

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN  
Department of History  
Semester I, 1983-84

History 474

European Social History, 1830-1914

Prof. Goldberg

I. By Way of an Introduction

Our field of inquiry will be the "modernizing" countries of the Western world during the first century of an expanding industrial capitalism. We propose to reflect seriously about the social and cultural impact of material-technological progress: what it meant to transfer large multitudes from villages to cities; to replace artisan skills with machine production; to concentrate masses of wage-earners into factories and burgeoning cities. We intend to probe deeply into the crisis of "work discipline": i.e., why the governing authorities targeted the laboring poor as a "dangerous class"; how they inculcated a traumatizing work ethic; how they devised technologies of social control over the spontaneous movements of urbanized multitudes and their habits of sociability. We will also probe into the productive achievements of the market economy and into the contradictions which generated its periodic crises. Above all, we will deal with the varieties of collective resistance to "modernity" itself, and to the social effects of "progress": i.e., how socialism, trade unionism, and anarchism placed the System in question; whether these collective movements produced bodies of critical thought and modes of struggle which have continuing relevance. In the final analysis, of course, our concern is about contemporary life and society: how we arrived at our present "civilization of risk"; whether, in the dense underbrush of the past, we may find long-buried insights which can serve as a point of departure for our appraisal of progress (and the "high-tech" axioms which now suffuse our discourse about it). By the time we have ended our Long March through the expanse of industrial capitalism, we may be better prepared to contend with the exiguous rhetoric of its contemporary ideologues: so that we can seriously address the question which Anatole France once posed, about whether the rank-and-file citizens of modern mass societies are essentially "free", or only "at large".

II. Books for the Course

a. Required Paperbacks

Eric Hobsbawm -- Industry and Empire  
E.P. Thompson -- The Making of the English Working Class  
Barbara Taylor -- Eve and the New Jerusalem  
K. Marx -- Class Struggles in France  
Stephen Gould -- The Mismeasurement of Man  
Melvyn Dubofsky -- We Shall Be All  
Mikiso Hane -- Peasants, Rebels, and Outcasts  
Arno Mayer -- The Persistence of the Old Regime

b. Optional Paperbacks (though not entirely optional)\*

E.P. Thompson -- William Morris  
Yvonne Kapp -- Eleanor Marx (2 volumes)

Emma Goldman -- Living My Life  
Ehrenreich and English -- For Her Own Good

(\*As we will explain at some length below, you will have to choose, among those "optional" books, your one essential source for the written paper).

### III. The Required Work in the Course

1. There will be one written test, the final examination, which will be drawn from a list of study questions to be distributed about a week before the last scheduled class of the semester. These study questions will be based on material drawn from the lectures and the reading assignments. You will then have a reasonable choice of questions from those posed on the study sheet. Thus, the final should pose no great problem; in fact, as some of you know from our previous experience together, the preparation for the final furnishes a rich opportunity for your collective discussion and collaboration.
2. You will have to write one paper for the course. In the last section of this syllabus, we have explained the topic for this essay, and set down clear guidelines for composing it.

### IV. The Discussion Sections and Reading Assignments

The weekly discussion sections will be an essential and valuable part of our course. We urge you to attend every meeting of your section, and to participate as actively as you can in the discussions. (Please take the following injunction very seriously: that flagrant absenteeism in the section meetings can serve as a negative ingredient in averaging your grade for the course.)

a. Each discussion will gravitate around the problems raised by the weekly reading assignment. During any particular week the topic for the discussion may differ from the questions we're addressing in our lectures. But you must understand that in three long lectures a week, spanning an entire semester, we propose to analyze a much larger body of evidence and to cope with a wider range of conceptual problems than any set of course readings can cover.

Yet in no way should the occasional disjuncture between the lectures and the quiz discussions cause you consternation or confusion; on the contrary, you should treat them as two interrelated parts of a single global analysis. Treat the sequence of discussion meetings as your own mini-seminar, where you can address a number of questions that go to the heart of our inquiry.

b. The first discussion section will meet in the third week of the semester (Sept. 12-16). Be sure to attend that first meeting. We base all of our course records on your presence in the sections; and unless we see you there, we can't realistically confirm your registration.

During the first two weeks (Aug. 29-Sept. 9), until the sections begin to meet, we are asking you to dig seriously into certain chapters of two required

paperbacks: chapters which will furnish a solid framework for our overall inquiry.

