



OXFORD JOURNALS
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Definitions of Modernity: Social Mobility in a German Town, 1880-1901

Author(s): David Crew

Source: *Journal of Social History*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Autumn, 1973), pp. 51-74

Published by: Oxford University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3786497>

Accessed: 26-12-2019 10:32 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Oxford University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Social History*

**DEFINITIONS OF MODERNITY:
SOCIAL MOBILITY IN A GERMAN TOWN,
1880-1901**

For the individual proletarian, every prospect of working himself up out of the morass into which modern methods of production have thrust him by himself, through his own strength have disappeared. He can only achieve his elevation through the elevation of the whole class to which he belongs.

Karl Kautsky
"Comments on the Erfurt Program, 1912"

They want to succeed in life, as it is called; the one to own a house, the other fine lodgings, the third expensive clothes, the fourth a life of pleasure in food, drink and dancing. In the education of their children some go much beyond what is possible for them. And many want to lead a pleasant life just from the earnings of the husband without working in field or garden. When their means are not sufficient then discontent is immediately there. And envy, hatred . . . against all those who are better situated.

Reports of the Kreissynode of Bochum,
(Hofstede, 12 June 1899)

Two pictures of the same subject—Kautsky's more a statement of ideology than of fact; the report to the Kreissynode more a reproach to the lower classes than an accurate description of their condition, hopes and prospects. But both are drawn on the same canvas and both portray a society in which there was little room to move, little chance of material progress and a great gulf between opportunities and expectations which would inevitably cause social conflict.

Since then little has been added to our knowledge of the dimensions and processes of social mobility in industrial Germany.¹ Instead, we are forced to make assumptions based on the theories and clichés of other fields and disciplines, among which there is, unfortunately, no consensus. Students of social mobility disagree about the relative "openness" of industrial societies

Mr. Crew is a graduate student at Cornell University. The preparation of this study was assisted by a grant from the European Studies Committee, Center for International Studies, Cornell University.

because they have not reached a common assessment of the effects of industrialization and modernization on social structure. On one side stand the partisans of American uniqueness. Their view, rooted in American folklore and supported by many scholars, is that rapid and widespread social mobility has been uniquely American while European industrial society has remained comparatively closed.² Opposition to that interpretation derives from what we might term the folklore of sociology and has been best articulated by Seymour Lipset and Reinhold Bendix.³ Starting from the assumption that industrialization has basically similar consequences wherever it occurs, Lipset and Bendix have followed a trail of impressive but often ambiguous and incomplete statistics⁴ to reach the conclusion that social mobility is and has been widespread in all industrial societies. In short, they can detect no significant differences between the structure of opportunities in Europe and America.

Those German historians who have documented the intellectual and political reaction against modernity seem to have implicitly accepted the sociological dogma of universal cause and effect.⁵ Others, clinging to the idea of German uniqueness, have maintained a healthy scepticism regarding the supposed homogenizing consequences of industrialization and modernization, but only by adopting a narrow focus on the persistence of traditional social patterns in such elitist institutions as the German officer corps or university.⁶ While it is important that we should know, for instance, how many businessmen's sons attended universities, this is only a limited indicator of the relative "openness" of German society and the nature of the changes that were transforming it in the late nineteenth century. Few historians have attempted to ask how modernization affected German social structure as a whole, nor whether it was or had to be the same there as in other industrial nations.

This study begins that task by addressing itself to one of the most important questions that can be asked about social structure and social change: How rapid, widespread and significant was social mobility? Its aim is to establish the actual dimensions of social movement in one expanding industrial town, Bochum in the Ruhr, through an examination of occupational mobility, property mobility and the accumulation of savings. It suggests that it was the values of individuals, not simply the imperatives of economic processes that determined which roads were opened, which barred and to whom, and indeed whether a journey should be made at all or whether it was not simply better to stay at home. In short, it seeks not only to describe the objective structure of opportunities but to suggest how these opportunities were perceived, desired and grasped.

Until the 1840s, Bochum remained a small county seat and local market center whose population barely exceeded 4,000. But in 1841, the first deep mine in Westphalia, the *Präsident*, was sunk near the village of Hamme on the town's northwest boundary;⁷ others soon followed. A year later, a Schwabian craftsman and a Magdeburg banker started a small foundry in the town. By 1900, it had expanded into one of the major iron and steel companies in the Ruhr, producing a wide variety of products from cannons to rails and employing almost 7,000 men.⁸

By 1907 Bochum had already become an *Industriegrossstadt*, with a population of over 120,000 and a labor force in excess of 50,000.⁹ Like other industrial centers in the Ruhr, it had grown by massive immigration; only 23 percent of the labor force in 1907 had been born in the town.¹⁰ Immigrants were attracted to the mines and foundries which dominated the local economy and to the subsidiary chemical industry, metalworking and machine building shops. This growth of the population stimulated the building, food, clothing and transport trades, creating other sources of employment.¹¹

The General Dimensions of Occupational Movement

What were the main patterns of occupational mobility during the period under consideration? Tables I and II indicate degrees of mobility after ten and 21 years among members of a random sample taken from the city directory in 1880.¹²

Table 1—Occupational Mobility by 1890

	Absolute Numbers*	Percent
Unskilled & Semi-Skilled in 1880		
Remaining unskilled/semi-skilled	190	87.1
Rising to skilled/artisanal	15	6.9
Rising to non-manual	13	6.0
Total	218	100.0
Skilled & Artisanal in 1880		
Remaining skilled/artisanal	125	78.6
Falling to unskilled/semi-skilled	18	11.3
Rising to non-manual	16	10.1
Total	159	100.0
Non-Manual in 1880		
Remaining non-manual	103	96.3
Falling to skilled/artisanal	1	0.9
Falling to unskilled/semi-skilled	3	2.8
Total	107	100.0

Table 2—Occupational Mobility by 1901

Unskilled & Semi-Skilled in 1880		
Remaining unskilled/semi-skilled	93	78.8
Rising to skilled/artisanal	11	9.3
Rising to non-manual	14	11.9
Total	118	100.0
Skilled & Artisanal in 1880		
Remaining skilled/artisanal	67	60.9
Falling to unskilled/semi-skilled	17	15.5
Rising to non-manual	26	23.6
Total	110	100.0
Non-Manual in 1880		
Remaining non-manual	60	96.8
Falling to skilled/artisanal	0	0.0
Falling to unskilled/semi-skilled	2	3.2
Total	62	100.0

*This includes those retired or invalided by 1880 or 1901; if a sample member was so listed in either of these years, his occupation was considered to be the one last exercised before he ceased working.

From these figures two important images emerge. The first is of a society neither completely static, nor yet highly mobile. By far, the majority remained occupationally stable, while those who did move generally made very modest gains. Unskilled and semi-skilled workers had the least chance of moving into higher positions; even after a 21 year period only two in every ten had experienced any form of upward mobility and only one of these had been able to abandon manual work completely. Indeed, the most common form of mobility for unskilled and semi-skilled workers was not upward but sideways; for instance, after ten years almost 29 percent of the stable group had moved into other unskilled or semi-skilled work. Skilled and artisanal workers were more mobile but they faced the danger of falling downward into the ranks of the unskilled almost as often as they had the opportunity to rise into non-manual positions. Members of non-manual occupations also made some advances, as we shall observe later, but their most notable achievement as a group was their extremely low rate of downward mobility into manual work.

