



# ISHA NEWSLETTER

International Social History Association

## CONTENTS

1. **Holberg International Memorial Prize 2011 >>>**
2. **The world historical significance of Asian social history – Interview with Sanjoy Bhattacharya >>>**
3. **Conference report >>>**
4. **Obituary – Klaus Tenfelde (1944–2011) >>>**
5. **News / Announcements >>>**

---

### Holberg International Memorial Prize 2011



Jürgen Kocka, founding member of the ISHA, was awarded the prestigious Holberg International Memorial Prize this year. By way of celebrating this event, the ISHA Newsletter gladly features the speech by Professor Kocka held at the award ceremony on 8 June 2011.

*Jürgen Kocka was born in 1941 and received his M. A. in Political Science from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill (1965), his doctoral degree from the Free University of Berlin (1968) and his Habilitation in Modern History from the University of Münster (1973). From 1973 to 2009 he taught history at the University of Bielefeld and the Free University of Berlin. Between 1983 and 1988 he was Director at the Zentrum für interdisziplinäre Forschung, Bielefeld (Centre for Interdisciplinary Research), He was then appointed Permanent Fellow at the Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin (Institute for Advanced Study (1991-2000)); followed by a position as President of the Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin (Social Science Research Centre Berlin, from 2001-2007). In the 1990s he co-founded the Zentrum für Vergleichende Geschichte Europas (Centre for Comparative History of Europe) and later served as co-Director of this institution (which was jointly supported by the Free University and Humboldt University Berlin). From 2000 to 2005 he served as President of the International Committee of Historical Sciences (ICSH) and as vice president of the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences from 2008 to 2010.*

*Jürgen Kocka is presently Senior Advisor of the International Research Centre “Work and Human Life Course in Global History” at the Humboldt University Berlin and Senior Fellow of the Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung Potsdam (Centre for Contemporary History). He teaches regularly at UCLA As a Visiting Professor.*

*He has received Honorary Degrees from the Erasmus University Rotterdam, the University of Uppsala, the Russian Academy of Sciences Moscow, the European University Institute Florence and the Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow. He was also awarded the Leibniz Preis of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft and the Historians’ Prize of the City of Bochum. Professor Kocka is a member of the Academia Europaea, the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Sciences, the German Academy of Sciences*

*Leopoldina, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the Torino Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Sciences, Republic of Korea.*

## I.

Your Royal Highness Crown Prince, Minister, Your Excellency, representatives of the Ludvig Holberg Fund, members of the Holberg Prize Academic Committee, dear colleagues, friends and guests,

I am deeply impressed and extremely delighted, I feel distinguished and honored by the prize I am receiving today, the Holberg International Memorial Prize. I want to express my gratitude to the Ludvig Holberg Memorial Fund, the members of its Board and its Academic Committee. I am grateful to the University of Bergen which I do not visit for the first time. I am grateful to the Norwegian Parliament for having established this unique and generous prize which I see as a sign of respect and recognition for what in German is called *Kulturwissenschaften* including the humanities, the social sciences, law and theology.

I am proud to join a distinguished group of previous laureates whose names lend additional weight to this prize, eminent scholars, among them the philosopher Jürgen Habermas who has influenced my way of thinking since I was a student, the sociologist Shmuel Eisenstadt from whom I have learned so much in many interesting meetings and delightful conversations before he died last year, and Natalie Davis, fellow historian and close colleague whom I admire and envy for her capability to pursue history not only as a scholarly discipline but also as an art. Clearly, it is an excellent company one is allowed to join if awarded the Holberg Prize. I enjoy very much to be honoured together with Jörn Jacobsen who has been awarded this year's Nils Klim Prize for his research in criminal law and legal theory.

## II.

I was invited to speak about my current work which is on the history of capitalism. Over the last decades, most non-Marxist economic historians, economists and social scientists have avoided the term as too vague or polemic. But recently the semantic situation has started to change. This has to do with the decline of Marxism, the end of the Cold War, and perhaps with the recent financial crisis. We can observe a come-back of the term, at least in English and German.

Why does it make sense for a historian to reflect upon capitalism? One reason: the concept helps to overcome narrow specialization. It brings economic, social, cultural and legal-political factors together. If one writes about capitalism, one certainly writes about property rights and decentralized economic decision making by entrepreneurs and firms, about money, markets and commodification about investment, profit and risk, about credit and speculation innovation, innovation and growth. But one also discusses how religious beliefs have facilitated or hindered the rise of capitalism. One cannot avoid talking about social classes and social inequality, about the relations between markets and states as well as about the tension between private success and public responsibility or irresponsibility.

Another advantage of the term "capitalism": it allows (and demands) cooperation between historians and the practitioners of neighbouring disciplines. The most influential ideas for the study of capitalism have been offered by historically oriented social scientists in the tradition of Marx, Max Weber or Schumpeter – to mention just three, but I could add many others like Tawney, Braudel and Albert O. Hirschman. Clearly this is a field of rich interdisciplinary opportunities. Historians can profit a lot, and they can offer a lot when cooperating with historically interested social scientists from other disciplines. I wished there were more of this cooperation.

