel, *Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview* (Princeton: M. Wiener, 1997); Anthony G. Hopkins, *Globalization in World History* (New York: Norton, 2002); Robert J. C. Young, *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001).

23. See Trevor H. Aston and C. H. E. Philpin, eds., *The Brenner Debates: Agrarian Class Structure and Economic Development in Pre-Industrial Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985); Perry Anderson, *Passages from Antiquity to Feudalism* (London: NLB, 1974) and *Lineages of the Absolutist State* (London: NLB, 1974); Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System*, 3 vols. (New York: Academic Press, 1974–89).

24. See Charles Tilly, ed., *The Formation of National States in Western Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975), *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990–1990* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990), and *European Revolutions, 1492–1992* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993); Keith Thomas, *Religion and the Decline of Magic: Studies in Popular Beliefs in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century England* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971) and *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England, 1500–1800* (London: Allen Lane, 1983).

25. See especially Michael Mann, *The Sources of Social Power*, vol. 1, *A History of Power from the Beginning to A.D. 1760*, and vol. 2, *The Rise of Classes and Nation States, 1760–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986–93); *States, War, and Capitalism: Studies in Political Sociology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1988). See also Anthony Giddens, *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism*, vol. 2, *The Nation-State and Violence* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1985); John A. Hall, *Powers and Liberties: The Causes and Consequences of the Rise of the West* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1985); Evelyne Huber Stephens, John D. Stephens, and Dietrich Rueschemeyer, *Capitalist Development and Democracy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); Theda Skocpol, ed., *Democracy, Revolution, and History* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998). For suggestive commentary, see Perry Anderson, *English Questions* (London: Verso, 1992), 205–38.

26. Kenneth Pomeranz, *The Great Divergence: China, Europe, and the Making of the Modern World Economy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000) and “Beyond the East-West Binary: Resituating Development Paths in the Eighteenth-Century World,” *Journal of Asian Studies* 61 (2002), 539–90; Victor B. Lieberman, *Strange Parallels: Southeast Asia in Global Context, c. 800–1830*, vol. 1, *Integration on the Mainland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Lieberman, ed., *Beyond Binary Histories: Reimagining Eurasia to c. 1830* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999); Christopher A. Bayley, *The Birth of the Modern World, 1780–1914: Global Connections and Comparisons* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004).

27. For especially powerful examples of social science articulation with politics and policymaking—one reactionary, the other liberal—see Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996), *Who Are We? The Challenges to America’s National Identity* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2004), and *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991); Robert D. Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000), and Putnam, ed., *Democracies in Flux: The Evolution of Social Capital in Contemporary Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

28. Carolyn Steedman, “Lord Mansfield’s Women,” *Past and Present* 176 (August 2002), 105–43, and “The Servant’s Labour: The Business of Life, England, 1760–1820,” *Social History* 29 (2004), 1–29; Catherine Hall, *Civilizing Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination, 1830–1867* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002); Hall, McClelland, and Rendall, *Defining the Victorian Nation*; Leora Auslander, *Taste and Power: Furnishing Modern France* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996).

29. Much of the early polemics were fueled by the particular identities of Gareth Stedman Jones and Joan Wallach Scott. Each had been heavily associated, politically and historiographically, with the earlier breakthrough to social history, including a heavy stress on the axiomatic priority of social explanation, which has been self-consciously Marxist for Stedman Jones. By advocating forms of linguistic analysis and the primacy of discourse during the early to middle 1980s, they seemed to be disavowing their former materialism and everything it entailed. By the early 1990s, the most pronounced self-describing “postmodernist” was the British historian Patrick Joyce, who followed a similar trajectory out of social history. See Joyce, “The End of Social History?” *Social History* 20 (1995), 73–91; “The Return of History: Postmodernism and the Politics of Academic History in Britain,” *Past and Present* 158 (February 1998), 207–35.

30. For a rather random selection of first-rate examples, see Becky E.

Conekin, *"The Autobiography of a Nation": The 1951 Festival of Britain* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003); Matthew Hilton, *Smoking in British Popular Culture, 1800–2000* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000); Jennifer Jenkins, *Provincial Modernity: Local Culture and Liberal Politics in Fin-de-Siècle Hamburg* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003); H. Glenn Penny, *Objects of Culture: Ethnology and Ethnographic Museums in Imperial Germany* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002).

31. See especially Steedman, "Culture, Cultural Studies, and the Historians," 613–22.