The second image is of a society in which the division between manual and non-manual work is not merely a demarcation of status but a barrier. Movement occurred much more frequently on either side of that barrier than it did across it.¹³ By 1890, only 7.7 percent, and by 1901 less than 18 percent of all manual workers persisting in the town had been able to move into non-manual positions. The extent of mobility in the other direction was even smaller; after ten years, only 3.7 percent, and after 21 years about 3.2 percent of the non-manual group had been forced to descend to manual jobs. Thus, by 1901 few people in either group had experienced significant movement away from the position they had held 21 years before; for the majority, the dominant frame of social reference remained stability and continuity.

If the dimensions of occupational mobility were small in absolute terms, they appear even more limited in comparison to movement in a society generally considered to be open in the nineteenth century. Mobility rates in Bochum were qualitatively different from those in several American cities which have recently been studied. Worthman, in his analysis of working-class mobility in Birmingham, Alabama, found that "after twenty years in Birmingham more than one half of the persisting workers had risen to non-manual jobs."¹⁴ In Bochum, as we have seen, the comparable figure after 21 years was only 18 percent. Richard Hopkins, studying Atlanta, found that after a decade one of every five workers, both natives and immigrants, had abandoned manual jobs for white-collar occupations; in Bochum it was one in thirteen. Both also discovered significantly higher rates of upward movement within the manual class. In Birmingham, after five or ten years, one-quarter to one-third of the workers persisting in most groups improved their occupational status, while in Atlanta 50 percent of the native whites and 33 percent of the immigrant unskilled workers rose to higher positions after a decade. The only group of workers in Atlanta who showed lower mobility rates than all workers in Bochum were the blacks.¹⁵ In Boston, Stephan Thernstrom discovered that rates of movement out of blue-collar into

non-manual employment varied quite strikingly among various ethnic groups, but not even the lowest rate for any of the four decadal periods he studied matched the paltry 7.7 percent for Bochum's manual workers in the first decade (1880-90).¹⁶

American workers undoubtedly experienced more and faster movement than their German peers. Not only were German workers more stable in the status hierarchy, but they also remained more firmly attached to a particular line of work. Hopkins noted that among all groups in his 1870 sample who remained in Atlanta for at least a decade, fewer than 10 percent had the same occupation or continued to work for the same employer;¹⁷ in Bochum after the first ten years, 62.4 percent of all unskilled and semi-skilled workers were still in the same occupations, while among skilled workers and artisans that figure was 61.6 percent.

Our investigation of the main dimensions of occupational mobility in Bochum has revealed a general picture of the local structure of opportunity. Analysis of the career patterns of specific occupational groups within the overall status hierarchy can not only illustrate contrasts in that picture but can also inform us in detail about the actual processes of mobility: What paths were open to what people? Which ones did they choose? The answers to these questions begin to take us from the concrete realm of mobility shown by facts and figures alone to the more intangible and intriguing territory of social movement as the product of personal mentality and motivation.

Unskilled and Semi-Skilled Workers

There were three main groups of unskilled and semi-skilled workers in the sample: day laborers, miners and unskilled factory workers. The experience of day laborers is important because they represented the absolute rock bottom of the manual level; if they could make significant advances, this would have been an important indication that local society was relatively open. But, as Table III indicates, even though day laborers made advances, in few instances could these be termed significant. No doubt the individual day laborer counted it as an achievement if he could exchange his insecure existence for the more regular and sometimes higher paid employment offered by the mine or factory. But this was at best a very modest advance involving little real increment of status. Significant upward movement, into skilled or artisanal positions, or into the non-manual level was part of the experience of only a small minority of day laborers.

The mobility patterns of miners and unskilled factory workers were significant for other reasons. As Table III indicates, these two worker groups had quite different experiences.

It was obvious that mobile unskilled workers could follow one of two paths: they could remain within the manual hierarchy in the hope of gradually rising to a skilled job and perhaps eventually enter the non-manual world via a lower managerial or clerical post, or they could enter the non-manual world directly as tradesmen. Factory workers almost exclusively

**Table 3—Occupational Mobility
of Unskilled and Semi-Skilled Workers***

Occupation in 1890 (Percent)				
Occupation in 1880	In Same Occupation	Other Unskilled/Semi- Skilled Work	Skilled/ Artisanal	Non- Manual
Day Laborers	33.3	54.8	2.4	4.8
Unskilled				
Factory Workers	72.5	8.9	11.8	4.9
Miners	69.4	10.2	0.0	6.1
Occupation in 1901 (Percent)				
Day Laborers	8.7	65.2	4.3	4.3
Unskilled				
Factory Workers	66.1	3.4	11.9	6.8
Miners	33.0	16.7	0.0	13.0

*In none of the cases does the total equal 100 percent since in each group workers had retired or become invalided by 1890 and 1901; these were not included. A separate trace of these people's careers indicated that hardly any of them had experienced occupational mobility.

followed the first course, while miners took the second. Why? Did miners have greater expectations than unskilled factory workers? Did factory workers take the easier path? Granted that it was probably difficult for the average factory worker to accumulate the capital necessary for a small business, becoming a skilled worker was not all that much easier. The unskilled worker might learn the few skills necessary to tend a machine without financial sacrifice, thereby becoming semi-skilled,¹⁸ but few could afford to undertake the apprenticeship generally required for recognition of skilled status.¹⁹ Yet this path was appealing to many, for it had the psychological advantage of being not only familiar, but of offering relative safety and security. This type of advancement did not require individual initiative or the willingness to take risks, as did shopkeeping; it called for more passive virtues, chiefly that of loyalty to the company.²⁰ Hence, if unskilled factory workers tended to advance within the factory considerably more often than they did outside of it, this was not merely an indication of their objective opportunities, but of which opportunities they preferred.

Upwardly mobile miners, however, seemed to have concentrated all their energies on entering the non-manual world by becoming small tradesmen. Was this a result of their greater expectations and opportunities? Certainly miners, as we shall see, were able to accumulate more capital than other worker groups. But the evidence also suggests that miners were cut off from advancement within the manual hierarchy and that owning a small business was not their preferred, but their only escape upwards. The structure of work in the mining industry did not present the same scope for significant advancement that existed in the metal trades. Distinctions of status and

function between workers in the mines were based more on experience than on formal training; these did not mean a great deal in terms of wages, and after the 1860s they meant even less in terms of skills.²¹ As the mines expanded, new labor was needed and the owners hired "everything that applied and had arms."²² It was possible to enter the lower levels of management in the mines, but that meant attending the *Bergschule*, and few miners in the sample followed that path. The miner could go to work in a factory, but unless he made that shift while still young (as few did) he was not likely to advance very far. Moreover, the social prejudice against his occupational background and—if he came from the east—against his regional origins, probably closed other avenues of advancement within the manual hierarchy.²³ In short, if miners wished to leave mining, their choices were virtually restricted to setting up a small shop selling beer or groceries, often to fellow workers in their own neighborhoods. And since the miner had to move further away from his original position in order to leave it at all, fewer were capable of doing so; while almost 19.0 percent of unskilled factory workers had made some advance by 1901, only 13.0 percent of the miners had risen at all. Those who did advance aimed at higher goals than other unskilled workers, not necessarily because of their greater personal ambitions or opportunities, but because they lacked more accessible alternatives closer to home.

Mobility Patterns of Skilled and Artisanal Workers

Mobility was a more common ingredient of the experience of skilled and artisanal workers, but since these men had status to lose as well as to gain, movement could be a dangerous as well as rewarding proposition. Table IV outlines patterns of mobility among this group of workers.

