

Kocka, Jürgen

Book Part — Digitized Version
Social and economic history

Provided in Cooperation with:
WZB Berlin Social Science Center

Suggested Citation: Kocka, Jürgen (1973) : Social and economic history, In: Claus D. Kernig (Ed.): Marxism, communism and western society: a comparative encyclopedia. Vol. 7. Principle - socialist patriotism, Herder & Herder, Frankfurt/M. ; New York, NY, pp. 341-362

This Version is available at:
<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/122675>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



WZB-Open Access Digitalisate

WZB-Open Access digital copies

Das nachfolgende Dokument wurde zum Zweck der kostenfreien Onlinebereitstellung digitalisiert am Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung gGmbH (WZB). Das WZB verfügt über die entsprechenden Nutzungsrechte. Sollten Sie sich durch die Onlineveröffentlichung des Dokuments wider Erwarten dennoch in Ihren Rechten verletzt sehen, kontaktieren Sie bitte das WZB postalisch oder per E-Mail:

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung gGmbH
Bibliothek und wissenschaftliche Information
Reichpietschufer 50
D-10785 Berlin
E-Mail: bibliothek@wzb.eu

The following document was digitized at the Berlin Social Science Center (WZB) in order to make it publicly available online.

The WZB has the corresponding rights of use. If, against all possibility, you consider your rights to be violated by the online publication of this document, please contact the WZB by sending a letter or an e-mail to:

Berlin Social Science Center (WZB)
Library and Scientific Information
Reichpietschufer 50
D-10785 Berlin
e-mail: bibliothek@wzb.eu

Digitalisierung und Bereitstellung dieser Publikation erfolgten im Rahmen des Retrodigitalisierungsprojektes **OA 1000+**. Weitere Informationen zum Projekt und eine Liste der ca. 1 500 digitalisierten Texte sind unter <http://www.wzb.eu/de/bibliothek/serviceangebote/open-access/oa-1000> verfügbar.

This text was digitizing and published online as part of the digitizing-project **OA 1000+**. More about the project as well as a list of all the digitized documents (ca. 1 500) can be found at <http://www.wzb.eu/en/library/services/open-access/oa-1000>.

“economic” and on the relation of economic history to the allied disciplines. If it is taken to be part of history in general (see HISTORICAL SCHOLARSHIP), its practitioners follow the basic principles of the historical method (cf. Clapham, et al., *Economic History*, . . .). This means that the available sources are critically used, that questions relevant to but entirely deducible from the sources are posed and tested against the material in order to arrive at a causal-generic, functional explanation showing interdependencies as well as to provide a *verstehende* (understanding) interpretation of economic developments within their general and socio-historic connex. Thus economic history contributes to the knowledge of this historical connection, while it at the same time provides empirical material on which to base economic theories.

When economic historians regard their subject as part of economics or as an independent field with links to economics, they mostly apply economic theories and models to historical phenomena. Thereby they often, in method, follow the principles of the neopositivist, analytical theory of science, restrict themselves to a great extent to treating purely economic problems and so prescind from the complexity of historical reality — along the lines of the systematic sciences, though not to the same extent. Historical processes are mainly considered relevant in terms of their relation to key variables of the economic theory being used at a given moment. Such variables would be the relationship between supply and demand, distribution of income and processes of exchange (Hekscher, *A Plea for Theory in Economic History*, . . .), national incomes (Marczewski, *Introduction à l'histoire quantitative*, . . .) and the problem of economic growth (q.v.) and its determinants (North, *History: Economic History*, . . .). With the problems thus isolated, economic historians use explicitly formulated theories and hypotheses and apply mathematical statistical methods to attain a measure of exactness and intersubjective verifiability which had not previously been attainable by traditional economic history. Tendentially the connection of economic history (thus understood) to the cognitive interests, methods and concepts of historical scholarship (q.v.) in general is becoming more tenuous. There are a number of intermediate positions between the traditional, historical view of economic history predominant in Germany, France and England, and the systematic view now coming more to the fore especially in the USA since about 1960 under the heading of “New Economic History”. The representatives of this last school cannot entirely omit treatment of non-economic factors and the application of traditional historical methods, while the others are increasingly intent on including questions and models taken from the systematic economic and social sciences. These, however, have rather the function of ideal types, and there is no effort to isolate purely economic factors in a non-historical manner.

A special intermediate position is that of economic history based on Marxist positions. This applies particularly to Marxist-Leninist history as treated in the socialist countries. Economic history is seen as the science of “the historical development of modes of production of human society”, which takes in productive forces and production relations as well as those “realms of the social superstructure which have decisive influence on economic development” (*Ökonomisches Lexikon*, . . ., Bd 2, p. 1159). Questions appropriate to Marxist-Leninist economic science (see ECONOMICS – POLITICAL ECONOMY) are then applied to history. Since in this approach economic and social processes are conceived as being most closely connected and “the process of the concrete interactions between the productive forces and the relations of production” is treated “in its historical totality” (Eckermann, Mohr, eds. *Einführung in das Studium der Geschichte*, . . ., p. 65), Marxist-Leninist economic history remains relatively closely connected to the historical disciplines of the social sciences and is in fact economic and social history as part of general history.

II. SOCIAL HISTORY

I. As a Sectoral Science. — In this approach social history is regarded as a branch of the historical disciplines with its specific object of study, be it the “history of a people, omitting politics” and economics (Trevelyan, *English Social History*, . . ., p. 9), or be it the history of estates and classes, of social strata and groups, of their movements and of the co-operation and conflict between them (cf. Rüter, *Introduction*, . . ., p. 4; Wehler, *Moderne deutsche Sozialgeschichte*, . . ., p. 13f.). Along with the traditional instruments of the historical-critical method, research into this domain (or any subdivision of it) makes increasing use of the specific, object-orientated theories and models drawn from the systematic social sciences, applying these mostly in an ideal-typical, pragmatic manner. Such theories and models can then be modified and further developed by confrontation with the historical material. Social history, when understood in this way as one branch among others of the historical disciplines such as political, economic or intellectual history, presupposes that historical reality falls into a number of sections or can be meaningfully divided into such sections for analytical purposes. It implies in particular the separation of economics, society and the state. However, it has been noted, chiefly by Otto Brunner and Werner Conze, that this conceptual distinction, like its actual historical basis, is a product of the revolutionary upheavals of the period around 1800 and that it does not correspond to the older European past up to the 18th century, where economic, social and political factors were inextricably combined, nor to the reality of the 20th century, which is once more characterized by the growing interpenetration of

above: I), so that these three branches of history are frequently conceptually unclearly distinguished. They have in common the fact that in comprehensive presentations, which refuse to be limited to the treatment of the state and state affairs, but lacking a conceptual system and a method which would make possible the integration of the most divergent spheres of reality, they introduce particular aspects, themselves hardly mediated with the whole, solely as a process of addition.