Over the first week we want you to read: Hobsbawm, Industry and Empire, pp. 23-107. That book is a concise, exceptionally perceptive history of the Industrial Revolution in Britain: its causes and consequences; its impact on class structure and cultural values; its integral relationship to expansion and dominion in the world market place. In a word, Hobsbawm's book will serve as a point of reference for our wide-ranging reflections on the social history of the bourgeois era.

Over the second week we want you to read: Thompson, The Making of the English Working Class, chapters 6, 7, 8, and 10. Let us say straightaway: that Thompson's book is an authentic masterpiece, one of the most important contributions to social history produced over the past 50 years. But in its exposition, it is infinitely complex, like an intricately-woven tapestry. It isn't a quick and easy read, but it is always riveting, fascinating. You surely won't absorb it all the first time around; but you will find whole passages which, by the sheer force and beauty of their argument, will come to you as brilliant shafts of light. And over the first several weeks of the semester, as we lecture upon many of the same themes, Thompson's chapters will become clear and unambiguous.

As you work through these four chapters, you should focus your attention on the critical questions they raise: about the ambiguity of industrial "progress"; about the incompatibility between the atomized society of the new factory or urban slum, and the sociability or mutual aid of older working class communities. In the chapter called "Exploitation," you will confront the "standard-of-living" debate: whether, as Establishment historians are wont to "prove", the material lot of the wage-earning masses improved in the early decades of the Industrial Revolution; or whether, as radical social critics in the 19th century insisted, and certain morally-inspired historians in the early decades of the 20th reiterated, the workers suffered a veritable catastrophe: the degradation, both quantitatively and qualitatively, of their living standards. You must grasp what Thompson means when he says of the latter-day apologists for "productionism", that they have "lost a sense of the whole process...the changes in social relationships and cultural modes which the Industrial Revolution entailed." (Then, distend your imagination to its full stretch and you'll see why Thompson's argument serves to challenge the productionist rhetoric of our own day: that the resolution to the contemporary capitalist crisis lies in intensified, rationalized production; that the corollary to prosperity is sharp reduction in the safeguards and regulations designed to protect consumers, workers, and environment). You see the point: when you tote up the balance sheet of growth and efficiency, you must include in your calculations not only the speed and volume of commodity production, but also the ways of living and working; not only the technical capacity to produce, but also the critical question of whether everything that can be produced ought to be.

In two other chapters -- on the "Field Labourers" and on the "Artisans" -- Thompson carries you into the world of the laboring poor, who experienced in their daily lives the consequences of the free-market economy and the new labor discipline. In the process, he challenges the proposition (which has served

capitalist apologists, from the factory masters and liberal economists of the 19th century, to Milton Freidman and his assorted disciples in our own day): that the capitalist strategy of development, by reorganizing the work force and intensifying production, enhances the well-being of the entire citizenry; that the inevitable corollary of the free market is the general expansion of human freedom. Thus, as you read about the agricultural work force, you should ask certain critical questions about the new economic order: why "land improvement" (as its protagonists called the enclosure movement and agrarian capitalism) exacerbated the insecurity of the village masses; how capitalist development transformed those rural masses into "casual" or "precarious" labor; how the new class relationships eroded the sociability of the village community (and triggered the peasant revolt of 1830).

In the chapter on the "Artisans", Thompson has reminded us that over the early decades of the Industrial Revolution the skilled craftsmen remained more numerous and conspicuous than unskilled factory hands; that their artisan culture, politics, and struggles comprised the principal ingredient in the "making of the working class"; that not until the mid-Victorian decades (after 1850) did mechanized factory production suffuse the economic order and the industrial bourgeoisie triumph over all comers. In comprehending that artisan universe, you must distinguish between a customary and a market economy; focus upon the collective defenses by craft workers; recall the status and dignity which separated them from mere laborers, and which they fought to protect. But then, you must carefully note how that status and dignity nonetheless eroded under the pressure of market forces and mechanization: so that the struggle for the customary economy became, increasingly, a lost cause; so that under-employment, technical innovation, the repeal of apprenticeship rules, etc., subjected the world of the artisans to agonizing insecurity.

Finally, in the chapter on "Standards and Experiences", Thompson has forced us to the issue: about the "human ecology" of the emerging social order; about urban slums and child labor; about impoverishment and the death rate; about the sorry state of health and safety for mill hands....in the final analysis, about the dehumanization of the laboring poor and the relative indifference to that process of liberal strategists.

