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Alltagsgeschichte, Social Science History and the Study of Mundane Movements in 19th-century Germany

James H. Jackson, Jr.*

Abstract: German residency registers have been used in a variety of ways to develop important insights into migration and its contribution to the development of an urban-industrial world. Because manuscript census data for the 19th century has not survived in central Europe except in limited areas, these registers will continue to provide a fundamental source for historical analysis, especially when linked with other documents such as employment records, marriage contracts, and vital records. Continuous residency registers present a unique opportunity to define more accurately the character and quality of German life during a period of fundamental social changes and to understand the degree to which ordinary people were able to actively shape their own destinies.

In the past several decades, the scope of European social history has been widened considerably by the increasing attention given to the historical experience of inarticulate, ordinary people. (2) Three questions have been central in the search to recover the texture of past lives: First, what is the character and quality of social life in the past? Second, what was the nature of structural change that transformed the arena in which common folk lived? What long-term environmental, economic, political, and intellectual processes were at work? And third, were these ordinary people invariably caught in the powerful undertow of such changes or was it possible for them at times to actively and creatively shape the development of social structures and processes? In their pursuit of answers to these questions, social historians on both sides of the Atlantic have imaginatively explored neglected sources. And, as might be expected in a vigorous and youthful field of inquiry, practitioners have energetically debated methodological issues.

* Address all communications to: James H. Jackson, Jr., Department of History and Political Science, Point Lorna College, 3900 Lomaland Drive, San Diego, California 92106-2899, USA.
In recent years, social science historians who specialize in German history have been confronted by the challenges of Alltagsgeschichte - the history of ordinary events. (3) Using a methodology influenced by anthropology, practitioners of »every-day history« have utilized memoirs, letters, old photos and interviews with participant observers in order to evoke the past social life of select groups. These scholars have often reported their findings in vivid, detailed narratives in order to avoid forcing the multifaceted experience of ordinary folk into what these scholars consider arid statistical tables and reified constructs, dangers that particularly beset consumers of computer-generated crosstabulations and regression equations. In addition, advocates of »peoples' history« have attempted to make historical scholarship unambiguously relevant to contemporary issues by setting their research against a backdrop of current social and political controversy and by espousing »populist« social views.

Social science historians for their part have been quick to probe for the blemishes of Alltagsgeschichte. In their view, the first weakness of every-day history« has been its inability to carry on a critical dialogue between evidence and the reigning paradigms of social transformation, whether from Marxist or modernization schools. Populist social perspectives on and dissident political attitudes toward late 20th-century technological society have precluded an even-handed analysis of the human consequences of large-scale change in the past two centuries because pre-industrial times have often been treated in a nostalgic, homogeneous manner. Second, a preoccupation with the minutiae of narrative has prevented historians of plebeian concerns from ascertaining the representativeness of their data and from determining the context of their findings. For social science historians, this debilitating antiquarianism has underscored clearly the necessity of accumulating systematic data about long-term social processes. Thus, the failure of social science historians and practitioners of »every-day« history to co-operate more closely in the effort to understand complex social processes is not only due to contrasting methodological biases but also to the distinctive documentation used by each group of scholars.

The study of geographical mobility illustrates many of these tensions and potentialities. Migration was a universal experience of ordinary Germans long before industrialization, a fact reflected in the attempts of »home towns« to defend their social integrity against vagabonds and paupers. (4) During the 19th century, mass population movement became commonplace as the ambitious, the desperate, and the restless abandoned their rural hamlets for the promises of the New World and the urban industrial complexes of Berlin, Silesia, and the Ruhr. (5) The outstanding features of 20th-century German migration have been the exchange of population due to post-war political settlements and the impact of guest workers from southern Europe. (6)
The analysis of these shifting migration patterns has depended primarily on the diligent study of published aggregate statistics. Social observers of the late 19th- and early 20th centuries investigated the ways in which migration enabled Germany to utilize new resources in agriculture and industry and to accommodate to shifting regional population growth rates, concluding that more Germans were in circulation between 1850 and 1914. Social critics, including Friedrich Engels, Max Weber, Georg Simmel, Friedrich Tönnies, and Gustav Schmoller, were not only interested in the demographic ebb and flow and its implications for the life of the nation and for social order; they were curious about the social adjustment of the individual migrant as well. Without any way to directly and systematically observe the behavior of individual migrants, they inferred that more aggregate movement translated into family destabilization, increased personal uprootedness and loss of psychic integrity. These powerful stereotypes of community and society are still influential in the form of modernization theory. (7)