2. *As Socio-Economic Interpretation of General History.* — Beyond this, what is meant with social and economic history is a certain historiographic method that relates the phenomena under investigation, no matter to what domain of reality in the stricter sense they may belong, to socio-economic factors. What is more, this is done in such a way that the analysis proceeds from the decisive influence of such factors within the totality of history. The principle in question does not necessarily include the affirmation that the influence is in one direction only, from socio-economic factors on one side to political, ideological, cultural, etc., phenomena on the other. On the contrary, it can take into consideration in varying degrees the multi-causal relations, interdependencies and reciprocal influences between the various factors and dimensions which are predominant in historical reality. In this sense, social and economic history can take on the following forms: the socio-economic “underpinning” (Conze, *Sozialgeschichte*, . . . , 1962) of political, cultural and general historical processes; the economic-sociological analysis of historical details (such as voting patterns, political decision-making, churches, religious ideas, educational systems and collective attitudes, etc.); and finally the socio-economic interpretation of the history of complex units — cities, societies or eras (Marx, Engels. *The German Ideology*, . . . ; Seligman, *The Economic Interpretation of History*, . . . ; Polard, *Economic History* . . . , p. 8f.). These efforts start as a rule with the investigation of material conditions, population factors, productive forces and economic organization (division of labour, exchange relationships and systems of distribution, etc.). They go on to analyse the processes of socialization, the social classes, groups and strata, protest and coalitions. They finally include in the analysis the political institutions, the processes of policy formation and decision-making, science and art, religion and ideas (Hobsbawm, *From Social History to the History of Society*, . . . , p. 31).

However, if only on grounds of economy of effort, the whole field of historical and social reality can seldom be mastered in any one study. As a rule, scholars will tend to concentrate here as elsewhere on special fields, while nonetheless maintaining the connection to the total frame of reference. In its tendency to write a comprehensive history in accordance with definite integrative interpretations, this approach resembles social history as a science of integral aspects (see above:

II, 2). One of the elements which distinguishes it from the latter is that it has a specific notion — even though often not explicitly stated — of the actual substance of the social process which is to be investigated. This is its recognition of the efficacy, decisiveness or predominance of socio-economic factors in the total historical process. The advocates of such social and economic history reject the dissection of reality into sectors and try to mediate economic, social, political and other factors with one another, which often leads to extremely difficult methodological problems. However, they hold firm to the premise that socio-economic elements can be delineated from the political or cultural and thus identified as such, though here the distinction itself can only be understood and analysed as the product of a totality of interconnections, and that any claim to an autonomy of individual sectors (such as economics, politics and culture) must be critically called into question by an over-all socio-economic interpretation. In contrast to the largely formal structural and processual concepts of a social history understood as a special approach to or view of history (see above: II, 2), social and economic history based on a comprehensive understanding makes it imperative to examine causal and functional relations and relations of contingency and reciprocal effects, to examine the causes and consequences of historical developments, while it also offers hypotheses to answer such questions. By starting from the notion of a dominant socio-economic dimension which can be conceptually isolated but can still only be understood in connection with the total historical context, social and economic history points to its underlying social base, namely the modern capitalist society (*Wirtschaftsgesellschaft*) since the 18th century, conceptually assuming as well as criticizing its notion of a relative separation of state and culture. — This interconnection of the origin and the effect of social and economic history is the basis of its explanatory effectiveness in the analysis of the modern world since the revolutions of the late 18th century.

The critical relationship of social and economic history to the capitalist society as it has existed since the 18th century likewise marks out the limits of this historical approach. If the notion of the relationship between economy, society and state, which is constitutive for this approach, is not to be dehistoricized in the form of an ontologized historical materialism, if furthermore it is not to be assumed that present categories are more useful in analysing the past than the categories as found in the sources because the past is presumed to be solely the still veiled form of the present, then the applicability of socio-economic interpretations in the sense given above will always have to be subject to reappraisal when one is dealing with earlier centuries and with domains of research which are socially and culturally very remote from modern Europe.

developments and economic policies that deviated from economic liberalism. The thinking of this school, especially in its younger representatives, was further influenced by the impact of the social conflicts which emerged with industrialization. Its strictly empirical and historical orientation, its increasing social-reformist commitment under the twin banners of anti-liberalism and anti-socialism and its principle of state intervention to solve social problems administratively led its representatives — especially Gustav von Schmoller, Karl Bücher, Georg Friedrich Knapp and Werner Sombart — to investigate economic development only in the context of social and political factors and to emphasize the institutional elements of the general development. This type of economic history (the term goes back at least to 1853 as the title of a lecture at Heidelberg, and at the latest in 1879 it appeared as the title of a book by Karl Theodor von Inama-Sternegg) was not the work of professional historians but followed nonetheless the historico-critical method to a considerable extent. In its best products, it was economic, social and constitutional or administrative history with an emphasis on lines of economic development. It thus contained the seeds of a comprehensive view of the most diverse historical problems, though these possibilities were taken up and expanded by only a few historians such as Otto Hintze (see HISTORICAL SCHOLARSHIP). Such economic history received new impulses from the economic crisis after 1873 which factually discredited liberal economic views, from the growing intensification of social conflicts which followed the crisis and from the intense debate on capitalism around the end of the century. After the 1880s it also influenced scholarship in other countries, for instance the work of the English writers William Cunningham and Sir William Ashley. The latter held the first chair of economic history, from 1892 on, at Harvard University.

In the course of the 19th century the possibility and the tendency arose to see society as an independent object of study, to conceive of it as the difference (as Hegel put it) between the state and the private sphere, as the domain constituted primarily by socio-economic factors (the market, labour, commerce) and mediated through interests (i.e. private individuals acting in accordance with their “enlightened self-interest”). This new concept reflected the experience of a reality whose tempo had markedly increased in the last decades of the 18th century and of a gradually recognizable dependence on conditions and relationships which were largely beyond the disposition of individuals, though also not of state character. It reflected, as could hardly be otherwise after the revolutions (see FRENCH REVOLUTION and REVOLUTIONS OF 1848), the inescapable fact of the power of mass, collective social forces, and it was furthered by the impact of social conflicts of a fundamental nature which had come to the fore with the advance of industrializa-

tion. In most of the resulting theories of society, history — understood as social history — was of central importance. Hence Lorenz von Stein, for instance, inspired by the early French socialists (see SOCIALISM, EARLY), demanded that history be brought down from the gleaming mountain-heights. In his social history of France (*Geschichte der sozialen Bewegung in Frankreich von 1789 bis auf unsere Tage*. 3 Bde. Lpz., 1850) he attempted to understand the inner life of society in terms of its social conflicts and development and to write social history with an eye to contemporary reforms of social policy. Professional historians for the most part ignored him (on von Stein, see PROLETARIAT, B, III).

Karl Marx (q.v.) and Friedrich Engels (q.v.) combined certain elements of left Hegelianism with an empirical analysis of the economic system of private capitalism, especially that of the England of their times. They produced a complex, critical analysis of the situation then existing, an analysis inextricably interwoven with a concept of social and economic history based on a philosophy of history, but in the early works to a lesser degree on concrete detailed analyses of actual history (cf. Marx, Engels. *The German Ideology*, . . .; id., Engels. *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. In *Marx, Engels SW*, vol. 1, p. 21–65). Their analysis of the contradictions of bourgeois society, which tend to their self-elimination (*Selbstaufhebung*), and in particular their thesis of the revolutionary mandate of the proletariat (q.v.) were based on an analysis of the present, pregnant with the future, as a stage in an encompassing historical process which is primarily defined by its socio-economic dimension. Thus with Marx and Engels social and economic history are most closely combined with a practical guide to revolutionary activity. As a part of a radical critique of society, with its negation of historical scholarship orientated solely to events, ideas, persons and politics and with its claim to an integrative analysis of manifold historical reality in terms of socio-economic collective forces, the Marxian concept of history became a fundamental critique of ideology which was sharply opposed to the predominant historiography. The latter's national-integrative function demanded that emphasis be placed on such traditions as would unite the nation and its parts. A social and economic history like the Marxian, which put the social conflicts and opposing experiences of estates and classes struggling against each other in the centre of analysis, not only did not fulfil such a function, but opposed it with revolutionary intent.

