

Shapiro argues that if we can understand bourgeois reform proposals better by understanding the context in which they were formulated and evolved, we can also reverse this approach and use housing strategies as a tool for understanding political, social, economic and cultural developments. And she offers some good material to illustrate this. I liked her analysis of the reactions of workers and revolutionary socialists to housing problems and proposals. And I especially found helpful her discussion on how the housing problem prompted conservative bourgeoisie in the Radical-Socialist camp to embrace Solidarism.

The documentation of the text is good although I found a number of undocumented statements for which I would have liked some proof. A more serious flaw, however, is Shapiro's failure to substantiate that 1902 is the cut-off point for the story. I do not dispute Shapiro's contention, but I would argue that since the campaign for low-cost housing does not end in 1902, a brief epilogue on accomplishments in housing and sanitation regulation up to World War I would have been in order. The book should not end abruptly, as it does, with the law of 1902.

The other main problem with this book is that scholars will not be able to rely on it fully, particularly for ease of access to material. In many endnotes Shapiro fails to give specific page references for books or articles she cites. More regrettable, however, is the fact that there are more than the usual number of inaccuracies in her citations and references. I have perused only those sources available to me locally, but I uncovered enough of these inaccuracies to cause me to fear that the problem pervades the book. To give some idea of these inaccuracies, I found incorrect page numbers in endnotes, a few direct quotes which contain some interpolation, a paraphrased statement that was not documented, and a couple of sources that were cited incorrectly. I would like to emphasize, however, that I found absolutely no evidence of major inaccuracies or misinterpretations. Therefore I am persuaded that Shapiro's findings are basically reliable.

My final comments: The titles of the first three chapters of the book are not truly reflective of their content; nor is there a faithful match between the descriptions of those chapters in the preface and what they actually offer. Also, in the preface, Shapiro tells us that "in addressing the question of working-class housing, the bourgeois society ... was forced, in effect, to engage in a complex process of self-examination and redefinition." She then claims that "it is the purpose of this book to explore this process..." (p. xvi). But what the monograph actually does illustrate is what Shapiro mentions at the beginning of that same paragraph in the preface, namely that "housing reform strategies... raised corollary issues which forced contemporaries to *reexamine accepted dogmas and cherished assumptions*" [emphasis added]. There are perhaps two more statements in the preface that are not supported in the body of the book. Shapiro does provide a useful selection of maps, charts, figures and pictures. Her index, however, is far too abbreviated to be of much help. And scholars will find that inconsistencies in identifying persons or commentators in the text itself only make matters worse. But the book is well-written and easy to read.

In sum then, Shapiro's book is a valuable one, but it will have to be used with some caution.

Sandra Horvath-Peterson  
Georgetown University

\* \* \*

ROLF PETER SIEFERLE — *Fortschritts-Feinde? Opposition Gegen Technik und Industrie von der Romantik bis zur Gegenwart*. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1984. Pp. 301.

This book is an uneven attempt by the West German economic historian, Rolf Peter Sieferle, to explain the cultural consequences of the coming of rapid technological change to the European scene. Tracing this development through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the author pays a minimal amount of attention to actual scientific and engineering innovations. Instead, his focus is

overwhelmingly on just how these unprecedented industrial changes were affecting cultural trends, in particular the thinking of those groups that were most adamantly opposed to the intellectual revolution that technology was creating. On base, Siefertle tells us that the endless stream of criticism that these groups produced was really a reaction against the smashing of an older society, its values and its mores. Prof. Siefertle states further that these resolute opponents of rapid industrialization and advanced capitalism fought back as best they could, in the main with words.

In attempting to prove his major theme the author is highly dependent on literary evidence. In several chapters, that evidence exists in abundance, but often only a single critic or just a few writers are cited. As a result of the paucity of literary evidence in some parts of this book, the reader is left with some truly nagging doubts about whether these supposedly outspoken movements in opposition to modernization were as widespread as the book insists.

Even if this volume is not equally convincing, it does contain some remarkably thought-provoking portions. Siefertle's initial discussion of the materialistic advances that transformed Europe from the deprivations of the past to the affluence of the present is full of poignant insights. There was an improving standard of living for the majority that meant that the hunger and cold, phobias and neurosis, and alcoholism and loneliness of previous generations were indeed being dispelled from society. These changes, unparalleled for the masses, were largely ignored by the opponents of technology. In their highly partisan fashion, they preferred to point to the shortcomings of industrialization and were rarely willing to praise this new society in any way. The most telling part of Siefertle's work, however, appears later on when the author comes to analyze the cultural trends that led up to the victory of National Socialism. Rightfully, Siefertle sees the Nazis of the 1920s and 1930s as absorbing many of the movements of cultural discontent that had characterized previous generations of German society. The Nazis pounced upon these anti-modern prejudices, ever-present among the peasantry, the petty-bourgeoisie and the aristocracy, and turned those feelings of cultural alienation into quick political success.