Many of the contentions of this conventional wisdom can only be authenticated if the focus of migration research moves away from an examination of gross national patterns toward the experience of individual migrants. Accordingly, some migration scholars who take a quantitative approach have attempted to test the assertions of earlier social theories by utilizing published statistics and detailed archival data aggregated at the city or county level. (8) Although their efforts have uncovered a great variety of migration behavior, their findings have affirmed the general observation that migration was a major social force rearranging German society during industrialization and urbanization. Such an approach is not likely to satisfy the Alltagshistoriker, who have just begun their search for pungent testimony that would help recover migrants* personal experience. Building on the pioneering work of HsiHuey Liang on Berlin migrants, this quest will likely provide a helpful counterweight to a passive view of geographical mobility often embedded in the quantitative analysis of the »pushes« and »pulls« of population aggregates. (9) Such testimony can reveal not only the degree to which migrants* motivations diverged from their village neighbors who stayed behind but also illuminate contrasting experiences of adjustment to a bewildering urban-industrial world.

If the historiographic development of German migration studies emulates a pattern followed by investigations of social protest and the labor movement, however, the greatest danger to the emergence of a comprehensive picture of Germany's mobile masses is a bifurcation of the field between quantifiers and historians of the »every-day.«(10) To avoid such an unproductive split in the field, some migration scholars have begun to utilize complementary sources that can link the structural analysis of geographical mobility with an explication of vivid personal experience.
Nominative-level source material that systematically recorded a large number of individual residential moves and simultaneously provides access to group behavior has proved difficult to uncover for central Europe. Manuscript censuses have survived only in limited areas. Tax lists and housing surveys often are hard to find. Residency registers, on the other hand, can be found more easily and have the potential to provide a fundamental source for historical analysis, especially when linked with other documents such as employment records, marriage contracts, and vital records. This essay will examine the origins and character of continuous residency registers in Germany, discuss their accessibility, and their potential future use.

I

Not unexpectedly, statistical surveys like residency registers were shaped by the preoccupations of rulers of various German lands and their clerks. Drawing their lessons from the years of bloody warfare that had engulfed Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, German kings, dukes and bureaucrats came to believe that political survival and expansion depended on control of national resources. These rulers were convinced that consistent support for a credible military force could be insured only by harnessing the productive powers of a territory through the development of an internally unified and self-sufficient economy. To fulfill this mandate, state bureaucrats throughout Germany needed accurate information concerning the productivity of agriculture, the strength of trade and commerce, and the vigor of the labor force. In Brandenburg, for example, state administrators produced a Directory of Subjects in 1654 that contained economic as well as demographic data. In 1683, Elector Friedrich Wilhelm ordered church officials to prepare Populationlisten, annual summaries of the demographic information recorded in their parish registers. By the middle of the next century, a broad range of manufacturing statistics were being collected and condensed in the General-Fabrik-Tabellen. On the whole, the results of such statistical surveys were considered state secrets and were not published.

