

des »Gewerkschaftsstreites«, der schließlich (päpstlich »geduldet«) zugunsten der katholischen Arbeiterformierung in der Christlichen Gewerkschaftsbewegung endete.

Die durchgängige kritische Skizzierung des neuesten Forschungsstandes und die breit gefächerten Dokumente, flankiert von Kurzbiographien der hervorstechenden Persönlichkeiten des katholischen Deutschland sowie einem Sachregister, prädestinieren diese Publikation bestens zum fruchtbaren Unterrichtseinsatz im Rahmen der Sekundarstufe II und des Hochschulstudiums.

Michael Klöcker

Ulrich Aufmuth, Die deutsche Wandervogelbewegung unter soziologischem Aspekt (= Studien zum Wandel von Gesellschaft und Bildung im 19. Jahrhundert, hrsg. von Otto Neuloh und Walter Rüegg, Bd. 16 — Forschungsunternehmen »19. Jahrhundert« der Fritz Thyssen Stiftung), Verlag Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen 1979, 259 S., kart., 54 DM.

This is not an easy book to review. It is by turns obscurantist and enlightening, credulous and sophisticated, stimulating and intolerably dull. Not the least of its uses is as an example of what can be gained and what may be lost in the application of sociological theory to historical subjects — a reminder that historical sociology must be good history if it is to be effective sociology.

The object of Aufmuth's study, the Wandervogel (WV), continues to present an intriguing field for social analysis, in spite of the massive body of literature produced by the movement itself and a series of more or less scholarly accounts published since the last war. What began as a hiking- and discussion-club among students and teachers at a Berlin secondary school just before the turn of the century had by the outbreak of the First World War become a national movement with its own administrative apparatus and a membership in the tens of thousands. It made a lasting impact on twentieth-century German culture; »Wandervogel« remained a catchword for the youth movement in Germany, even after 1918, when the WV itself was in relative decline. Aufmuth argues that the movement deserves consideration as a unique instance of the self-activation and self-organization of adolescents on a national scale. In the light of the Western experience of youth movements of the past thirty years and the sociological insights they have generated, he asks, how can we explain the growth of such a movement in Wilhelmine Germany?

As far as it goes, Aufmuth's answer is rather more convincing than his question: The key to the development of the WV, as to its character, is the crisis of confidence suffered by the humanistically educated middle classes in Germany — the *Bildungsbürgertum* — at the end of the century. Both the cherished values and the traditional status of this group were threatened by the rise of a new industrial bourgeoisie, armed with cash and an instrumental approach to social relations. In its search for sources of cultural survival and renewal, the middle class rediscovered its own youth, those adolescents to whom, since Humboldt, German humanism had attributed a peculiar capacity for creative synthesis. There developed a cult of youth, which offered young people a new prestige while charging them with the whole burden of rescuing a threatened way of life. But the values that they were expected to maintain and revivify were transmitted in a new form; only when personal and social ideals were loosed from formal prescriptions for behaviour and criteria of achievement or, to use Aufmuth's term, »dematerialized«, could they be creatively adapted to new conditions. In effect, the more strongly certain central values were emphasized in the education of the young, and the greater was the onus placed on the individual youth to work through and internalize them in the process of personal character-building, the more abstract those values became. The result was that the cultural crisis of the parents was experienced by the children

as an acute psycho-social crisis. The WV, like other »highly emotionalized peer-groups with innovatory impulse«, provided a temporary resolution of this crisis, while manifesting its principal symptoms: the passionately idealistic striving after undefined goals (as symbolized by the practice of hiking), cultivation of personal »openness« and self-education, emphasis on common experience rather than intellectual consensus. For all its unconventionality, Aufmuth argues, the movement represents a form of »functional deviance«, a »learned rebellion« largely sanctioned by the values of the older generation and tolerated by the existing agencies of social control.

As an analysis of relations within a particular social stratum, Aufmuth's account is very attractive, not least for its internal coherence and the rigour and clarity with which it is presented. But the project of sociological analysis of large-scale social movements implies a more general account of socio-cultural change, and the reader who looks for that in Aufmuth's book is liable to be disappointed or, at worst, misled. If we try to picture, for example, what an ideal without a goal means, or what the wider social and political functions of a movement without a programme might be, the limitations of the study become apparent: There is more »sociology« than »history« here, and its sharpness of focus is achieved at the expense of both breadth and depth of analysis.

The problem is not simply that argument predominates over narrative. Nearly one quarter of the text is devoted to methodological and theoretical questions, and Aufmuth's descriptions of people, movements, events are condensed and rather colourless; those who have not already met the *Bildungsbürger* in some other context will not feel they know him after reading this book. More important, however, readers who do not already have some knowledge of the social issues and the alignment of political forces in Wilhelmine Germany will find only a very partial picture here. Aufmuth never extends his discussion beyond the horizons of the middle class in its domestic and associational life. This is an important failing, because while the WV was indisputably a middle-class movement, it was not the only youth movement of its time. Nor was bourgeois society's growing awareness of youth manifested solely in the idealization of its own sons and daughters. It is misleading to talk about the »cult of youth« without giving some attention to the contemporaneous public discussion of the means for controlling and disciplining lower-class young people or, in looking for phenomena with which to compare the WV, to propose various subcultures of the 1950s and 1960s and ignore the pre-1914 Social Democratic youth movement. And it is puzzling to find, in a work which emphasizes such themes as autonomy, emancipation and social control, only the briefest mention of the ways in which the WV was articulated with the dominant political structures of the period through various forms of adult patronage. This narrowness of range extends to the sources on which the study rests — almost exclusively publications of the WV itself and its members, supplemented by the literature of the declining *Bildungsbürgertum*. These tend to confirm one another, to an extent that not only biases the emphasis of Aufmuth's argument, but renders it logically suspect.

