GBS + GCL = ?

(Charles Tilly, Ctr for Studies of Social Change, New School for Social Research)

Introduction

How do the development of capitalism and the concentration of power in the national state affect the ways that ordinary people contend, or fail to contend, for their interests? In the era of capitalism and strong states, how does the set of means that ordinary people employ in pursuing their shared interests change? Our research group at the New School for Social Research is pursuing both questions historically in hopes of better understanding large, long changes in prevailing forms of conflict, including changes that are going on today.

No single inquiry can grapple with such large questions in general terms. We are attempting to get a grip on them by means of careful examination of French and British experience during important transitions of the last few centuries. Our central procedure consists of inventorying considerable numbers of comparable events. We seek periods and regions that permit significant comparisons with respect to time, place, social group, form of action, interest, and outcome. We then use the comparisons within the periods and regions to formulate and test ideas concerning the processes affecting popular contention -- the actions by which ordinary people band together to act on their interests, and thereby have visible effects on other people's realization of their interests.

In order to make the research feasible, we concentrate on discontinuous, concerted, contentious forms of action such as marches, meetings, demonstrations, rallies, invasions of fields, breaking of machines, strikes, and mocking ceremonies. One of the inquiry's organizing questions, indeed, asks how the repertoires of means that constrain the interactions of major pairs of actors -- workers and owners, citizens and state authorities, peasants and landlords -- come into being, change, and wax or wane in effectiveness. The painstaking description, comparison, and linkage of many small events in a well-defined historical setting makes it possible to address that question systematically, without losing sight of collective action's complexity.

Capitalism and statemaking enter the analysis as major influences on the incidence, intensity, form, and outcome of popular contention. Seen as the increasing dominance of concentrated capital and wage labor, the expansion of capitalism entails three fundamental conflicts: the struggle of capital and labor, the opposition of rival claimants on the factors of production, and the competition of participants within the same markets. The conflicts engendered by statemaking include the extraction of resources from resistant subject populations, struggles between states and rival governments (including would-be and quasi-governments) both within and outside their own territories, and competition among organizations for resources and facilities that are already under control of a state's agents. The relative importance of these different conflicts varies by time, place, and social setting; their particular combination strongly affects the character of popular contention.

The problem for theory and research, however, is to specify and measure the precise character of those effects. We approach the problem from both ends: by searching out the regularities and connections within particular historical settings, by following the similarities and differences among the collective-action experiences of populations that are facing different combinations of capitalism and statemaking.

These generalizations concerning the impact of capitalism and statemaking have emerged from our previous work on popular collective action in France and Britain:

1. Capitalism and statemaking set the dominant rhythms of change in popular collective action. Other commonly alleged factors -- for example, the overall pace of urbanization and industrialization -- did not have the effects generally attributed to them.

2. The largest effects of the development of capitalism were a) to stimulate defensive action on the part of people having interests vested in rights that were threatened by the capitalist reshaping of property, b) to shift the locus of struggle toward major concentrations of capital, c) to create new contenders for power -- not only organized capitalists, but also proletarian and proletarianizing workers -- through the reorganization of production.

3. The largest effects of concentrating power in national states were a) to stir resistance against the efforts of the state's agents to extract resources from households, communities, and organized groups of workers; b) to move the locus of struggle toward national arenas of power, c) to facilitate the creation of relatively autonomous special-interest groups as political actors.

4. In nineteenth-century France and Britain, as a result of the interaction of capitalism and statemaking, a whole new repertoire of collective action appeared. The new repertoire featured relatively national and autonomous forms of action. It replaced an earlier repertoire characterized by relatively parochial and patronized forms of action. Concretely, such forms as seizures of grain, machine-breaking, mocking assemblies, tax rebellions and invasion of enclosed fields gave way to such forms as election rallies, public meetings, strikes, demonstrations, and national social movements.

These tentative conclusions rest partly on characteristic differences in the timing, loci, and personnel of different sorts of contention (e.g. grain seizures vs. tax rebellions) and partly on parallel patterns of change in collective action (e.g. the emergence of the demonstration as a recognized way of making claims) in the two countries. All of them are controversial, especially when it comes to causal connections. Furthermore, they generate new problems of their own. It remains unclear, for example, how categories not defined clearly by the organization of production, such as women/men and religious minorities, mobilize and act collectively.

On the second count -- how and why repertoires of contention change -- our work so far suggests these conclusions:

1. The prevailing forms of collective action in any population tend to be limited in number, to change slowly, and to constrain the abilities of members of the population to act together on their interests. As a result, many groups work with repertoires that are significantly less effective in advancing their interests than other means they could, in principle, employ.