A third advantage of the term "capitalism": it invites us to investigate change over long periods of time, at least from the medieval period to the present time. It also enables us to adopt a global historical view. Usually capitalism is seen as a phenomenon which originated in Europe and flourished in the West before it spread out into other parts of the world, mostly in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and climaxing in present-day globalization. But is this correct? Were there not elements of capitalism – long-distance trade, merchants, investments, wage-work – in Tokugawa Japan, in Mogul India or in the Chinese Empire under the Quing dynasty (without using the word)? And what shall we make out of the recent experience of dynamic capitalism in places like Singapore, Vietnam and China? Apparently capitalism can flourish under very different legal-political roofs, under democratic, authoritarian and even dictatorial conditions. What, then, is the relation between capitalism and freedom?

"Capitalism and crisis" is a central historical topic with much relevance for today. The economic historian

Charles Kindleberger began his survey of deep economic crises with the highly speculative South Sea Bubble of 1720 in which Isaac Newton lost a gigantic fortune. Newton commented that he could calculate the motions of the heavenly bodies, but not the madness of people. For the period between 1810 and 1987, Kindleberger listed 20 such crises. He observed a regular pattern of manias, panics, crashes and painful recovery.

Recently I compared three of these crises – those of 1873, 1929 and 2008. While these crises show some similarities, they also differ in basic respects. While the similarities of the Great Depression of 1929 and the Great Recession of 2008 have been much stressed, the difference between them were huge, among them the powerful rise of finance market capitalism in recent decades, the nowadays broad acceptance of debt and indebtedness in the private and in the public spheres, a now much more active role of the governments – which this time have taken over and, in a way, shouldered the crisis of the markets, or at least tried to do so (with consequences not yet clear). Times are different and changing, and this limits the possibility of directly learning from history.

Each time, the economic, social, and partly even the political consequences, were devastating, the human costs high and unequally distributed. At the same time, the crises triggered, after some years, productive responses. In the 1880s there was a move towards a more organized type of capitalism. New forms of cooperation were invented, between large industrial enterprises as well as between them and large banks; associations were organized, and there were other steps towards market coordination, supported by increasing government regulation and the start of the rise of a welfare state. - And in the 1930s the Depression led not only to fascism and war, but also to Roosevelt's New Deal which, in a way, reformed American capitalism; and to John Maynard Keynes who developed his "General Theory" and his far reaching policy recommendations on the background of the Depression – a basis of economic policies in many countries for decades to come (though not repeatable for ever). In other words, crises caused breakdowns, sacrifices and losses, but they also served as dynamic factors, as engines which helped to change and reform capitalism. Whether the recent crisis will lead to such productive results remains to be seen, but it can be doubted.

Why? One of the reasons is the current weakness of *Kapitalismuskritik*. If we look more closely into the years after 1873 and 1929, we see that in both cases it was not the capitalist economy *per se* which led to those structural reforms, and not mainly the capitalist actors themselves who carried them through. Rather it was the interplay between the capitalist crisis, massive criticism of capitalism and political actions based on social mobilization in the public sphere – an interplay which generated partial solutions to basic problems and thus led to structural reforms. History shows how changeable capitalism has been over time. It has survived and outlived its enemies since it is a system which can learn, be reformed and adjusted to different conditions. But these reconfigurations of capitalism are not mainly the work of the capitalists, but, to a large part, results of criticism, anger and pressure from the public and politics. Capitalism needs its critics. Presently criticism of capitalism is weak – quite in contrast to the 1930s.

### III.

Like other intellectuals and scholars of the Enlightenment era, Ludvig Holberg was a man of many talents, activities and professions: playwright, essayist, historian and philosopher. He was not only professor of History, but also of Rhetoric and Latin. Nowadays we are usually more specialized. – In the times of Holberg, historians still dared to immerse themselves into huge topics. They were not yet disciplined and domesticated by all the caveats and methodological rules the profession has institutionalized in the meantime. When Holberg decided to write about Jewish history, it was a "Jewish History From the Beginning of the World". Modern historians are usually more modest. – There are other differences between Holberg and modern historians.

But I would like to close by mentioning two aspects of Holberg's intellectual profile in view of which I am particularly glad to receive a price named after this important native of Bergen. On the one hand he was very much an international figure who had travelled a lot, practiced the transfer of ideas across borders, and wrote about transnational phenomena. On the other hand he dealt with history in order to learn from it for the present. In both respects Holberg is modern or, at least, he should be.

