

By avoiding quantification, Lidtke leaves open the possibility that this so-called alternative culture was not really a popular culture. And his effort never does answer the nagging question of whether these clubs basically produced the recreation that these workers so badly needed or whether they were indeed institutions through which some kind of socialist indoctrination osmotically took place. Lidtke tries hard enough to milk this latter interpretation from the material, but it will not convince all of those who read this truly pioneering and continually fascinating study.

Vincent J. KNAPP  
State University of New York, Potsdam

\* \* \*

CLAIRE GOLDBERG MOSES — *French Feminism in the Nineteenth Century*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984. pp. xiii, 311.

The history of French feminism is finally being written, or rather rewritten, with the methods of the new social history and the insights of the recent resurgence of feminism. Until the publication of Claire Goldberg Moses' study of the nineteenth century (and primarily the 1830s through the 1880s), the brief flourishing of feminist activity during the Great Revolution and the emergence of liberal and especially suffrage feminism under the Third Republic had attracted the most attention, and left the paradoxical impression of a tremendous gap in time yet a fundamental similarity of outlook, i.e., equal rights. To study the intervening decades, historians had to understand the political and social context of four quite different regimes and to analyze utopian, socialist, maternal and liberal feminism, which was discontinuous due to feminists' connections to the Left, recurring repression by governments expecting disorder from the Left and its allies, and contradictory traditions. Moses explains the weakness of the movement in the nineteenth century in comparison with Anglo-Saxon feminism, with which she is familiar, as a function of the periodic silencing of the press and restriction of the right to assemble, so that succeeding phases of publicity and organization began with new leaders and new goals. She also refers to the lack of meeting places for women in France, the absence of charitable associations under the control of women, and the greater isolation of girls and women, in contrast to England and America. Although Moses does not stress Saint-Simonians as a thread of continuity through the flux, because she emphasizes the shift from Saint-Simonian dualism to liberal egalitarianism, she shows how Saint-Simonians served feminists first as colleagues in the "missions" of the late 1820s and early 1830s, and later as influential individuals supporting feminist ventures through the 1860s and 1870s. Perhaps more research on the families and support networks of feminists would reveal more concrete assistance from Saint-Simonians or Fourierists.

The most unusual and useful sections of *French Feminism in the Nineteenth Century* deal sympathetically and critically with the Saint-Simonians who formed the first autonomous women's movement in the mid-1830s and those who resurfaced in the Revolution of 1848. Anyone who has had trouble understanding Utopian Socialist mysticism about the couple and the woman will appreciate Moses' account. If her explanation for the blending of religious and socialist discourse is not as persuasive as Barbara Taylor's in *Eve and the New Jerusalem*, which appeared too recently to affect her analysis, Moses provides a more compelling interpretation of Saint-Simonian feminists' rupture with Enfantin and his new sexual morality than Taylor in her thesis about the Owenite feminists' move away from free love. Moses explains the break with Enfantin by the theoretical critique of the double standard of sexuality, notably the practical problem of determining which men were "constant" and which "mobile", the different lower-class perspective of the women, and the hostility they encountered in response to their demands for recognition. The subsequent abandonment of their radical position on sexuality is linked to their social isolation, their changing personal situations and their deteriorating economic condition. In addition to humiliation, even by Saint-Simonian women,

these young, single, self-supporting and independent women of the 1830s assumed sole responsibility for the children of their often unstable “free” unions in the late 1830s and found fewer work opportunities in the recessions of the 1840s. The sense of empathy for the plight of these women brings the subjects of this section vividly to life for the reader. When some of these women spoke and organized again in the Revolution of 1848, they elaborated the “passionless” maternal justification for political rights because they feared the public would associate feminism with “immorality”, because they were mothers, because they no longer believed in “self-sufficiency” in the present economy and because they realized the need for political action to change women’s condition. Like their predecessors, the feminists of 1848 become concrete and complex heroes rather than shadowy supporting characters in the historical drama.

To accommodate the sensual, dualist and utopian feminism of the 1830s, the passionless, maternalistic and political feminism of 1848, and the moderate, individualistic, and egalitarian feminism of the 1860s and 1870s, Moses employs a broad definition of feminism as an ideology “based on the recognition that women constitute a group that is wrongfully oppressed by male-defined values and male-controlled institutions of social, political, cultural, and familial power” (p. 7). As all-encompassing as the definition appears, it excludes any mention of Catholic feminism and limits references to late nineteenth-century socialist feminism. While these omissions may well be justified by the term “male-controlled institutions”, some discussion of the grounds for omission would have relieved the reader’s doubts about the identification of feminism with the Left but only until the end of the century. To account for the trend to moderation, Moses cites the repeated lessons in the need for a liberal political system and the shift from upper working-class and lower middle-class leaders in the 1830s to the privileged leaders of the Third Republic. The political thesis seems irrefutable; the social hypothesis, though promising, needs further thinking and research. Specifically, it is not clear that the seamstresses who allegedly funded *La Tribune des Femmes* were upper working-class, nor has Moses considered who the followers were, then or later. This kind of social analysis will be difficult, but it is the next step in a process begun in the 1970s and significantly advanced by *French Feminism in the Nineteenth Century*.

M.L. STEWART McDOUGALL  
Simon Fraser University

\* \* \*

JOHN A. MOSES — *Trade Unionism in Germany from Bismarck to Hitler, 1869-1933*. 2 Vols. Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes and Noble, 1982. pp. xi, 560.

This two-volume study of the German trade unions to the time when Hitler dissolved them is basically yet another attempt to explain what motivated Europe’s best organized and historically most powerful labor movement. Nearly every writer on this subject, from Heinz Josef Varain to Gerhard Ritter to Jürgen Kocha, has agreed on the facts surrounding the early history of German trade unionism and on the increasingly sophisticated efforts of these unions to form a centralized labor organization. Where these authors part company, sometimes subtly and sometimes dramatically, is over the question of just what drove Germany’s trade union leaders and their followers on against conspicuous governmental opposition.

Moses jumps right into this argument, one that has lasted, on occasion wearily, since 1956. Varain began the whole debate in that year in his book, *Die deutschen Gewerkschaften, Sozialdemokratie und Staat, 1890-1920*, by arguing, with significant factual evidence, that the trade unions were consciously pragmatic from the start and were never primarily interested in radically restructuring either the existing German state or German society. By contrast, Moses, repeatedly stressing the idea