

**Working-Class Historiography in France, Italy and Spain:
A comparative study (1939/1945-1982)**

Roberto Ceamanos Llorens¹

Abstract

This article undertakes a journey through the historiography of the working class in three of the countries in Western Europe where the movement was strongest and most successful: France, Italy and Spain. The aim is to show commonalities and differences through the comparative study of these three cases. Clearly, political circumstances – international and civil conflicts; dictatorships and democratic transitions – affected the process in different ways in each of these historiographies, but, in the end, the road taken – despite the very distinct rhythms and intensity – was largely the same. Initially centred on a “militant” historiography – basically revolving around a study of the working-class movement – and moving towards (and not without complications) a university-based one with pretensions of a scientific nature, this was a transition that signalled fundamental changes in the way of understanding the writing of the history of the workers.

KeyWords:

Working class historiography, France, Italy and Spain

The immediate post-war period: the Spanish wasteland versus the French and Italian evolution

While the end of the Second World War saw the recuperation of freedom in Italy and France, the result of the Civil War in Spain was the beginning of a lengthy

¹ Researcher, Project: “Transitions from dictatorships to democracies in Portugal, Greece and Spain (1969-1982): a comparative analysis (Transición de las dictaduras a las democracias en Portugal, Grecia y España (1969-1982): un análisis comparado”) (Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad de España, 2013-2015). Investigation Group: History of Spain in the Twentieth Century: society, politics and culture” (Historia de España en el siglo XX: sociedad, política y cultura) (Gobierno de Aragón/Fondo Social Europeo, 2011-2013).

dictatorship. These circumstances were decisive in the development of the historiography of the working class in these countries. In Spain, the history of the working class was the work of the victors.² From abroad, exiles and anti-Franco sympathisers wrote different works favouring the anarchist movement and, to a lesser extent, socialism.³ The French university world sympathized with this historiography of exile due to its opposition to Francoism, but considered it to be unscientific and written from beyond the academic world – a situation that the historiography of the French working classes was beginning to overcome at the time. In fact, in the post-Liberation period, the French working-class historiography regained the direction interrupted by the Nazi Occupation at the beginning of the Second World War.

Those specialists working prior to the war – writers such as Maurice Dommanget (a biographer of nineteenth century socialism) and Georges Bourgin (a specialist on the Commune) – were in the twilight of their careers at this moment. They were joined by a new generation born at the beginning of the century represented by the Socialist Georges Lefranc and the Communist Jean Bruhat. This was a historiography essentially centred on the French situation; for European history they turned to the *Histoire du socialisme européen* by Élie Halévy. These were histories written with political ends with the various sensibilities of the workers' movement being represented. Thus, *Histoire du Mouvement ouvrier français* by Édouard Dolléans (a reference point for decades) defended the autonomy of French socialism against the interference of Soviet Bolshevism. The work of these historians increased the prominence of working-class historiography, but did not remove it from the narrow realms of authors who were primarily militants in various wings of the workers' movement.

This historiography began to enter the French university system via a gradual process initiated by Jean Maitron. Accompanied by a notable range of historians of the working-class movement, Maitron took the first steps to institutionalising working-class

² GARCIA, Maximiano. *Historia de las Internacionales obreras*. Madrid: Ed. del Movimiento, 1956-1957; and *Historia de los movimientos sindicales españoles*. Madrid: Ed. del Movimiento, 1961. COMIN, Eduardo. *Historia del anarquismo español*. Barcelona: AHR, 1956; and *Historia del Partido Comunista de España*. Madrid: Editora Nacional, 1967. PASAMAR, Gonzalo. *Historiografía e ideología en la postguerra española: la ruptura de la tradición liberal*. Zaragoza: PUZ, 1991. CASANOVA, Julián. "El secano español revisitado". In: *La historia social y los historiadores*. Barcelona: Crítica, 2003. pp. 7-35.