The move towards transnational and even global perspectives is perhaps the most exciting and promising trend in the historical discipline today, especially fascinating for younger historians. - As to learning from history, one has to admit that there are sceptics. No doubt, history as a discipline serves many purposes and fulfils many needs, entertainment and enjoyment among them. Still, I belong to a generation of German historians who got into the field right after the catastrophes of German history which climaxed in the 1930s

and 40s, with a devastating impact on Europe and the world. To be critical *vis à vis* this history and to learn from it in order to assist in improving the opportunities of the future, has been a central motive. Nowadays, global issues are more pressing. But I continue to be convinced that, in a modest and usually indirect way, the study of history can help to orient the present and make us more prudent for the future.

It is in these contexts, too, that I like to see the Holberg International Memorial Prize. I am very proud to receive it. Thank you again.

>>>

---

## ***The world historical significance of Asian social history***

Interview with *Sanjoy Bhattacharya*



The editors of the ISHA Newsletter wish to generate dialogue among social historians regarding the place of the discipline in historical research and stimulate discussion of social history methodology. The following interview with *Sanjoy Bhattacharya*, Reader in the History of Medicine, University of York, addresses relevant issues, such as how to identify processes that have application to past, present and future contexts of world history. It also sketches some of the broad underlying elements of social history thought and sensibility that connect this work with, and distinguish it, from other fields of history.

### **Tell us about your own historical journey!**

After studying history at St. Stephen's College (University of Delhi, India) and Jawaharlal Nehru University (New Delhi, India), I moved to the School of Oriental and African Studies in London for my doctoral studies in 1992. I joined the Department of History at Sheffield Hallam University with a Wellcome Trust-funded fellowship in 1997, then moved to the University of Oxford in February 2001, then took up a tenure track Lectureship at the Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at University College London in September 2001. I left University College London in October 2010 to take up a Readership in the History of Medicine at the University of York – I am happily based within its department of history, working on a number of interesting projects.

### **What has motivated and directed your research?**

My doctoral thesis – which was published in 2001 as my first book - dealt with propaganda and information control policies in colonial Eastern India during the Second World War. A careful study of archival holdings in the UK and India made it apparent that propaganda took many more forms than print publicity – in times of severe economic, social and political stress, governments in colonial India quickly realised that support for the war or general calm could not be mobilised through the mindless distribution of print, film and radio-based publicity. Over time, therefore, a strategy of distributing food and medical aid, alongside other forms of propaganda, was developed. However, this was a labour-intensive process, requiring the collection and analysis of vast amounts of intelligence from newspapers, informants and the secret assessment of postal correspondence. As a result, certain sections of the population had to be prioritised over others – military personnel, labour in a range of 'war industries' and urban populations were generally given greater priority than rural populations (except villages ringing major troop encampments). It was an effective policy in the short term in that it helped mobilize a successful war effort; on another plane, it was a disastrous policy causing the loss of life, the political radicalization of communities and the strengthening of aggressive nationalist politics. Seen from this perspective, official propaganda materials directed at the so-called priority groups was geared to their shifting expectations; the form and content of these publicity efforts can, therefore, provide wonderful insights into a range of social and political attitudes during a period of military crisis. In hindsight, I would have liked to have had more time to study the Bengal Famine of 1943-44, which stoked a series of important debates at the moment – for instance, we still need to assess whether the excess mortality caused by this famine was a result of starvation, epidemic disease or a combination of both. The data is available in a range of state- and district-archives, but detailed analysis will take time – this topic can, perhaps, be the focus of a new book project, not least as academics involved in the social history of medicine appear not to consider this a worthy theme of enquiry.

### **In your view, why is research on social history important?**

I am a historian of medicine. However, I always try to approach the subject from a very wide angle – the examination of social contexts in which health programmes were conceptualised, and an analysis of the wide-ranging social and political responses to the implementation of projects have been a vital component of my work. This type of social history approach is important in ensuring that our outlook is not Eurocentric or derivative. The problem arises when grand narratives relating to one region and period are simplistically imposed on a study of a completely different geographical area and time span; carefully prepared social histories can provide a vital level of contextualisation, which, in turn, affords greater richness, complexity and accuracy (all of which are good things for a historian to strive for).

### **Why is the study of social history particularly relevant to Asia?**

Simply so that people do not keep assuming that Asia must have been a less-developed version of Europe and the United States of America. Indeed, there is more than a whiff of imperialism associated to such social history approaches. The concept of hegemony, especially when it is used in thoughtlessly uniform ways, suggests that social attitudes were often imposed by governing structures on colonised civilised communities as a whole (with the odd case of civilian resistance from amongst the “so-called” subaltern communities). It is an easy argument to make especially if the historian in question is developing the argument based on sources in European languages, which are generally trying to convince everyone that the government was united and in complete control of all its levers of power. However, the development of a more complex understanding of the concept of the state allows a more intricate understanding of the interactions between governing agencies and different sections of civilian population. Using such a social history approach we immediately become aware of the co-existence of - as well the competition between - different ideas of social responsibility and social competition. A social historian who considers it worthwhile to present us with a complex mosaic of social and political attitudes at the different levels of Asian state and society can do us the most wonderful service – she/he can guide us away from a dangerous predilection to privilege one viewpoint over others and then selectively compare it with a specific sets of ideas existing elsewhere. The most detailed studies in social history reveal that there are variations in all political and geographical units – each of these contexts needs to be studied in their own right and then connected to larger histories of empires, nations, the world or the ‘globe’. Seen from this perspective, social histories can unveil severe social deprivation and inequalities in all contexts; an acknowledgement that such problems existed in Europe and that they were a crucial part of the injustices wrought by an imperial political system does not need to be seen to be downplay the ravages of colonialism in Asian colonies. Instead, it helps us bring in nuance in social history writing about Asian contexts.