After the first decade, both skilled and artisanal workers showed considerable occupational stability. But both skilled metalworkers and skilled workers in the building and construction trades were more upwardly and downwardly mobile than artisanal workers. By 1901, the mobility of all four groups had increased, but whereas mobile artisans moved almost exclusively upwards, skilled workers in the metal and building trades had experienced considerable downward mobility as well. Thus skilled workers had risen more quickly, but suffered more losses in the long run than artisans. Differences in the timing and extent of upward mobility may have had something to do with the fact that skilled workers in the factories and on the building sites were less satisfied with their positions than artisanal workers, hence may have sought to improve their status more quickly and more often than artisans. But these two groups also followed different paths of upward movement which affected their relative rates of mobility. Artisanal workers concentrated on acquiring their own shops; that required capital and the time to accumulate it. Skilled metal and building workers may have dreamed of becoming tradesmen too, but most of them found advancement into lower managerial or clerical posts in industry. This meant that they could rise more quickly, but as a group, they were less secure. Skilled workers who had not

Table 4—Occupational Mobility
of Skilled & Artisanal Workers*

Occupation in 1880	Occupation in 1890 (Percent)			
	In Same Occupation	Other Skilled/ Artisanal Work	Unskilled/Semi- Skilled Work	Non- Manual
Skilled Metal- workers	71.4	0.0	9.5	14.3
Skilled Workers— building & con- struction	72.7	3.0	12.2	12.0
Skilled/Artisanal— food, drink & clothing	79.5	2.9	7.8	7.8
Skilled/Artisanal— wood, leather, luxury, etc.	80.6	0.0	6.4	9.7
Occupation in 1901				
Occupation in 1880				
Skilled Metal- workers	58.8	0.0	17.6	17.7
Skilled Workers— building & con- struction	50.0	3.8	19.2	19.2
Skilled/Artisanal— food, drink & clothing	70.4	0.0	0.0	14.8
Skilled/Artisanal— wood, leather, luxury, etc.	52.9	0.0	5.9	29.4

*As in Table 3, the retired and invalided were not included.

managed to advance into non-manual posts found it much harder than artisans to maintain their status, especially as they grew older. Forced to accept unskilled work during an economic slump or no longer physically able to exercise their skills, many skilled workers found themselves downwardly mobile. Artisanal workers did not suffer that indignity as often, in part at least because after the passage of 21 years considerable numbers of them owned their own shops and were their own masters.

Still, despite these differences, skilled and artisanal workers undoubtedly shared one important perception derived from their experience. Both could see examples of success in their own ranks; the skilled metalworker now foreman, the artisanal worker with his own shop. But they had also observed other less heartening signs; skilled and artisanal workers who were now miners, factory hands or even day laborers.²⁴ The lesson to be learned was

that mobility was a two-edged instrument, and that at least as much effort had to be expended in trying to maintain one's status as in improving it. As a group, the skilled and artisanal workers were marked by caution, defensiveness and modest ambition, qualities they undoubtedly felt best suited the needs of their exposed position on the boundary between the middle and working classes.

Non-Manual Occupations

Only two occupational groupings in this category need concern us as exhibiting any more than minimal movement. Members of the sample with professions (lawyers, doctors, etc.) were 100 percent stable during this period and others barely moved at all. Lower civil servants, for example, remained totally stable in 1890, while by 1901 one of the nine still remaining had become a cleric. Lower *Angestellte*, on the other hand, were more likely to experience mobility in both directions. By 1890, 8.4 percent had suffered the indignity of becoming laborers. But in general, they were more likely to move sideways or upwards; after ten years, 2.8 percent had become lower *Beamte* while 13.9 percent became tradesmen or merchants and 5.6 percent managed to rise into higher *Angestellte* posts. This still left 66.7 percent in their original positions. By 1901, the remaining members of this group had experienced even greater mobility, most of it in an upward direction; while 4.8 percent had dropped to become miners and 9.5 percent shifted into the lower ranks of the civil service, another 9.5 percent had become higher *Angestellte* and 14.3 percent were tradesmen or merchants.

The second group—tradesmen and merchants—also showed some movement, but only after a much longer period of time. By 1890, all but one had remained tradesmen or merchants; that one person worked as an unskilled factory hand. Eleven years later, almost 70 percent of the group remaining were still in the same occupation, although some had obviously made improvements in their condition. Of the rest, one had become an innkeeper, one was an industrial entrepreneur and one was still working as an unskilled factory hand.

Mobility and Out-Migration

Thus far we have been exclusively concerned with the mobility patterns of sample members who remained to be counted in 1890 or 1901. But what happened to those people who left the city?²⁵ Were they able to find greener pastures elsewhere, or was their geographic mobility a sign of their social and economic failure, a failure repeated elsewhere? We cannot answer that question definitively, simply because it would be impossible to trace these hundreds of individuals once they left the town. But certain evidence does suggest that the movers were largely the failures in the urban economy and probably had a good chance of remaining so wherever they went.

In the first place, rates of persistence varied quite strikingly among the different occupational groups, as Table V indicates.

Table 5—Persistence Rates (Percent)

	1882	1884	1886	1888	1890	1892	1894	1897	1899	1901
Miners	67.7	57.5	48.0	39.4	38.6	36.2	33.1	26.8	22.8	18.9
Unskilled										
Factory Workers	73.7	65.0	53.9	46.1	42.0	36.6	34.2	32.1	28.0	24.3
Day Laborers	66.7	53.5	41.9	35.7	32.6	30.2	27.1	23.3	21.7	17.8
Skilled Metal-workers	63.8	50.0	43.1	41.4	36.2	32.8	32.8	31.0	31.0	29.3
Skilled Workers—building & construction	88.5	80.3	70.5	63.9	54.1	49.2	49.2	45.9	45.9	42.6
Skilled/Artisanal—food, etc.	82.5	75.4	71.9	71.9	68.4	64.9	59.6	54.4	49.1	47.4
Skilled/Artisanal—wood, etc.	80.4	76.1	69.6	67.4	67.4	60.9	56.5	54.3	45.7	37.0
Lower										
<i>Angestellte</i>	71.6	63.0	55.6	50.6	44.4	42.0	38.3	33.3	28.4	25.9
Lower <i>Beamte</i>	66.7	56.7	53.3	43.3	40.0	40.0	33.3	30.0	30.0	30.0
Professionals	71.4	66.7	57.1	57.1	47.6	42.9	38.1	23.8	19.0	19.0
Tradesmen & Merchants	83.3	75.0	70.8	62.5	62.5	58.3	56.3	45.8	41.7	39.6
Innkeepers & Hoteliers	92.3	92.3	84.6	84.6	84.6	69.2	61.5	53.8	53.8	46.2

Persistence was minimal among the low-status groups, rose to a peak with certain skilled and artisanal workers, but then dropped again among the non-manual occupations. Does this mean that the movement of unskilled workers represented failure, or that geographically mobile non-manual sample members were simply following up new opportunities? The occupational mobility records of non-manual out-migrants would tend to discredit that hypothesis. For instance, 14.3 percent of the lower *Angestellte* who had left the city by 1884 had already dropped into unskilled factory work by 1882, whereas only 4 percent of that occupational group remaining in the city until 1884 were downwardly mobile. The other non-manual groups showed similar patterns. Indeed, the evidence from the first decade, when out-migration was highest, indicates that in almost all occupational groups, manual as well as non-manual, downward mobility was more prevalent among those who moved than among those who remained in the city.