³ DEL ROSAL, Amaro. *Los congresos obreros internacionales en el s. XIX*. México: Grijalbo, 1958; and *Los congresos obreros internacionales en el s. XX*. México: Grijalbo, 1963. PEIRATS, José. *La CNT en la revolución española*. Toulouse: CNT, 1951-1953. ABAD de SANTILLÁN, Diego. *Contribución a la Historia del Movimiento Obrero Español*. Puebla: Cajica, 1962-1971. French writers: LAMBERET, Renée. *Mouvements ouvriers et socialistes. Chronologie et bibliographie. L'Espagne (1750-1936)*. Paris: Ed. Ouvrières, 1953; and LEVAL, Gastón. *Espagne libertaire, 1936-1939*. Paris: Cercle, 1971.

historiography. In 1949, he founded the *Institut Français d'Histoire Sociale*, a centre where archives were kept and as well as a space for research and reflection though it was barely connected to other historiographies. One of his contacts was the Italian Giuseppe Del Bo. This institute had a modest bulletin where they published their research entitled *L'Actualité de l'Histoire* (1953-1960).⁴

Some of these characteristics can also be found in the Italian working-class historiography of the time: the predominance of the workers' movement, little connection to the outside world and militant in nature although in the Italian case, the Marxist influence was greater. However, this proximity to Marxism on the part of the Italian historians was more political than methodological. They maintained the idealistic historicism of their masters and wrote militant histories in line with the political culture of their authors based on an analysis of sources within a local framework.⁵ There was no lack of debate in these histories, such as that arising from the work of Rosario Romeo on the *Risorgimento* that tilted against the *gramsciana* tradition and opposed the idea of the “failed agrarian revolution”. This historiography began to research the origins of Italian socialism through scientific studies – the preparation and study of sources and publication of works – on the history of the working-class movement. This task was supported by the *Movimento operaio* (1949-1956), a publication that gathered together local monographs that served to debate frameworks for general explanations.⁶

This historiography is characterised by the mark left by the French (FCP) and Italian Communist Parties (ICP) who – having become important players in politics and

⁴ HALÉVY, E. *Histoire du socialisme européen*. Paris: Gallimard, 1948. DOLLÉANS, E. *Histoire du Mouvement ouvrier français*. Paris: Colin, 1936-1953. DEL BO, G. “La Bibliothèque Feltrinelli”. *L'Actualité de l'Histoire*. 6, 1954. pp. 46-48. CEAMANOS, R. *De la historia del movimiento obrero a la historia social. L'Actualité de l'Histoire (1951-1960) and Le Mouvement Social (1960-2000)*. Zaragoza: PUZ, 2004; and *Militancia y Universidad. La construcción de la historia obrera en Francia*. Valencia: Instituto de Historia Social-UNED, 2005.

⁵ Ex., LURAGHI, R. *Il movimento operaio torinese durante la Resistenza*. Torino: Einaudi, 1958. VITTORIA, Albertina. *Togliatti e gli intellettuali. Storia dell'Istituto Gramsci negli anni Cinquanta e Sessanta*. Roma: Riuniti, 1992. p. 46.

⁶ ROMEO, R. *El Risorgimento in Sicilia*, 1950; *Risorgimento e capitalismo*. Bari, 1959; and *Breve storia della grande industria in Italia 1861-1961*. Bologna: Capella, 1963. The bibliographical analysis by Luigi Bulferetti showed the tasks remaining: BULFERRETTI, L. *Introduzione alla storiografia socialista in Italia*. Firenze: Olschki, 1949. A decade later, Leo Valiani offered the abundant work undertaken: VALIANI, L. *Questioni di storia del socialismo*. Torino: Einaudi, 1958. ZANGHERI, R. “Gli studi storici sul movimento operaio italiano dal 1944 al 1950”. *Società*, XII, 1951. pp. 308-347; and CECCHI, Ottavio. ed. *La ricerca storica marxista in Italia*. Roma: Riuniti, 1974. Representative works from this period: CONTI, Elio. *Le origini del socialismo a Firenze (1860-1880)*. Roma: Rinascita, 1950; MANACORDA, Gastone. *Il movimento operaio italiano attraverso i suoi congressi (1853-1892)*. Roma: Riuniti, 1953; RAGIONIERI, E. *Storia di un comune socialista. Sesto Fiorentino*. Roma: Rinascita, 1953; and ROMANO, Aldo. *Storia del movimento socialista in Italia*. Milano: Fratelli Bocca, 1954-1956.