### **Gathering information through research – what are your principal sources?**

I love the archives. At the same time, I am deeply suspicious about most published sources. Where possible, I try to dig up different drafts of the report to study the changes, the notes on the margins and also the raw material on which they were being based. Such an approach allows me develop a more complex perspective on attitudes within the state, many which were highly critical of different elements of policy (the silences in the final report are also very instructive). In a similar vein, I love sitting down with English translations of reports and letters written languages such as Hindi. The ideas and concepts lost in translation are wonderfully informative about what each level of the state – and the social elites that they were in uneasy partnerships with – are trying to advertise. For my work on independent India, I also rely on interviews; where possible I interrogate information collected thus with information from the archives (the disparities can be most instructive).

### **What impact does your research have on understanding universal patterns in Indian social history?**

I would hope that my work has contributed to making historians very careful about claiming that the state in colonial and independent India – or organizations such as the World Health Organization – are monolithic, run mainly by the actions and ideas of a small handful of mainly European men. I would also hope that more historians now recognize the important fact that the structures of colonial state, especially those in districts and sub-divisions, were managed on a day to day basis by Indian actors who were not necessarily adept at the use of English, Latin and horse-riding (as their peers in the Indian Civil Service would be). Although we do not often have the names of these ‘subordinate officials’, I hope my research has shown is that the history of their work and interactions with different societies is worth recounting. Of course, this not prevented some historians from whitewashing such actors in their work, which, instead, privileges the work of elite, ‘educated’ actors; but then again, some people still keep trying to hang on to the supposed glories of empire (and the community of historians is not devoid of such individuals).

**If patterns are beginning to be identified, do we need to understand them more through further research i.e. evidence-based conclusions rather than see them in isolation?**

We need a democratization of vision, both in relation to our primary and secondary research. For example, we need to recognise that history writing in the English language is not limited to certain select British Universities. Once we have achieved a more democratic assessment of available secondary materials, some outrageous claims to originality in historical analysis will disappear. Although higher education is beginning to be privatised in the UK, supervisors of doctoral thesis need to be given the space to teach students ethical research practice and ensure that no one can get away with ignoring work done previously. Access to Asian languages obviously help when someone is trying to write a social history of the region; however, an increasing willingness to write books as collaborative projects would enable historians to access one or more languages relevant to the area they are studying. Careful analysis of data is crucial – where possible, it is important not to rely on tables in published reports and instead develop aggregations of data being sent in from people in the field. Comparisons of such data sets can be enormously instructive.

**Is there controversy over "apparent" patterns that you may have identified?**

I do think that some historians are deeply uncomfortable with my keenness to describe the existence of wide-ranging opinions and their disparate influences on the implementation of policies in the field. But, that is a good thing – if I get them angry enough, they'll be forced back to national and international archives, where they will need to spend time digging up evidence to contradict my arguments.

**Very few social issues can be understood in isolation.**

Absolutely – it would very dangerous to assume otherwise. The most rounded historical assessment can only be prepared once issues have been carefully contextualised in their social, political, economic and ideological settings; there is then a need to identify how different points of views and conditions get interconnected within and across imperial/national territorial limits. Put another way, complex social histories of multi-faceted localities do not need to be seen as being divorced from sensitively prepared 'world' or 'global' histories.

**Is there any other information/insights you wish to share with us?**

Historical work is meaningful and fun, but can also be very dangerous. You will note that all major policy declarations released by governments and international multilateral agencies are justified through very particular presentations of historical data. Seen from this perspective, history can often be used as propaganda. If history is to inform policy, the historian needs to be a critical and an independent actor, unafraid to question generalisations and the data being used to prop them up. Apart from this responsibility to police, the independent historian can also play another constructive role – help inform those involved in policy design and implementation about complexities that they are going to encounter in different countries and their myriad localities. Social history does not need to only operate in the academic realm. It can actually sensitise those in charge of national and international governance to many intricacies; but this is only possible if we – the historians – are willing to communicate our ideas without jargon that only a very small number of people can understand. Communicating social history through language that is easily understood does not make it simplistic history; anything but.

Interviewed by *Amarjit Kaur*

**Selected publications of Sanjoy Bhattacharya**

**Books**

*Expunging Variola: The Control and Eradication of Smallpox in India, 1947-1977.* New Delhi and London: Orient Longman India and Sangam Books, 2006.

