Civil Society, Associations and Urban Places

Class, Nation and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Europe

Edited by
Graeme Morton
Boudien de Vries
R.J. Morris

Civil Society, Associations and Urban Places

Civil Society, Associations and Urban Places

Class, Nation and Culture in Nineteenth-Century Europe

Edited by

Graeme Morton
University of Guelph, Canada

Boudien de Vries
University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

and

R.J. Morris
University of Edinburgh, UK

Contents

List of Figures

Notes on Contributors

Sven Beckert is Professor of History at Harvard University, where he teaches the history of the United States in the nineteenth century. He is the author of *The Monied Metropolis: New York City and the Consolidation of the American Bourgeoisie* (2001). Currently his work focuses on the history of nineteenth-century capitalism. He is writing a global history of cotton during the 'long' nineteenth century, to be published by Alfred A. Knopf, and a history of the world economy between 1760 and 1880, to be published by Harvard University Press.

Daniela Luigia Caglioti studied Philosophy at the University of Naples and received her PhD in History at the European University Institute in Florence. Her publications include *Il guadagno difficile. Commercianti napoletani nella seconda metà dell'Ottocento* (1994) and *Associazionismo e sociabilità d'elite a Napoli nel XIX secolo* (1996). She is Associate Professor of Contemporary History at the University of Naples Federico II and is currently completing a study on Protestant entrepreneurial minorities in nineteenth-century Southern Italy.

Jan Hein Furnée is historian and junior lecturer at the Institute of History, University of Amsterdam. He has published several articles on leisure culture and social relations in nineteenth-century The Hague and is currently completing his dissertation on this subject. He is editor of *Stadsgeschiedenis*, a new journal on urban history in the Low Countries (launched in 2006).

Carol E. Harrison is Associate Professor of History at the University of South Carolina, and author of *The Bourgeois Citizen in Nineteenth-Century France: Gender, Sociability, and the Uses of Emulation* (1999) and 'Citizens and Scientists: Toward a Gendered History of Scientific Practice in Post-revolutionary France', *Gender and History*, 13 (2001). Her present research concerns gender and the reestablishment of the Catholic Church in postrevolutionary France.

Ewald Hiebl, D.Phil., Department of History and Political Sciences, University of Salzburg in Austria. His major publications are *Kulturgeschichte des Salzes (18. bis 20. Jahrhundert)* (ed. with T. Hellmuth) (2002); 'Hallein – Bürgertum einer Salinenstadt' (with T. Hellmuth), in Hannes Stekl and Peter Urbanitsch, eds., *Stadtbürgertum und Politik in der Habsburgermonarchie 1860–1918* (2000) (Bürgertum in der Habsburgermonarchie, VIII).

Elena Mannová PhD, CSc., Institute of History, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava. Her major publications are *Bürgertum und bürgerliche Gesellschaft in der Slowakei 1900–1989* (1997); *Collective Identities in Central Europe in Modern Times* (ed. with M. Csáky, 1999); *A Concise History of Slovakia* (2000). Elena Mannová has written a number of articles on voluntary associations in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and on collective identities of Slovaks, Germans and Hungarians in Slovakia.

Irene Maver is Senior Lecturer in Scottish History at the University of Glasgow. Her research is on the urban history of Scotland. Her publications include: *Glasgow* (2000); 'The guardianship of the community: civic authority before 1833' in T.M. Devine and G. Jackson, eds., *Glasgow, Volume I: Beginnings to 1830* (1995); 'The Social problems of the city' (with W.H. Fraser) and 'Tackling the problem' (with W.H. Fraser), and 'Glasgow's civic government', in W.H. Fraser and I. Maver, eds., *Glasgow, Volume II: 1830–1912* (1996); 'Glasgow's Parks and the Community, 1850–1914: a Case Study in Scottish Civic Interventionism', *Urban History*, 25, 3, (1998); 'Leisure and Culture: the nineteenth century', and 'Leisure and social change in the twentieth century', in W.H. Fraser and C. Lee, eds., *Aberdeen, 1800 to 2000: A New History* (2000).