culture – capitalised on the writing of history. Faced with the writings of those Communists opposed to Stalinism such as Boris Souvaine and Angelo Tasca, the historiography linked to these parties was initially hegemonic. The FCP depicted their official history in the *Manuel d'histoire du PCF*. This simplified process connected the French Revolution with October 1917 and favoured the glory days of Communism, leaving the dark periods to the side. In their official historiography, the ICP also showed a disinterest in the early years under the leadership of Bordiga and the relationship with the Komintern while extolling the fight against the Fascists and the post-war democratic strategy. Both parties favoured a historical interpretation that provided them with national legitimacy. In the Italian case, this fed on readings of Antonio Gramsci; those aspects that did not coincide with the official interpretation were eliminated.⁷ Likewise, in the Italian case, notable work was undertaken by the *Fondazione Antonio Gramsci* (1948) and the publication *Studi Storici* (1959) which showed a special sensibility for the working-class movement, aiming to compare it with other historiographical models.⁸ Under the aegis of the ICP, courses in history were published for their schools: texts about their origins, memoirs of militants, a special edition of *Rinascita* (a systematic attempt at an official history), a “popular” biography of Gramsci and another by Togliatti that was almost an autobiography where he presented his interpretation of the history of the party.⁹

The burden of political militancy on the writing of history began to decline at the end of the 1950s. The beginning of this change is usually given as 1955-1956 both for external reasons (Khrushchev’s report to the XX Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the repression of the Hungarian Revolt) and internal ones among Italian historians. Among these must be highlighted the crisis in the magazine *Movimento operaio* motivated by the need to surpass the history of the origins of the

⁷ SOUVARINE, B. *Staline. Aperçu historique du bolchevisme*. Paris: Plon 1935; TASCA, A. *I primi dieci anni di vita del PCI*. Bari: Laterza, 1973; Commission d’Histoire du PCF. *Manuel d'histoire du PCF*. Paris: Éditions Sociales, 1964. GRAMSCI, A. *Lettere dal carcere*. Torino: Einaudi, 1947; and *Quaderni del carcere*, ed. Felice Platone. Torino: Einaudi, 1948-1951. Important for this latter, the critical edition by GERRATANA, Valentino (Torino: Einaudi, 1975, 2007). BOCCA, Giorgio. *Palmiro Togliatti*. Bari: Laterza, 1977, vol. II. p. 633.

⁸ www.fondazionegramsci.org. MANACORDA, G. “Nascita di una rivista di tendenza”. In: *Il movimento reale e la coscienza inquieta*. Milano: Angeli, 1992. p. 295.

⁹ CORTESI, L. introd. Tasca, A. *I primi dieci anni di vita del PCI*. Bari: Laterza, 1973; CARACCILOLO, A. and SCALIA, G. eds. *La città futura. Saggi sulla figura e il pensiero di Antonio Gramsci*. Milano: Feltrinelli, 1959; MONTAGNAGNA, Mario. *Memorie di un operaio torinese*. Rome: Rinascita, 1949; TOGLIATTI, P. ed. *Quaderni di Rinascita. Trenta anni di vita e lotte del PCI* (1952). LOMBARDO, Lucio and CARBONI, Giuseppe. *Vita di Antonio Gramsci*. Rome: Edizioni di Cultura Sociale, 1951. FERRARA, Marcella and Mauricio. *Conversando con Togliatti*. Rome: Edizioni di Cultura Sociale, 1953.

working-class movement. It wished to make progress in the study of working class, union and political cultures, as well as change from being strictly local in order to cover the national and international situation. There was also a social and economic historiography running in parallel to the history of workers' organizations that should not be forgotten, as well as a whole world of historiography from beyond Italian borders.¹⁰ Although some inertia was maintained through these studies of the politicization and origins of the workers' movement, there was excessive attention to leaders and congresses, few studies of the social context and scarcely any methodological reflection. Henceforth, the international sphere was favoured and interest grew in foreign historiography, a process aided by the work of institutes such as *Feltrinelli* and the *Basso Foundation* and new publications including *Movimento operaio e socialista* (1955), *Annali del Istituto Feltrinelli* (1958) and *Rivista storica del socialismo* (1958).¹¹

New directions, relationships, and Spanish convergence

The 1960s and 1970s saw periods of renovation in the French and Italian historiographies of the working class that – aided by the increase in university positions and the decentralisation of the university system – saw them begin to be consolidated professionally. In France, the work of *Le Mouvement Social* (1960) was fundamental – favoured by the *Centre d'Histoire du Syndicalisme* (1966) – in surpassing the hegemony of the history of the working-class movement, consolidating its cross-disciplinary nature and pushing the boundaries of history through to the present time. To the preceding publication, the *Dictionnaire Biographique du Mouvement Ouvrier Français* may be added: this was an ambitious project that had an influence on similar projects – an Italian biographical dictionary – and was the reason behind the transition from biography to prosopography.¹² Some of the main characters in these projects

¹⁰ GROPPPO, Bruno and RICCAMBONI, Gianni. dir. *La sinistra e il '56 in Italia e in Francia*. Padoue: Liviana, 1987. Debates on *Movimento operaio*: ARFE, G. “La lunga resistenza del compagno Bosio” and BERMANI, C. “Libertario perché marxista”. *Mondoperaio* XXV, 1 (1972). pp. 20-23 and pp. 29-36; PIRO, F. “Bosio e l'esperienza di *Movimento operaio*. *Mondoperaio*. XXXIII, 3, 1980. pp. 120-126; and MERLI, S. *L'altra storia: Bosio, Montaldi e le origini della nuova sinistra*. Milano: Feltrinelli, 1977.