*Fractured States: Smallpox, Public Health and Vaccination Policy in British India, 1800-1947.* New Delhi and London: Orient Longman India and Sangam Books, 2005.

*Propaganda and Information in Eastern India, 1939-45: A Necessary Weapon of War.* London: Curzon/Routledge, 2001.

## Edited books

*The Global Eradication of Smallpox*. Hyderabad: Orient Blackswan, 2010. (with Sharon Messenger)

*Social Determinants of Health: Assessing Theory, Policy and Practice*. Hyderabad: Orient Blackswan, 2010. (with Sharon Messenger and Caroline Overy)

*History of the Social Determinants of Health: Global Histories, Contemporary Debates*. Hyderabad: Orient Blackswan, 2009. (with Harold J. Cook and Anne Hardy)

## Edited special issues of journals

“Reassessing Smallpox Vaccination, 1789-1900”, *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, vol. 83, 2009, no. 1 (with Niels Brimnes)

“Epidemics in South Asian History”, *Economic and Political Weekly* (Mumbai, India), vol. 43, 2008, nos. 12 & 13, 39-78.

>>>

---

## Conference report

Conference on the *Processes of Radicalization and Deradicalization*, Bielefeld University (Germany), Zentrum für interdisziplinäre Forschung (ZiF), 6-8 April 2011



The conference was organized by the *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* (IJCV), in cooperation with the *Working Group “Orders of Violence”* of the *German Association for Political Science* (DVPW). It featured six thematic panels and two (opening and closing) sessions with keynote presentations by leading scholars in the field (Wilhelm Heitmeyer, Martha Crenshaw, Tore Bjorgo and Michel Wierkorka on *Transitions* and Heinz-Gerhardt Haupt and Donatella Della Porta on *Theories, Methods, Ethics and Strategies*).

The term “radicalization” was broadly defined by the organizers as “a process characterized by increasing commitment to and use of violent means and strategies in political and intergroup conflicts”. The single most important contribution of the conference was possibly in the systematic attention paid to the concept of “de-radicalization”, which was not simply intended as a reversal of radicalization processes, but as a productive process itself, to be scrutinized on micro, meso and macro levels and in the interplay between these dimensions.

Several general issues were addressed that revolved around the following questions: When, how, and under what circumstances do transitions from radicalization to de-radicalization occur? Which typical patterns of radicalization and de-radicalization can be identified? Which actors were involved and how did they interact? What are the structural conditions and larger discursive trends under which these processes may occur, and how can the contingency of such processes be understood? How are micro, meso and macro levels of analysis interlinked? Can causal mechanisms behind processes of radicalization and de-radicalization be identified across different cases?

The panels investigated various aspects of these broad issues in detail: De-/Radicalization in repressive settings; Legitimacy of de-/radicalization; Historical periods, transnational diffusion; Institutional de-/radicalization; Organizational dynamics; Outcomes of de-/radicalization. The papers then addressed specific theoretical issues, e.g. the “socialization of violence” and the distinction between domestic and international terrorism. “Traditional” cases such as Northern Ireland, the Basque Countries and Latin America were considered together with relative “new” objects of research (Nepal, Kosovo, the prison system, etc.) in a sustained effort to introduce a comparative approach.

Establishing interdisciplinary and trans-disciplinary perspectives also figured prominently among the aims of the conference. Particularly at the micro and organizational levels, the presence of several social

psychologists and anthropologists successfully introduced significant new elements in the predominantly social sciences-centred discussions. Yet, the much repeated (and never substantiated) need to consider 9/11 as a fundamental break in contemporary processes of political and social radicalization and de-radicalization limited the focus of the majority of the papers almost exclusively to post-9/11 contexts even when broader theoretical issues were at stake. As with terrorist studies and social movement studies in general, the conference therefore lacked historical insight, i.e. the longer-term perspective and diachronic comparisons, bringing once again to the fore the need for the creation of forums of effective inter- and trans-disciplinary discussion, where social historians can play a more prominent role.

Christian G. De Vito

>>>

---

## Obituary

*Klaus Tenfelde (1944–2011)*



Klaus Tenfelde, in recent decades Germany's most influential historian of labour and the working class, died on 1 July 2011, just three months after he had retired from "his" Institute for Social Movements at the Ruhr University Bochum. Those who met Tenfelde will not easily forget him, for he was a giant of a man with a powerful voice. Extraordinarily erudite, sometimes his manner was gruff, although he was big hearted too; and he was a passionately committed yet critical social democrat. Tenfelde always felt a strong connection with the *International Review of Social History* and the International Institute of Social History, and from 1992 to 2000 he was a member of the IISH's International Academic Advisory Board. Between 1996 and 2001 he played an important role on the Advisory Board of the *IRSH* too.