German bureaucracies were not the only constituents of statistics before the turn of the 19th century. The utility of statistical surveys was clearly understood by prominent university professors who gained access to state numerical data and built an important part of their academic disciplines on their use. In their lectures on state administration, geography, and currency development, they demonstrated how descriptive statistics could be used for the purposes of efficient public administration, social reform, and effective legislation. Another group of social observers, known as Po-
husche Arithmetiker, were also concerned about statistical information gathered by bureaucrats. Led by Johann Süßmilch, these scholars searched vital statistics for laws governing social behavior and founded the discipline of demography in Germany. (13) Both university professors and social observers assisted state administrators by analyzing data, suggesting new areas in the life of the state that could be investigated and by uncovering the regularities that seemed to rule social life. One important result of this alliance of data analysts was the establishment of independent statistical agencies in Prussia (1805), Bavaria (1808), and Württemberg (1820).

During the first half of the 19th century, state statistical offices restricted themselves to the collection of information and left interpretation to others. But their focus was fundamentally changed in the 1830s and 1840s by the example of the Belgian statistician Adolphe Quetelet and by the founding of the German Customs Union. Through his work on Belgian censuses and other surveys and by his essay on the regularities of social and economic life, Quetelet encouraged German statistical bureaus to unify the tasks of information collection and scholarly analysis, the results of which were published regularly. (14) The foundation of the German Customs Union, the Zollverein, also stimulated the development of official statistics. Not only was commerce with foreign countries monitored; uniform enumerations of member states became necessary because income from the Zollverein was distributed according to population.

The period of rapid social change after mid-century generated a demand by bureaucrats, academicians, demographers, and reformers for even more extensive and detailed information on social processes. These analysts needed reliable data that could be utilized to formulate concrete solutions to social problems they had identified, such as crime, suicide, pauperism, illiteracy, revolutionary political behavior, vagrancy, overcrowding, infant mortality, and a declining birth rate. Unfortunately, organizational constraints did not permit the collection of uniform statistics throughout Germany. Even with unification in 1871, statistical collection and publication remained fragmented, mirroring the combination of federal and unitary principles characteristic of the Second Empire. Central statistics were quite limited, consisting of work undertaken by the Imperial Statistical Bureau and focusing primarily on foreign commerce. Federal statistics, such as censuses, migration information, vital statistics, and economic data, were those collected by the separate states and arranged in uniform tables which were then transmitted to the Imperial office for publication. Special statistics consisted of data collected by individual states on their own initiative and without reference to the Empire. Finally, numerical data for large towns were kept by communal statistical offices. (15)

Thus, official statistics in Germany did not simply summarize the realities of the body politic but were the product of those same conditions.
Political choices that reflected the social, political, and economic concerns of the various constituencies for statistics were implicit in the decisions about the scope of various inquiries and about the categories used to measure changing realities. The crucial event in the history of German statistics was the switch from mere data collection in the 18th- and early-19th centuries to a greater stress on the importance of official numbers in the allocation of political power and tax revenue, a development that reflected the shifting preoccupations of complex bureaucracies with limited resources. It is not surprising, then, that population surveys and the tabulation of their results differed widely, depending on the topic or political jurisdiction. (16)

During the War of Liberation against France in the early 19th century, the Prussian government had instituted strong measures to control the movement of its population, both citizens and non-citizens alike. But in the course of the 19th century, the character of Prussian residency registration statistics was modified by state bureaucrats who were trying to balance royal assurances of free and unlimited movement within the nation and the requirements of public safety and of taxation. (17) In 1817, regulations concerning geographical mobility were recast by King Frederick William's General Edict on Travel in Prussia. (18) Foreigners were still required to obtain proper passports and visas, but permanent residents of Prussia were guaranteed the right of free and uninhibited travel without a police passport. This did not mean, however, that geographical mobility went unobserved by governmental agencies. All officials charged with maintaining public safety were required to intensify their efforts to keep under close observation certain types of individuals and classes who might endanger law and order. To make the job easier for security police, registration procedures were strengthened for certain highly mobile occupational groups and for all those traveling or visiting outside their permanent place of residency, irrespective of citizenship. In addition, even those with the right of free movement without an internal police passport had to be able to present proper identification on demand, papers that could be provided by a citizen's hometown police. Thus, the general pattern of regulatory evolution was set: The basic laws of Prussia and, later, of the German Empire, guaranteed that permanent residents could move about the nation freely and choose their domicile. But such rights and freedoms were always hedged by special administrative limitations and police oversight.