The established historians of the second part of the 19th century found their task of rejecting the opposing Marxist position all the easier because Marxists had been excluded from the universities and were to a large extent out of touch with the critical methods of research and testing which had become much more advanced and refined since Barthold Georg Niebuhr and von Ranke. Thus the Marxist

methodology to supply the integrating framework: concentration on structures instead of on events; comparative procedures and explicit generalization going beyond empathic understanding and modelled in part on the natural sciences; integration of the allied disciplines into history with the goal of a unified historical science of man with socio-psychological foundations. Kurt Breysig (*Kulturgeschichte der Neuzeit, ...*) called for a historical synthesis based on social history and developed the notion of a comprehensive social history, understood as a particular approach. This he distinguished from social history in the accepted sense where it was narrowly seen as the history of mainly non-political groups (family, estate, class). Breysig's notion, however, found little resonance. Max Weber, an outsider to professional historians, who only came gradually to allow themselves to be influenced by him after World War II, produced various studies of historical sociology. Written under the impact of modern capitalism and the growth of bureaucracies, they were held together by his perception of how all domains of social and cultural life were being transformed by a process of continuous, inexorable rationalization which also threatened the freedom and dynamism of the individual personality. And in the programme of the New History in America the call for a new synthesis was combined with the effort to place stronger emphasis on social and economic aspects than had hitherto been done in historical scholarship. Here the advancing social sciences, which were in a process of dehistoricization, and the general reform movements at work since 1900 showed their influence in the demand for the investigation of historical laws and in the effort to make history for progressive purposes more and more relevant to contemporary affairs (Robinson, *The New History, ...*; Brinton, *The "New History" and "Past Everything", ...*).

II. THE DEVELOPMENT IN WESTERN COUNTRIES

1. *United States.* — It was in the USA that there was the least resistance to the diverse efforts to revise the character of traditional historical scholarship with its fixation on politics, individuals, ideas and events, and hence to modify its function in the bourgeois society of the end of the 19th century. The historical scholarship of the USA of 1900 — young, hardly professionalized, never one-sidedly sworn to political history — had preserved a large measure of flexibility and openness with regard to new impulses from social and economic history. Under the impact of social conflicts in the agrarian and urban sectors, territorial expansion and the wide differences between the various regions of the country, with a special impulse from liberal, progressive reforms, socio-economic matters and perspectives came to the fore in general historical scholarship with the works of Frederick J. Turner (*The Significance of the Frontier*

in American History, ...), Carl L. Becker (*The History of Political Parties in the Province of New York, 1760–1776, ...*), John R. Commons (*History of Labour in the United States, ...*) and Charles A. Beard (*An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, ...*). These were largely responsible for the direction taken by the progressive school of American history which came to be clearly dominant between the wars and whose interpretations of history, in their various forms, were along socio-economic lines. The progressive historians discussed the processes of political decision-making, which often stood in the foreground, in the context of social conflicts (mostly fitting them into the basic pattern of democratic people versus privileged interests). Hereby they laid great stress on the unequal distribution of property, on class distinctions and the economic, geographical and social factors stemming from the various milieux ("frontier thesis" and history of the West), with much emphasis on the story of the "common man", the small farmer, the wage-earner and the immigrant. Their work at times strongly resembled simplified Marxist interpretations (e.g. Louis M. Hacker).

To a greater degree than in any other country except the USSR, history in the USA consisted of social and economic history (in the sense of a socio-economic interpretation of history; see above: A, III 2), such that the latter could not take root as a separate subject. Economic history and social history continued to be integrated into general history and made little progress as branch disciplines. "Business history" as a sectoral science only came to be studied under the influence of the economic sciences. It took the form of case histories which concentrated on entrepreneurial decisions and management in a given firm and did not identify itself with the generally progressive lines of the professional historians (cf. Gras, *Business History, ...*; *Journal of Economic and Business History*, 1928 ff.). There also developed a new interest in the type of economic history where business cycles and long-term variations were studied and an effort made to work out theories and apply quantitative assessments (as for instance in the publications of the National Bureau of Economic Research from 1920 on). The number of studies devoted to economic history increased considerably in the 1930s as a result of the problems in agriculture and industry and of unemployment, and stimulus was provided by the statistical investigations and commissioned studies of the New Deal governments as well as by the general atmosphere of the Depression. Of lesser importance were the efforts to create separate branches of social history or social and economic history (see above: A, II 1 & III 1), as were mainly undertaken in the series *A History of American Life* (1927 ff.) in a descriptive approach which was void of theory and sought to render everyday life in an ostensibly democratic manner.

After World War II the socio-economic interpretation

least deterministic in the history of entrepreneurs and enterprises. These studies, as carried on at the Research Center in Entrepreneurial History at Harvard in the 1940s and 1950s, received important multidisciplinary impulses. Their importance is growing to the extent in which they are being freed from the solely narrative, individualizing tradition of company history, often from the ideological perspective of the company directors, and to the extent that they regard enterprises as social systems and as interwoven in total-economic and total-societal relationships (Chandler, *Strategy and Structure*, ...).

Alongside of this, social and economic history as socio-economic interpretation of general history (see above: A, III 2) has maintained its position in modified and varying forms (Potter, *People of Plenty*, ...; Williams, *The Contours of American History*, ...; Genovese, *The Political Economy of Slavery*, ...; Moore, *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, ...). In addition, social history understood as an integral, often structural-functional approach (appearing at times under other nomenclature such as the "new institutional history") is gaining in precision and significance. This approach can, where necessary, be combined with medium-range, problem-orientated theories and with various methods (e.g. in the *Journal of Social History*, 1967 ff.; cf. also Hays, *A Systematic Social History*, ...; Higham, *Writing American History*, ..., p. 157-74; De Pillis, *Trends in American Social History*, ..., p. 47).

2. *Germany*. — Professional historians in Germany, with a particularly long and solidly structured tradition to rely on, reacted in a completely different way to the new approaches to social and economic history before and after 1900. These were in the main rejected, sometimes in the course of fierce controversies, in which the historian Karl Lamprecht played a central rôle. The scholarly establishment was here little affected by the questions posed in social and economic history. In reaction to this, social history and economic history, already closely associated by reason of their origins, took shape all the more clearly as a common, separate discipline, though it soon lost its oppositional character. As a sectoral science (see above: A, III 1), which placed emphasis on the study of the ancient European rather than the modern world, on the economic rather than social aspects and on historical *Verstehen* (understanding) rather than on theory, it forfeited both politically and methodologically its once polemical character to a great extent, though in individual cases it produced modest, but solid results. It became of less importance to economics and sociology as these sciences were progressively dehistoricized. On the other hand, it scarcely affected the authoritative standing of general history which was expanding along the lines of intellectual history and taking once more a stronger interest in political problems after the defeat in World War I. Here German historians remained deliberately aloof from scientific developments in the

other Western countries and affirmed with growing vehemence the autonomy of the methods of (empathic) *Verstehen* in history. Thus general history increasingly took on ideological functions for a social-conservative public, clamouring for an authoritarian state (*Obrigkeitsstaat*), sceptical of democracy and steeped in a bourgeois education. In such circumstances there were very little prospects for a social and economic history going beyond its sectoral limitations (Eckart Kehr).