Klaus Tenfelde was born on 29 March 1944, the son of a construction worker and a housewife in the small town of Erkelenz near the Dutch border. At the age of fourteen he began an apprenticeship at the coal mine in Essen-Rossenray, then after three years in the mines joined the Bundesgrenzschutz (Federal Border Police). Taking the opportunity of becoming a mature student, he passed his final secondary school examinations (*Abitur*) in 1967 and went on to study history and a range of other subjects at the University of Münster.

His personal experience as a mineworker shaped the direction of his academic work throughout his career. He obtained his doctorate in 1975 with an extremely wide-ranging and comprehensive thesis on the social history of mineworkers in the Ruhr in the nineteenth century.<sup>[1]</sup> This was followed by ten years on the academic staff of the University of Munich, where in 1981 he completed a second doctorate (*Habilitation*) on the Bavarian coal-mining town of Penzberg.<sup>[2]</sup> In 1985 Tenfelde was appointed Professor of Economic and Social History at Innsbruck in Austria, and five years later moved to Bielefeld where Hans-Ulrich Wehler and Jürgen Kocka were well-known researchers at that time. In 1995 Tenfelde was appointed Professor of Social History and Social Movements at the Ruhr University Bochum, a position he continued to hold until his retirement in 2011.

In Bochum, Tenfelde was also, *ex officio*, director of the Institute for Research on European Workers' Movements. This institute had been based there since 1980 and had an excellent relationship with the IISH ever since its inception. The core of its library was created in the first half of the 1970s, when tens of thousands of duplicate items were transferred from Amsterdam to Bochum. As academic manager, Tenfelde was extraordinarily successful in running the Institute. The Institute saw a period of significant expansion, was given a "more modern" name in 1999 (Institute for Social Movements), and, together with a number of related institutions, moved to a new building, the splendid House for the History of the Ruhr.

As a researcher too, Tenfelde was a man of great distinction. He introduced new approaches to the strongly institutionally-oriented history of German mineworkers, through his own studies of proletarian communication structures, everyday life, work experience, associational culture, gender relations, and religious socialization, for example;<sup>[3]</sup> and by exploring less familiar documentary sources such as petitions and photographs.<sup>[4]</sup> He introduced a systematic international-comparative perspective<sup>[5]</sup> and extended the



field of labour history to include not just “free” waged labour but also forced labour, especially during the Nazi era.<sup>[6]</sup> After the fall of the Berlin Wall, he played a significant role in the historiography of the working class in the GDR,<sup>[7]</sup> and he made a major contribution to the integral historiography of the German working class as a whole.<sup>[8]</sup>

During the course of 2010 Tenfelde was diagnosed with lung cancer. Just five months before his death, he wrote to me: “Now, after six months of treatment, the worst seems to be over, and I may start recovering – but this is a deceptive disease. Slowly, I am fighting my way back.” It seemed, briefly, as if he would win his battle. He began to contribute to academic conferences again, although the man, whose voice had once been so powerful, was now able only to whisper. But that “deceptive” disease eventually got the better of him.

In retirement, Tenfelde had hoped to continue work on his substantial “History of the Ruhr”, but his illness prevented this.<sup>[9]</sup> Tenfelde is survived by his wife Ellen and their two children.

*Marcel van der Linden*

---

[1] Klaus Tenfelde, *Sozialgeschichte der Bergarbeiterschaft an der Ruhr im 19. Jahrhundert* (Bonn-Bad Godesberg, 1977).

[2] Klaus Tenfelde, *Proletarische Provinz. Radikalisierung und Widerstand in Penzberg/Oberbayern 1900-1945* (Munich, 1982).

[3] Klaus Tenfelde, “Arbeiterchaft, Arbeitsmarkt und Kommunikationsstrukturen im Ruhrgebiet in den 50er Jahren des 19. Jahrhunderts”, *Archiv für Sozialgeschichte*, 16 (1976), pp. 1-59; *idem*, “Mining Festivals in the Nineteenth Century”, *Journal of Contemporary History*, 13:2 (1978), pp. 377-412; *idem*, “Bergarbeiterkultur in Deutschland: Ein Überblick”, *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 5:1 (1979), pp. 12-53; *idem*, “Adventus. Zur historischen Ikonologie des Festzugs”, *Historische Zeitschrift*, 235 (1982), pp. 45-84; *idem*, “Die Entfaltung des Vereinswesens während der Industriellen Revolution in Deutschland (1850-1873)”, *Historische Zeitschrift. Beihefte, New Series*, 9 (1984), pp. 55-114; *idem*, “Arbeiterfamilie und Geschlechterbeziehungen im Deutschen Kaiserreich”, *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 18:2 (1992), pp. 179-203; *idem* (ed.), *Religiöse Sozialisationen im 20. Jahrhundert. Historische und vergleichende Perspektiven* (Essen, 2010).

[4] Klaus Tenfelde and Helmuth Trischler (eds), *Bis vor die Stufen des Throns. Bittschriften und Beschwerden von Bergleuten im Zeitalter der Industrialisierung* (Munich, 1986); Klaus Tenfelde (ed.), *Pictures of Krupp: Photography and History in the Industrial Age* (London, 2005).