R.J. Morris is Professor of Economic and Social History at the University of Edinburgh. His major publications include: *Class and Class Consciousness in the Industrial Revolution* (1979); 'Voluntary Societies and British Urban Elites, 1780–1870', *The Historical Journal* (1982); *Class, Sect and Party* (1990); 'Associations', in F.M.L. Thompson, ed., *The Cambridge Social History of Britain, 1750–1950*, vol. 3 (1990)*; The Victorian City. A Reader in British Urban History, 1820–1914* (ed. with R. Rodger) (1993); 'Governance. Two Centuries of Urban Growth', in R.J. Morris and R.H. Trainor, eds., *Urban Governance. Britain and Beyond Since 1750* (2000); 'Structure, Culture and Society in British Towns', in M.J. Daunton, ed., *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain*, vol. 3 (2000). R.J. Morris was the founding editor of *History and Computing*.

Graeme Morton is Professor and The Scottish Studies Foundation Chair in the Department of History at the University of Guelph. His research focuses on national identity, civil society and government in nineteenth-century Scotland. He is the author of *Locality Community and Nation* (1998) (with A. Morris), *Unionist-Nationalism: Governing Urban Scotland 1830–1860* (1999) and *William Wallace: Man and Myth* (2001, 2004); His publications include: 'Civil society, municipal government and the state: enshrinement, empowerment and legitimacy, Scotland, 1800–1929', *Urban History*, 25, 3 (1998) and 'Civil Society, Governance and Nation, 1832–1914' (with R.J. Morris) in the *New Penguin History of Scotland* (2001), eds. R.A. Houston and W.W.J. Knox. Graeme Morton is editor of the *International Review of Scottish Studies*.

Sabine Rutar, PhD, is Research Fellow at the Institute for Social Movements, University of Bochum. Her publications include: 'Arbeit und Überleben in Serbien: Das Kupfererzbergwerk Bor im Zweiten Weltkrieg' in *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 31 (2005); 'Zwischen Volkstumspolitik und Volksbefreiungskampf. Braunkohlenabbau im deutsch besetzten Slowenien' in Klaus Tenfelde and Hans-Christoph Seidel, eds., *Zwangsarbeit im Bergwerk. Der Arbeitseinsatz im Kohlenbergbau des Deutschen Reiches und der besetzten Gebiete im Ersten und Zweiten Weltkrieg, Bd. 1* (2005); *Kultur – Nation – Milieu. Sozialdemokratie in Triest vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg* (2004) (Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für soziale Bewegungen, Bd. 23).

Boudien de Vries is Associate Professor of Social History at the University of Amsterdam. She has written numerous essays and articles on aspects of the nineteenth-century Dutch middle class. Recently she edited a volume on urban history: *Leiden. De geschiedenis van een Hollandse stad III 1795–1896 (2004)* and she is the author of *Een stad vol lezers* (forthcoming) on reading culture in the nineteenth century. Her present research concerns the history of associations in the Netherlands.

Historical Urban Studies
General Editors' Preface

Density and proximity are two of the defining characteristics of the urban dimension. It is these that identify a place as uniquely urban, though the threshold for such pressure points varies from place to place. A third defining characteristic is functionality – the commercial or strategic position of a town or city which conveys an advantage over other places. Over time, these functional advantages may diminish, or the balance of advantage may change within a hierarchy of towns. To understand how the relative importance of towns shifts over time and space is to grasp a set of relationships which is fundamental to the study of urban history.

Towns and cities are products of history, yet have themselves helped to shape history. As the proportion of urban dwellers has increased, so the urban dimension has proved a crucial unit of analysis through which to understand the spectrum of human experience and to explore the cumulative memory of past generations. Though obscured by layers of economic, social and political change, the study of the urban milieu provides insights into the functioning of human relationships and, if urban historians themselves are not directly concerned with current policy studies, few contemporary concerns can be understood without reference to the historical development of towns and cities.

This longer historical perspective is essential to an understanding of social processes. Crime, housing conditions and property values, health and education, discrimination and deviance, and the formulation of regulations and social policies to deal with them were, and remain, amongst the perennial preoccupations of towns and cities – no historical period has a monopoly of these concerns. They recur in successive generations, albeit in varying mixtures and strengths; the details may differ.

The central forces of class, power and authority in the city remain. If this was the case for different periods, so it was for different places and cultures. Both scientific knowledge and technical information were available across Europe and showed little respect for frontiers. Yet despite common concerns and access to broadly similar knowledge, different solutions to urban problems were proposed and adopted by towns and cities in different parts of Europe. This comparative dimension informs urban historians as to which were systematic factors and which were of a purely local nature: general and particular forces can be distinguished.