### c. The Reading Assignments for the Discussion Sections

- I. The Emergence of Industrial Capitalism, 1780-1830: the Early Factory System and its Impact; Disintegration and Resilience of the Collective Communities; Working Class Resistance and Reorganization

Section #1 (Sept. 12-16): Thompson, pp. 269-314; 350-374; 401-447

And so, you must begin with the weavers: the tragic history of those handloom artisans who, by the hundreds of thousands, lost status, livelihood, and life itself during the 19th century. For they were victims, first, of the vagaries in the free market, and then, of implacable competition from machines. As you reflect upon the grim fate of the weavers, how do you calculate the cost of progress? Read Thompson's very moving pages on the culture of the old weavers' communities, and think about how much that is humane and cooperative may have been permanently lost as 19th century societies, marching under the

banner of productionism, inched toward the promised land of consumerism. (And does the image suddenly come into your mind of present-day deserted towns, where plants have shut down or "run away"; and where pathetic older workers are beyond "re-cycling"?)

But for the factory system's most unyielding ideologues, like Dr. Andrew Ure (pp. 359-62), the disappearance of the old working-class culture was hardly the occasion for regrets. On the contrary, the imperative of progress dictated a new work ethic: the systematic inculcation of an un-costomary, un-natural discipline; a strategy to purge wage-earners of their irregular habits and their pretensions to independence. In his penetrating pages of *Methodism*, Thompson has reminded us that doctrinaries like Ure recommended not only external coercion to whip workers into line, but also "moral conversion": so that wage-earners became accomplices in their own exploitation. How then did Methodism "reprocess" workers during the critical decades of industrial transformation? And what does Thompson mean when he argues that the "moral machinery" distorted personality?

In Chapter 12, "Community", Thompson has set certain limits to this cultural-psychological offensive: reminding us that the old collective forms of leisure and sports (though under heavy attack by the "moral majority" of that age) didn't disappear entirely or at once; and also, that the "methodical way of life", which was surely triumphant, derived partly from the workers' own efforts. What does Thompson mean when he talks about the "rituals of mutuality", which continued to underlie the working-class community? In this context, consider carefully the significance of the Friendly Societies; and reflect upon their relationship to strategies of self-defense (like trade unionism, Chartism, Owenism) which bulk so large in the "making of the working class"...Finally, concentrate on those last few pages (444-47); for within them lies a key to the more general discourse.

Section #2 (Sept. 19-23): Thompson, pp. 521-575; 669-696; 774-806

The new industrial order remained tentative over the first half of the 19th century: the accomodation of the laboring poor, no better than a partial success; the collective resistance of wage-earning artisans, a veritable guerilla war; the formation and radicalization of consciousness, a warning that nothing was inevitable and that the future of humankind was still up for grabs. Thus, the System hovered in doubt until the conquering bourgeoisie had finished off the rebellion which militant artisans sparked against unrestrained mechanization; until those bourgeois authorities had contained the barrage of ideological and political attacks which left-wingers leveled against the claims of productionism and the free market.

In his brilliant discussion of Luddism, Thompson has rescued that astonishing artisan rebellion from the ridicule of its bourgeois critics: so that he has refuted the interpretation of the machine-wreckers as mere enemies of all technological progress; so that he has denied that their revolt was a blind, formless exercise in hopeless nostalgia. But were the croppers, framework knitters, and cotton weavers, who filled the Luddite ranks, acutely conscious of what was at stake? Were they against "progress", or rather against the degradation of work? Did they scorn law and order, or did they have recourse

to violent direct action only after the governing elites had foreclosed the option of legal remedy for their grievances? Then, reflect upon the practice of Luddism. Was it formless and without direction, or highly organized: a near-insurrectionary movement which "continually trembled on the edge of ulterior revolutionary objectives"?

Luddism was defeated. But the point is that by 1848 the spectre of working-class radicalism had come to haunt the ruling elites of Britain and Western Europe. From Thompson's rich and complex analysis, you can begin to fathom how the English working class, from so many of their varied collective experiences, reached a level of consciousness and organization, which rocked the foundations of the Established Order.

Start with 1819; or more precisely with the explosive happening at Peterloo. Understand the setting: that the Industrial Revolution had already disrupted pre-industrial society; that the free play of the market (inflating the economy during the years of the Napoleonic Wars, then bringing on depression after 1815) had subjected wage-earners to terrible misery; that mass grievances had taken political shape after the war in the great reform movement to universalize the vote and break the parliamentary power of the governing classes (the big landlords and the very rich bourgeoisie). Do you understand the panic of the ruling elite? Their prevision of what might happen to their social and economic power if the State passed into "democratic" hands? And worse yet, what might happen if the whole fabric of deference should unravel? And if workers, no longer a "mob", had both organization and a clear sense of their own power? And so, how did the ruling elite respond at Peterloo? And why did that show of ruling class violence actually strengthen the political resolve of the working class?