These traditions, which are in such sharp contrast with the development in the USA, were primarily responsible for the post-war development of the discipline. Even though the fascist dictatorship and World War II (q.v.) had undermined the credibility of the nationalistic, idealistic traditions of German historiography and thereby made possible a lasting and accelerating upswing in the development of economic history and social history, the traditional combination of social and economic history in publications, in university faculty organization, in curricula and in the organization of professional associations remained intact. Within this framework more strongly particularizing traditions, on the one hand, still continue to be influential in newly expanded sub-sections, such as company history and the local and regional research which has proved so fruitful for social and economic history. Thus, with some exceptions, the integration of systematic questioning into economic history continues to take place within a broad context of social and economic history. On the other hand, there is the continuous, programmatic demand that the allied disciplines of a systematic type should be taken into consideration, a demand increasingly voiced in conjunction with discussions going on in other Western countries. This has gradually led to the cautious application of theories, models and methods drawn from sociology and economics in historical investigations of particular problems. The most comprehensive example hitherto is that of Hans-Ulrich Wehler (*Bismarck u. der Imperialismus*, ...) who was influenced by Hans Rosenberg (*Grosse Depression u. Bismarckzeit*, ...). But on the whole, actual research still lags far behind the programmatic declarations concerning the importance of studies in social and economic history and social history. In contrast to earlier periods, however, the problems of modern industrial society are now determining to a greater extent the interests of research and the more recent fields of research — such as industrialization (q.v.), its prerequisites, mechanisms and consequences (cf., for example, the works of Wolfram Fischer, Wilhelm Treue, Wolfgang Zorn and the Swiss writer Rudolf Braun), interest groups (q.v.) and labour movements (q.v.) — are attracting greater attention. The study of the modern world, the period since the late 18th century with its political and industrial revolution (see INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION), received strong programmatic and practical impulses from the Arbeits-

and society was absent; likewise the study of history gained academic honour and took on public, ideological functions very much later and to a less extent than in Germany and France. Nonetheless, the development in historiography ran along basically the same lines as on the Continent, though without the same sharp confrontations and programmatic protest. Under the influence of historically-minded economists and social scientists critical of social conditions, scholars began to devote themselves, somewhat later than in Germany, to the study of social and economic history, under the heading of "economic history". The research was more strongly influenced than in Germany by economic theories and quantitative methods (Clapham, *An Economic History of Modern Britain, . . .*). In 1926 the Economic History Society was founded, and in the same year the series *Economic History* was begun as a supplement to the *Economic Journal*. The *Economic History Review* began to appear in 1927. As in the controversy about the effect of industrialization on the living standard of workers or in the debate, influenced by Max Weber and Ernst Troeltsch, on the connection between religion and economic development (Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism, . . .*) or again in the controversy about the rise of the gentry in the 16th and 17th centuries (Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558-1641, . . .*), the problems of economic and social history were generally treated in close connection with one another.

Though this combination was maintained in principle, economic-orientated problems of growth and analytical, often quantitative, statistical methods came gradually to claim more attention after World War II (Postan, *Economic Social History, . . .*; Court, *Economic History, . . .*; Deane, Cole, *British Economic Growth, 1688-1959, . . .*). Writings on economic history multiplied, but, as on the Continent, the literary tradition as well as a certain connection with social and general history were maintained. Though political factors still form the main interest of the standard professional historians up to the present day, problems of social and economic history were never excluded from their field of vision as much as in Germany (Bury, *An Inaugural Lecture: The Science of History, . . .*; Namier, *The Structure of Politics at the Accession of George III, . . .*; *The Oxford History of England*. Ed. by George Norman Clark. 15 vol. Oxford, 1934-65). But in historical manuals the sections on social history and on the history of politics, economics and ideas, etc., were for the most part relatively disconnected and merely tacked together in an additive fashion. This was due to the absence of an integrating theoretical concept. Special works on social history and social and economic history (understood as sectoral sciences) were the consequence of this line of thought. A product of this trend was George M. Trevelyan's *English Social History*, which with its impressionistic style and lack of theory did more to diminish rather than enhance the standing of social history. In recent years there has

been a greater inclination to take over modified forms of special theories from related systematic disciplines. These are being used in the investigation of subdivisions of social history and social and economic history, such as historical demography, urban history and mass movements (Thomas, *The Tools and the Job, . . .*).

In social and economic history Marxist traditions form the basis of efforts to integrate the sectoral sciences and the various aspects of reality (Hill, *Puritanism and Revolution, . . .*). Hereby the interest in the history of the "common man", the lower strata and the working class becomes predominant, though with explicit consideration of the interconnections with total-societal functions and mechanisms of domination. With the simultaneous application of considerations from the social sciences, new perspectives are thus being opened up for the integration of labour history — long treated one-sidedly as history of the labour movement — into a comprehensive social and economic history, including business history (Thompson, *History from Below, . . .*; Briggs, *Trade-Union History and Labour History, . . .*). With increasing distance from the traditions of historical materialism, on the other hand, recent but previously little developed attempts have been made by social historians for whom the term "social history" signifies an emphatic rejection of the tradition of historiography where history was primarily or exclusively the study of diplomacy, constitutions, economics or ideas (Marwick, *The Nature of History, . . .*, p. 61). This view logically entails a structuralist approach to social history, where it would seem appropriate to make use of theories, models and methods from the allied systematic disciplines both in the analysis of particular historical problems and in the investigation of the history of whole societies (Laslett, *The World We Have Lost, . . .*).

III. THE DEVELOPMENT IN SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

With its principally binding basis in the theories of history of Marx (q.v.), Engels (q.v.) and Lenin (q.v.) Marxist-Leninist historical scholarship (q.v.) is essentially a particular form of social and economic history in the wider sense (see above: A, III 2 & 3). For Marx and Engels history was constituted in the metamorphosis of man with nature, in conscious societal labour. For them the basis of the historical process was material production, which is characterized by a historically changing tension between productive forces (q.v.) and production relations (q.v.). This material production is determinative of the form of social classes (see CLASS, CLASS STRUGGLE), which are defined by their position in the sphere of production. Class struggles, culminating in revolutions (q.v.), are the main impetus and the main content of the historical process. As the central element of the socio-economic basis, the sphere of production is also determinative of the totality of

sociology". At the same time, history began to be written once more in the traditional, individualizing forms of exposition, primarily no doubt in the hope of making it a more effective tool in national politics. Russia's own past was made to appear in a favourable light, though it was often very difficult to combine this interpretation with the basic principles of a socio-economic view of history. It was only with the discussion on periodization, beginning about 1950, that more consideration came to be given to socio-economic standpoints and themes (*Zur Periodisierung des Feudalismus u. Kapitalismus...*, p.467-75; Sidorov, *Osnovnye problemy i nekotorye itogi razvitiia sovetskoj istoricheskoj nauki, ...*).