2. Repertoires belong not so much to individual actors as to pairs of actors, ranging from the interactions of all citizens with their national government, at one extreme, to the interaction of a single group of workers with their employer, at the other.

3. To the extent that power itself moves from a local to a national scale, repertoires operating at a national scale (e.g. the routines of national electoral campaigns) tend to reshape and even to supplant repertoires operating at a small scale.

4. In the long run, the changing interests, organization, and opportunities of major pairs of actors set the direction of change in repertoires of collective action.

5. In the short and medium runs, however, the character and intensity of repression or facilitation of collective action by major powerholders, especially agents of the state, have powerful effects on the level and types of collective action among actors falling within the powerholders' control. With important exceptions for highly mobilized groups, repression diminishes collective action while facilitation increases it, and collective action tends to move toward those forms that are facilitated or less severely repressed.

6. Innovations within existing forms of collective action play a large part in the alteration of repertoires. Although actors are constantly innovating, experimenting, and observing, direct invention of new forms that actually enter a repertoire is extremely rare.

Much more often, actors push an existing routine into new terrain, for example by converting a petition march into a quasi-demonstration or a regular demonstration into the occupation of a public space.

7. Potential actors tend to monitor all uses of forms of action in their repertoire attentively, watching for successes and failures. The closer the observed groups to them, the stronger the effect on their own behavior. Their own successes and failures have the strongest effect. As a result, innovations diffuse, unsuccessful forms of action die out, successful forms of action become more prominent elements of the repertoire.

8. For these reasons, sustained repression or facilitation of collective action by powerholders tends to alter the repertoire, especially when the repression or facilitation is selective. Nevertheless, repression and facilitation only operate effectively within limits set by the interests and organization of the actors to whom they are applied.

Again, the conclusions are controversial. Among other things, they assign a rationality to collective actors that many analysts find excessive. Fortunately, many implications of these rational-action arguments lend themselves to empirical test.

After years of preparation, our group now has the means to examine the applicability of these arguments to three important blocks of historical experience: a) that of France as a whole, and especially of Anjou, Burgundy, Flanders, the Ile de France, and Languedoc, since 1600; b) that of London and its region from 1758 to 1834, c) that of Great Britain (England, Wales, and Scotland) as a whole from 1828 to 1834. Since many models of popular collective action draw implicitly or even explicitly on the experience of the two countries in these periods, the times and places involved provide the double advantage of rich evidence and guaranteed theoretical relevance. Since detailed descriptions of the French data have appeared in print elsewhere (see "Other References" at the end of the paper), this discussion will concentrate on our evidence concerning the London region, 1758 to 1834, and Great Britain as a whole, 1828 to 1834.

In the London region, the period from 1760 to the 1830s brought an enormous expansion of popular involvement in national struggles for power, as well as a large transformation of metropolitan social geography. In Great Britain as a whole, the years from 1828 to 1834 saw not only widespread industrial conflict, scattered struggles over food and a major movement of agricultural laborers, but also the mobilizations and struggles centering on Catholic Emancipation, repeal of the the Test and Corporation Acts, the New Poor Law, the Factory Act, and, preeminently, parliamentary reform.

GBS — Great Britain Study

The Great Britain Study (GBS) centers on the analysis of a large set of "contentious gatherings" that occurred somewhere in Great Britain (England, Wales, or Scotland) from the beginning of 1828 to the end of 1834. A contentious gathering is an occasion on which a number of persons gather in a publicly-accessible place and visibly, by word or deed, make claims that would, if realized, affect the interests of some person or group outside their own number. In our research, we include only those events for which we have substantial evidence that ten or more persons made the claims.

In practice, such a definition brings in almost every event that an observer or an historian would label disturbance, disorder, riot, protest, or something of the sort, plus a great many meetings, rallies, marches, processions, celebrations and other sanctioned assemblies during which people made claims. At the edge of the sample, the word "contentious" becomes inappropriate; the definition includes public statements of support for persons, policies, and governments; in those instances, the events' main claims to contentiousness consist in the bearing they have on the contrary claims of third parties. But on the whole, a collection of contentious gatherings gives a good picture of the more public, discontinuous, and collective ways in which the people of a given time and place contend for their interests.

Our aims were to assemble a continuous sample of such events, and to identify the sample's

main biases. After exploring a number of other sources, we settled on seven periodicals: the
Times of London, Morning Chronicle, Mirror of Parliament, Hansard's Parliamentary Debates,
Gentlemen's Magazine, Annual Register and Votes and Proceedings of Parliament. During a year of
experimentation, we worked out routines to assure the reliability and accuracy of the reading:
training readers on standard blocks of periods and periodicals, having them report all meetings
and assemblies rather than deciding on the spot which ones met our definitions, creating a
regular reporting form and a system for logging reports, making complete copies of every single
mention, collating the mentions into event-by-event dossiers, and so on (for details, see
Schweitzer 1978).   Once these routines were working well, we read every issue of the seven
periodicals from the beginning of 1828 to the middle of 1835 -- the extra six months to capture
retrospective reports of events that occurred before the end of 1834.