These analytical frameworks and comparative frameworks inform this book. Indeed, thematic, comparative and analytical approaches to the historical study of towns and cities is the hallmark of the *Historical Urban Studies* series which now extends to over 30 titles, either already published or currently in production.

European urban historiography has been extended and enriched as a result and this book makes another important addition to an intellectual mission to which we, as General Editors, remain firmly committed.

Université de Lyon II   Jean-Luc Pinol
University of Leicester   Richard Rodger

Introduction
Civil Society, Associations and Urban Places: Class, Nation and Culture in Nineteenth-century Europe

R.J. Morris

This volume presents a series of studies of associational culture in a variety of European and in one North American environment. Voluntary associations have taken a central place in the discourse and debates around the concept of civil society. This concept re-emerged in the 1980s and 1990s with a number of intellectual and political objectives. The first was to understand and direct the nature of political change in Eastern Europe and the then Soviet Union and then more generally in a variety of totalitarian and dictatorial regimes.[1] The concept was then employed to explain the relative stability of particular liberal, pluralist democracies and the relative success of specific societies in making the transition from totalitarian regimes as well as in studies of the governability of complex societies in general.[2] The concept has been employed in the search for conflict resolution and more recently in the effort to build regimes favourable to a world of liberal capitalism.[3] Related to this has been

---

[1]   Jan Kubik, 'Between the State and the Networks of "Cousins": The role of civil society and non-civil associations in the Democratization of Poland', in Nancy Bermeo and Philip Nord, eds., *Civil Society Before Democracy. Lessons from Nineteenth-Century Europe* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000), pp. 181–208; Krishan Kumar, 'Civil Society: an inquiry into the usefulness of an historical term', *British Journal of Sociology*, 44 (Sept 1993), pp. 335–95; Beverly Crawford and Arend Lijphart, 'Old Legacies, new institutions, hegemonic norms and Institutional Pressures: explaining political and economic change in post Communist Eastern Europe', *Comparative Political Studies*, 28 (1995), pp. 171–99 discusses this in terms of the 'imperatives of liberalization'.

[2]   John A. Hall, 'After the fall: an analysis of post communism', *British Journal of Sociology*, 45 (Dec. 1994), pp. 525–42; Jorda Borja, 'The city, democracy and governability: the case of Barcelona', *International Social Science Journal*, 147 (March 1996), pp. 85–93; Aprodicio A. Laquian, 'The Multi-ethnic and multicultural city: an Asian perspective', *International Social Science Journal*, 147 (March 1996), pp. 43–54.

[3]   Trenholme Junghans, 'Marketing Selves. Constructing civil society and selfhood in post socialist Hungary', *Critique of Anthropology*, 21 (2001), pp. 383–400.

the interest in applying the concept and its related theories to certain aspects of the creation of a global society.[4] Alongside these strands, the notion of civil society has been used as a means of addressing the perceived deficit in something loosely called 'community' in western and North American society.[5]

Historical approaches have tended to focus on the intellectual genealogy of the concept. The earliest formulations saw civil society in opposition to the state of nature or primitive society, notably in Adam Ferguson's *An Essay on the History of Civil Society* (1767). Civil Society was characterized by commerce, property, justice, the rule of law, transparency of government and the accumulation of knowledge in arts, science and morals.[6] Ferguson's civil society was embedded in a theory of progress but above all in the republican tradition of participation and an anxiety that this was being lost. Ferguson did not talk about voluntary associations but regarded the public assembly of citizens as crucial to the well being of any society. There was no mention of opposition to the state but this active citizen participation he regarded as essential to preserve 'the liberties they enjoy' against tyranny and usurpation. He contrasted equality with subordination. He saw love of society, friendship and public affection as the basis of social discipline: 'the very contagion of society itself, an esteem for what is honourable and praiseworthy'.[7] Ferguson would not have seen nationalism as antagonistic to civil society, indeed he saw war and national rivalry as an object of civil society and had a liking for small nations and communities.[8] Both Hegel and Marx separated civil society from the state. For Hegel civil society was the location of economic relationships and institutions, corporations and social relationships of all kinds. Civil society played an almost mystical part in the making of the identity and ethical life of an individual. It was where the individual became socially conscious. Civil society was separate from the state and indeed mediated between family and the state. 'The pursuit of private ends here turns out to be conditioned by universal laws'.[9] Like Marx, Hegel used the term *bürgerliche*

---

4   Roger A. Coate, Chadwick F. Alger and Ronnie D. Lipschutz, 'The United Nations and civil society: creative partnerships for sustainable development', *Alternatives*, 21 (1996), pp. 93–122; Mary Kaldor, *Global Society. An Answer to War* (Cambridge: Polity Press 2003).