The destalinization which began in 1956 made it possible to revise particular elements of the official image of history in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. It led to a certain slackening of party pressure on individual matters in the scientific establishment, especially on questions of detail with only indirect political bearing, and to a lively discussion of methodology. Finally, from the beginning of the 1960s on, empirical social research gradually won acceptance. Having previously been rejected as bourgeois and as superfluous in view of the available findings of historical materialism in the social field, it was now expected to be an increasingly fruitful source of information which could be used as a guide in political, social and economic management tasks. This turn to empirical data, which was quite feasible within the basic framework of the social and historical theory of Marxism-Leninism, also influenced historical scholarship, bringing about an increasing differentiation and specialization. The theoretical premise behind this tendency is a flexible interpretation of the basic concept of the economic social formation, which is taken to be a comprehensive system made up of sub-systems (the economy, the state, law, art, etc.) which are hierarchically interrelated, interact upon each other and are relatively autonomous. Their relation to each other and to the over-all system varies, in spite of the general predominance of the economic sub-system, even during the life of any one social formation and above all in the course of history as a whole. There are laws governing the transition from one social formation to another, but such transitions take place in the form of varying developmental and structural types which are dependent on numerous factors. Concrete reality displays the coexistence of elements from various stages of development in complex, tension-laden patterns. Counter-currents, individual events and "chance happenings" are constantly modifying the realization of the historical laws in a way that is politically and scientifically relevant (Zhukov, *V. I. Lenin and the Methodology of Historical Science, ...*; Küttler, *Lozek. Die historische Gesetzmässigkeit der Gesellschaftsformationen...*). Such arguments are used to underline the impossibility of deducing concrete historical phenom-

ena from the general principles of historical materialism (q.v.) and the systematic sciences. Thus it is also principally shown that historical phenomena call for questioning and investigation. The task of historical, empirical detail research is delineated, and the impulse given to the production of monographs (for instance, on economic history), to the adoption of quantitative methods or to the study of hitherto neglected sectors, such as social psychology or — as in Poland in particular — demography (Koval'chenko, *Mathematisch-Statistical Research into Socio-Economic History, ...*; Kakhk, *Nuzhna li novaia istoricheskaja nauka?...*; Palli, *Some Problems in the Historiometric Approach...*; Topolski, *Développement des études historiques en Pologne 1945-1968, ...*).

Economic history is defined as "the history of the productive forces and production relations in the individual economic social formations, ... of the individual branches of production (industry agriculture, transport) as also of the individual enterprises". But since it also deals with the "economic bases for the rise, development and decline of classes and social groups, the objective bases of their interests and the contradictions between them" and is thus regarded in the socialist countries as the "foundation of historical scholarship" (Eckermann, Mohr, eds. *Einführung in das Studium der Geschichte, ...*, p.76), it remains more closely linked to general history than in the West. In the Soviet Union, for instance, the discipline "economic history" has no journal of its own. But in East Germany the *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (appearing since 1960) and in Poland the *Roczniki dziejów społecznych i gospodarczych* (appearing since 1932) and the *Kwartalnik historii kultury materialnej* are special journals devoted to economic history and to economic and social history.

The changes within economic history reflect the more general trend towards specialized research into particular problems. The development of economic history in East Germany is symptomatic. In 1960 the focus was still on such themes as "industrial revolution", "relation between production, basis and superstructure", "development of the home market and foreign trade", "formation of monopolies and transition to imperialism", "rôle of the bourgeoisie and problems of their alliance with the Junkers", "situation of the workers and the labour movement", while complaints were being heard about the lack of basic research into individual problems (Fricke, ed., *Historische Forschungen in der DDR, ...*, p.230f.). But a report produced in 1970 could look back on ten years of great expansion in historical research in economics, and it could also note a definite shift towards specifically economic questions which gave them a priority previously accorded to broader, more comprehensive issues and socio-economic interests (*Historische Forschungen in der DDR 1960-1970, ...*, p.96). Not only did the study of technology as a factor in the labour

shift was accelerated by revolutionary and directly political pressures. Elsewhere it was influenced by processes in which the notion of the autonomy of the world of ideas and of the state have been undermined in particular by the shattering experiences of two world wars and the repercussions of the so-called second industrial revolution and in which the feeling that the individual was largely dependent on "circumstances" seems to have become universal. To the extent that the traditional, national-political and bourgeois-ideological functions of historiography gradually receded into the background and its commitment to an idealistic, anti-sociological and increasingly unreal concept of freedom and personality lessened, historians even in the non-socialist countries found it all the easier to accept and formulate these fundamental changes. More and more frequently, and without regard for national borders, history is conceived as the history of societies and historical scholarship as historical social science.

The consequent highlighting of supra-individual, collective and mass phenomena in the over-all historical context induces the economic and social historian to make a prudent application of comparative, statistical and quantitative methods. This context also led, if not to the first discovery, at least to the first serious exploitation of the non-literary types of sources such as census figures, parish registers and voting patterns. Quantitative methods lead to hitherto unattainable results in particular fields, to greater precision in language, hypotheses and findings, and ensure that such findings are more highly representative. But on the other hand, they are only applicable to particular fields and must be constantly reciprocally related to qualitative methods (Aydelotte, *Quantification in History*, ...; Soboul, *Description et mesure en histoire sociale*, ...; Hexter, *History, the Social Sciences and Quantification*, ...; Deopik et al. *Quantitative and Machine Methods of Processing Historical Information*, ...). With interest predominantly bearing on supra-individual structures and processes, economic history, social history and social and economic history both in the East and in the West continue to maintain a certain distance to the merely individualizing, historicist methods which are confined to the interpretation of individual attitudes, actions and texts in the light of their own particular meaning and motivation within the framework of specific situations. The former can only give structure to their material by using sets of concepts, models, hypotheses and theories which they cannot themselves derive from the sources alone. The need for methods and theories, which is simply more clearly and keenly felt in economic, social and social and economic history than in the other special branches, has caused social and economic historians to turn more and more, in the East and in the West, to sociology (q.v.) and economics (q.v.). The devising of concepts, models and theories presents difficult problems in this

connection which cannot yet be considered solved, in spite of the growing liveliness of the discussion (cf. Cahnmann, Boskoff, eds. *Sociology and History*, ...; Bollhagen, *Soziologie u. Geschichte*, ...; Laslett, *History: History and the Social Sciences*, ...; Berkhofer, *A Behavioral Approach to Historical Analysis*, ...; Schieder, *Unterschiede zwischen historischer u. sozialwissenschaftlicher Methode*, ...).

Up to the present, the use of theory in special branches of history has been taken furthest in historical demography (q.v.) and the type of economic history which is orientated to macro-economics. Their integration into general history will be difficult, since the allied theoretical disciplines of demography and economics, by reason of their specialization, language, goals and methods, are moving apart from each other and from the general interests and vocabulary of historians (Vann, *History and Demography*, ...; Laslett, *op. cit.*, p. 438; Fogel, *The New Economic History*, ...). Similarly, the modifications imported into social and economic history by its adoption of specialized questions, models and concepts from sociology and economics should threaten its existence as an independent unity more than hitherto even in Western and Central Europe and may hasten the day when social history and economic history may become relatively independent subjects. On the other hand, impulses from a radical critique of society, which have recently been gaining ground in some Western countries, are working in favour of maintaining the connection between social history and economic history. It is expected of social and economic history that it will have critical, emancipatory effects which cannot be achieved either by a strictly economic history, mainly orientated to trade and growth and largely abstracting from the social context, or by a social history regarded as a comprehensive mode of vision or split up into specialized studies. In view of the growing recognition of the need for theory in the historical sciences, this means that a social and economic history intent on preserving its unity must increasingly have recourse to socio-economic theories, theories linking up sociology and economics themselves. Outside Marxism-Leninism, such theories exist only in the rudimentary stage. But then again, in the development of such theories social and economic history should play an important part (Borchardt, *Zur Theorie der sozialökonomischen Entwicklung der gegenwärtigen Gesellschaft*, ...).

Greater attention to social science theory promises to provide economic, social and social and economic historians in the non-socialist countries with novel results. But for most Marxist-Leninist scholars the link-up with the social sciences of historical materialism and with its theories is already so intensively pursued that some loosening up is rather to be expected, bringing with it new questions, methods, experiments and results. The link with theory did in fact prove flexible enough to allow historians in socialist coun-

scholar to determine what practice means and demands in its historical changes. In the Marxist-Leninist system, however, the interpretation of practice in any given case and the resulting demands on the historian are monopolized by non-scientific, political, central authorities, while the (very limited) influence of the historian can only work through central covert channels relatively impenetrable to the experts as a whole.