We collected many other sources.   For example, we arranged for the Public Record Office
(London) to film the entire county correspondence of the Home Secretary (H.O. 52) for the seven
years of the study, and assembled notes and copies from many other archival series. We compared
our enumerations from the seven sources with comparable enumerations of other periodicals such
as the Scotsman and the Lancaster Gazette.   We prepared a machine-readable transcription of the
events that E.J. Hobsbawm and George Rude cataloged in their study of the Swing rebellion of
1830. We also combed the historical literature for descriptions and analyses of British conten-
tion in the first half of the nineteenth century.   We did not, however, incorporate evidence
from these additional sources into our basic descriptions of contentious gatherings.   We held
them apart on the ground that their incorporation would make the sample's biases even harder to
identify and would make more difficult the independent verification or falsification of conclu-
sions drawn from the sample.

After reading and collating, the accounts drawn from the seven sources went into editing.
The editing involved several steps: determining whether the event in question qualified for the
sample, locating and dating it, using the accounts to construct standardized narratives (for
details, see Tilly & Schweitzer 1980, Tilly 1980). In essence, we constructed a series of small
questionnaires concerning different elements of the event, and then used the texts from the
periodicals to answer the questionnaires. These were the elements:

1. at least two formations consisting of a person or persons who acted distinguishably in
the course of the contentious gathering, the minimum set consisting of a formation of ten
or more persons that made a visible claim and another formation that was the object of the
claim, with additional formations included by virtue of their interaction with those core
formations during the gathering;

2. at least three action-phases (minimum: beginning/action/end) starting any time any
formation a) began to make a claim, b) began a new response to a claim, c) visibly ceased a
response to a claim, d) visibly ceased to make a claim, e) changed location, f) changed
personnel; we allowed for the description and marking of related actions (for example,
holding a meeting or arresting participants) that occurred before or. after the event
itself;

3. at least one location in which the gathering took place;

4. at least one source from which we constructed the narrative;

5. the event considered as a whole.

Our editing, then, involved using the words of the texts in our sources to answer questions
concerning these five elements.   However, it also added refinements.   For example, we used
Ordnance Survey maps to pinpoint every location in grid-square coordinates -- to the nearest
hundred meters in the London region, and the nearest kilometer elsewhere. That refinement makes
detailed mapping of events fairly straightforward.

Having finished the editing, we proceeded to transform the standardized narratives into
machine-readable records.   For that purpose, we created a set of interactive computer routines.
In essence, the routines presented successive sections of our questionnaire on the screen of a

microcomputer, and asked us to fill in the blanks (for details, see Schweitzer & Simmons 1981). They included some prompting and error-checking, for example by using a calendar to reconcile the date and the day of the week. Through several steps of editing, the routines built records -- separate records for formations, locations, action-phases, sources, events, and comments -- within a database manager. Although the preliminary editing and the interactive direct-entry routines certainly required considerable standardization and reduction of the accounts from which we were drawing our information, they largely eliminated coding in the usual sense of the word. The result, for example, was to produce formation records containing the principal name our sources gave to each formation involved, approximately 12,000 different names over the roughly 23,000 formations appearing during the seven years. (Supplementary machine-readable records include a) every other name our sources gave to the formations, e.g. "mob" for a formation whose principal label was "labourers", b) every personal name our sources supplied for individual members of formations; those files, which we have not so far counted, may well contain 100,000 names.) For purposes of analysis, to be sure, we must usually reduce those 12,000 formation names to a manageable number of categories. But in our system that is the analyst's decision, not that of a research assistant who does not know which distinctions will matter.

The appendix of this paper presents the blank forms we used to establish the dossier for each event -- a coversheet for each report taken from a periodical, checkoffs for the assembly and computer entry of the event, an event coversheet containing information about the preparation of the data, sheets anticipating and simulating the machine-readable version of each section (event, formation, action-phase, source, individual comments, general comments), and a page from the logbook we used to keep track of events as they moved through editing and entry.