Maintaining public safety was not the only motive for keeping close watch on population movements. Fiscal officers were concerned about locating mobile taxpayers. Administrators in the central government urged revenue agents to make more strenuous efforts to keep their assessment lists accurate. For example, notices alerting local officials to the need for taxpayers to register when they moved from town to town appeared in the
Administrative Communications Bulletin of the Düsseldorf District. (19) But these admonitions for more stringent bureaucratic record keeping apparently did not have the desired effect. As a result, a series of specific administrative regulations were issued from 1832 to 1838 in an attempt to strengthen the whole system of looking after non-residents. From 1832 on, all households were obligated to report to the police the presence of non-resident guests who stayed overnight. (20) Personal information, including the purpose of the visit, was recorded. Innkeepers kept their own books on travelers and were required to forward a summary to the police by nine o'clock each morning. Non-residents who stayed longer than three days in certain large cities were required to obtain a temporary residency permit. Fines could be levied for noncompliance. Evidently, these measures did not prove to be a sufficient remedy as non-residents were still not registering properly. Innkeepers, for example, constantly complained that travelers gave false information. In spite of these problems, new requirements for formal registration were issued in 1838. (21) Each houseowner was required to inform the police when a renter moved in or out, including sub-renters and lodgers. Servants, apprentices, handworkers, and factory laborers who moved had to be registered by their employers within twenty-four hours. As might be anticipated, such measures were not without controversy.

Also of concern to the Prussian Finance Ministry was the division of tax revenues from the Zollverein based on population size. Prussian fiscal administrators believed that census methods used by the Royal Statistical Bureau to calculate the number of Prussian subjects were unreliable, thereby depriving the realm of tax money. In a series of meetings between civil servants from both agencies during the 1830s, tax officials suggested the establishment of a continuous residency register in Prussia, much like the nominal lists of taxpayers already in existence. Knowing the serious limitations of the registration procedures used to compile such information, however, the Statistical Office objected to the suggestion and the idea was dropped. Each agency did agree, however, to improve its data collection and reporting methods.

Although the Belgian census of 1846 was a powerful example of how to keep track of a total population, Quetelet's methods were not adopted. By the late 1840s, Prussian population statistics had become more accurate and comprehensive, and the separate Prussian agencies did not see any advantage in establishing a unified population registration system, one that they believed might be less accurate than the one they had evolved. Thus, population registration in Prussia remained fragmented among several agencies: Vital records continued to be kept by the churches; responsibility for periodic censuses remained with the Statistical Office; and tax lists were maintained by the Finance Ministry along with the local
police, who were also responsible for registering day-to-day population movements. These police Meldebucher were the only set of official documents in Prussia that tried to measure population changes on a continuing basis.

In 1857, during the first flush of industrial expansion that was accompanied by an acceleration of geographical mobility, the cluster of registration ordinances was revised and expanded. (22) The former regulations on non-residents (1832) and residency change (1838) were adopted without major modification. But now, non-residents or special occupational groups were not the only ones subject to registration requirements. There was a growing interest in keeping track of all new arrivals who intended to change their permanent residence. Such persons were obliged to report to the police within fourteen days of their arrival and receive a special certificate. Local officials, for their part, could recommend to the mayor whether someone should be allowed to stay. In addition, the 1857 regulations required that the personal data on new arrivals be entered in permanent registration ledger books and used to correct class tax rolls. Simplified regulations were issued in 1874, but procedures remained fundamentally the same. (23) The only change of consequence was that registration now had to occur within three days of arrival. (24)