2. In the liberal-democratic societies the various approaches to history and its interpretations are a matter for what is in principle open discussion. The widest possible range of positions and arguments is allowed and encouraged, in the hope of a temporary and limited consensus to be arrived at by free and full interchange of views. It is taken for granted that prior to this nothing can be said, in principle, about a position being more appropriate, relatively "progressive" or even "admissible". But in the socialist countries there are ready-made criteria, provided by a theory of history with political and institutional backing and by political institutions relying to some extent on this theory of history for their justification. With the help of such criteria, or in the name of such criteria, scientific discussion is supervised and homogenized, and its fundamental findings are not open to debate but are clearly prejudged.

3. The liberal-bourgeois concept of science tends to affirm that the mentality of the historian — given that results are intrinsically uncertain and open to revision — should be such that in choosing his own standpoints, questions and interpretation, he does not completely ignore, anathematize or entirely eliminate other possible interpretations. This has bearings, say, on his treatment of sources which do not suit his own view and on his attitude towards his scientific opponents. By contrast, Marxist-Leninist historians, when dealing with interpretations at variance with their views, are inclined to qualify them and their authors as "hostile to the working class" and to combat them on that score, while making open, determined and exclusive use of the class standpoint even at the level of source analysis (Brachmann, *Die Anwendung von Methoden der Informationstheorie in der Arbeit des Historikers*, . . . , p. 344f.).

4. According to the bourgeois notion discussion among experts or the progress of scientific knowledge may lead to the revision of standpoints originally accepted. The possibility of revision must be fully conceded by all the partners in this scientific debate. Basic premises and constituent elements of the Marxist picture of history are not open to such revision by discussion among historical experts. Revision, if achieved at all, comes through a long-drawn-out process of shifting the emphasis, a process in which the political authorities again clearly play a leading rôle (see also SCIENCE).

5. All these differences point to differing concepts of

society (q.v.) and history. For most non-Marxist-Leninist scholars, scientific discussion takes in a broad spectrum of different approaches and positions which cannot be reduced to the dichotomy of proletarian-progressive against bourgeois-reactionary historians — or can only be interpreted in this way if violence is done to it. There are two reasons for this. One is that they proceed on the principle that social conflicts and distinctions are too fluid to be adequately comprised as a rule in a two-class model. The other is that they are convinced that scientific discussion is anything but a sheer prolongation of the structures of class, interests and domination obtaining in non-socialist societies and that it is far from being fully determined by such structures. The Marxist-Leninist concept of science, on the other hand, starts from the reality of a dichotomous class structure and assumes that science and scientists are to such an extent rigorously and completely bound up with class and society that detached or conciliatory scientific positions are excluded. Under these circumstances, the Marxist-Leninist view of history is that it is a process governed by laws, structured throughout and directed to a goal, the process of the class struggle which moves towards the victory of the working class and the development of the communist society, and which must therefore be comprehended in such categories. The correct historical analysis of this process — i.e. the explanation determined by Marxist-Leninist ideology and guided by competent authorities controlled by the party — situates the established socialism of today, and its rulers, at the highest point yet reached by the movement of history, thereby legitimating the policies of these rulers and their power of making decisions, including their competence to control the interpretation of history. Hence historical knowledge within the institutionally assured framework of the philosophy of history as put forward by historical materialism justifies the fact that it is itself made an instrument of politics. To most bourgeois historians, not sharing the trans-empirical presuppositions of the Marxist-Leninist philosophy of history and not being exposed as a rule to any such powerfully institutionalized ideology, this sort of link-up between historical scholarship, philosophy of history and practice appears to be a vicious circle, a near-theology and unacceptable. The rôle of history in legitimating the social and governmental systems under which they live is mostly only a minor one — which in the eyes of Marxist-Leninists is due to the lack of historical perspective in a declining class. With regard to the philosophy of history, there is hardly any such thing as a consensus among bourgeois historians, since most liberal-democratic forms of rule neither need it nor enforce it to any comparable extent.

6. Consequently the specific socio-political functions of history differ in type in Western and Eastern countries. In socialist countries the main task of the historian is "to shape socialist ideology, enlarge the