GCL - Geography of Contention in London

Our study of the Geography of Contention in London (GCL) overlaps considerably with GBS (for details, see Tilly & Schweitzer 1982). For the four counties around and including London (Middlesex, Sussex, Kent, and Surrey), we have followed GBS procedures to identify contentious gatherings during thirteen years: 1758, 1759, 1768, 1769, 1780, 1781, 1789, 1795, 1801, 1807, 1811, 1819, and 1820. Added to the seven years included in GBS, that gives us a set of twenty out of the seventy-seven years from 1758 to 1834. In this case, we used fewer periodicals: the London Chronicle, the Times (from 1789 onward), the Annual Register, and Gentleman's Magazine. In compensation, we built up two kinds of files we could not afford to construct for Great Britain as a whole: a) machine-readable catalogs of routine assemblies that did not qualify as contentious gatherings, b) machine-readable data on London's social geography.

The routine assemblies consisted of all gatherings involving ten or more persons identified in our systematic reading that failed the test of visible claims; sporting events, ceremonies, festive dinners, and many public meetings fell into that second sample. For each of these events, we prepared a very simple machine-readable record -- enough to follow variation in space, time, and type of event, but insufficient to carry out the rich analyses of participation and action our contentious gathering files permit.

The geographical data fall into two quite different files. The first is a Topographical Survey providing a standardized machine-readable description of every parish, town, ward, and other named place in the London region (for more detail, see Stanley 1983). Compiled from nineteen volumes of gazetteers and similar works published from 1756 to 1816, the Topographical Survey contains coded information on: 1) location 2) source 3) population and housing 4) trades, industries, markets, fairs 5) squares, cemeteries, other land use 6) public buildings 7) trade halls 8) political structure and representation 9) miscellaneous

To be sure, the information is no better than its sources. The sources are incomplete, and sometimes inaccurate. Nevertheless, the survey provides a means of characterizing the location of each contentious gathering and routine assembly in our GCL files.

The second geographic collection serves a similar purpose. Kent's directory of London trades began publication in 1732, and by the 1750s was listing a substantial (although, alas, unknown) proportion of all tradesmen who were doing business in the built-up areas of the

metropolis. Its changes therefore provide a valuable key to shifts in the city's industrial and commercial geography. We transcribed either 100 percent or 5 percent of the directory's entries for seven years: 1759 (100%), 1768 (100%), 1781 (5%), 1795 (5%), 1801 (100%), 1811 (5%), and 1828 (100%) (for more detail, see Stanley 1984). Those years, obviously, correspond to years we also selected for GCL. By 1828, the directory included more than 19,400 entries. We geocoded the locations, transcribed the names of tradesmen and trades, then added two items: a 24-category business code, and a mobility code stating whether the same business had appeared in the previous directory at the same address or a different one, and (if at the same address) whether the proprietor had changed. The transcribed directories, then, permit us to follow complex alterations in London's economic geography from 1759 to 1828.

In GCL, we are asking how the changing social geography of London interacted with routine patterns of gathering, and how the two jointly affected the geography of contention. Since the years involved include such events as the Wilkes campaigns of 1768-69, the Gordon riots of 1780, the activities of London radicals during the French Revolution, and the mobilization for Reform in the 1830s, the analysis should clarify the changing place of the metropolis in popular contention and national struggles for power.

Evidence on British Contention

The British data only became fully available -- cleaned, documented, and accessible on disk -- during the spring of 1985. As a result, we have just begun descriptions and analyses of the data; their quality appears to be exceptionally high.

Figure 1 graphs the number of events in our sample for each month from January 1828 to December 1834. Broadly speaking, the graph shows a rising frequency of events from year to year between 1828 and 1831, then a lower level of activity in 1832, 1833, and 1834. More than a hill, however, the graph resembles a forest of stalactites: sharp peaks of a month or two amid periods of much lower activity. To a surprising degree, the calendar of peaks in contention corresponds to the timetable of conflict in and around Parliament. The zero-order product-moment correlation coefficient between the number of days Parliament sat in a month and the natural logarithm of the number of CGs occurring in that month is .27; partialling for trend leaves that correlation essentially unchanged at .25.

In order to show that correspondence more clearly, Figure 1 attaches labels to the major peaks. Those labels name the dominant issues in the months of most frequent contentious gatherings. With one obvious exception, they mark the moments at which Parliament and its electorate were most severely torn over questions of national importance: Test and Corporation Acts repeal in 1828, Catholic Emancipation in 1829, Parliamentary Reform in 1831 and 1832, church reforms, the New Poor Law and a ministerial crisis in 1834. The great exception came in November 1830, when the "Swing" rebellion reached its peak in Southeastern England, wide resistance to the installation of the New Police developed in London, and anti-slavery activists met repeatedly to demand governmental action. Thus the history of popular contention and the history of national politics begin to converge.