5   Robert D. Putnam, 'Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital', *Journal of Democracy*, 6.1 (1995), pp. 65–78; Barry Knight and Peter Stokes, *The Deficit in Civil Society in the United Kingdom* (Birmingham: Foundation for Civil Society, Working Paper no 1, 1996), Barry Knight and Peter Stokes, *Organizing a Civil Society* (Birmingham: Foundation for Civil Society, Working Paper no 2, 1997); Stein Ringen, 'Wealth and Decay. The Norwegian Study of Democracy', *Times Literary Supplement*, 13 February 2004, pp. 3–5 and www.sv.uio.no/english/index.html.

6   Adam Ferguson, *An Essay on the History of Civil Society*, ed. by Fania Oz-Salzberger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

7   Ferguson, *Essay*, pp. 93 and 156.

8   Ferguson, *Essay*, pp. 28 and 116.

9   T.M. Knox, *Hegel's Philosophy of Right*. Translation with notes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1942), pp. 122 and 353. On transparency, see p. 166.

Gesellschaft for civil society thus allowing meaning to slide between that of citizen and that of bourgeoisie.

Marx had no doubt that civil society was the location of bourgeois power. Civil society was dominated by the institutions of the market and related class organizations. The state for Marx was not a fulfillment of universal rationality but simply an agent of the dominant class whose interests were defended by the organized violence of the state.[10] The Italian Marxist Gramsci identified civil society as the arena in which consent or the hegemony of the dominant class was generated. This was distinct from political society in which the dominant classes deployed the coercive and juridical power of the state. In some ways, the two were interdependent; the one on the other, especially when seen in terms of the dominant class, but civil society was the location of the activities of the 'subaltern classes' and hence played a crucial role as Gramsci pondered revolutionary strategy. In Gramsci's writing civil society begins to emerge in opposition to the state. Given the primacy of hegemony in Gramsci's thinking and given the identity of civil society with ideological relationships, civil society became a key place for the reduction and withering away of the state. Human freedom and welfare begins to be identified with an expansion of civil society and the limitation of the state.[11] This preceded the recent development of civil society rhetoric, discourse and meaning in the last 30 years which has enabled the concept to reach an almost iconic status.

This broad and changing meaning has led some to doubt the value of the concept, at least for analytical purposes.[12] Ernest Gellner, and those who have developed his ideas, provides a simple and direct route from this difficulty. Their definition locates civil society in the social space between the tyranny of cousins and the tyranny of kings. In other words, civil society exists between the prescription imposed by the state and the prescription imposed by the ritual and custom of tightly organized kin or quasi kin networks.[13] Locating civil society in this way is important because it counters the late twentieth century emphasis on civil society as an area of potential social action in some way opposed to the state. The attention paid to the 'tyranny' of kin and quasi kin directed attention to the important limitations placed upon choice and self direction by 'domestic' values within a family context and by the quasi kin networks of patronage.[14] Civil society is and was much more than a negative form of liberty. If non prescriptive social actions were to produce the conditions

---

10   Mark Neocleous, 'From civil society to the social', *British Journal of Sociology*, 46 (Sept. 1995), pp. 395–408.

11   Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from Prison Notebooks*, ed. and trans. by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1971), esp. pp. 12, 52, 160, 206 and 263.

12   Kumar, 'Civil Society', pp. 375–95.

13   E. Gellner, *Conditions of Liberty. Civil Society and its Rivals* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1994), p. 7.

14   L. Davidoff and C. Hall, *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780–1950* (London: Hutchinson, 1987); L. Roniger and A. Günes-Ayta, eds., *Democracy, Clientelism and Civil Society* (London: Boulder, Colo: L. Rienner, 1994).

for individuals to make self-directed choices and for the toleration of a plurality of values and practices, then the social actions needed to be organized. Essays by John Hall and others suggest a minimum 'tariff' for the existence of civil society. This includes a limited state, the rule of law and a market economy linked to private property, which gives rise to associations based upon 'interests' rather than on ethnic or religious identity. Usually, these associations have limited and stated objectives and hence limited and defined claims upon their members. Such associations will be universal rather than particularist in their scope. In addition, civil society will include a sphere of open and informed public debate and an array of voluntary associations.[15] This basis of definition is especially valuable for an analysis which is focused on the long nineteenth century with an emphasis on the rule-based association and on the autonomy of the self-directed individual. Such a definition is suited to the centrality of liberalism and pluralism and the contested nature of religion and nationality in the long history of civil society in European and North American traditions.