The one-sidedness of Aufmuth's vision is in part, at least, a function of his theoretical framework; he has drawn on American sociology and psychology of the 1950s and 1960s for both analytical models and empirical referents. The basic structure of the analysis is provided by the modified Parsonian functionalism of N. Smelser's theory of social movements, and there are extensive references to S. N. Eisenstadt's work on age-groups and social structure and E. Erikson's theory of personality development (among other, less original works). It is of the nature of this kind of enterprise that its palatability will vary with the extent to which the reader is in sympathy with the basic theoretical approach, and it would be invidious to dismiss Aufmuth out of hand simply because the present reviewer finds it difficult to sympathize with scholars who can adduce »the crowd, the street demonstration, the mob, the panic, the audience, fashion, public opinion, revolution and the social movement« in one

breath as manifestations of a single object of study (collective behaviour). But there are more objective measures of a model's credibility. One of these is the availability of alternatives, and here Aufmuth is less than convincing. His critique of one alternative approach, the Marxist one, is naive in itself and reveals no awareness of the recent contributions of Marxism and structuralism to the discussion of youth and youth culture. Moreover, where the author does encounter conceptual problems in an otherwise well argued work, they are a direct reflection of the contradictions implicit in his model; his struggles with the idea of the »social emancipation of youth«, which he first describes as his central concern, then refuses to define, and finally declares to be impossible, given »the inescapable [...] tie [...] to the cognitive and symbolic structures of the parent culture«, offer an object lesson in the pitfalls of functionalism. And Aufmuth's choice of mentors ultimately affects the whole shape of the work, for he has absorbed the complacency of the functionalist school and cannot therefore escape its tendency to present as a general model of social relations a reflected image of the society that produced it. Consequently, whenever he discusses youth and society in general terms, we find ourselves wafted back to the affluent, »classless« and apolitical America of the post-war decades. His fixation on relations within the bourgeoisie is thus hardly surprising. But it is a serious limitation on the usefulness of what is otherwise a conscientious and sometimes illuminating analytical exercise.

Eve Rosenhaft

Gerhard A. Ritter unter Mitarbeit von Merith Niehuss, Wahlgeschichtliches Arbeitsbuch. Materialien zur Statistik des Kaiserreichs 1871—1918 (= Beck'sche Elementarbücher; Statistische Arbeitsbücher zur neueren deutschen Geschichte), C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, München 1980, 204 S., Pb., 29,50 DM.

Die bislang zur Wahlgeschichte des Kaiserreichs vorliegenden neueren Untersuchungen behandeln entweder das Wahlverhalten bestimmter Bevölkerungsgruppen oder die Wahlergebnisse in ausgewählten Regionen. Dazu kommen Monographien zu Parteien und Studien zu einzelnen Wahlterminen. Was immer noch fehlt, ist eine historische Längsschnittanalyse, die sich mit den Wählerbewegungen im Gesamtzeitraum befaßt und versucht, diese unter systematischen Gesichtspunkten zu erschließen. Die bestehenden Lücken in der Wahlforschung erklären sich teilweise aus der Tradition der deutschen Geschichtswissenschaft, die der Entwicklung demokratischer Partizipation und der politischen Mobilisierung der Bevölkerung lange Zeit zu wenig Aufmerksamkeit schenkte, die es aber auch versäumte, Anstöße der französischen und angelsächsischen Wahlsoziologie aufzugreifen bzw. selbst ein methodisches Instrumentarium zu entwickeln, das die notwendige interdisziplinäre Zusammenarbeit ermöglicht hätte. Daneben erschwert die schlechte Quellenlage die genaue Erforschung von Wahlverhalten und Wahlentscheidungen. So fehlt u. a. eine Reihe von wichtigen regionalen und lokalen Basisdaten über die Parteiorientierung der Wähler und über ihr Abstimmungsverhalten, und es mangelt an genauen Angaben über die Berufs-, Gewerbe- und Konfessionsstruktur der Wahlbezirke.

Angesichts dieser Ausgangslage ist die historisch-statistische Aufarbeitung der gedruckten amtlichen Quellen und die Auswertung der in zeitgenössischen Untersuchungen überlieferten Zahlen, wie sie von der zu besprechenden Untersuchung geleistet wird, ein wichtiger Schritt auf einem weitgehend unerschlossenen Forschungsterrain. Die in insgesamt 47 Tabellen, Schaubildern, Karten und Graphiken zusammengestellten Angaben sind verstreuten, unübersichtlich publizierten und oft unvollständigen Statistiken entnommen und dokumentieren für den Zeitraum von der Reichsgründung bis zum Kriegsbeginn 1914 die Wählerbewegungen und Wahlergebnisse für das Deutsche Reich, für Preußen, Bayern und Sachsen. Da die Bear-