In the passage running from p. 774 to p. 806, Thompson has demonstrated how, in the 1830's, the consciousness and organization of English workers become more clearly anti-capitalist and tinged with socialism. Start on 774 with the contribution of John Gast to collective organization and action; and the contribution of Thomas Hodgskin to an emergent socialist theory. Then, enter upon the critical juncture, in Owenism, between the English working class and socialism. How did the paternalism of the industrialist Robert Owen and his "preposterous" ideas (p. 786) spawn a movement far more self-emanipatory than Owen himself imagined or anticipated? How, in other words, did the laboring masses begin to take matters into their own hands? (pp. 789-97)

## II. Utopianism, Feminism and Revolution: The Cultural and Political Convulsions of Industrial Capitalism, 1830-50

Section #3 (Sept. 26-30): Taylor, Introduction; then pp. 1-136

What a splendid book Barbara Taylor has written! And how much it teaches us about the rich history of human struggle and aspiration which remains buried under the ponderous structures of conventional wisdom! Begin with the fact that radical feminism emerged in modern times with movements (Owenism in Britain, St. Simonianism in France) which latter-day critics have dismissed as "utopian". But could you argue that "utopianism" is the source of a more profound realism than the varieties of "practical" social engineering? That the utopian socialists were the ones who placed the entire culture of market societies

into question; that in refusing to operate within the existing norms they expanded the realm of the thinkable and the potential?

Consider how much further the Owenites went in their understanding of female oppression than even radical democrats like Mary Wollstonecraft. Was there anything wildly unreal about their critique of marriage, family and property, as the point of departure for women's emancipation? Think about remarkable feminists like Anna Wheeler, Fanny Wright, and Frances Morrison. What special courage did it take when they detached themselves from the "respectable norms"? (Wheeler: "I am a woman, and without a master: two causes of disgrace in England.") Why were Owenite feminists "infidel": opponents of the organized churches?

Then approach the sensitive problem (chapter 4) of working-class solidarity. Did male and female wage-earners always struggle in harmony, and for a common ideal? Or ever? (Note Morrison's description of working-class households, p. 100; and her brilliant analysis, pp. 113-14.)

Consider how Owenism burst the limits of Owen's paternalism and class collaboration; how, as a radicalized mass movement around 1840, it moved beyond coops, labor exchanges, and trade unionism toward a wholly new kind of human community. What were the values of the "new moral world"; and what do they tell us about the options people can forge when they create their own history? Was it possible, then, for women to live freely without calling into question authoritarian schooling, orthodox religion, the patriarchal and nuclear family?

Consider finally Taylor's acute insight (the final paragraph of page 126) about the strategem of a moral division of labor. A mind-blowing observation!

Section #4 (Oct. 3-7): Taylor, pp. 136-287

Are you startled, shocked, exhilarated? Just think of how much more imaginative and profound the Owenites were than the more tepid feminists (even the suffragettes) of a later age; and how long it would be before a minority in the recent women's movement subjected the cultural order to such a penetrating critique. In this light you can see that the 1840's (the era of Owenite communities, Chartism, and the revolutions of '48) comprised a cross-roads; and that for an impassioned interlude bourgeois civilization was by no means "home safe".

As you read chapter 6 (on the debate over the marriage system) note especially how virulent the assault was against socialist feminism; how utterly impossible it was for establishment critics (including a considerable number of women) even to consider relationships apart from patriarchy and monogamy. Why? What was at stake, what was threatened? And in chapter 8, reflect upon what the new communities (based theoretically on values other than self-interest) might have meant in creating more egalitarian relationships. (What, for example, such a life could have meant for very vulnerable single women). But then, in practice, how closely did Owenite communities hew to the ideal?

Reflect finally about the cultural and social consequences of defeat and burial. (Taylor, p. 261: "An idea which had seemed plausible and necessary,

etc., etc.") Why was "paradise lost"? (chapter 9) What would have to be re-invented a-fresh? And so, can you say that it was all futile, idle, "Utopian"?

