

BOOK REVIEWS

Title	Author(s)/Editor(s)	Reviewer
<i>Philanthropy and Police</i>	Donna T. Andrew	M. J. D. Roberts
<i>Strasse und Brot</i>	Manfred Gailus	Richard Tilly
<i>The Birth of the Japanese Labor Movement</i>	Stephen E. Marsland	Kazuo Nimura
<i>Weltgericht oder Revolution</i>	Lucian Hölscher	Erhard Lucas-Busemann
<i>Class and Ethnicity in the Pale</i>	Yoav Peled	Nathan Weinstock
<i>The Revolution of 1905</i>	Abraham Ascher	John Morison
<i>1905 in St. Petersburg</i>	Gerald D. Surh	John Morison
"Blutmai"	Thomas Kurz	James Wickham
<i>Division of Labour</i>	Tom Sheridan	Ray Markey
<i>Working-Class Americanism</i>	Gary Gerstle	John J. Bukowczyk

ANDREW, DONNA T. *Philanthropy and Police*. London Charity in the Eighteenth Century. Princeton University Press, Princeton 1989. x, 299 pp. \$ 32.50.

Donna Andrew's skilful survey of eighteenth-century London volunteer charitable organizations reminds us yet again how little we know of the period. It also illustrates how much we stand to gain from extending our curiosity. It is not much more than a decade ago that the eighteenth century as a whole seemed to be the stagnant backwater of modern English history, apparently isolated from connection with the rapids and waterfalls of the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, and generally ignored because of it. At present, by contrast, the period is the subject of active and lively reappraisal by historians – lively enough to make historians of the periods both before and after distinctly nervous about the status of supposedly distinguishing features of their own areas of specialization. Donna Andrew argues a scrupulously unsectarian case but her survey clearly gives support to those who are rediscovering the eighteenth century as the age of a "rising middle class".

The argument is briefly as follows: One of the most significant innovations in English public life from the late seventeenth century onwards was the emergence of the voluntary association for the promotion of charitable goals – or, to be more

precise, for the promotion of philanthropy, viz. the pursuit of corporate social ends of “Publick Good” (p. 5).

Unlike older generations of givers, the new philanthropists showed a more proprietorial, less “steward-like” attitude towards disposal of the resources bestowed on them by divine providence. This showed itself in various ways, among them an increasing desire to supervise (or at least be aware of) the application of their charity, and a more acute awareness of the way in which their efforts might contribute towards the promotion of an overall set of national values and priorities (or, in eighteenth-century shorthand, “police”). These trends become the more explicable when it is discovered that most of the promoters and an increasing proportion of the supporters of these associations came from non-aristocratic and non-landed backgrounds, demanding in their volunteer activities the same standards of business-like organization and monitored “return” which they were accustomed to expect in their commercial and professional lives.

The argument is developed in two strands. The first of these explores the evolving social setting and intellectual milieu of three or four generations of philanthropic activists between 1690 and 1815. This is an exploration of particular interest, supplying us with many missing pieces in the intricate jigsaw of eighteenth-century social policy. Questions of labour discipline, attitudes towards the socialization of the young, the place of commerce and population growth in the production of national prosperity, above all the debate over the nature and extent of the social obligation of the rich to relieve distress among the poor (i.e., the definition of “true charity”) – all these receive systematic attention.

In addition, the trends revealed are shown to have had practical significance by a second strand of argument exploring the “shape” of eighteenth-century charity. Ideas are linked to the prospectus sheets, reports and subscription lists of specific institutions such as the Foundling and Magdalen Hospitals, the Marine and Philanthropic Societies and the Society for Bettering the Condition of the Poor. In this way the charitable objects of the age are contextualized with precision, and explanations given for the popularity of particular causes at particular conjunctures of intellectual and social development. In similar fashion explanations are given for changes in popularity of various causes over time. Some niggling criticisms of range and emphasis might perhaps be made. The focus, for example, seems to narrow in the course of the book. (Volunteer societies for law-enforcement and for the schooling of the poor attract more curiosity in the earlier than in the later periods covered though they formed central concerns of any general plan of “police” in both.) And the role of sheer sectarian competition as a propellant of volunteer activity might also be brought out more clearly, given the deeply entrenched fears of High Church and religious Dissent alike that “the other side” might prove capable of rekindling seventeenth-century fires of ideological commitment if allowed unrestrained liberty of association. In most respects, however, readers will find Andrew’s book a more rewarding guide to its subject than its obvious rival for attention, part I of David Owen, *English Philanthropy 1660–1960* (1964).

What of its conclusions? Andrew makes out a strong case for giving philanthropy its due as a key mechanism through which English society adjusted to “market principles”, not just for the regulation of its economic life but of its social dealings as well. Clearly, volunteer groups often acted as social pacemakers by promoting types

of relief designed to encourage self-reliance rather than the acknowledgment of social dependence. Andrew also points out that philanthropists took some pride in their role as “community builders”, preserving and extending links between classes in a sphere not serviced by the market (p. 196). It would be interesting to know in addition how far she sees enthusiasm for systematic charity as an admission by middle-class philanthropists themselves that the labouring masses needed assistance in withstanding the temptations to imprudent consumption offered by market capitalism. Was philanthropy sometimes carried out to counteract the market as well as to supplement it? Whatever the answer to this, Andrew’s central point is firmly established: it is indeed necessary to any adequate understanding of the dynamics of social change in eighteenth-century England that the achievement of “the voluntary sector” be taken into account.

M. J. D. Roberts

GAILUS, MANFRED. *Strasse und Brot. Sozialer Protest in den deutschen Staaten unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Preußens, 1847–1849.* [Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, 96.] Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 1990. 546 pp. DM 112.00.

Gailus’s book is a study of social protest in Germany covering the turbulent period from January 1847 to the middle of 1849. Historiographically speaking, it has two main addressees: (1) that species of social history which analyzes social protest and especially food riots; and (2) the literature on the German Revolution of 1848–1849. It has important documentation and commentary for both fields, though it assigns more weight to the former.

The book’s empirical core is a collection of contemporary reports on 1,486 disturbances (or protest actions) taken from 5 major newspapers published in different parts of Germany in the period. This new collection – based on a day-by-day reading of the sources – represents the most comprehensive “protest” data set for these years now available. Most of the more detailed analysis in the book, however, is based on case studies of actions within *Prussia* (Germany’s largest state). These studies draw on Prussian government archival materials as well as newspapers, they offer depth as well as breadth.

Gailus works with a definition of “social protest” which is quite similar to that employed in previous studies (including those of this reviewer). It stresses the *collective* character of the actions (e.g., at least 10–20 persons), their episodic nature (with beginning and end), the presence of conflict, and the importance of physical action, as opposed to intellectual argumentation. This is very close to the concept of “collective action”, for Gailus, very much like proponents of the collective action view, sees social protest as a form of political behavior appropriate to the needs and resources of the poor and working-class population. He calls these actions “street politics” (*Strassenpolitik*), stressing the importance of the street as public space in which popular demands and resources could be articulated and registered, space whose control was contested. “Bread”, in turn, represents not simply the