Another type of tension arises from the manner in which the concept of civil society operates at several levels in current discourse. Current debate has a major descriptive function. The task of defining and mapping the nature, extent and context of civil society in all its forms is a massive and continuing one. The essays in this volume are a small part of that task. At a normative level 'civil society' is clearly a good thing. The claim to be part of civil society is a claim for valuable political and cultural capital.[16] At the same time this claim can be contested as 'civil society' tends to be appropriated by specific and dominant value systems, notably that of United States capitalism.[17] Lastly civil society as a concept has a major analytical function reviewed in this introduction. Debates scarcely conceal the normative contests in terms of the relationship of civil society to pluralism, nationalism, religion and stable democracy and in terms of the historical conditions likely to produce the benefits of a civil society. Civil society is an intensely political concept. The historical perspective offered here has a number of values. It adds empirical and analytical depth to an analysis of the long term conditions which produce civil society as well as to an analysis of the effects of civil society on social and political development. The historical perspective provides depth in terms of the strengths and limitations of civil society, especially its bounded nature, and the inter-action with other social forces.

Despite its continuing importance little attempt has been made to create any consistent historical analysis or narrative. Robert Putnam's analysis of recent Italian regional politics plays a central part in current debates. Embedded within it is a very simple historical narrative. He derives the relative success of strong, responsive and

---

15   J. Hall, ed., *Civil Society. Theory, History, Comparison* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995).

16   Molly Doane, 'A Distant Jaguar. The Civil Society Project in Chimalapas', *Critique of Anthropology*, 21 (2001), pp. 361–82.

17   Junghans, 'Marketing Selves', pp. 383–400.

effective government in the northern regions of Italy from the nature of medieval governance. Northern Italy was dominated by communal city republics. Citizens co-operated through town councils, guilds and fraternities.[18] By the early nineteenth century these had declined in importance and been replaced by 'popular sociability', Masonic lodges, drinking clubs, choral societies as well as mutual aid societies.[19] With increased urbanization, these were joined by new civic, charitable and educational associations. This historical momentum was based upon 'a pragmatic willingness to co-operate' which in turn came from the experience of social interaction and organizing skills, or 'social capital' built up over many generations. This was quite different from the history of powerful monarchy in Southern Italy which produced a culture of client politics and mistrust over such matters as public works, contracts and the choice of officials. Thus a clear narrative emerged deriving civil society from the nature of medieval government.

Much of this story was developed from Tocqueville's account of *Democracy in America* written in the shadow of the French Revolution and subsequent upheavals in social and constitutional arrangements. Tocqueville's work is often quoted but his analysis was by no means as uncomplicated as it is some-times presented. Tocqueville was clear that 'private associations' were essential for sustaining 'the morals and intelligence of a democratic people … Feelings and ideas are renewed, the heart enlarged, and understanding developed only by the reciprocal action of men one upon another'.[20] He also laid great emphasis on the importance of what he called 'political associations', – permanent associations such as townships, cities and counties created by law.[21] 'Politics' he claimed, 'spreads the general habit and taste for association', 'where political associations are forbidden, civil associations are rare'.[22] He also placed significant importance on the newspaper press, 'Only a newspaper can put the same thought at the same time before a thousand readers. Newspapers make associations and associations make newspapers'.[23] There was a sting in the tail of Tocqueville's analysis. The dangers of 'the tyranny of the majority' were given prominence, but he also devoted a long section to the dangers to the new society of the USA arising from the exclusion of the Black and native Indian populations from 'enlightenment, power and happiness'.[24]

---

18   Robert D. Putnam, *Making Democracy Work. Civic Traditions in Modern Italy* (Princeton, N.J.; Chichester: Princeton University Press, 1993), p. 121.

19   Putnam, *Making Democracy Work*, p. 137.

20   Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, ed. J.P. Mayer, trans. George Mayer (London: Fontana Press 1969), p. 515. This translation was based upon the 1848 edition of the original. First published 1835 and translated into English 1838.

21   Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, p. 189.

22   Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, pp. 520–22.