The records required by these new registration regulations assumed different configurations in different locations. In Duisburg, for example, four different types of ledger books were kept for each year, with a few exceptions. (25) One kind of book listed family units that settled in Duisburg; another recorded their departures. Persons without a family group, even if married, registered their arrivals and departures in two other books. Each ledger contained a chronological listing of migrants, including the date of registration, name, occupation, birthplace and birthdate, last place of residence, religion, marital status, wife's and children's names (if applicable), criminal record, address, and proposed next place of residence. Occasionally, the name of a landlord, military service, place of employment, and vaccination record of children were listed. Breslau city administrators complicated the process even further by making two different offices responsible for the continuous registration of the population and each created forms for its own particular needs. (26) First, each precinct police station was required to maintain three different records: 1) A list of residents in each house (including date of arrival, name, occupation/family status, birth information, religion, place of previous residence, date of departure/death, and intended place of next residence); 2) An alphabetical register of the population (listing essential the same information as the house lists); and 3) a list of travelers. Second, the city registration office compiled a master list of residents based upon police documents. This record included information on a resident's name, occupation/status, birth data, religion, date of arrival and address.
Only near the turn of the century, when an alphabetical registration card system for all residents past and present was inaugurated, were German registration methods altered substantially. The same basic information was recorded. But the use of registration cards facilitated the exchange of information between various branches of the city administration, including vital records office, the tax office, the criminal police, the public health office, and youth and school authorities. (27) Although this kind of record approaches the character of population registers in some other European countries, it remained incomplete because the information gathered was not exchanged in any extensive way with previous or subsequent cities of residence. (28)

Those German states that joined or were annexed to the North German Confederation in 1867 - Schleswig, Holstein, Mecklenburg, Hamburg, Bremen, Hannover, Electoral Hesse, and Saxony - had the same governmental priorities as Prussia for revenue and public safety, concerns that shaped the introduction of residency registers. In the textile city of Chemnitz in Saxony, for example, the overriding focus of local officials was tax receipts. (29) City administrators decided to assess the most mobile occupational groups, such as unmarried journeymen and factory workers, to help balance the city budget. Thus, registration books for only a few categories of persons were kept, unlike other Saxon cities, such as Leipzig, Dresden, and Zwickau, where a unified system of registration regulations could be found. After 1876, this situation was rectified and the residency registers in Chemnitz recorded the name, occupation or status, birthplace, citizenship, year of birth, religion, address, date of naturalization, date of death, date of departure, grants of business licenses, and police matters for the entire population of the city. In Schleswig-Holstein, travelers were required to satisfy registration requirements as early as the sixteenth century. (30) It was only after Prussia assumed control of this territory in 1867 that a general registration law was issued, however. (31) Concern for taxes, public safety, and the influx of hordes of migrants were the primary motivations for these rules. Name, occupation and status, birth date, birthplace, and religion were among the personal details found in the residency registers of this region.

The Hanseatic city-state of Hamburg developed yet another kind of registration system. (32) As early as 1814, non-citizens were required to register with the police within 48 hours of their arrival. After 1834, household servants, journeymen, apprentices, and laborers who were not members of a guild had to obtain special police documents even to search for work. These regulations were extended to natives of Hamburg after 1881. When Hamburg joined the North German Confederation in 1866, freedom of movement was guaranteed by law, although the city was permitted to keep track of migration in its own way. As a result, Hamburg did not
begin comprehensive registration of in- and out-migrants and changes of address until 1892. At this time, five different alphabetical card files were established, including a list for the entire population (organized by address as well as by family name), for servants, and for those with outstanding arrest warrants. Similar developments can be noted in Hannover, Electoral Hesse, the Grand Duchy of Hesse, and Bremen.(33)