[5] Gerald D. Feldman and Klaus Tenfelde (eds), *Workers, Owners and Politics in Coal Mining: An International Comparison of Industrial Relations* (New York, 1990); Klaus Tenfelde (ed.), *Towards a Social History of Mining in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries* (Munich, 1992). See also the collection of essays, which runs to almost 900 pages, published as Klaus Tenfelde (ed.), *Arbeiter und Arbeiterbewegung im Vergleich. Berichte zur internationalen Forschung* (Munich, 1986).

[6] 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* (Essen, 2005), 2 vols; *idem* (eds), *Zwangsarbeit im Europa des 20. Jahrhunderts. Bewältigung und vergleichende Aspekte* (Essen, 2007).

[7] Klaus Tenfelde (ed.), *Sozialgeschichte des deutschen Kommunismus* (Göttingen, 1995); Peter Hübner and Klaus Tenfelde (eds), *Arbeiter in der SBZ-DDR* (Essen, 1999); Peter Hübner, Christoph Klessmann, and Klaus Tenfelde (eds), *Arbeiter im Staatssozialismus. Ideologischer Anspruch und soziale Wirklichkeit* (Cologne, 2005).

[8] See the monumental study Gerhard A. Ritter and Klaus Tenfelde, *Arbeiter im Deutschen Kaiserreich, 1871 bis 1914* (Bonn, 1992), and also Klaus Tenfelde (ed.), *Arbeiter im 20. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1991).

[9] The first instalment is the massive, three-kilo tome: Klaus Tenfelde and Thomas Urban (eds), *Das Ruhrgebiet. Ein historisches Lesebuch* (Essen, 2010).

>>>

## NEWS / ANNOUNCEMENTS

### **Migrations and societies in Africa and the Middle East: a long term perspective, The 4th Global Migration History Conference (Rabat, 19-21 May 2012)**

#### ***Aim of the conference***

The conference seeks to map and understand patterns of cross-cultural migration in Africa and the Middle East from 1500 until the present. We are interested in local, internal, international and intercontinental movements of people, as well as in free and unfree migration. Following Manning's ideas on the crucial role of cross-community migration as an engine for social and cultural change (*Migration in World History*, 2005), both in sending and receiving societies, we are predominantly interested in geographical moves that involve the crossing of cultural boundaries. Such migrations, defined in linguistic, religious, class or other terms, bring people with different cultural repertoires in contact with each other and thereby have the potential to lead to innovations in various domains.

The conference seeks to assess the degree of mobility in African and Middle-Eastern societies over a longer time-frame, changes therein between periods, and, ultimately, the cultural, political, social and economic effects of migration on both sending and receiving societies. We especially invite scholars to critically rethink widespread assumptions that portray non-Western parts of the world as essentially immobile until the 19th and 20th centuries, and interpret any forms of mobility there were as induced by the actions of violent and coercive outsiders (mostly Europeans). As a counterpoint, we put forward the hypothesis that, throughout the period under study, cross-community migration has been both part and parcel as well as a major determinant of processes of social change in the countries of Africa and the Middle-East. Therefore, we urge conference participants – where possible – to particularly pay attention to the human capital of migrants into their analyses.

#### ***Analytical and theoretical framework***

In order to guarantee that the data presented at the conference enable systematic comparisons, we have chosen a conceptual framework and typology of different forms of migration that has been developed for Europe and since applied to Asia (discussed in the *Journal of Global History*, no. 2, 2011): moving to cities (urbanization); moving to land (colonization); moving as soldiers and sailors; moving as seasonal workers; emigrating from the geographical unit under study (Middle East or Africa); immigration into the geographical unit under study, such as Middle East or Africa (see Jan Lucassen en Leo Lucassen, 'The Mobility Transition Revisited, 1500-1900: What the Case of Europe Can Offer to Global History', *The Journal of Global History* 4, no. 4 (2009): 347-77). This typology is inspired by Patrick Manning's work on global migration history mentioned above. The aim of the typology is first of all to distinguish different modes of migration and their respective impact on social and cultural change. For reasons of coherence and comparison we strongly urge conference participants to apply this typology to the region and period of their study; and secondly, to reflect critically on the typology itself and come up with suggestions and modifications needed to encapsulate other types of cross-community migration (like forms of nomadism) that can be found in Africa and the Middle East in the last five centuries.

The application of this model to Africa and the Middle East implies a number of specific challenges:

- There will be a special emphasis on demography (i.e. population statistics through time and migration data and/or estimates) before 1900. Such demographic key data are at the core of our global comparison, but have been less well studied for Africa and the Middle East.
- For the reconstruction of population mobility in Africa and the Middle East from 1500 onwards we solicit contributions based on written evidence produced by historians but also on archaeological, linguistic, anthropological and geographical data and insights.
- As to written evidence, apart from the usual based data (in English and French), we particularly solicit contributions by historians well versed in Portuguese, Spanish and Latin sources, and especially in Arabic, Ottoman and other non-European languages, which usually tend to fall below the radar-screen of mainstream scholarship on the issues of migration and mobility.