For purposes of comparison, Tables 1 to 4 present general characteristics of events divided into three categories: 1) GCL — four-county London region in 13 years from 1758 to 1820 (one vagrant event of the 1,204 in GCL, to be strictly accurate, began outside the four-county area, but ended in London when a group of participants marched there), 2) GBS four-county — the same four counties from 1828 to 1834, 3) GBS other — the remainder of Great Britain, 1828-1834. Table 1 presents the raw counts for numbers of events, formations, action-phases, sources, and locations. The raw numbers themselves convey a certain amount of news. The great increase in annual number of contentious gatherings from 1811 to 1819-20, for example, reflects the enlargement of public demands and disputes concerning national government -- including the controversy over Queen Caroline's rights -- after the close of the Napoleonic Wars. The buildup from 1829 to 1831 results largely from the massive mobilization around the question of Parliamentary Reform. The average number of formations per event varies from 4.46 (1780) to 2.75 (1834), the number of action-phases per event from 9.08 (1759) to 4.93 (1834); the irregular downward drift of both numbers probably results from the increasing prominence of formal public meetings as the loci of contention. Thus the simple counts point the way to more detailed investigations of the

evidence.

When we regroup the major issue of each event (as judged by our editors) into 43 categories (my empirical regrouping into distinguishable clusters), the distributions of the three samples appear as in Table 2. Again, the numbers pose questions for further investigation. GCL, for example, includes a higher proportion of events involving attacks on persons or objects, and concerning local government, royalty, and trade affairs than does GBS. Hotly-debated Parliamentary issues such as Catholic claims, Reform, and repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts occupy a larger share of GBS events; the contrast suggests the possibility of a nationalization of contention after the Napoleonic Wars.

A regrouping of the principal names our sources give to formations into 62 categories yields Table 3. This time it is worth noting that aldermen, clergy, local officials, mobs, nobles, royalty, workers, members of trades, and troops constitute significantly higher shares of GCL formations, while Parliament, electors, governmental ministers, police, political parties, Protestants, and associations all loom considerably larger in GBS. Again we see a hint of nationalization and formalization of contention. The prominence of royalty, always as the object, rather than the originator, of claims, in GCL stems mainly from the disputes about Queen Caroline, while the importance of churches and Protestants in GBS results chiefly from the mobilization to influence the Parliamentary debate on Catholic Emancipation in 1828 and 1829. In the period 1828-1834, some interesting differences likewise appear between the London region and the rest of Great Britain: more local officials of various kinds in London, more troops, constables, and judges (but not police) outside the London region, more general gatherings of inhabitants outside, and so on.

Finally, when we group the main verb in each action-phase into 45 categories, we arrive at Table 4. The greater incidence of such verbs as adjourn, assemble, hear petition,, meet, and petition in GBS undoubtedly reflects the increased role of public meetings and formal assemblies as the starting-points of contention. On the other hand, within the London region the similarities between the distributions of actions in 1758-1820 and 1828-1834 are more impressive than the differences between them. Obviously, the next step is to turn away from ad hoc interpretation of totals to the analysis of variation and covariation from time to time, place to place, issue to issue, group to group.

Figure 3 shows what happens when we group two of these categories into action-phases. It presents the very beginning of the action-phase listing for our first year, 1758, with an indication of the actual formation names and verbs of the principal actors plus the categories into which we placed the names and verbs. Event 758010701, for example, was the first and only contentious gathering we identified on 7 January 1758; the identification number contains that information. One of the accounts appears in the London Chronicle for 10 January 1758. It reads:

Saturday about Seven in the Evening, several Prest Men, on board of the Namur Man of War, lying along side of the Jetty-Head, who had been refused Liberty to come on Shore to see their Friends, forced their Way into the Dock: the Lieutenant of the Ship ordered some of the Marines to fire at them, which they accordingly did, and wounded one or two: however they all got out of Dock, and gave three Cheers. Several of the Workmen had very nigh been shot: one of the Balls went into a Plank, where there was a Number at Work.

The event began in Portsmouth and ended in London. Further accounts in the Chronicle, the Annual Register and Gentlemen's Magazine describe the journey of the escaped sailors to London in order to petition the Lords of the Admiralty for better treatment, their capture, trial and conviction. (Fifteen "mutineers" were condemned to death and then, in a characteristic move, fourteen received pardons.) In Figure 3, we see the sequence:

SAILORS (CATEGORY: TROOPS) GATHER (CATEGORY: GATHER)

SAILORS (CATEGORY: TROOPS) FORCE (CATEGORY: CONTROL)

LIEUTENANT OF THE SHIP (CATEGORY: TROOPS) ORDERS (CATEGORY: CONTROL)

MARINES (CATEGORY: TROOPS) FIRE AT (CATEGORY: ATTACK)

And so on. The full machine-readable record also includes the object of each action (for example, the Marines fire at the sailors), and an excerpt of the text being summarized (for example "Lieutenant of the Ship ordered . . . Marines to fire at them"). Thus a simplified, systematic, but relatively complete narrative appears in the machine record.