In southern Germany, residency registration along the lines found in the north was not widespread until the 1880s. (34) Nevertheless, population accounting was commonplace. Community social values in this region stressed stability and familiarity and local politics was given coherence by the defense of a town's integrity against the intrusion of bureaucrats, the invasion of poor vagabonds, and the irresponsibility of the promiscuous. Preoccupied with the rights and obligations of city citizenship and with the completeness of vital records led to the creation of family registries and lists of transients in places like Bamberg, Regensburg, Stuttgart, Ulm and Würzburg in the first decades of the 19th century. (35) The Familienbogen, which were kept in the district administrative center where the family had its place of residence, contain information on the names of family members including genealogical data, birth dates and places, religion, occupation or status, address changes, purpose of residence, marriage information, names and birth dates of children, and notes regarding the dissolution of the marriage, either through death or divorce.

Even though contemporaries considered the continuous residency registers the best available guide to yearly population fluctuation and used this information when making up communal and class tax lists, there is no way at present to independently estimate the accuracy and inclusiveness of Germany's continuous residency registers. Scattered evidence exists that an unregistered floating population of unknown size slipped through the registration process, thus avoiding the grasp of the city tax collector. In the city of Duisburg, for example, the number of persons cited by the police for violation of registration regulations between 1871 and 1891 was equal to between 0. (9)% and 5. (4)% of the annual volume of registrations. (36) If it is not clear exactly how comprehensively in-migration was recorded, contemporaries were agreed that, relatively speaking, registration at the time of departure was systematically underestimated by perhaps as much as five percent. (37) In addition, it is possible that for Berlin, Hannover and other large cities, the accuracy of registration statistics was even worse. By assuming that vital records and census tabulations were accurate, the Berlin City Statistical Office calculated that 10% - 21% of the male out-migrants and 3% - 11% of female out-migrants were not included. (38) Out-migrants among the most mobile age groups were also believed to be underrepresented. Bureaucrats who compiled out-migration figures for Hanover were convinced that their data needed to be corrected in order to compensate for a 12% underregistration. (39)
The same history of German state administration and scholarly preoccupations that shaped the development of statistics in general and of population registers in particular has also determined the character of German archives. Until the 19th century, they existed to preserve administrative and legal documents of various German states and were not generally open to the public. Gradually, portions of archival holdings were made available to scholars. But because archival functions continued to be concerned with the needs of Germany's autonomous states, decentralization was a major hurdle. Not even the enthusiasm of unification led to the creation of a centralized archive administration. The destruction of many archive collections during World War II and the division of Germany into the Federal Republic of Germany (BRD) and the German Democratic Republic (DDR) have intensified the difficulties stemming from decentralized archival organization to make research a complex and arduous task. Except for the establishment of a Federal Archive (Bundesarchiv) that houses documents of the central government, archives in the Federal Republic have followed the tradition of decentralization. Because residency registration was the responsibility of local police in the 19th century, these records will not be found in state or federal archives, but must be sought at the local level. City archives, registration offices (Meldeamt), and vital records offices (Standesamt) could each have all or part of the surviving records. (See Chart 1)

This search through various local archives is not, however, the only impediment to using continuous residency registers from the 19th century. In an effort to protect the privacy of its citizens, the Federal Republic recently enacted a law concerning data protection, known as the Bundesdatenschutzgesetz (BDSG). Many provincial governments have followed suit. This law asserts that all automatic data processing - whether in the private economic sphere or under the jurisdiction of federal, provincial, and local government - is prohibited, except as specifically permitted under the BDSG or when the affected person has expressly agreed. The BDSG is especially sensitive to the problems for individual privacy that arise from a comprehensive registration system. These attitudes were manifest during and reinforce by the conflict over the federal census of 1983/1987. Although an Orwellian vision was often invoked by census opponents as a warning against governmental data collection, Germany's experience under the National Socialist dictatorship provided a far more frightening reminder of how centralized population registration could be used as a technique of social manipulation and political repression. In an attempt to guard against such abuses, the BDSG, in conjunction with subsequent court decisions and legislation, sets limits on the
transmission of personal information to other public or private agencies and requires that data no longer needed for the fulfillment of legally sanctioned government tasks or private economic pursuits must be erased. (44) In some cases that are specifically authorized by federal and state law, data can be transferred to an appropriate archive for later reference.