## ***Call for papers***

The organizing committee invites scholars to submit proposals and abstracts for papers. The deadline for submission of abstracts is **1 December 2011**. The deadline for submission of full papers will be 1 May 2012. Abstracts can be sent to Mrs. Astrid Verburg, IISH secretariat ([ave@iisg.nl](mailto:ave@iisg.nl)). Guidelines for contributions:

- Paper proposals should in principal be historical in the sense that they deal with longer periods of time or compare current developments with earlier periods
- Paper proposals and abstracts should engage with the theoretical and conceptual framework as set out above
- Where possible, papers should reflect on ways to quantify types of migrations in relation to the total population of a given area as this is essential for a proper assessment of the importance of cross-community migration in its entirety and as well as in its constituent parts.



## **New Forms of Day Labour Work?**

### ***An international workshop on the historical development of temporary work agencies from a global perspective, 15 March 2012, Stockholm***

It is with great pleasure that the Research Committee of the Labour Movement Archive and Library and the Centre for Labour History, Landskrona, wish to announce a workshop on the history of temporary work agencies. The workshop will take place on 15 March 2012 in Stockholm, Sweden.

The aim of the proposed workshop is to explore relations between unions, employers and temporary work agencies as well as the consequences of temporary work for workers' power from a historical perspective. The workshop is intended to bring together union activists and researchers, in the hope that this will inspire future research while also addressing a topic of great relevance for the trade union movement.

The issue of temporary work agencies has become very prominent in union debates during recent years. However this debate is not a new one. Different forms of hired labour have threatened job security and have therefore been a union issue from the very beginning. The global division of labour has gone through profound changes during the last few decades and recent development is characterized by buzzwords such as flexibility and efficiency, but also global competition. Companies in the north Atlantic region have reduced their permanent workforces and temporary work agencies have become important suppliers of labour. Both permanently employed workers and agency employed workers have experienced threatened job security accompanied by a loss of union power. Moreover it is more difficult to organize both groups of workers in local unions, although they are doing the same job. In other words, the growth of temporary work agencies as a global phenomenon raises questions about job security, solidarity and the development of union strategies. Historians have not yet tackled these questions in any depth.

Papers analysing the historical development of relations between unions and temporary work agencies or their predecessors with a focus on one of the following issues are welcome:

- Local, national and international union strategies towards temporary work agencies and their predecessors
- Local, national and international laws, agreements or conventions concerning temporary work agencies
- Mobilization and organisation of agency employees by unions
- Temporary work agencies as a global phenomenon

### **Submission schedule and other information**

Abstracts should be no longer than 400 words and submitted no later than 10 November 2011 to [silke.neunsinger@arbark.se](mailto:silke.neunsinger@arbark.se). Authors will be informed whether their paper has been accepted no later than the end of June 2012. Proposals for full panels including chair and commentator are welcome, as are individual papers. We would also very much like to hear from researchers working in this field who know already at this stage that they will not be able to attend the conference. Final drafts of workshop papers are due by 10 February 2012. The conference language is English.

### **Contact**

If you have further questions, comments or ideas, please contact:

Silke Neunsinger: [silke.neunsinger@arbark.se](mailto:silke.neunsinger@arbark.se)

Lars Berggren: [lars.berggren@hist.lu.se](mailto:lars.berggren@hist.lu.se)



>>>

## **ISHA Newsletter**

The Newsletter is the publication of the International Social History Association

### **Editorial board:**

Amarjit Kaur, University of New England, Armidale NSW  
Marcel van der Linden, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam  
Christian De Vito, University of Florence, Florence

### **Editor:**

Béla Tomka, University of Szeged, Szeged  
E-mail: [tomka@hist.u-szeged.hu](mailto:tomka@hist.u-szeged.hu)

**Submissions** are welcome including brief notes, such as reports on conferences; personal accounts related to ISHA issues; announcements of forthcoming conferences and meetings on issues related to ISHA; readers' comments sharing your reactions to and thoughts about materials published in the Newsletter. All documents need to be formatted using Microsoft Word (.doc). Please send all manuscripts as an e-mail attachment to the editor.

**Subscribe or unsubscribe:** Send a mail with the subject "subscribe" to [tomka@hist.u-szeged.hu](mailto:tomka@hist.u-szeged.hu) to be added to the list. To be removed from the list send a mail with the subject "unsubscribe" to the same address.

**ISHA President:** Marcel van der Linden, International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, Cruquiusweg 31, Amsterdam 1019 AT, Netherlands, Phone: 00-31-20-6685866 Fax: 00-31-20-6654181 E-mail: [mvl@iisg.nl](mailto:mvl@iisg.nl)

| TOP | CONTENTS | E-MAIL |