This detail makes possible a rapid movement from the small scale of the individual event to the large scale of many events. Let one example suffice. Two hundred and eighty-five of the contentious gatherings that we have identified in 1830 had clear ties to the Swing Rebellion, the series of events in southeastern England in which agricultural laborers made wage demands, broke agricultural machinery, burned hayricks, and otherwise put pressure on leaseholders, landlords, and local officials. Our machine-readable descriptions of the 285 events not only record general characteristics of the gatherings, but also include separate records describing the 1,500 formations (sets of people that acted distinguishably) participating in the events, the 620 locations in which the events occurred, the 701 sources that gave us information about the events, the 2,885 distinguishable actions engaged in by the formations, and so on. Among the recorded actions, 2,609 actually occurred during the event, as we define its limits, while another 276 happened either before or after. For each action, we record a standardized version of the verb used in our source. Thus the machine-readable transcription of actions during a contentious gathering at Benenden, Kent, on 9 November 1830, reads:

LABOURERS ASSEMBLE

LABOURERS DESTROY THRESHING MACHINE [OBJECT: MR. LUCK]

LABOURERS DEMAND HIGHER WAGES, RISE IN PARISH RELIEF [OBJECT:FARMERS, OTHERS]

GENTLEMEN REFUSE TO YIELD

CAPTAIN KING AND SOLDIERS APPEAR

LABOURERS DISPERSE

The string of verbs (assemble - destroy - demand - refuse - appear - disperse) encapsulates the action. If we group the 2,609 verbs in "Swing" events by the order in which they occur, and by very broad categories, the overall distribution looks like this:

ORDER	ASSEMBLE	ATTACK	CONTROL	COMMU-NICATE	MOVE	OTHER	TOTAL	N
1	75.9%	0.3%	6.6%	10.6%	4.5%	2.1%	100.0	290
2	4.4	24.3	18.0	10.7	19.6	23.0	100.0	317
3	0.7	12.0	15.3	12.1	16.0	44.0	100.1	300
4	2.9	13.3	11.6	12.5	14.1	45.6	100.0	241
5	2.2	13.5	17.3	16.2	18.4	32.4	100.0	185
6	0.7	11.3	9.3	16.6	21.2	41.1	100.2	151
7	2.8	13.0	11.1	9.3	26.9	37.0	100.1	108
8	0.0	16.7	14.4	15.5	32.2	21.1	99.9	90
9	4.8	14.3	13.1	7.2	33.3	27.4	100.1	84
10-14	1.5	12.2	17.3	12.9	26.2	29.9	100.0	271
15-19	2.6	15.8	10.5	11.2	30.9	28.9	99.9	152
20-30	1.1	15.3	16.9	8.7	33.9	24.0	99.9	183
30-39	2.0	22.0	14.0	11.0	30.0	21.0	100.0	100
40+	1.5	17.5	9.5	8.6	33.6	29.2	99.9	137
TOTAL	10.3	13.8	13.5	11.8	21.7	28.9	100.0	2609

Leaving aside the first action, where simple reporting conventions play a large part, even this crude tabulation shows tendencies for verbs denoting attack to increase in later phases of the action (the high proportion in phase 2 representing the considerable number of brief accounts of assaults on threshing machines taking the form assemble - attack - disperse), for controlling actions to concentrate in the middle phases, for place-to-place movement to become more prominent as an event grows longer, and so on. We move easily from the aggregate observation to the introduction of controls for length of event, type of action, locus, kind of formation, and other relevant characteristics. The data obviously lend themselves to the refined analysis of action and interaction, firmly implanted in time.

The evidence also lends itself to network analysis; that is the reason for publishing this report in _Connections_. For most actions involve both a subject and an object. The verbs therefore represent a wide variety of connections among actors. Each aggregation of subjects, objects, and verbs defines a numbered asymmetrical matrix of relationships. A preliminary look at the matrices connecting major categories of actors by verbs of claim, attack, and support, for example, indicates that Parliament became much more salient as an object of claims and support, and the royal administration much less salient in those regards, between 1758 and 1834.