If no special law concerning materials held in archives is in effect, the provisions of the BDSG regulate access to nominative data, such as continuous residency registers. (45) Only if access serves the public interest or legitimate research purposes can these documents be made available. How these concepts are defined by the BDSG and by the Law Concerning Registration (Melderechtsrahmengesetz) and how federal and state regulations affect archival research is now being clarified. (46) Data Protection commissioners at both the federal and provincial levels agree that current legislation is concerned with preserving the privacy of living individuals and that access to materials concerning persons who have died is a matter for each individual archive to resolve. (47) Until the situation is further clarified, some local archives will possibly interpret these regulations strictly, believing that they have the same obligation toward 19th-century residency registers as they have with data from the present. (48) Others will undoubtedly show sensitivity to the purposes of the BDSG but will be more open to scholarly use of such older documents. This diversity is again a manifestation of the Federal Republic’s decentralized administrative system and can hinder scholarly investigation.

The events of November 1989 are likely to fundamentally change the more centralized archival system that existed under the regime in the German Democratic Republic. (49) If the flexible and diverse system of archives found in the Federal Republic serves as a model, access to residency registers in archives in the east will likely be subject to the same regulation as in the west. Because city archives are likely to retain the considerable autonomy that they possessed even under the previous regime, local archives will determine access to these sources. Data protection and preservation of personal privacy are likely to be particularly sensitive issues as well.

III

Just as political shifts, economic change and social upheaval influenced the character of data collection and access to those documents, the kinds of questions asked of those data were influenced by the crucial political and cultural events in German history during the past century, including the economic and social restructuring that accompanied industrialization, defeat in World War I, economic disaster, the ascension of the Nazis, the
destruction of World War II, the division of Germany into two states, and economic reconstruction during the past 40 years. (50) In addition, migration studies during the past two decades have reflected the influence of the Annales, the scholarly concerns of English and East German labor historians, and biases of American quantitative approaches. (51) And Alltagsgeschichte is likely to make a contribution as well by melting the frozen voices of the past. The complexity of the questions confronting migration researchers demands the skills of each of these approaches and the use of all kinds of data, including published aggregate statistics, personal recollections, and nominative lists that can link the other two together.

The agenda of German migration studies is likely to revolve around five issues. (52) First, only scattered evidence on the operation of migration differentials at different times and places has been unearthed. More descriptive studies of how German geographical mobility was selective on a wide range of variables are needed. Second, the motivations of Germany's mobile masses must be analyzed in greater detail. Recent research indicates that migrants are far from perfect economic actors and that family cultural values, occupational traditions, and lore about possible destinations are crucial to understand why people move. Third, migration studies must move beyond a simple analysis of net flows to an understanding of the development of migration systems, embodying complex return and seasonal migration arrangements. This approach would require a recognition that pre-industrial migration patterns in Germany often continued into the industrial age and must be distinguished from newer trends. In addition, this approach would help determine to what degree migrants were really strangers from an alien rural culture. Fourth, the impact of migration on places of origin and destination must receive more attention. Migrants were not only problems for Germany's policy makers but they could be innovators whose arrival/departure had a profound impact on political, social, and economic life of a region. Of particular interest in this regard is the relationship of migration and the fate of cottage industry. Finally, the human consequences of migration must be more carefully delineated. The basic conclusions of Tönnies, Simmel, and Weber regarding the level of alienation and rootlessness experienced by migrants have not yet been thoroughly tested. What little has been done on this subject indicates a paradox of individual stability in the context of massive population movement. If borne out through further study, this finding has potentially a great significance for the analysis of industrial labor force formation and collective protest.