Geographic mobility was clearly associated with patterns of occupational mobility. Most of the people who remained only a short time in the city had either worked in the lowest status occupations and been incapable of gaining a toehold, or had started higher up but soon begun to slip. It must have been obvious to Bochum's inhabitants that the first and, in most cases, the main success they could hope to achieve in the city was simply being able to remain in it.²⁶

Intergenerational Mobility

If rates of upward mobility were low within a single generation, did a higher degree of movement exist between generations? Were a sizeable

number of sons able to achieve a higher status than their fathers? By what avenues could they hope to rise? Table VI outlines the dimensions of intergenerational mobility among sons from manual backgrounds at the time of their marriage in 1900.²⁷

Table 6—Intergenerational Mobility

Fathers' Occupa- tions	Sons' Manual Occupations (Percent)					(6) Non- Manual
	(1) Same as Father	(2) Same Skill Level	(3) Total Stable (1+2)	(4) Higher Skill Level	(5) Lower Skill Level	
Miners Unskilled	44.0	10.2	54.2	27.1	0.0	19.0
Factory Workers	40.0	25.8	65.8	28.1	0.0	5.9
Skilled Metal- Workers	46.6	20.0	66.6	0.0	23.3	10.0
Skilled Workers— building & con- struction	27.4	15.7	43.1	0.0	39.2	17.6
Skilled/ Artisanal— food, drink & clothing	23.0	33.3	56.3	0.0	31.3	12.5
Skilled/ Artisanal— wood, leather & luxury	16.7	37.4	54.1	0.0	29.1	16.6

There were too few sons from the individual occupational groups in the non-manual category to warrant inclusion in this table. Sons from non-manual backgrounds were often able to maintain the general status enjoyed by their fathers and, less often, to improve on it—54.3 percent in all—but no less than 46.6 percent had dropped into the manual category; 25.9 percent working in skilled or artisanal employment, while 21.5 percent were unskilled.²⁸

For all practical purposes then, manual work in Bochum constituted an ascribed characteristic—no less than 87.8 percent of the sons of manual workers also worked with their hands. Many had made advances within the hierarchy of manual labor, but others remained stable or even experienced downward mobility. More sons of unskilled and semi-skilled workers were able to advance into skilled or artisanal positions than had members of the intragenerational mobility sample from the same occupational group. But sons of skilled and artisanal workers had great difficulty simply avoiding downward mobility. Sons of artisanal workers in particular were considerably more downwardly mobile than were artisans in the sample.

Clearly, this generation of manual workers, like their fathers, perceived the idea of mobility through a prism of limited opportunity, modest expectations and, in some cases, very great fears. Their main concern was probably security, defined by most as reaching or maintaining a position at the pinnacle of the manual class. On the other hand, the failure of so many white-collar class sons to retain the status of their fathers undoubtedly induced a similar concern with security among non-manual sons. In both cases, sons and parents might well agree that it was better to remain close to home, at least socially, than to attempt any lengthy and possibly dangerous voyages.

Processes of Intergenerational Mobility

Apprenticeship

The shortest and most familiar route to advancement for sons of manual workers was apprenticeship. In Bochum, whose economy was dominated by heavy industry, factory apprenticeship (usually to a skilled metal trade), was most common; fewer sons trained to become independent artisans. Table VII, based on apprenticeship lists at the town's largest iron and steel company, the *Bochumer Verein*.²⁹ indicates which groups among Bochum's manual inhabitants managed to see their sons enter a skilled metal trade.

Table 7—Parents of Apprentices
at the Bochumer Verein, 1882-1893

Unskilled Manual Workers	Percent
Miners	3.4
Unskilled Factory Workers	41.7
Others	4.4
Skilled and Artisanal Workers	
Skilled Metalworkers	11.3
Others	5.9
Non-Manual Occupations	10.3
Widows or Working Women	14.7
Others	8.3

Obviously apprenticeship to a skilled metal trade was an important avenue of advancement for sons of unskilled workers, but it was monopolized almost exclusively by sons of unskilled factory workers who were well placed to help their sons along this path.³⁰ Sons of miners were underrepresented in proportion to their numbers in the total population. Miners' sons were no less successful overall than sons of unskilled factory workers in rising into skilled or artisanal positions, but they followed other paths into the building trades or artisanal work. This constituted an important difference of opportunity and experience between them and other worker groups.

The Schools

Since the early part of the century, Bochum had a *Fortbildungsschule* designed to help apprentices, both industrial and artisanal, to learn more of the practical and theoretical knowledge they needed to advance in their trades. But from the beginning the school faced the apathy, disinterest and even open hostility of parents and employers. In 1878 the city made attendance mandatory.³¹ In 1892 it was forced to issue a second ordinance warning that "parents and guardians may not keep their sons or wards from . . . attending the *Fortbildungsschule*. Rather they must guarantee to them the necessary time."³² But as late as 1912, the director of the school was still appealing to employers to show greater interest in the school's programs; undoubtedly few apprentices were helped by the school.³³

An alternative to apprenticeship was the *Bergschule*. There, depending on the course of instruction followed, a student could be qualified for lower or higher managerial posts in the mines. Sons of manual workers could conceivably attend the lower level course because it allowed them time each day to work to support themselves.³⁴ But the higher course required "complete devotion of one's energies and in general does not permit exercise of an occupation."³⁵ In either case, as the mobility study has indicated, the proportion of miners' and other manual workers' sons using this path of advancement was very small.

The *Gewerbeschule* was another potential social escalator for sons of manual workers. Its training in mathematics, science and technical subjects provided the necessary preparation for a career in the lower managerial levels of local industry, or further training at a *Technische Hochschule*. But sons of manual workers remained a distinct minority among its students: as late as 1880, only eight of the 49 then attending the school had manual workers as parents, all of them skilled workers or artisans. The rest were from the middle and upper-middle classes.³⁶

But if worker parents had been seriously concerned and able to help their sons out of the manual class, the surest step would have been to send them to the *Gymnasium* or *Oberrealschule*. Completion of nine years and the *Abitur* at the *Gymnasium* qualified the student for entry to a university, and even only six years carried several privileges bestowing important advantages both within and outside the civil service.³⁷ The *Oberrealschule* offered fewer direct privileges, but it too could be a path to social advancement.

As Table VIII indicates, relatively few sons of manual workers attended either school. These figures reflect the function of these schools in determining social status; rather than aiding mobility, they ensured status continuity. Evidence pertaining to the *Gymnasium* suggests that even within the non-manual class, secondary education helped few sons to improve their social position.³⁹ If we compare the 1910 occupations of *Gymnasium* graduates to those of their fathers we discover the following: of the class entering in 1876, less than half of the students who could have risen—students from the manual group and the lower and middle levels of the non-manual group—did achieve upward movement. In the 1886 and 1896

classes, the pattern was similar. Hence *Gymnasium* education aided only a minority even within the non-manual world in achieving upward mobility.