Section #5 (Oct. 10-14): Marx, the entire pamphlet

Inevitably, the life and thought of Marx must intrude repeatedly in any discourse about the social evolution of 19th century Europe. Thus, some of you may want to read a reliable biography of him: a short but sensitive work by Werner Blumenberg, or the longer classic by Franz Mehring (both in paperback and both entitled simply Karl Marx).

In his brilliant political pamphlets on critical contemporary happenings (like the revolutions of 1848, or the coup of Louis Bonaparte, or the Paris Commune) Marx wrote as an involved observer. But he wrote with such analytic depth that his understanding of those events has, to a large degree, stood the test of time. As a masterful stylist and a committed revolutionary, he composed sharp, acerbic, rapier-like texts. But alas! Marx has been very poorly served by the English translations of his tracts: so that his epigrammatic delivery comes through as turgid, clumsy, often obscure. And so, you may have some difficulty with this brochure which, in its original prose, would have struck you as clear and revealing. Hopefully, we will have lectured on the French revolution of 1848 by the time you read this tract: so that you can follow it more easily. But even if not, don't worry. The point of this week's reading isn't to reproduce the history of the revolution, but rather to reveal Marx's analytic skills at work: to note, already in this early writing, how effectively he deployed a class analysis; and to understand how he conceived of the future political tasks before the proletariat.

What did Marx mean when he asserted that the capitalist class, per se, didn't triumph in the French revolution of 1830? And that the manipulation of power by a very narrow elite paved the way to 1848? Why did Marx characterize the February revolution in '48, and its Provisional Government, as a compromise of social forces? How was it that the working classes, having done the fighting and articulated radical demands, saw the fruits of victory fall into other hands?

Consider Marx's contention that the workers deluded themselves: that having dictated the universal suffrage Republic, they thought that they could emancipate themselves peacefully, and within the System? In that light, do you see the special significance of "June Days" in 1848? Note how Parisian workers were goaded into revolt, then crushed and isolated; how the Constituent Assembly after June '48 annulled the gains which the laboring poor had made in the wake of the February upheaval; and how, in the evolution of the Second Republic, the monarchical forces (the Party of Order) gradually took command. And what was the role of Louis Bonaparte in social stabilization? (Remember that Marx wrote these articles while the Republic was still alive: so that there are some real errors of interpretation, especially about Bonapartism, which he would correct in a later brochure). But in stressing the cleavage between bourgeoisie and working class, which 1848 so clearly revealed, Marx was provisioning the proletarian strategy of future decades.

III. The Age of Capital, 1850-1900: Recovery; Expansion;  
Ideological Hegemony; Crisis and Imperialism

Section #6 (Oct. 17-21): Hobsbawm, pp. 109-195

In these lucid chapters you can see why and how industrial capitalism emerged from the crisis and uncertainty of the 1840's; and then entered the confident, expansionist mid-Victorian decades. But the System is never free of contradictions. How do you account for the great depression cycle which Western societies experienced over the 25 years, from the early 1870's through the late 1890's? And what role did imperialism play in extricating British capitalism from the crisis? How, finally, did the intense competition among the Great Industrial Powers not only end Britain's supremacy in the world market but deepen both international and internal tensions....The preface to the first World War?

Section #7 (Oct. 24-28): Gould, pp. 30-145

With Stephen Jay Gould's superb volume, we are posing the critical problem of social control and ideological hegemony. The point is: that no matter how expansive the market economy is, and how profitable for the entrepreneurial class, the guardians of the System never feel secure enough; that the threat from below remained, throughout the century, the source of great apprehension (whether it was a question of the hungry, nomadic proletariat whom the 19th century bourgeoisie called the "dangerous class"; or the immigrant masses, who comprised a volatile reserve army of labor; or those colonized peoples who might well nourish dreams of revolt). Thus, the history of modern and contemporary Western societies is replete with the efforts to forge strategies of social control and ideologies of bourgeois domination. In our lectures we will approach the problem from many avenues: the indoctrination of the work ethic; the use of the prison and the asylum to modify behavior; the strict surveillance over street crowds, random assembly, and customary sociability.

But with Gould we are approaching the problem through the ideological route: how free-market societies (presumably anchored to freedom of opportunity) justified glaring inequality; how the losers in the market place were deemed to be victims, not of social and cultural conditions, but of their own moral and intellectual deficiencies. In a splendid book, like Ehrenreich and English, For Her Own Good, (which some of you will read), we see how the "experts" (in this case, the medical guardians of the Establishment) "proved" the debility, or inferiority, or unique maternal function of women.