¹¹ SPRIANO, P. *Socialismo e classe operaia a Torino dal 1892 a 1913*. Torino: Einaudi, 1958; RAGIONIERI, E. *Socialdemocrazia tedesca e socialisti italiani*. Milan: Feltrinelli, 1961; and MASELLA, L. *Passato e presente nel dibattito storiografico italiano: storici marxista e mutamento della società italiana (1955-1970)*. Bari: De Donato, 1979.

¹² <http://biosoc.univ-paris1.fr/> MAITRON, J. and PENNETIER, Cl. dirs. *Dictionnaire Biographique du Mouvement Ouvrier Français*. Paris: Ed. de l'Atelier, 1997. ANDREUCCI, Franco and DETTI,

dedicated their doctoral theses to working-class history, thus strengthening its university-based nature. Some tackled the working-class movement, such as Claude Willard who studied “guesdisme”, but others went further. Rolande Trespé researched the change in the figure of the peasant to that of the miner and showed how the creation of the French working class was the result of a progressive and complex process. Michelle Perrot undertook a detailed study of the strike, the principal means of pressure and expression through which the workers transformed themselves into mindful wage-earners. Lastly, Yves Lequin revealed a model of industrialization that emerged from the rural world, with workers accepting industry so long as it could be controlled by them. However, the turn-of-the-century crisis affected domestic production methods and production was reorganized into large industrial establishments where a new class was forged in which the corporate spirit of trades was redrawn in favour of the notion of the wage-earning working man. He researched their working and living conditions and how their collective fight reinforced group awareness that favoured their participation in politics, split between republican integration and revolutionary breakaway.¹³

The history of the organized movement continued to benefit from commemorations such as the centenary of the Commune (1971) and, in particular, from the development of a historiography of Communism, introduced into the university system through a thesis by Annie Kriegel that concluded that the FCP was the result of the grafting of Soviet Bolshevism onto the French left-wing.¹⁴ However, influenced by the context of social transformation in May 1968, the fall of orthodox Marxism and the rise of the “Nouvelle Histoire”, French working-class historiography moved towards a history interested in the whole of the working class world supported by cross-disciplinary studies. A good example of this lies in the thesis by Patrick Fridenson on Renault. Blending social, economic and technical history with political sciences and social sciences of the workplace, he analysed the transformations in working conditions,

Tommaso. dirs. *Il movimento operaio italiano. Dizionario biografico, 1853-1943*. Roma: Riuniti, 1975-1979. CEAMANOS, R. “De la biografía a la prosopografía: el *Dictionnaire Biographique du Mouvement Ouvrier Français*”. *Ayer*, 56, 2004. pp. 245-267.

¹³ WILLARD, Cl. *Les guesdistes*. Paris: Ed. Sociales, 1965. TREMPÉ, R. *Les mineurs de Carmaux. 1848-1914*. Paris: Ed. Ouvrières, 1971. PERROT, M. *Les ouvriers en grève (France, 1871-1890)*. Paris: Mouton, 1974. LEQUIN, Y. *Les ouvriers de la région lyonnaise dans la deuxième moitié du XIXe siècle (1848-1914)*. Lyon: PUL, 1977.

¹⁴ KRIEGEL, A. *Aux origines du Communisme français (1914-1920)*. Paris: Mouton, 1964. CEAMANOS, R.: “Historia social de la Comuna de 1871: ¿crepúsculo del ciclo revolucionario iniciado en 1789 o aurora de la revolución proletaria?”. *Cuadernos de Historia Contemporánea*. n.26, 2004. pp. 197-208 and “La historiografía francesa sobre el PCF. Controversias científicas y polémicas (1964-2010)”. *Historia del Presente*. 2010.