Table 8—Social Backgrounds
of Entering Classes (Percent)³⁸

Fathers' Occupations	Gymnasium				Oberrealschule	
	1876	1886	1896	1906	1895/6	1901
Unskilled						
Manual	3.3	4.7	2.5	3.8	3.6	4.3
Skilled Manual	5.5	1.2	11.3	6.7	15.5	15.3
Lower						
Angestellte & Beamte	26.4	24.7	28.8	24.1	26.4	30.6
Higher						
Angestellte & Beamte	3.3	17.7	5.0	14.4	4.5	5.8
Tradesmen, merchants, innkeepers, etc.	24.2	14.1	23.8	21.1	33.7	24.8
Professionals	4.4	8.2	7.5	13.5	3.6	2.2
Factory Owners, etc.	7.7	4.7	5.0	1.9	7.3	5.1
Others	14.3	14.1	3.8	4.8	2.7	1.5

Savings and Homeownership

Savings were regarded by middle-class contemporaries as security against poverty for the lower classes,⁴⁰ but savings were also crucial to several forms of inter- and intragenerational mobility (for instance, owning a business or educating a son). What were the dimensions of worker savings in Bochum? Table IX indicates the proportions of workers among depositors at the main savings bank in the city. It suggests that workers were usually in the minority and that, between 1860 and 1895, their relative numbers declined.⁴¹ In short, the savings bank was and remained a middle-class institution. And within the manual class, the per capita distribution of savings was one-sided; considerable numbers of master craftsmen were depositors, but few factory workers or journeymen ever had accounts and while miners had considerably more per capita, their numbers decreased between 1867 and 1895.⁴²

Table 9—Unskilled & Skilled Manual Depositors
at the Sparkasse

	% of all manual workers among all depositors	Workers' deposits as % of total deposits
1860	43.8	37.0
1870	52.6	31.5
1880	40.9	26.6
1885	33.6	28.5
1890	39.7	30.3
1895	38.5	29.6

However, manual workers who did save were often able to show quite significant increases in the size of their deposits; between 1856 and 1895 the average size of accounts among master craftsmen increased by 411 percent, accounts of miners by 321 percent, while factory workers and journeymen trailed with 147 percent and 86 percent respectively. In 1895 the average size account held by a master craftsman was over 2000 marks, that of a miner over 1,100 marks, balances sufficient to help many members of these two manual groups to acquire their own shops or small businesses, a pattern of mobility already revealed in Tables III and IV. But few factory workers or journeymen ever accumulated savings that exceeded the 1,000 mark line. Their balances represented neither business capital nor even security in old age or illness. At best the savings accumulated by most factory workers, journeymen and many miners could have facilitated the acquisition of another and more modest form of improvement, a home.

Homeownership offered not only greater status in the eyes of the community,⁴³ but provided a certain material security as well. Table X outlines the dimensions of homeownership in 1880, 1890 and 1901 among sample members still remaining:

Table 10—Homeownership

Occupation	Total in Group	1880		Total in Group	1890		Total in Group	1901	
		Home- owners abs.	%		Home- owners abs.	%		Home- owners abs.	%
Miners	127	8	6.3	48	8	16.7	17	2	11.8
Unskilled									
Factory Workers	243	10	4.1	112	7	6.3	67	5	7.5
Day Laborers	129	3	2.3	25	0	0.0	4	0	0.0
Skilled Metal- workers	58	3	5.2	31	2	6.5	20	2	10.0
Skilled Workers— building & con- struction	61	11	18.0	26	10	38.5	16	8	50.0
Skilled/ Artisanal—food, drink, clothing	57	8	14.0	38	9	23.7	23	7	30.4
Skilled/ Artisanal—wood, leather, luxury	46	9	19.6	31	12	38.7	13	8	61.5
Lower <i>Angestellte</i>	81	8	9.9	33	8	24.2	23	6	26.1
Lower <i>Beamte</i>	30	2	6.7	15	3	20.0	13	3	23.1
Tradesmen, merchants	48	15	31.3	43	18	41.9	34	25	73.5
Innkeepers	13	9	69.2	15	10	66.7	7	5	71.4
Professionals	21	3	14.3	11	5	45.5	4	2	50.0

The percentage increases should not mislead us; in most cases, they indicate only that property owners were more likely to remain in the city than renters. The absolute increase of homeowners in each occupational group was

not particularly large, although it is obvious that some people who did not own homes in 1880 had become propertyed by 1890 or 1901. Among the 90 homeowners in 1901 for instance, 61.6 percent had rented in 1880, while 30.0 percent were still propertyless in 1890.

Evidence from the mobility study suggests that among manual workers, homes were often acquired by committing the incomes of all members of the family to that one goal. In most cases this sacrifice was rewarded by greater security: homeowners were on the whole less downwardly mobile than renters. Not living on as narrow a margin between income and expenditure as renters, they were somewhat less vulnerable in economic crises. They could, for instance, afford to wait longer when unemployed before seeking a lower status job from which escape might be impossible later. For a few, homeownership even seems to have opened new possibilities. By 1901, homeowners were often more upwardly mobile into the non-manual class than renters. Most of those who advanced did so by becoming small tradesmen whereas mobile renters usually entered clerical or managerial posts. For some upwardly mobile homeowners, acquiring a house simply accompanied the acquisition of a shop, but in most cases the home preceded and aided the purchase of the business. Homeowners could afford to save the capital necessary to this form of mobility from their incomes, a possibility denied most renters.⁴⁴

But property mobility may have eliminated other types of movement, particularly for the second generation. The children certainly benefited from the fact that the family had acquired a home (and in some cases, a shop) which they would eventually inherit; but such a long-term investment of the family's income often ruled out the possibility of occupational mobility through apprenticeships or secondary education.⁴⁵

Conclusion

Social movement in Bochum was neither rapid nor widespread. Rates of intragenerational occupational mobility were low both in absolute terms and in comparison to those observed in America. The degree of occupational advancement between generations resembled the prescription followed by a Berlin voluntary association in counseling orphans on the choice of a future career: "A descent of the child below the *Stand* of the parents is to be avoided if at all possible, but a disproportionate ascent . . . is only to be furthered in special and exceptional cases."⁴⁶ Other forms of progress—savings and homeownership—were attained only by a small minority. The manual classes in Bochum remained without a visible "stake in society."

Here would be the obvious place to list what we might regard as the inevitable consequences of this social reality for the way people thought and felt about themselves and the society: frustration, desire for greater opportunity, increasing dissatisfaction with a social structure which hindered their progress. But these consequences are inevitable only so long as we make at least three assumptions: first, that most people wanted or expected to experience significant individual mobility; second, that the example and

ideology of leading groups in the community encouraged such mobility; third, that as a result of these sets of values, low rates of mobility induced a widespread feeling of being locked in to a narrow range of occupational and social roles from which it was rarely possible to escape.

Yet I suspect that these three assumptions were actually foreign to the social vocabulary of Bochum's inhabitants. Local leaders did not act as models for the mobility of the city's manual population; few of them had risen from very humble origins, and most either ignored or denied the possibility and necessity of significant social movement for the lower classes. But did Bochum's workers accept the mirror held up to local society by its leaders? We cannot pass out questionnaires inquiring about life goals and motivations. But German sociologists in the early 20th century who did so found that workers in other cities expressed a strong desire for security, sometimes perceived in terms of becoming skilled or an artisan, more rarely associated with the desire for greater advancement to ownership of a small business or a position in the state bureaucracy.⁴⁷ Sixty years later, Neuloh found that among certain workers in the Ruhr and Saar "interesting work, good chances for upward mobility, good opportunities for further education, the conditions, then, for which every worker concerned with prestige and advancement must have a burning interest . . . were given relatively little value."⁴⁸ The Bochum metalworker Steinmeyer expressed similar sentiments and no doubt spoke for many of his colleagues when he told them "to take care that our children think just as we do and that they also in the future become loyal and diligent workers."⁴⁹

Low expectations were clearly a response to what many workers and others perceived to be the unalterable realities of German social structure. True, there were real, often insuperable barriers to change; even modest advances, such as becoming a skilled worker, required resources possessed by few. Yet it is impossible to dispel the suspicion that individual advancement could have been greater and more widespread had more individuals been convinced that it was both possible and desirable. Bochum was, after all, a young industrial town with an active, expanding economy and a growing population. Its industry needed more skilled workers than it could usually attract, and there were considerable opportunities for white-collar employment. Its growing population presented new markets for small tradesmen, for building and construction companies and for service industries. Yet few individuals from the lower levels of local society advanced along these paths. If self-made men were a local rarity, and if indeed most upward mobility took the form of cautious advances between adjacent social groupings, the cause cannot be found solely in the inequities of the social system, or even the rates of economic growth.