23   Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, pp. 517–18.

24   Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, pp. 316–407.

In 1961, Jürgen Habermas produced an account of the 'public sphere', a concept closely related to, but not identical with civil society.[25] None the less, his account provides a clear narrative for the history of civil society. The public sphere was an area of social action in which private individuals could debate public issues and thus create a public opinion. The public sphere originated in late seventeenth- and eighteenth-century England. The characteristic location was the salon and the coffee house. The development of such a public sphere depended upon the existence of the territorial modern nation state with legal and bureaucratic structures which depersonalized government. Above all, the public sphere depended upon print media through which ideas could be shared across social and spatial boundaries. Habermas gave especial importance to the writing, publication and reading of novels, private actions which were shared with the novel reading public. The public sphere depended upon a sense of self as an autonomous individual. It also depended upon a sense of legitimate opinion forming as a 'rational' activity. Initially the public sphere was a matter of elite and middle class males communicating, but it can be seen as expanding through associational culture, public meetings and wider social inclusion. However by the mid nineteenth and early twentieth century, the public sphere was in decline. The active debates of 'communicative rationality' were being replaced by the passive consumption of the commercial culture of a mass society, by groups pressing sectional interests rather than seeking to take part in debate and by the welfare state. Richard Sennett saw the same sort of decline as the public man of the coffee house was replaced by the silent and disciplined spectator of the mid nineteenth-century theatre and concert hall.[26] Both provided 'ideal types' and had little place for the distractions of nationalism, religion and gender. Their work left a need to explore the boundaries of 'public' and recognize the threats to the civility and rationality that was central to the idealized world typified by the coffee house.

Thus two very different stories have been provided. For Putnam, a stable civil society able to sustain an effective democracy in a Tocquevillian manner, has deep historical roots and has been carried forward by the accumulation of 'social capital' and trust. The implication here is that societies and cultures with a medieval cultural heritage of urban corporations, guilds and fraternities are able to produce such a civil society, and those with a past based on strong monarchical and other forms of authoritarian rule will not be able to achieve such a desirable social and political end. In other words, this privileges certain parts of Europe and North America and cultures derived from those societies. Habermas presents a periodization of creation, development and decline related to trade, the nation state and above all to the

---

25   Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. by Thomas Burger (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989), first published in German in 1962. The analysis in this paper relies upon Craig Calhoun, ed., *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge, Mass: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1994), especially the introduction by Calhoun.

26   Richard Sennett, *The Fall of Public Man* (New York and Cambridge: Knopf and Cambridge University Press, 1977), pp. 80–82, 205–12.

conditions, technologies and normative regimes of communication. This leaves a more open situation for societies to create their own civil society. Ironically in later work Putnam also sees 'decline' in civil society although he locates this later in the twentieth century.[27]

Ernest Gellner's discussion of civil society is part polemic and part analysis. His narrative shared some features with both Putnam and Habermas, but his account of the most recent phase in the history of civil society was very different. Civil society had its origins in Atlantic society. The stimulus came from enlightenment thinking, notably the decline of superstition, from economic development especially the growth of the market, and from the spread of writing and the unitary state, especially in those dynastic monarchies which granted property rights.[28] Gellner saw the most recent phase of civil society in a very distinctive way. In the late twentieth and early twenty-first century, civil society was a dynamic, assertive and expanding social and political form, playing a key part in the defeat of a variety of Marxist-Leninist and authoritarian regimes. He also saw civil society as an asset which needed defending against both particularist nationalism and the Muslim 'south' with its client politics and rule-based 'fundamentalist' versions of Islam.[29] There was no hint of decline in his account of civil society. He felt that the historical record demonstrated the long term military advantage of 'free' societies over internally coercive ones.[30] Gellner backed his account of civil society with a complex geography which divided Europe into the Atlantic dynastic monarchies in which the nation states and high cultures coincided, the former Holy Roman Empire with developed high cultures, especially German and Italian, but with no corresponding political units, eastern Europe with no high cultures and the Czarist/Soviet Empire to the east. In the complex and differentiated ebb and flow of civil society within these areas, it was the final collapse of the Soviet Empire which released the hunger for civil society and accelerated the recent assertive expansionist phase. This was supported by a longer term convergence of ethnic feeling amongst advanced industrial nations which made direct conflict less likely.[31]