- prise. New ed. Garden City, N. Y., 1966. 1st ed. Cambridge, Mass., 1962. — Chaunu, P. L'Histoire sérielle. Bilan et perspectives. In *R. hist.* 243, 1970: 197–320. — Chubar'ian, A. O. Itogi mezhdunarodnogo Soveshchaniia kommunisticheskikh i rabochikh partii i zadachi istoricheskoi nauki. In *Vopr. ist.* 44, 1969, no. 9: 3–13. [The Results of an International Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties and the Tasks of Historical Scholarship.] — Clapham, J. H., et al. Economic History. In *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*. Ed.: E. R. A. Seligman and A. Johnson. Rev. ed. Vol. 5. N. Y., 1937: 315–30. — Id. *An Economic History of Modern Britain*. 3 vol. Repr. Cambridge, 1950–52. 1st ed. 1926–38. — Cochran, T. C. The "Presidential Synthesis" in American History. In *Amer. Hist. R.* 53, 1947/48: 748–59. — Id. Research in American Economic History: A Third Year View. In *Mid-America* 29, 1947: 3–23. — Cole, A. H. The Committee on Research in Economic History: An Historical Sketch. In *J. Econ. Hist.* 30, 1970, no. 4: 723–41. — Id. A Report on Research in Economic History. *Ibid.* 4, 1944: 49–72. — Commons, J. R., et al. *History of Labour in the United States*. 4 vol. Repr. N. Y., 1966. 1st ed. 1918–35. — Conze, W. Sozialgeschichte. In *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Bd 6. Hrsg.: K. Galling et al. 3. Aufl. Tübingen, 1962: 169–74. — Id. Sozialgeschichte. In H.-U. Wehler, ed. *Moderne deutsche Sozialgeschichte*. 3. Aufl. Köln, 1970. 1st ed. 1966. — Id. *Die Strukturgeschichte des technisch-industriellen Zeitalters als Aufgabe für Forschung u. Unterricht*. Köln, 1957. — Court, W. H. B. Economic History. In H. P. R. Finberg, ed. *Approaches to History; a Symposium*. Repr. Ldn, 1969: 17–50. 1st ed. 1962. — Cunningham, W. *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce*. 5th ed. 2 vol. Cambridge, Mass., 1922. 1st ed. 1882. — Curti, M. E. *The Making of an American Community*. Stanford, Calif., 1959. — Deane, P., and Cole, W. A. *British Economic Growth, 1688–1959*. Trends and Structure. 2nd ed. Ldn, 1967. 1st ed. Cambridge, 1962. — Deopik, D. V., et al. *Quantitative and Machine Methods of Processing Historical Information*. [Lectures given at the] 13th International Congress of Historical Sciences. M., 1970. — De Pillis, M. S. Trends in American Social History and the Possibilities of Behavioral Approaches. In *J. Soc. Hist.* 1, 1967: 37–60. — Eckermann, W., and Mohr, H., eds. *Einführung in das Studium der Geschichte*. 2. Aufl. Bln[O], 1969. 1st ed. 1966. — Ehrard, J., and Palmade, G. P. *L'Histoire*. Paris, 1964: 7–93. 3rd ed. 1971. — Elton, G. R. *Modern Historians on British History, 1485–1945; a Critical Bibliography, 1945–1969*. Ithaca, N. Y., Ldn, 1971. — Engels, F. *The Condition of the Working Class in England*. Oxford, N. Y., 1958. — Id. Socialism: Utopian and Scientific. In *Marx, Engels SW*, vol. 2: 116–55. — Febvre, L. P. V. *Combats pour l'histoire*. Paris, 1953. — Fleischer, H. *Marxismus u. Geschichte*. Frankfurt/M., 1969. — Fleury, M., and Henry, L. *Des registres paroissiaux à l'histoire de la population*. Manuel de dépouillement et d'exploitation de l'État civil ancien. Paris, 1956. Later manual entitled: *Nouveau Manuel de dépouillement et d'exploitation de l'État civil ancien*. Paris, 1965. — Förtsch, E. Geschichtswissenschaft. In *Produktivkraft Wissenschaft*. Sozialistische Sozialwissenschaften in der DDR. Ed.: H. Lades and C. Burrichter. Hbg, 1970: 93–136. — Fogel, R. W. The New Economic History. I.: Its Findings and Methods. In *Econ. Hist. R.*, 2nd ser. 19, 1966: 642–56. — Id., and Engerman, S. *The Reinterpretation of American Economic History*. N. Y., 1971. — Fricke, D., ed. *Historische Forschungen in der DDR*. Analysen und Berichte. Zum 11. Internationalen Historikerkongress in Stockholm August 1960. Bln[O], 1960. (*Z. Gesch.-Wiss.* 8, 1960, Sonderheft.) — Galambos, L. Parsonian Sociology and Post-Progressive History. In *Soc. Sci. Quart.* 50, 1969, no. 1: 25–45. — Genovese, E. D. *The Political Economy of Slavery*. N. Y., 1965. — Gerschenkron, A. *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective*. Cambridge, Mass., 1962. — Geyer, D. Gegenwartsfragen der sowjetischen Geschichtswissenschaft. In *Vjh. Zeitgesch.* 15, 1967, Nr 2: 109–20. — Glénisson, J. L'Historiographie française contemporaine: tendances et réalisations. In Comité français des sciences historiques. *La Recherche historique en France de 1940 à 1965*. Paris, 1965: IX–LXIV. — Gooch, G. P. *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century*. Rev. ed. Ldn, 1961. 1st ed. 1913. — Goubert, P. *Beauvais et le Beauvaisis de 1600 à 1730*. Paris, 1960. — Gras, N. S. B. Business History. In *Econ. Hist. R.* 4, 1934: 385–98. — Groh, D. Strukturgeschichte als "totale" Geschichte? In *Vjschr. Soz.-u. Wirtsch.-Gesch.* 58, 1971, Nr 3: 289–322. — Gulyga, A. V. The Subject Matter of Historical Scholarship. In *Sov. Stud. Hist.* 3, 1965, no. 4: 54–64. Russ.: O predmete istoricheskoi nauki. In *Vopr. ist.* 39, 1964, no. 4: 20–31. — Gurevich, A. Ia. Universal Law and Special Regularity in History. In *Sov. Stud. Hist.* 5, 1966, no. 1: 3–18. Russ.: Obshchii zakon i konkretnaia zakonomernost' v istorii. In *Vopr. ist.* 40, 1965, no. 8: 14–30. — Habermas, J. *Knowledge and Human Interests*. Boston, Mass., 1971. Ger.: *Erkenntnis u. Interesse*. Frankfurt/M., 1968. — Id. *Zur Logik der Sozialwissenschaften*. Materialien. Frankfurt/M., 1970. — Hammond, J. L., and Hammond, B. *The Village Labourer, 1760–1832; a Study in the Government of England before the Reform Bill*. New ed. 2 vol. Ldn, 1948. 1st ed. 1911. — Handke, H., et al. Strukturprobleme der Arbeiterklasse. Bericht vom internationalen Kolloquium über die Struktur der Arbeiterklasse u. deren Wandlungen in der Geschichte. In *Jb. Wirtsch.-Gesch.* 1964, Tl 4: 130–55. — Handlin, O., and Handlin, M. F. The New History and the Ethnic Factor in American Life. In *Persp. Amer. Hist.* 4, 1970: 5–24. — Hassinger, H. Die Wirtschaftsgeschichte an Österreichs Hochschulen bis zum Ende des ersten Weltkrieges. In *Wirtschaft, Geschichte u. Wirtschaftsgeschichte*. Ed.: W. Abel et al. Stuttgart, 1966: 407–29. — Hays, S. P. A Systematic Social History. In G. A. Billias and G. N. Grob, eds. *American History: Retrospect and Prospect*. N. Y., Ldn, 1971: 315–66. — Heer, N. W. *Politics and History in the Soviet Union*. Cambridge, Mass., Ldn, 1971. — Heckscher, E. F. A Plea for Theory in Economic History. In *Econ. Hist.* 1929, no. 4: 525–34. — Heuss, A. *Verlust der Geschichte*. Göttingen, 1959. — Hexter, J. H. *History, the Social Sciences, and Quantification*. [Lecture given at the] 13th International Congress of Historical Sciences. M., 1970. — Id. *Reappraisals in History*. Ldn, Evanston, Ill., 1961. — Hidy, R. W. History: Business History. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. Ed.: D. L. Sills. Vol. 6. N. Y., 1968: 474–80. — Higham, J., et al. *History*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J., 1965. — Id. *Writing American History: Essays in Modern Scholarship*. Bloomington, Ind., 1970. — Hill, J. E. C. *Puritanism and Revolution; Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the 17th Century*. Repr. N. Y., 1964. 1st ed. Ldn, 1958. — Hintze, O. *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*. 3 Bde. 2. Aufl. Göttingen, 1962–67. 1st ed. Lpz., 1941–43. — *Historische Forschungen in der DDR 1960–1970*. Analysen u. Berichte zum 13. internationalen Historikerkongress in Moskau 1970. Ed.: G. Becker et al. Bln[O], 1970. (*Z. Gesch.-Wiss.* 18, 1970, Sonderband.) — History and Social Science. In *Int. Soc. Sci. J.* 17, 1965, no. 4: 559–654. — Hobsbawm, E. J. From Social History to the History of Society. In *Daedalus* 100, 1971, no. 1: 20–45. — Hoffmann, W. G. *The Growth of Industrial Economics*. Manchester, 1958. Ger.: *Stadien u. Typen der Industrialisierung*. Jena, 1931. — Id. Wachstumstheorie u. Wirtschaftsgeschichte. In F. Greiss and F. W. Meyer, eds. *Wirtschaft, Gesellschaft u. Kultur*. Bln, 1961: 147–58. — Hofstadter, R. *The Progressive Historians: Turner, Beard, Parrington*. N. Y., 1968. — Hughes, H. S. The Historian and the Social Scientist. In *Amer. Hist. R.* 66, 1960, no. 1: 20–46. — Iggers, G. G. *The German Conception of History; the National Tradition of Historical Thought from Herder to the Present*. Middletown, Conn., 1968. — Izuchenie otechestvennoi istorii za 50 let Sovetskoi vlasti. In *Vopr. ist.* 42, 1967, no. 11: 3–18. [The Study of Russian History during 50 Years of Soviet Rule.] — Jodl, F. *Die Kulturgeschichtsschreibung, ihre Entwicklung u. ihr Problem*. Halle, 1878. — Kakhk, Yu. Nuzhna li novaia istoricheskaiia nauka? In *Vopr. ist.* 44, 1969, no. 3: 41–54. [Do We Need a New Kind of Historical Scholarship?] — Kellenbenz, H., et al. *Wirtschaftsgeschichte*. In *Handwörterbuch der Sozialwissenschaft*. Bd 12. Stuttgart, 1965: 124–85. — Klaus, G., and Schulze, H. *Simn, Gesetz u. Fortschritt in der Geschichte*. Bln[O], 1967. — Klíma, A. *Manufakturní období v Cechach*. Praha, 1955. [The Manufacturing Period in Bohemia.] — Kocka, J. Karl Marx u. Max Weber. Ein methodologischer Vergleich. In *Z. ges. Staatswiss.* 122, 1966, Nr 2: 328–57. — Köllmann, W. Zur Situation des Faches Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte in Deutschland. In *Wissenschaft, Wirtschaft u. Technik*. Ed.: K.-H. Manegold. München, 1969: 135–46. — Kötzschke, R. *Grund-*