However, low expectations for individual mobility were not just indicators of a traditional fatalism. They pointed to the fundamental difficulty which most people experienced in defining themselves socially as individuals. Bochum's inhabitants were far more likely to regard themselves as miners, skilled metalworkers and so on with expectations and hopes tailored to the goals which the community and the group regarded as proper to that

position, than as individuals who could determine their own future through their talents, initiative and ambition. This sense of group identity was obviously stronger in some cases than in others; the group had to have a coherent internal existence, its members had to experience a feeling of occupational community and the group had to be able to define itself against other groups. Hence miners, who had a fairly homogeneous structure of work, a past tradition and who were socially isolated, felt this sense of community whereas unskilled factory workers, who exhibited none of these characteristics, did not. But in either instance, group identity usually took precedence over individual identity.

This sense of community clearly offered the individual a great deal more than simple resignation to his lot. As Foster notes, it protected people from "irrelevance within society at large by allowing them to build up smaller sub-cultures with their own small-scale versions of success."⁵⁰ Rather than being forced to perceive industrial society as a society of classes possessing varying degrees of wealth and power—a situation of potential conflict—it allowed each group to experience society as a hierarchy of occupational orders, each different from the other, each with an identity and a pattern of life that was *proper* to it. Obviously this tended to defuse social conflict as long as most members of a group were in some sense satisfied with the condition and status of the group. But if they were not, what could they do about it? Individual mobility away from the group was, as we have seen, not readily available to most members of any occupational group; but if individuals could not rise, groups could. Group mobility superseded individual mobility.

If this was the manner in which dissatisfactions were experienced and formulated, it will have found expression in protest, particularly in strikes and labor organizations. Rather than deriving its impetus from the frustrations and anger of individuals who have found the road to improvement barred by social injustice, it will have drawn strength from the status anxieties of a group. In Bochum, workers' protest was spearheaded and dominated by miners, a group which had both a definite sense of occupational community and a marked dissatisfaction with the status and conditions of their occupation.⁵¹ The main thrust of their protest was directed at improving the prestige of their work and the conditions under which it was performed, not at increasing the economic rewards for their labor. Before the liberal reforms of the 1860s, miners had enjoyed a privileged position which derived from state protection and control. Remembrance of the past plus the fact that association with the state remained an important source of status in German society were factors which compelled miners to seek state involvement in the structure of the enterprise.⁵² They also demanded improvements in the actual conditions of their work which would not only benefit them directly, but in turn enhance the status of their occupation in the eyes of the community. But seldom did they seek direct economic advances; wages only became a crucial issue when they had been recently reduced. Higher wages which could have been used to improve the standard and style of life off the job and even to promote

individual mobility out of the group were distinctly less important to miners, since it was primarily by his occupational *Stand* that a man was known.

Where this sort of protest can lead is fairly obvious. Since it does not aim at breaking down barriers between groups, at making the society more open, but rather at shifting the relative positions of parts which remain discrete in the whole, it has implications which are ultimately conservative. The class structure of industrial society was to be neither transformed nor reformed, but simply ignored—social injustice was to be accommodated rather than attacked. And the development of the individual as a citizen with the same rights, duties and opportunities as other citizens was to be sacrificed for the security of the occupational community.⁵³

FOOTNOTES

1. The main exceptions being the informative but rather limited series of investigations carried out under the guidance of Max Weber and subsequently published in the *Schriften des Vereins für Sozialpolitik*. In particular see Marie Bernays, "Auslese und Anpassung der Arbeiterschaft der geschlossenen Grossindustrie dargestellt an den Verhältnissen der 'Gladbacher Spinnerei und Weberei A-G' zu München-Gladbach im Rheinland," 133, I, (Leipzig, 1910) and Clemens Heiss, "Auslese und Anpassung der Arbeiter in der Berliner Feinmechanik," 134, II, (Leipzig, 1910). Renate Mayntz has plotted intergenerational mobility in a small German town during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; *Soziale Schichtung und Sozialer Wandel in einer Industriegemeinde. Eine soziologische Untersuchung der Stadt Euskirchen* (Stuttgart, 1958).

2. Among nineteenth-century observers of America, both Tocqueville and Bryce commented on the differences between the prospects of the lower classes in that country and in Europe. While Thernstrom, in his pioneering study of social mobility among day laborers in Newburyport, has advanced important qualifications regarding the openness of American society, he nonetheless maintains that "it is premature to dismiss entirely the old belief that the opportunity level in the United States has been higher than in Europe." *Poverty and Progress: Social Mobility in a Nineteenth Century City* (Cambridge, Mass., 1964), 270.

3. Seymour Martin Lipset and Reinhard Bendix, *Social Mobility in Industrial Society* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963). The literature on European mobility referred to by them is reported in more detail in the earlier work of Pitirim Sorokin, *Social Mobility* (New York, 1927).

4. As Thernstrom points out, most of the materials on European social mobility deal with the period after 1900, are concerned only with occupational mobility and only with intergenerational movement.

5. Among numerous works in this vein we might cite Fritz Stern's *The Politics of Cultural Despair: A Study in the Rise of the Germanic Ideology* (New York, 1965) and especially David Schoenbaum's *Hitler's Social Revolution: Class and Status in Nazi Germany, 1933-1939* (New York, 1966), Chapter VIII. Others include Herman Lebovics' "'Agrarians' versus 'Industrializers': Social Conservative Resistance to Industrialism and Capitalism in late Nineteenth Century Germany," *International Review of Social History*, Vol. XII (1967) and the recent work by Kenneth Barkin, *The Controversy over German Industrialization, 1890-1902* (Chicago, 1970).

6. Among others, Karl Demeter, *Das deutsche Heer und seine Offiziere* (Berlin, 1930) and the recent work by Fritz Ringer on the German universities; *The Decline of the*

German Mandarins: The German Academic Community, 1890-1933 (Cambridge, Mass., 1969).

7. Helmuth Croon, "Vom Werden des Ruhrgebiets" in Walter Först, ed., *Rheinisch-Westfälische Rückblende* (Beiträge zur neueren Landesgeschichte des Rheinlandes und Westfalens, Bd. I; Köln, Berlin, 1967), 185. See also H. Croon, "Studien zur Sozial und Siedlungsgeschichte der Stadt Bochum" in Paul Busch, Helmuth Croon, Carl Hahne, eds., *Bochum und das mittlere Ruhrgebiet* (Paderborn, 1965).

8. Walther Däbritz, *Bochumer Verein für Bergbau und Gusstahlfabrikation in Bochum. Neun Jahrzehnte seiner Geschichte im Rahmen der Wirtschaft des Ruhrbezirks* (Düsseldorf, 1934), IV Anhang, Tab. 8.

9. *Statistik des deutschen Reichs*, Bd. 210, 2 (Berlin, 1910), 191f.

10. *Ibid.*, 191-94.