Bermeo and Nord sought to create their narrative from the critical engagement of historians and political scientists. The interrogation of the link between associational culture and stable democracy led to a focus on nineteenth-century Europe, the period of the 'effervescence of civic activism'. Within the enormous variety of experience, Nord identified three moments.[32] The first came in the 1820s after the Congress of Vienna. The associational world was dominated by the social and cultural activities of the clubs and circles of the elite and *bourgeois* male. Running alongside these

---

27   Robert D. Putnam, *Bowling Alone. The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000).

28   Gellner, *Conditions of Liberty*, pp. 48 and 197.

29   Gellner, *Conditions of Liberty*, pp. 13–29.

30   Gellner, *Conditions of Liberty*, p. 33.

31   Gellner, *Conditions of Liberty*, p. 119.

32   Bermeo and Nord, eds., *Civil Society before Democracy*, especially the introduction by Philip Nord.

were the neighbourhood networks of the lower classes and semi secret societies like the Freemasons. Britain was out of line with an early development of the 'subscriber democracies'. The revolutions of 1848 were followed by a period of repression, but this was countered in the 1860s and 1870s by the explosive rise of subscriber democracies across Europe, open, liberal and directed at values of science and progress. The years around 1900 saw further expansion of a qualitatively different kind. Associational culture spread into the countryside, but also became less integrated. There was a tendency to pillarization as Catholics, Calvinists, socialists as well as the liberals created contending networks of associations.

This survey has already made evident the variety of historical experience and the importance of the careful 'mapping' of this experience across time and space. It is to this process that the following essays contribute. The chronology and typology of associational development needs to be identified as well as those features of culture and practice which might form the basis of further analysis and research into the context and impact of associational culture.

British experience was distinctive in several ways. Chronology was in advance of what was found in Europe. A culture of clubs and lodges emerged in the late seventeenth century and grew rapidly during the eighteenth century.[33] Equally distinctive was the early emergence of the 'subscriber democracy', a form of association characterized by openness and transparency.[34] By the 1820s, it was clear that the increasing density not only played a part in class formation, especially for the middle classes, but also in class relationships. As Marx asserted, civil society may have been a location of *bourgeois* power, but as Gramsci hints the culture and institutions of civil society could also be appropriated by 'subordinate' classes. The temperance movement was characteristic of many British associations. It was urban based, central to class relationships and contested between middle class and lower class cultures. Temperance was also part of an Atlantic culture in which associational initiatives and practices crossed and re-crossed national boundaries.[35] In the first half of the nineteenth century, New York demonstrated many features in common with provincial British towns. There was a massive density of associations with important cross membership. They sought and gained inclusive membership across the middle classes and through them the middle classes formed and captured a 'public sphere'.[36] As with British towns, the elite used associations to fashion their relationship with the poor, the working and lower middle classes as well as to create an exclusive preserve for themselves. Although this was certainly not a global civil society, it is worth pointing to an Anglophone culture of associations which was spread by language,

---

33   Peter Clark, *British Clubs and Societies, 1580–1800. The Origins of an Associational World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

34   See Morris's chapter in this volume; R.J. Morris, *Class, Sect and Party. The Making of the British Middle Class: Leeds, 1820–50* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1990).

35   See Maver's chapter in this volume.

36   See Beckert's chapter in this volume.

empire and trade. Anti Slavery Societies, Literary and Philosophical Societies, Mechanics Institutes, and the many associations of both the evangelicals and the women's movement, all exchanged ideas, practice and people as well as creating an 'opinion' which transcended state boundaries. The New York study identified a change in the later part of the century. Although associational density increased, the structure was more segregated and sectionalized. The elite club, employers' organizations and the Chamber of Commerce were the characteristic forms. There was an element of a Habermas type decline in the 'public sphere'.

French experience was dominated by the supervision of the state. Article 291 of the Napoleonic code required the authorization of government for any association of more than 20 people and the resulting law lasted until 1901.[37] The experience of the political clubs of the revolutionary period left a deep suspicion of voluntary associations amongst French governing classes. The resulting supervision did not lead to the suppression of voluntary association, indeed the French state – through its local and regional officials – realized, as did many states, that the formation of associations was one way of ensuring a governable society. The outcome of this supervision was an associational structure that tended to be local and specific. Dominant were the *cercles* and casino of the male elite.[38] Activities were dominated by elite leisure and community. It seems to have been difficult to generate the networks of associations designed to guide class relationships. It proved easier to exclude and set boundaries. Significant was the application for recognition of a female society in Colmar. They were not suppressed, simply ignored.[39]