German residency registers have been and will continue to be used in a variety of ways to develop important insights into migration and its contribution to the development of an urban-industrial world. Because manuscript census data for the 19th century has not survived in central Eu-
rope except in limited areas, these registers will continue to provide a fundamental source for historical analysis, especially when linked with other documents such as employment records, marriage contracts, and vital records. Although some critics of social history have expressed varying degrees of dissatisfaction with and distaste for statistical approaches to understanding the lives of ordinary Germans, these avenues of analysis that are based in part on residency registers will continue to be explored by scholars who believe that historical demography is fundamental for a complete understanding of the material bases of life. (53) Continuous residency registers present a unique opportunity to define more accurately the character and quality of German life during a period of fundamental social changes and to understand the degree to which ordinary people were able to actively shape their own destinies.
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Chart 1  

Location of Population Residency Registers from the Nineteenth Century, for Selected German Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVINCE and CITY</th>
<th>TYPE OF DOCUMENT</th>
<th>DATES COVERED</th>
<th>LOCATION OF DOCUMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRUSSIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bielefeld</td>
<td>Melderegister</td>
<td>1823-1886</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottrop</td>
<td>Meldekartei ?</td>
<td>1850-1901</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castrop-Rauxel</td>
<td>Anmelderegister</td>
<td>1857-1894</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duisburg</td>
<td>Abmelderegister</td>
<td>1857-1894, 1908</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essen</td>
<td>Anmelderegister</td>
<td>1857-1883, 1896</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abmelderegister</td>
<td>1899, 1904, 1909</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abmelderegister</td>
<td>1882, 1890-1893, 1895-1900, 1904</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krefeld</td>
<td>Ummelderegister</td>
<td>1903, 1905</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malstaat-Burbach</td>
<td>Melderegister</td>
<td>1870-1900</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meldekartei</td>
<td>1900-1930</td>
<td>Saarbrücken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saarbrücken</td>
<td>Abmelderegister</td>
<td>1867-1902</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solingen</td>
<td>Einwohnerregister</td>
<td>1846-1930</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Johann</td>
<td>Anmelderegister</td>
<td>1870-1890</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abzugsregister</td>
<td>1874-1890</td>
<td>Saarbrücken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ausländerregister</td>
<td>1887-1890</td>
<td>Saarbrücken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAVARIA</td>
<td>Familienbogen</td>
<td>-ca.1935</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamberg</td>
<td>Einwohnerkartei</td>
<td>1844-1868, 1881--</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melde- und Aufenthaltsregister</td>
<td>1893, 1902-1938</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiserslautern</td>
<td>Melderegister</td>
<td>1839, 1872-1917</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>Polizeimeldebogen</td>
<td>1810-?</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regensburg</td>
<td>Familienbogen</td>
<td>1810-?</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Würzburg</td>
<td>Familienbogen</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BADEN</td>
<td>Meldekartei</td>
<td>1807-1900</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freiburg i.B.</td>
<td>Familienbogen</td>
<td>1901 - ca. 1959</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannheim</td>
<td>Meldekartei</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WÜRTTEMBERG</td>
<td>Familienregister</td>
<td>1900-1914</td>
<td>Standesamt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
<td>Personenregister</td>
<td>1900-1914</td>
<td>Stadtarchiv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ADDITIONAL REMARKS:

1) To be filmed by the Genealogical Society (Salt Lake City)
2) Genealogical Society
3) Some records from suburban towns; some records war damaged
4) Early records contain only selected types of residents
5) Records of many suburban towns also
6) Also records of many Einwohnerbücher suburban towns
7) Some war damage
8) Records damage due to flooding

### NOTE:

The following cities reported total loss of residency registration records due to war damage: Berlin, Bochum, Cologne, Dortmund, Esslingen, Hal-le/Saale, Herne, Karlsruhe, Ludwigshafen am Rhein, Magdeburg, Mainz, Nuremberg, Potsdam, Wiesbaden