11. The following table indicates the distribution of the work force among the main branches of the economy by 1907:

	abs.	%
Mines & Foundries	15,709	30.9
Metalworking	5,071	9.9
Machinery & Instruments	1,712	3.3
Building & Construction	4,623	9.1
Transport	2,064	4.8
Trade & Commerce	3,920	7.7
Food	1,641	3.0
Clothing	2,252	4.4

12. A random sample of 1,117 adult males living in the city in 1880 (approximately 10 percent of the total) was traced in each succeeding city directory until 1901. Changes in occupation, residence and property holdings were noted. This data was then coded, punched onto IBM cards and analysed by computer using a packaged program known as SPSS. The time period 1880-1901 was chosen because: (a) it covers the years in which the most important social and economic change in the town took place; (b) the directories were most reliable for these years.

13. Dahrendorf presents a similar image of contemporary German society; Ralf Dahrendorf, *Society and Democracy in Germany* (New York, 1967), 109.

14. Paul B. Worthman, "Working Class Mobility in Alabama, 1880-1914," in Tamara K. Hareven, ed., *Anonymous Americans; Explorations in Nineteenth Century Social History* (Englewood Cliffs, 1971), 196.

15. Richard J. Hopkins, "Status, Mobility and the Dimensions of Change in a Southern City: Atlanta, 1870-1890" in Kenneth T. Jackson and Stanley K. Schutz, eds., *Cities in American History* (New York, 1972).

16. Stephan Thernstrom, "Immigrants and Wasps: Ethnic Differences in Occupational Mobility in Boston, 1890-1940," in Stephan Thernstrom and Richard Sennett, eds., *Nineteenth Century Cities: Essays in the New Urban History* (New Haven, 1969), 129.

17. Hopkins, *op. cit.*

18. For an explanation of the divisions of work and processes of training in a machine building factory applicable to other branches of the metal industry see Richard Sorer, "Auslese und Anpassung in einer Wiener Maschinenfabrik," *Schriften des Vereins für Sozialpolitik*, 135, 2 (Leipzig, 1911), 162f.

19. Adult unskilled workers with families to support could seldom contemplate apprenticeship; see Moritz Bromme, *Lebensgeschichte eines modernen Fabrikarbeiters* (Jena, Leipzig, 1905).

20. This is reflected in the comments in *Bericht über die Jubelfeier des Bochumer Vereins* (Bochum, 1894). For an analysis of the relationship between stability and advancement at the Krupp works see Richard Ehrenberg, "Krupp'sche Arbeiterfamilien. Entwicklung und Entwicklungsfaktoren," *Thünen-Archiv*, Bd. 3. (Jena, 1911), 394.

21. There were three main divisions of work in the mine. The beginner, whether young or old, started as a *Schlepper*, or the man who moved wagons about in the mine. After two years, he began, as a *Lehrhauer*, to dig coal under the supervision of the *Hauer*. When he was deemed capable of working coal independently he, too, became a *Hauer*. The *Schlepper* was generally paid a set daily wage; the others according to how much coal they produced. But wage differentials were not all that great; at most perhaps they stood in the ratio 1:1.50; Aurel von Jüchen, "Beim Bergarbeiter" in G. Koepper, *In Schacht und Hütte: Die Industrie des Ruhr-Kohlenbezirks und benachbarten Gebiete* (Reutlingen, n.d.), 74; Staatssteuerrolle, 1901, Stadtarchiv Bochum. For miners' wage series from 1889 to 1912 see Max Jürgen Koch, *Die Bergarbeiterbewegung im Ruhrgebiet zur Zeit Wilhelms II (1889-1914)* (Düsseldorf, 1954). Adelman indicates that the acute labor shortage and the massive immigration of unskilled workers from the east resulted in progressive skill dilution in the post-reform era; Gerhard Adelman, *Die soziale Betriebsverfassung des Ruhrbergbaus vom Anfang des 19. Jahrhunderts bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg* (Bonn, 1962), 74.

22. Gerhard Adelman, ed., *Quellensammlung zur Geschichte der sozialen Betriebsverfassung*, Bd. I, (Bonn, 1960) Nr. 335. Oberbergamt Dortmund an Minister für Handel und Gewerbe Frhr. von Berlepsch, 3. Juli, 1890, 522.

23. Helmuth Croon notes that local *Handwerker* preferred local boys to those from the east as apprentices; H. Croon, "Vom Werden des Ruhrgebiets," *op. cit.*, 213. Easterners were socially isolated from the rest of the town's inhabitants. For a description of the attitudes of the inhabitants of a small industrial town to these outsiders see H. Croon and K. Utermann, *Zeche und Gemeinde: Untersuchungen über den Strukturwandel einer Zechengemeinde im nördlichen Ruhrgebiet* (Tübingen, 1958).

24. The significance of this downward movement is hard to grasp unless one is familiar with the social distance that separated skilled from unskilled workers in most industries. Skilled workers were often regarded as more aloof than managers. Certain rituals pointed up distinctions of status; in some factories, for instance, the unskilled could not receive their pay before the skilled; Leo Uhen, *Gruppenbewusstsein und informelle Gruppenbildungen bei deutschen Arbeitern* (Berlin, 1964), 27f.

25. We should of course like to know what types and patterns of mobility later in-migrants into the city experienced, but they pose a somewhat more difficult problem. One way of identifying them would be to take a sample say in 1890, then trace it backwards for several years to determine which members had not been listed in previous years. Theoretically this should give us a sample of in-migrants, but in fact it would also include young men who might have grown up in the town or lived there for many years, yet only appeared in the directory when they started working. It would be impossible, given the type of sources available, to isolate these people from in-migrants. Even if there were some way of isolating in-migrants, we would need some information on where they had come from, what occupation they had exercised before moving and so on, before we could determine in detail the relationship between immigration and mobility. One possible source for such information, not available in Bochum but perhaps still existing in other cities, are the police registration files.

26. Historians who have investigated patterns of persistence and mobility in American cities have reported somewhat similar findings. Thernstrom and Knights suggest that "men on the lower rungs of the class ladder were less rooted . . . than their betters;" Stephan Thernstrom and Peter R. Knights, "Men in Motion: Some Data and Speculations about Urban Population Mobility in Nineteenth-Century America" in Tamara K. Hareven, ed., *Anonymous Americans; Explorations in Nineteenth-Century Social History* (Englewood Cliffs, 1971), 33. In his study of Newburyport, Thernstrom suggested that out-migrating laborers were seldom in a position to take advantage of new opportunities in other communities and that, in their case at least, American folklore, which equated movement with success, was probably wrong; Thernstrom, *op. cit.*, 86-87. In another study, Knights attempted to trace out-migrants from Boston; he found that many were able to do better than those who remained in the city but cautioned that the people he was able to trace constituted only one-fifth of migrants from Boston and that they "held better jobs before they left, owned more property, and were more often of native American stock than the typical migrant"; Thernstrom and Knights, *op. cit.*, 39. In Birmingham, Alabama, whose economic structure was somewhat similar to that of Bochum, workers in many occupational groups were usually more transient than their German counterparts, perhaps suggesting that more failures may have been concealed by out-migration in the U.S. than in Germany; Worthman, *op. cit.*, 184. But the evidence is too fragmentary and there are too many other considerations, such as differing sizes and occupational structures, to allow us to draw any definite conclusions from a comparison of persistence rates in Bochum with American cities. Until further research proves otherwise, it seems reasonable that Thernstrom's comments on Newburyport laborers are applicable, at least to manual workers in other cities, both in America and Germany: "Workers who remained . . . for any length of time were a somewhat select group because to find sufficiently stable employment to maintain a settled residence in a community was itself success of a kind," Thernstrom, *op. cit.*, 90.