The special merit of Gould's book is to have revealed how deeply-embedded racism has been in the dominant ideology of Western societies; how readily the governing classes trampled upon formal professions of equality to justify their privileges as the sign of innate superiority; how imperative it seemed to keep the untermenschen in their place, or even (as the eugenicists proposed) to sterilize them out of existence; how arrogantly imperialism could be palmed off as a "civilizing mission" to barbaric cultures. But note it well: that Gould's remarkable demonstration is like a lethal weapon aimed directly at the resurgent ideological Right in present-day France, Britain, Italy, and not least of all the United States: a Right which conscripts biology and genetics to finish off the claims of equality.

As you read Gould's fascinating chapters, consider the function of "pseudoscience" in setting social policy; the Establishment frenzy over the sexual threat of the lower classes; the use of both "Creationism" and evolution in ranking the races; the fantasy of "craniometry" in validating (p. 74) "the common prejudices of comfortable white males"; the insidious role of Gustave Le Bon (pp. 109 ff) in arguing the inferiority of women; and the even more influential role of Lombroso in identifying "innate criminality" with the character of the lower classes. Reflect, finally, upon Gould's acute observation, p. 136: "As a conservative political argument, it (racism) can't be beat: evil or stupid, or poor, or disenfranchised or degenerate, people are what they are as a result of their birth." Hence: blame the victim, not the environment.

IV. The Decades of Capitalist Accumulation, 1880-1914: Mass Social Struggles; Technological Onslaught and its Victims; the Persistence of the Old Hierarchical Order

Section #8 (Oct. 31-Nov. 4): Dubofsky, pp. 5-145

In our lectures we will address, and with copious detail, the great social movements and struggles of the working classes over the half century before 1914. But since the significant books on European movements are either in foreign languages or unavailable in paperback, we have chosen for your study Dubofsky's definitive history of that extraordinary American organization: the IWW. And why not? For the story of the Wobblies is immensely revealing about the sources and practice of class strife in any industrializing country during that violent era of monopoly capitalism. And so, from the history of the IWW, we learn a great deal about the meaning of syndicalism; the cleavage between the "labor aristocracy" and the less skilled multitudes; the close rapport between the State and the entrepreneurial class. Now, Dubofsky's book is richly detailed; but we are not asking you to try and retain masses of data. Read the assigned chapters swiftly, with an eye toward larger strategic and conceptual questions. At any rate, you will be swept along by a history which you probably haven't encountered in conventional Americana.

Consider the special obstacles in the way of working class consciousness in the U.S. (the power of the giant corporations: the strategem of divide-and-rule; the conservative craft unionism of the AF of L). Consider then the special role of the IWW: to organize new immigrants, blacks, unskilled hands in the mass production industries. Why was the West the fertile seed ground for the growth of the IWW? What sparked the revolt of the Western miners? (Consider especially the Coeur d'Alene strike; the creation of the Western Federation of Miners; then the savage conflict in Colorado City and its impact on radical consciousness).

What do you understand by the strategy and goals of syndicalism (i.e., the primacy of economic over political action; the uneasy relationship with political parties; the imperative of workers' control over the productive front).

Section #9 (Nov. 7-11): Dubofsky, pp. 146-290

What was the critical issue in the struggle for free speech? And what does it reveal about the contradiction between "free enterprise" and "free expression"? Consider the efforts of the IWW to organize ethnic and racial minorities in the years between 1910 and 1912 (i.e., the Louisiana-Texas timber belt; the radicalization of Arthur Lee Emerson; the racist appeal of the Southern Lumber Operators' Association).

Could you argue that the daily practice of labor solidarity, the sheer imperative of a common struggle, comprised an effective solvent to racism among workers? And then, what can we learn about social relationships and political forces in the burgeoning prewar capitalist societies from the drive of the IWW into Lawrence in 1912? What do you understand by the proposition that "two nations" faced each other in Lawrence? And why did the astonishing victory of labor in that city then crumble into bitter defeat? And did young John Reed go to the heart of the matter, about the class strife of that era, when he wrote from Paterson in 1913: "There is war in Paterson. But it's a curious kind of war. All the violence is the work of one side: the mill owners."

Section #10 (Nov. 14-18): Your Paper is Due this Week!!