The experience of the German lands must play a central part in any analysis of the creation and influence of voluntary associations. German associational culture was as dense, vibrant and dynamic as any and yet the outcome was certainly not the stable pluralist democracy anticipated by Tocquevillian theory.[40] Indeed, the importance of associational culture in German life played a part in the disasters of the later *Kaiserreich* and of the Third Reich.[41] The experience of Hallein in Austria traced a familiar path. The associations of mid century followed the liberal enlightenment ideology of the self directed individual. By 1900, the older as well as new associations had become particularist and nationalistic. The exclusion of Jews and the limitation of membership by at least one association to 'German men of sterling character', were key moments.[42] This followed very much the same path traced in the Rhineland university and service town of Marburg. Early associations were part

37   Carol E. Harrison, *The Bourgeois Citizen in Nineteenth-century France. Gender, Sociability and the Uses of Emulation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 27.

38   Harrison, *The Bourgeois Citizen*, pp. 87–122.

39   See Harrison's chapter in this volume.

40   Frank Trentmann, ed., *Paradoxes of Civil Society. New Perspectives on Modern German and British History* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2000), especially the introduction by Trentmann.

41   Sheri Berman, 'Civil Society and the Collapse of the Weimar Republic', *World Politics*, 49 (1997), pp. 401–29.

42   See Hiebl's chapter in this volume.

of the formation of an active *Bürgertum* concerned with education, science, arts and public usefulness. By 1900, Marburg had a number of contending networks and was noted for its 'patriotic societies'. Professors and public officials provided leadership and members.[43] Explaining this in terms of the weakness of German liberalism is in many ways to re-state the question.[44] A comparison of Hamburg and Manchester has shown that the German city produced an inward looking associational culture based on a strong corporate tradition and did not have the open, partisan discourse of Manchester.[45] Hamburg's pride in its own autonomy of organization questions the neo Tocquevillian identity of stable effective democracy with a corporate past. German experience was dominated by the complex history of the state in Germany and by the origin of many aspects of German associational culture in the brief Napoleonic period. Many of the gymnastic clubs, bands and shooting societies originated under French rule as a basis for sustaining German identity and the hope of independence. The mid nineteenth century saw the suppression of many associations followed by revival. This in turn was followed by the uneven and partially effective direction of associational culture from an authoritarian, militaristic and expansionist state with few mediating representative institutions. The *Bürgertum* had little autonomy to defend itself and multiple bases for fragmentation. Thus attention needs to be given to the nature of the German state created in the second half of the nineteenth century, as well as to the detail and origin of the practices of German associations.

Two chapters explore the impact of nationalism within two cities of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. In the early nineteenth century, Bratislava had a weak and sporadic associational culture and lacked the focus of a powerful bourgeoisie. By the 1880s, the casino defined urban cultural leadership, but any sense of a multi ethnic multi lingual discourse was challenged by the growth of Magyar associations. The result was the creation of several 'middle classes', Magyar, German, Slovak, Jewish, Evangelical and Catholic.[46] In Trieste, associational development followed the same path of defining national and linguistic identity despite the presence of both internationalist and liberal democratic rhetorics.[47] Language was especially powerful as an agent of division and exclusion.

---

[43]   Rudy Koshar, *Social Life, local politics and Nazism. Marburg 1880–1935* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986).

[44]   Jonathan Sperber, 'Bürger, Bürgertum, Bürgerlichkeit, Bürgerliche Gesellschaft: Studies of the German (Upper) Middle Class and its Socio-Cultural World', *Journal of Modern History*, 69 (June 1997), pp. 271–97; David Blackbourne and Geoff Eley, *The Peculiarities of German History. Bourgeois Society and Politics in nineteenth-century German History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984), esp. pp. 118, 190–201 and 261.

[45]   John Breuilly, 'Civil Society and the public sphere in Hamburg, Lyon and Manchester, 1815–1850', in H. Koopman and M. Lauster, eds., *Vormärzliteratur in europäischer Perspektive I. Öffentlichkeit und nationale Identität* (Bielefeld: Aisthesis, 1996), pp. 15–39; John Breuilly, 'Middle class politics and its representations', in Koopman and Lauster, eds., *Vormärzliteratur*, pp. 143–66.

[46]   See Mannová's chapter in this volume.

[47]   See Rutar's chapter in this volume.