- sionen auf dem XIII. Internationalen Historikerkongress. In *Z. Gesch.-Wiss.* 19, 1971, Nr 2: 242–65. — Seligman, E. R. A. *The Economic Interpretation of History*. 2nd ed. N.Y., Ldn, 1961. 1st ed. N.Y., 1902. — Shtepa, K. F. *Russian Historians and the Soviet State*. New Brunswick, N.J., 1962. — Sidorov, A. L. Osnovnye problemy i nekotorye itogi razvitiia sovetskoi istoricheskoi nauki. In International Congress of Historical Sciences. 10th, Rome, 1955. Delegation from the U.S.S.R. *Desiatyi mezhdunarodnyi kongress istorikov v Rime, sentiabr' 1955 g.* Doklady. M., 1956: 5–55. [10th International Historians' Congress in Rome, September 1955. Reports.] — Simiand, F. Méthode historique et science sociale. In *Annales* 15, 1960: 83–119. First publ. in *R. synthèse hist.* 6, 1903: 1–22 & 129–57. — Smelser, N. J. *Social Change in the Industrial Revolution; an Application of Theory to the Lancashire Cotton Industry, 1770–1840*. Ldn, Chicago, Ill., 1959. — Soboul, A. Description et mesure en histoire sociale. In *L'histoire sociale*. Sources et méthodes. Paris, 1967: 9–25. — Social Science Research Council. Committee on Historical Analysis. *Generalization in the Writing of History*. A report. Ed.: L. Gottschalk. Chicago, Ill., 1963. — Id. Committee on Historiography. *The Social Sciences in Historical Study*. A report. N.Y., 1954. — Id. Committee on Historiography. *Theory and Practice in Historical Study*. A report. N.Y., 1946. — Sombart, W. Economic Theory and Economic History. In *Econ. Hist. R.* 2, 1929, no. 1: 1–19. — Id. *Der moderne Kapitalismus*. Historisch-systematische Darstellung des gesamteuropäischen Wirtschaftslebens von seinen Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart. 3 Bde. Neuaufgabe. München, 1928. 1st ed. 2 Bde. Lpz., 1902. — Stone, L. *The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1558–1641*. Oxford, 1965. — *Studien zur Geschichte der industriellen Revolution in Deutschland*. Ed.: H. Mottek et al. Bln[O], 1960. — Tawney, R. H. *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism; a Historical Study*. Repr. N.Y., 1962. 1st ed. Ldn, 1926. — Thernstrom, S. A., and Sennett, R. *Nineteenth-Century Cities*. New Haven, Conn., 1969. — Thomas, K. The Tools and the Job. In *Times Lit. Suppl.*, Apr. 7, 1966: 275–76. — Thompson, E. P. History from Below. *Ibid.*, Apr. 7, 1966: 279–80. — Tilly, R. Soll u. Haben: Recent German Economic History and the Problem of Economic Development. In *J. Econ. Hist.* 29, 1969: 198–319. — Topolski, J. Développement des études historiques en Pologne 1945–1968. In Académie Polonaise des Sciences. Comité des Sciences Historiques et Institut d'Histoire. *La Pologne au XIII^e Congrès International des Sciences Historiques à Moscou*. 1^{ère} partie: *La Recherche historique en Pologne 1945–1968*. Rédigé par A. Wyczański. Varsovie, 1970: 7–75. — Id. Le Développement des recherches d'histoire économique en Pologne. In *Stud. hist. econ.* 1, 1966: 3–42. — Trapeznikov, S. P. Razvitie obshchestvennykh nauk i povyshenie ikh roli v kommunisticheskom stroitel'stve. In *Vopr. filos.* 21, 1967, no. 11: 3–27. [The Development of the Social Sciences and the Increase in Their Contribution to the Building of Communism.] — Trevelyan, G. M. *English Social History*. New ed. Harmondsworth, 1967. 1st ed. Ldn, 1942. — Turner, F. J. *The Significance of the Frontier in American History*. Repr. Ann Arbor, Mich., 1966. 1st ed. Madison, Wis., 1894. — *V. I. Lenin i istoricheskaja nauka*. Sbornik statei. Red.: V. V. Mavrodin. L., 1970. [Lenin and Historical Scholarship. Collection of Papers.] — Vann, R. T. History and Demography. In *Hist. and Theory* 1969, special no. 9: Studies in Quantitative History and the Logic of the Social Sciences: 64–78. — von Below, G. A. H. *Die deutsche Geschichtsschreibung von den Befreiungskriegen bis zu unseren Tagen*. 2. Aufl. München, 1924. 1st ed. Lpz., 1916. — von Inama-Sternegg, K. T. *Deutsche Wirtschaftsgeschichte*. Lpz., 1879. — Webb, S. J., and Webb, B. *The History of Trade Unionism*. New ed. N.Y., 1965. 1st ed. Ldn, 1894. — Weber, M. *Economy and Society; an Outline of Interpretative Sociology*. 3 vol. N.Y., 1968. Ger.: *Wirtschaft u. Gesellschaft*. 2 Halbbände. 4. Aufl. Tübingen, 1956. 1st ed. Bln, 1922. — Id. "Objectivity" in Social Science and Social Policy. In id. *Max Weber on the Methodology of the Social Sciences*. Glencoe, Ill., 1949: 49–112. Ger.: Die "Objektivität" sozialwissenschaftlicher u. sozialpolitischer Erkenntnisse. In *Archiv Soz.-Wiss. Soz.-Polit.* 19, 1904: 22–87. — Wehler, H.-U. *Bismarck u. der Imperialismus*. Köln, 1969. — Id., ed. *Moderne deutsche Sozialgeschichte*. 3. Aufl. Köln, 1970. 1st ed. 1966. Einleitung: 9–16. — Id. Theorieprobleme der modernen deutschen Wirtschaftsgeschichte (1800–1945). In *Entstehung u. Wandel der modernen Gesellschaft*. Ed.: G. A. Ritter. Bln, 1970: 66–107. — Williams, W. A. *The Contours of American History*. Cleveland, Ohio, 1961. — Wish, H. *The American Historian; a Social-Intellectual History of the Writing of the American Past*. N.Y., 1960. — Wittram, R. *Zukunft in der Geschichte*. Göttingen, 1966. — Wüstemeyer, M. Die "Annales": Grundsätze u. Methoden ihrer "neuen Geschichtswissenschaft". In *Vjschr. Soz.- u. Wirtsch.-Gesch.* 54, 1967: 1–45. — Zhukov, Ye. (E. M. Zhukov.) V. I. Lenin and the Methodology of Historical Science. In *Soc. Sci.* 2, 1970: 40–49. [Trans. from Russ.] — *Zur Periodisierung des Feudalismus u. Kapitalismus in der geschichtlichen Entwicklung der UdSSR*. Bln[O], 1952. (Sowjetwissenschaft, Beiheft 20.) [Trans. of papers from *Voprosy istorii* 1949–51.]

Jürgen Kocka