Happy day! You now begin a fortnight without a further weekly reading assignment for the sections. But alas, none of us is ever wholly free. You must attend the section meeting this week. For if you haven't already submitted your paper to your TA, then your last chance to do so is at this week's section. Once you have all handed over your written essays, we expect you to use the rest of this week's section meetings for free-wheeling discussions about what you learned, and ultimately concluded about the militant life of William Morris, or Eleanor Marx, or Emma Goldman.

\*\*\*During the Thanksgiving week we will not have any section meetings. Enjoy your long weekend; but return to the front refreshed, combative and brimming with courage.

Section #11 (Nov. 28-Dec. 2): Hane, pp. 3-27; 79-101;173-245

No question is more critical than the one we now confront: whether "modernity" is an unmixed blessing; whether technological breakthrough and productive acceleration are, ipso facto, the stuff of progress; whether everything that can be produced should be, regardless of the conditions of production or the nature of the commodities. In our own times the issue is a burning one: all the more so because our governing authorities have so generally refused to address it. And so, all of the bien-pensants of the society drink copiously from the cup of "high technology"; as for the rank-and-file multitudes they can only hope to be retrained and processed for some place in the new "civilization of risk". But even a century or so ago, the modalities of development became unassailable axioms; for those countless men, women, and children, who experienced only the dark underside of "progress", had no audible voice. And yet, even now, especially now, we can and must learn from them.

If we have chosen to examine the problem in Japan, it's because that under-developed country underwent such rapid, exemplary modernization in the decades after 1870; because that development came to be considered the miracle of the 3rd World, the very model of what capitalist expansion could produce; and not least of all, because Prof. Hane has written one of the very few significant books about the dark underside, the harsh realities of "modernity": the emergence, through the very process of development, of what sociologists now call "the permanent underclass".

In the transition from the traditional society of Tokugawa Japan to the new capitalist order ushered in by the Meiji Restoration, who bore the sacrifices of modernization? How then did the new economy affect the peasant masses? What does Hane mean when he talks about the "pain, bewilderment, and anger" of the peasantry? Consider the women silk workers (pp. 173 ff): what did technology do for them? What drove Takai Toshio into such a militant life? What light does the prostitution of so many young women cast upon the price of "modernity"? And what burdens fell upon the coal miners in order to ensure Japan's position in the international export market? In all of these pages, read carefully the personal testimonials which Prof. Hane has recorded. They give pathetic yet powerful voice to the victims of progress.

Section #12 (Dec. 5-9): Mayer, pages to be assigned later in the term

Since the paperback of Arno Mayer's book hasn't yet arrived in the local stores, we can't assign exact page numbers. Thus, when the book will have hit town, we'll announce the reading for this last discussion section of the semester.

## V. The Guidelines for the Written Paper

We are requiring of every enrolled student a concise, reflective written essay. It is to be about "the militant experience": the life in socialism or anarchism; in ideal and agitation; in revolutionary hope and bitter despair. Look: we inhabit a moral and political universe suffused with cynicism and the higher realism...so that the wisdom of the 80's is to dump on the illusions of the 60's; so that erstwhile militants of that earlier era turn a fast buck by recanting on talk shows; so that, as any well-groomed MBA can tell you, the business of living has become nothing but business. In such a climate the sacrifices which so many women and men have made for a more humane order of affairs seem almost bizarre: a function, not of politics but of pathology. From such vacuous mummeries do we fabricate today's political wisdom...But let's not drown in a sea of mindlessness. Before we foreclose too many options for living, we should examine, at close hand, the biography of some militant, whether man or woman, who shouted an "everlasting nay" to the Established Order ...who pursued an ideal, and never strayed from that path.

For the purpose of examining the militant life, we have chosen three superb and moving books: each one delineating, in rich detail, the personal and political trajectory of an extraordinary fighter: E.P. Thompson's classic biography of the great libertarian socialist William Morris; Yvonne Kapp's quite marvelous biography, in two volumes, of Marx's youngest daughter,

Eleanor Marx; and the abridged version of an authentic anarchist masterpiece, Emma Goldman's memoirs, Living My Life.

You must select one of these books as the basis for your essay; and then, over the first twelve weeks of the semester, until you turn in your paper, you should virtually live with that militant; follow the twists and turns of his or her experience; reflect upon the problems it raises. What propelled that militant into socialism or anarchism? What did a revolutionary commitment mean in non-revolutionary, often repressive societies? What was Morris's human and cultural vision, or Emma Goldman's? What difference did it make to be Marx's daughter? How did such militants sustain themselves in the long valleys of sorrow or defeat? Did they, could they themselves live liberated lives? Was there tension between their private emotional needs and their political commitment? And how much of what they said, or thought, or did still merits our close attention, even perhaps our emulation? Were such lives worth the effort? Would you do it? Could you? Or was it all in vain, even somewhat absurd?