Research Plans

The next round of work falls under two general headings: 1) a study of social change and contention in Great Britain from 1828 through 1834, involving the description and analysis of about 6,900 contentious gatherings occurring during those years; 2) an analysis of changes in the patterns of contention in the London region during twenty years spread over the period from 1758 to 1834, including the preparation of a substantial amount of evidence on the region's social geography as well as description and analysis of a) the 1,204 contentious gatherings that occurred in Kent, Surrey, Sussex, or Middlesex during thirteen selected years from 1758 to 1820, plus the 3,068 London-region events in the seven years from 1828 to 1834, b) about 2,000 routine assemblies between 1758 and 1820.

1. Social Change and Contention in Great Britain from 1828 to 1834. The major analyses planned are an examination of the structure and change of repertoires, a study of the influence of repression, facilitation, and external modeling on the course and outcome of contention, and a close look at connections among events, especially national campaigns such as the mobilization for parliamentary reform.

The studies of repertoires treat the degree to which they consist of highly standardized sequences of actions, and to which their previous use or disuse constrains their current employment by different categories of actors; the extent and character of correspondence between the organization, interests, and power of important pairs of actors, on the one hand, and the contents of their repertoires, on the other; the process by which new routines such as the demonstration and the public meeting take shape, enter repertoires, and displace other routines; the conditions for effectiveness of different forms of action, as well as the consequences of their relative effectiveness for subsequent uses of those forms.

The studies of repression, facilitation, and external modeling examine the extent to which elections promoted the adoption of election-linked forms of action such as public meetings for the making of non-electoral claims; the impact of different forms and intensities of repression on sequences of action within events (e.g. the appearance of violent encounters in the course of parades and meetings) and on the next round of action; the conditions under which powerholders repress or facilitate different sorts of popular collective action. In this regard, the overlap of our evidence with the conflicts composing the "Swing" rebellion of 1830, already well studied by George Rude, Eric Hobsbawm, Andrew Charlesworth, and others, provides a splendid opportunity both to check the validity of our own data, and to push beyond the existing literature by examining the response to action, success, failure, and/or repression in adjacent localities by people who share interests with those who have already acted.

The studies of connections among events investigate the degree to which groups that have already acted on certain issues alter their means of action as a function of their involvement in regional or national movements such as the campaign for Catholic Emancipation or against the

Poor Law; the conditions under which national authorities and organizations become the objects of popular action; the influence of Reform's passage in 1832 on subsequent popular contention around national issues; the determinants of fluctuations in the overall frequency and intensity of popular collective action concerning particular major issues such as food supply and rights of workers to organize.

2. Changes in London's Contention, 1758 to 1834. The studies of London emphasize geographic patterns much more strongly than those of Great Britain as a whole. We have much more spatial detail for Sussex, Surrey, Kent, and Middlesex, the four counties comprising our London region: while we locate actions elsewhere to the nearest square kilometer, in London and vicinity we resolve to the nearest hundred-meter square; furthermore, the data from Kent's directories, our machine-readable topographical survey of parishes, and the accumulated geographical work of other scholars provide rich evidence on the characteristics of individual localities. Our research therefore falls into these five steps: 1) describing alterations in the geography of different types of contentious gatherings within the region, 2) relating those alterations to changes in social geography (e.g. the increasing segregation by class) 3) describing altera- tions in the geography of routine assemblies, 4) relating those alterations to changes in social geography, 5) relating the alterations in contentious gatherings to a) changes in social geog- raphy, b) shifts in the pattern of routine assembly.

We have some reason to believe, for example, that routine gatherings to drink and talk, on the one hand, and authorized public ceremonies and festivals, on the other, became less frequent occasions for collective contention as the one-craft street declined in importance among worksites, segregation of homes from workplaces increased, the right to assemble for the deliberation of shared interests extended, and the involvement of national authorities in trade disputes enlarged. Our evidence provides the possibility of examining the influence of at least some of these changes. As a byproduct, the study of London will also provide means of tracing back in time some of the innovations (for example, the petition march as a quasi- demonstration) we see spreading in the period from 1828 to 1834, and of examining much more closely some relationships (for example, the patterning of rural conflicts by the extent and character of local involvement in the London market) that we are likely to detect on the national scale.

DATA ON GREAT BRITAIN AVAILABLE AT THE END OF JULY 1986

1. Microfilms or photocopies of about 20,000 pages of manuscripts in British archives (especi- ally the Public Record Office, London) from 1740 to 1860. The documents come especially from administrative and political correspondence concerning the control of collective action.