As it turns out, the major reason why this volume does not speak directly to the many technological innovations of this age is because the opponents of modernization, and its inevitable social consequences, steadfastly refused to discuss them. They virtually never mentioned the steam-engine, railroad, gas-lighting, telephone or the streetcar. What they wanted to talk about was the "dire" consequences of these engineering feats — mostly, what they imagined to be the declining standard of living and the loss of stabilizing traditions. Feeding off the sometimes real and more often illusory results of the industrial revolution, opponents of technically-inspired change split eventually into two readily identifiable groups. Reactionary elements immediately made a golden age out of the past, while socialists, equally dissatisfied, constructed just as idealized a picture of the future in their attempt to draw public attention.

The first of these anti-modern groups emerged during the Romantic period. Romantic writers despised the triumph of the bourgeoisie, for to them it meant, simultaneously, the unleashing of the masses, the destruction of convention, a confirmed hedonism and a fanatical pursuit of the ultra-modern principles of freedom and equality. In a chapter with some but actually not enough literary references, Siefertle gives the well-known German critic Adam Muller a central role. One of Muller's fundamental arguments about this new age was that it caused pauperization, or so he insisted. At the same time, Siefertle finds great significance in the Luddite movement. The breaking of new-fangled machines is not seen by him as just a simple attempt by artisans to save their own jobs, but as something much larger. He views this event as a general political and social rebellion, although one has to wonder on reading this segment of the book if the handicraftsmen doing the actual breaking were conscious of this. It is difficult to draw a firm conclusion here because so few actual references to what masters and journeymen said either in protest or at their trials are included in these pages.

No trend in the nineteenth century fanned the fuels of anti-modernism more than the supposed existence of mass pauperization. Both the reactionary right and revolution left blamed poverty directly on the factory system and industrial capitalism. Neither group really cared whether nineteenth-century capitalism had inherited poverty from the past and was, indeed, systematically reducing it. In this

sense, as the middle portion of the book implies, but does not state forthrightly, the opponents of modernization were all historical. This was certainly true, as Sieferle proves, of the biting criticism of conservatives like Robert Mohl and Wilhelm Riehl and the socialist spokesmen Max Nordau. Passionate and vitriolic, these writers were never interested in the history of poverty. Rather, they used Europe's growing social consciousness and feelings of guilt regarding the poverty that was left over from previous generations to launch their initial critiques of this new industrial age.

From the start of their movement, and this is one part of this book that is well documented, opponents of the unrelenting growth of industrialization went on to indict the society of the time in the other ways. In the last half of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, conservative essayists Ernst Rudorff and Paul Schultze-Naumburg seriously began to raise the environmental issue. In their estimation, industrial capitalism was threatening the destruction of nature. They called for the protection of agriculture and the rural landscape, plus all remaining animals and endangered plants. This particular movement, originally an issue called forth by the right would, after World War I, become an increasing monopoly of the left. In time, it would wind up as the current Green Movement of West Germany. Although there is declining literary evidence in this book about this development, Sieferle does, nonetheless, prove its importance.

Affixed to this movement was the vision of the eternal peasant kept alive by men like Justus Moser and Peter Rosegger. Sieferle explains that this was a vital myth perpetuated by conservatives to again indict capitalistic society, but once more he does not muster overpowering evidence to prove his point. In any event, peasants in the past were depicted as resolute and productive and always in harmony with their environment and community. The truth may have been radically different, but this myth was a convenient one for those who felt perpetually unsettled by and antagonistic to industrial change.

No one would argue that Prof. Sieferle has not told an important story here, for he has. His book is cerebral, well-organized and clearly written. He has taken on a daunting task and deserves credit for a major philosophical effort. While no book is definitive, this volume would at least have come closer to being truly profound if the author had used literary evidence in greater abundance and more evenly from chapter to chapter to underpin his overall contentions. As it is, while this volume is unquestionably thoughtful, not all of its themes are actually proven.

Vincent J. Knapp  
State University of New York, Potsdam

\* \* \*

JUDITH F. STONE — *The Search for Social Peace. Reform Legislation in France, 1890-1914*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1985. Pp. xvii, 260.

Recent historians have not been terribly kind to France's pre-1914 advocates of social reform, those middle-class politicians and academics who hoped to soothe labour strife by legislating a measure of *solidarité*. Scholars, especially those on the left, have tended to dismiss them as closet conservatives more interested in shoring up capitalism than in helping the working class. But with the welfare state increasingly under attack, historians have begun to view the early proponents of social amelioration with more sympathy. Judith Stone's refreshing new book examines the achievements as well as the limitations of the *Belle Époque*'s champions of "bourgeois reform." And in the process she suggests some of the reasons why it has been so difficult to make capitalist societies more equitable.

Stone identifies two main groups of reformers during the years from 1890 to 1914: leaders of the Radical Party and academicians, principally in the fields of law and political economy. A sprinkling of independent socialists rounded out this intellectually impressive coalition. Stone argues