27. The sources used for the intragenerational mobility study did not permit tracing of the careers of sons of sample members. Hence a separate study was undertaken to determine intergenerational mobility among a different group of people, namely those men who married in the year 1900. This was not, of course, a random sample since it excluded men who did not marry that year. But it still provides us with information on the nature and extent of intergenerational movement otherwise not available. In all, the occupations of 697 sons marrying that year were compared with the occupations of their fathers as listed in the marriage register: Standesamt Bochum, Familienbuch, 1900.

28. This of course, raises, without answering, the question of how the white-collar middle classes in Bochum grew. Obviously the *Angestelltenschaft* which was becoming an important segment of the middle class in Bochum, as in other German cities, was recruited from downwardly mobile sons of fathers higher up in the non-manual world as well as upwardly mobile sons of manual workers, but this would not seem to have been sufficient. It is quite possible that immigrants supplied the balance, but in terms of the analysis advanced here, the problem cannot be definitively answered.

29. Werksarchiv Friedrich Krupp Hüttenwerke (Bochumer Verein), 25000, Nr. 1. Lehrling, 1878-1888 and Nr. 4, 1889-1895.

30. This was an instance in which the interests of employer and family harmonized to their mutual benefit. The company wanted sons to follow fathers into its workshops and blast furnaces, thus ensuring the continuation of a stable and loyal core in the work force; see Adolf Günther and René Prévôt, "Die Wohlfahrtseinrichtungen der Arbeitgeber in Deutschland und Frankreich," *Schriften des Vereins für Sozialpolitik*, 114, (Leipzig, 1905), 106. And fathers who worked for the company could speak for their sons and get them jobs and apprenticeships much the same as the workers Young and Willmott observed in East London; Michael Young and Peter Willmott, *Family and Kinship in East London*, (Baltimore, 1967), 97f.

31. *Verwaltungsbericht der Stadt Bochum*, 1880-81, 45.
32. "Orts-Statut betr. die gewerbliche Fortbildungsschule in der Stadt Bochum," (1892) in *Lokalverordnungen der Stadt Bochum* (Bochum, 1895), Stadtarchiv Bochum, Z.S., 391.
33. *Märkischer Sprecher*, March 8, 1912, 3.
34. Aurel von Jüchen, *op. cit.*, 74. The instruction itself was free.
35. *Verwaltungsbericht der Stadt Bochum*, 1913-24, 238.
36. "Schulgeldliste: Gewerbeschule, Ostern, 1880," Stadtarchiv Bochum.
37. Ringer, *op. cit.*, 31f.
38. "Schulgeld Hebeliste" (*Gymnasium* and *Oberrealschule*), Stadtarchiv Bochum, Städt. Hauptkasse.
39. The source for the occupations of *Gymnasium* students was the list in *Festschrift zur fünfzigjährigen Jubelfeier des königlichen Gymnasiums zu Bochum* (Bochum, 1910), 71f. Among the 1876 class, 25.3 percent in all had a higher status than their fathers; for the classes entering 1886 and 1896 the figures were 18.8 percent and 27.5 percent respectively.
40. Statements of middle-class views of the importance and function of lower-class saving can be found in *Verwaltungsbericht der Stadt Bochum*, 1860-61, 46. The American view of savings was quite different; Thernstrom describes their intended role in promoting social mobility: *Poverty and Progress*, 126.
41. Calculated from the reports in *Verwaltungsbericht der Stadt Bochum*.
42. The following table suggests the number of depositors per one hundred workers in two main occupational groups. The rate for miners is probably much too high, since those living outside Bochum no doubt also made deposits at the *Sparkasse* whereas I could only use the census figures for miners actually living within the administrative confines of the town as a base for the rate.
- | | Occupational Group | Depositors
per 100 Workers |
|------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1867 | Miners | 42 |
| | Journeymen & Factory Workers | 8 |
| 1871 | Miners | 70 |
| | Journeymen & Factory Workers | 8 |
| 1895 | Miners | 38 |
| | Factory Workers | 11 |
43. Comments on the moral value of homeownership can be found, among other places, in *Verhandlungen der Kreissynode Bochum* (Hofstede, 12 June, 1899), Stadtarchiv Bochum, Z.S. 105. See also the remarks in H. Croon, "Studien zur Sozial- und Siedlungsgeschichte der Stadt Bochum," 107f. and his "Die Grossstadt als Heimat," *Rheinische Heimatpflege*, Neue Folge, IV, 1964. Wolfram Fischer indicates the negative evaluation of people who were "heimat- und bindingslos": "Soziale Unterschichten im Zeitalter der Frühindustrialisierung," *International Review of Social History*, VIII, (1963): 423.
44. Even after taxes and maintenance costs, the homeowner might be able to save as much as a tenth or more of his annual income; in many cases this could be supplemented by taking in boarders.

45. Thernstrom examines this problem in Newburyport; *op. cit.*, 155f.
46. Adolf Weber, *Die Grossstadt und ihre sozialen Probleme*, (Leipzig, 1918), 99.
47. See Bernays, *op. cit.*, 241f. and Heiss, *op. cit.*, 222f.
48. Otto Neuloh and Jenö Kurucz, *Vom Kirhdorf zur Industriegemeinde. Untersuchungen über den Einfluss der Industrialisierung auf die Wertordnung der Arbeitnehmer* (Köln, Berlin, 1967), 181. However, other workers Neuloh studied did have greater expectations.
49. *Bericht über die Jubelfeier des Bochumer Vereins* (Bochum, 1894), 9.
50. John Foster, "Nineteenth-Century Towns—A Class Dimension" in H.J. Dyos, ed., *The Study of Urban History* (London, 1968), 283. Like Foster, I see this social system retarding the formation of class consciousness, but I do not think that it is simply a holdover from traditional society. Occupational group identity may have been Germany's alternative to class; an alternative form of modernity, not just the persistence of traditionalism.
51. The occupational community of miners derived more from the nature and structure of their work and from their social isolation in the community than from past tradition. After the 1860s the trade was swollen by new miners, many of them from the east, who had no memory of the past; native miners from old mining families formed a distinct minority. However, evidence suggests that they did assume a very important role in the leadership and were crucial in formulating miners' conceptions of themselves as a group. When, for instance, miners' representatives went to the Kaiser during the 1889 strike, they couched their demands in terms of tradition: "We asked what we have inherited from our fathers"; Wilhelm Brepohl, *Industrievolk Ruhrgebiet* (Tübingen, 1957), 129. As late as 1905 the chairman of the local Christian Trade Union complained that: "Today we are not treated as *Bergleute* (an older term contrasting to the modern *Bergarbeiter*) at all"; *Märkischer Sprecher*, Jan. 20, 1905. Information on leaders of miners' organizations is contained in Stadtarchiv Bochum, Landratsamt, III, 3a, 21, 1902-07.
52. Another consideration was the fact that employers absolutely refused to negotiate with miners; miners had to turn to the state to intervene. For an interesting discussion of the different paths followed by German and English miners see Gustav Rimlinger, "The Legitimation of Protest: A Comparative Study in Labor History" in *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. II (1960).
53. A very stimulating treatment of certain aspects of this theme with regard to contemporary German society is Ralf Dahrendorf, *Society and Democracy in Germany* (New York, 1967), in particular Ch. 2.