2. Standing files:

   a. dossiers of 6,884 contentious gatherings that occurred in Great Britain from 1828 through 1834. All dossiers include photocopies of original sources and complete, detailed coding.

   b. dossiers of 1,204 contentious gatherings that occurred in Kent, Surrey, Sussex, or Middlesex during one of the following years: 1758, 1759, 1768, 1769, 1780, 1781, 1789, 1795, 1801, 1807, 1811, 1819, and 1820.

   c. dossiers of about 2,000 routine assemblies that occurred in Kent, Surrey, Sussex, or Middlesex during one of the same years. The dossiers include photocopies of the sources.

   d. standard descriptions of 818 locations (parishes, towns, wards, and other sites) in Kent, Surrey, Sussex, or Middlesex in the period 1756-1816.

   e. descriptive material on about twenty major events or series of events (e.g. strike waves, campaigns, Swing rebellion) that occurred in Great Britain during the years from 1828 through 1834, including abstracts and photocopies of all articles referring to those events (whether qualifying as contentious gatherings or not) found in our sources.

3. Machine-readable files:

a. standard descriptions of the 6,884 contentious gatherings from 1828 to 1834 in Great Britain as a whole mentioned above. The records include subfiles describing 22,756 formations, 42,693 actions, 17,966 sources, 2,366 secondary locations, plus 1,186 records containing supplementary comments.

b. standard descriptions of the 1,204 contentious gatherings from 1758 to 1820 in Kent, Surrey, Sussex, or Middlesex mentioned above. The records include subfiles describing 4,436 formations, 8,163 actions, 3,060 sources, 587 secondary locations, plus 175 records containing supplementary comments.

c. standard descriptions of about 1,000 of the roughly 2,000 routine assemblies in the same years and counties mentioned above. We have not yet completed or cleaned these files, and therefore can't yet guarantee their quality.

d. standard descriptions of the 818 locations in Kent, Surrey, Sussex, or Middlesex mentioned above. (For detail, see Erica Stanley, "The GBS Topographical Survey of London").

e. standard descriptions of 285 contentious gatherings forming part of the "Swing" rebellion of 1830.

f. standard descriptions of about 1,100 events from the "Swing" rebellion cataloged in the appendix to Eric Hobsbawm and George Rude, Captain Swing.

g. total population, urban population, proportion of land cultivated and 35 other characteristics for all counties of Great Britain, as of 1831.

h. complete transcriptions of Kent's London street directory of trades and businesses for 1759, 1768, 1801, and 1828, plus transcriptions of 5 percent of all entries in the directories for 1781, 1795, and 1811. (For detail, see Erica Stanley, "Kent's Directories of London, 1759-1828: A Guide to the Machine-Readable Transcription".

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

R.A. Schweitzer
1978   "Source Reading for Contentious Gatherings in Nineteenth-Century British Newspapers," CRSO Working Paper 186.

1979   "A Study of Contentious Gatherings in Early Nineteenth-Century Great Britain," Historical Methods 12: 1-4. Reprinted as CRSO Working Paper 209, 1980.

R.A. Schweitzer & Steven C. Simmons
1981   "Interactive, Direct-Entry Approaches to Contentious Gathering Event Files," Social Science History 5: 317-342. Revised version of CRSO Working Paper 183, 1978. This version issued simultaneously as CRSO Working Paper 245.

Erica A. Stanley
1983   "The GBS Topographical Survey of London," CRSO Working Paper 308.

1984   "Kent's Directories of London, 1759-1828: A Guide to the Machine-Readable Transcription," CRSO Working Paper 309.

Charles Tilly

1980   "How (And, to Some Extent, Why) to Study British Contention," CRSO Working Paper 212. Revised version published in Charles Tilly, As Sociology Meets History (New York: Academic, 1981).

1982a   "Britain Creates the Social Movement," in James Cronin and Jonathan Schneer, eds., Social Conflict and the Political Order in Modern Britain (London: Croom Helm). Revised version of CRSO Working Paper 232, same title, 1981.

1982b   "British Conflicts, 1828-1831," CRSO Working Paper 255; revised version of paper presented to the American Historical Association.

Charles Tilly & R.A. Schweitzer
1980   "Enumerating and Coding Contentious Gatherings in Nineteenth-Century Britain," CRSO Working Paper 210.

1981a   "The Changing Geography of Contention in London, 1755-1835: Sketch of a Research Plan," CRSO Working Paper 225. Revised version published as "How London and its Conflicts Changed Shape, 1758-1834," Historical Methods 5: 67-77 and issued simultaneously as CRSO Working Paper 270.

Basic Forms for Description of GBS Events

1. coversheet for photocopy of report from periodical

2. assembly review form, recording the original collation of reports concerning the same event

3. entry completion form, indicating entry of data into computer

4. event coversheet: general identification of event

5. event section: data for machine-readable description of contentious gathering as a whole

6. formation enumeration: list of all formations

7. formation description

8. action-phase section

9. source section

10. comments on individual elements of the event

Note: The originals of these forms are color-coded by year and type for easy identification and filing.