Each of these three works is long, copious enough so that you can concentrate your efforts on a single book. They are all roughly the same price (even the two volumes on Eleanor Marx add up to about the same total as the single volumes on Morris and Goldman); and in each case the price is a very considerable bargain for such a thick book.

Since the unabridged edition of Emma Goldman's memoirs runs to over 1600 pages, we have chosen the shorter, cut version as one of the three selections. But since that abridged volume has somewhat fewer pages than either the Thompson or the Kapp; and since we want to equalize the three (so that you are not tempted to select for the spurious purpose of saving 100 pages or so), we are adding to the Goldman book a section from Ehrenreich and English, For Her Own Good, which the bookstores have stocked for us. Thus, if you should choose Living My Life as your sources, you must add to that reading: pages 101-210 in Ehrenreich and English. As a study of sexist ideology in 19th and 20th century America, it will give you a deeper appreciation of what Emma had to contest as she tried to "live her own life".

Thus, to recapitulate: your paper will be an essay on "The Militant Life: toward an explanation and a judgement". That essay will be about William Morris; or Eleanor Marx; or Emma Goldman. Your principal material will derive from one of the following:

E.P. Thompson -- William Morris  
 Yvonne Kapp -- Eleanor Marx (2 volumes)  
 Emma Goldman -- Living My Life (plus the section from Ehrenreich,  
 For Her Own Good)

a. Concrete Instructions for Preparing and Submitting the Paper

1. You must select one of the three biographies during the very first week. Don't make a big production number about the choice. Each of those three persons lived a fascinating and essential life. Each of these three books is a gripping and exciting read. No matter which you choose, you can't go wrong.

2. Buy the book which you have chosen very quickly. Don't delay! The bookstores have a limited stock of the Thompson, Kapp, and Goldman volumes. Wait too long, and you'll be stuck.
3. The essay is due no later than the twelfth week of the term (Nov. 14-18). That deadline is firm and fixed: so that we will not accept any paper submitted after November 18. But over 12 weeks, you should have plenty of time to read the material; reflect upon it; and compose your essay. Don't put it off until the last minute, or you'll produce a mediocre paper.
4. If you are taking History 474 for three credits, you should submit a concise, well-organized, clearly argued essay of some 7 to 9 pages in length. You can satisfy that requirement by reading no more than the one principal source: either Thompson's Morris; or Kapp's Eleanor Marx; or Goldman's Living My Life.

If you are taking History 474 for four credits, you should submit a concise, well-organized, clearly argued essay of some 10 or 12 pages in length. You can satisfy that requirement by reading and reflecting on one principal source (Thompson, Kapp, or Goldman), plus referring in your paper to one supplementary reading. That supplementary book shouldn't be very taxing:

a) You can choose one of the following course books (which you are required to read anyway), and which can help to explain in your paper the kind of conditions your militant was opposing; or the kind of social struggles which were erupting in his or her lifetime; or the kind of Establishment ideologies which were predominant: Dubofsky, We Shall Be All; Hane, Peasants, Rebels, and Outcasts; Mayer, The Persistence of the Old Regime; Gould, The Mismeasurement of Men; Ehrenreich and English, For Her Own Good. b) Or you can choose one of the following paperbacks (generally available in the bookstores): Blumenberg, Karl Marx; Mehring, Karl Marx (either of which might help in a paper on Eleanor Marx); Stanley Buder, Pullman (on the company town of Pullman and the great strike which exploded there in the 1890's); D. Greaves, Life and Times of James Connolly (short, excellent work on the great Irish revolutionary and syndicalist). c) Or you can consult one of several relevant books on three-day reserve in Helen White: H. Goldberg, The Life of Jean Jaurès (the standard work on the greatest of French socialists, and arguably, the greatest socialist in the entire Second International); Gareth Stedman Jones, Outcast London (a splendid book on the mass impoverishment in London during the depression of the 1880's); David Montgomery, Workers' Control in America; David Nasaw, Schooled to Order: social control in public schooling; Eugene Schulkind, The Paris Commune of 1871; Robert Tressell, The Ragged-Trousered Philanthropists (a classic novel about English workers, by an English worker).

But remember: the principal ingredient in your paper must be the one thick book; the supplementary book is the extra seasoning.