company policy, working class and employers' organisations, and the mentality of the French resulting from the automobile industry. Other fruitful encounters in working-class history took place in cultural history: history "from below" sparked interest in a working-class culture that had not broken away from its peasant and artisanal past, but which developed among an atmosphere of exploitation and fighting for rights. Moreover, historians began to study the history of women who suffered from the chauvinism of the society as a whole, paying attention to the work, behaviour and problems of women and their connections to the larger working-class movement. Alain Touraine analyzed the fall of the working-class movement and the rise of the new social movements from a sociological point of view. The class conflict typical of an industrial society had disappeared. In post-industrial society, the objective was to improve health, education, culture and the unrestricted development of one's personality. The workers as a social class passed into history and their evolution was covered in the *L'ouvrier français* trilogy by Michel Verret.¹⁵

Aware of the need to obtain a comprehensive overview of working-class history, Italian historians strengthened their contacts with other historiographies. They disseminated the debates around the works of Eric J. Hobsbawm and Edward P. Thompson in Great Britain and Rolande Treppe and Michelle Perrot in France that questioned the traditional way of writing the history of the working classes. The reflections of the British Marxists on working-class culture and the importance of day-to-day experiences in the forging of a common identity were received as signs of cultural and methodological vitality.¹⁶ The French historiography of the working class became known in Italy through the translation of the *Histoire générale du Socialisme* (under the aegis of Jacques Droz) and the diffusion of French theses on working-class

¹⁵ FRIDENSEN, P. *Histoire des usines Renault*. Paris: Seuil, 1972. REBÉRIOUX, M. dir. *Critique littéraire et Socialisme au tournant du siècle. Le Mouvement Social*. n. 59, 1967 and *Culture et militantisme en France: de la Belle Époque au Front Populaire. Le Mouvement Social*. n. 91, 1975; PERROT, M. dir. *Travaux des femmes dans la France du XIXe siècle. Le Mouvement Social*. n.105, 1978. CEAMANOS, R. "La historia obrera: una línea de investigación pionera de la *histoire des femmes*". *Clepsydra*. n.4, 2005. pp. 113-126; TOURAINE, A. *La société post-industrielle*. Paris: SNEG, 1969; VERRET, M. *L'espace ouvrier*. Paris: A. Colin, 1979; *Le travail ouvrier*. Paris: A. Colin, 1982; and *La culture ouvrier*. Saint-Sébastien-sur-Loire: ACL, 1988.

¹⁶ HOBBSAWM, E.J. "Per lo studio delle classi subalterne". *Società*. XVI, 1960. pp. 436-449; "Dalla storia sociale alla storia della società". *Quaderni Storici*. v.22, 1973. pp. 49-86; and *Lavoro, cultura e mentalità nella società industriale*. Laterza: Roma-Bari, 1986. THOMPSON, E.P. *Rivoluzione industriale e classe operaia in Inghilterra*. Milano: Il Saggiatore, 1969; and "Alcune osservazioni su classe e «coscienza di classe»". *Quaderni storici*. v. 36, 1977. pp. 900-908. "Un' intervista a E.P. Thompson: per un dibattito sulla storia sociale del movimento operaio". *Movimento operaio e socialista*. Vol. 1-2, 1978. pp. 77-101.

history.¹⁷ Italy experienced a period of social transformation to which must be added an ideological context characterized by the dissatisfaction of workers and students with the actions of the ICP and the rise of alternative movements, which reached a peak with the “movimento ’77”. In that same year, 1977, Georges Haupt – a member of the *Groupe de travail international sur l’histoire sociale moderne et contemporaine* at the *Maison des sciences de l’homme de Paris* – contacted Lelio Basso of the *Fondazione Basso-Issoco* to organize a series of meetings to which leading figures in the writing of French working-class history – Perrot, Trempé, Lequin and Madeleine Rebérioux – were invited. The objective was to link the history of the working-class movement to a wider social history. In a seminar entitled “Storia sociale e storia del movimento operaio” (Roma, 1978), Trempé stressed the importance of recovering the day-to-day experiences, the mentality and, above all, the culture of the working class; a year later, during a seminar entitled “Cultura operaia e disciplina industriale” – featuring the participation of Edward and Dorothy Thompson – this theoretical reflection emphasized the transformations in working-class culture and fostered the founding of *Memoria* (1981), which was an innovative reference point for feminism that – starting from the teachings of Franca Pieroni Bortolotti – aimed to retrace the memory of Italian women.¹⁸

Starting from the collective bases mentioned above and new works such as *Quaderni storici* (1966), these Italian historians set out to have a written version of working-class history that maintained a dialogue with the social sciences, updated the methodology (oral history and micro-history) and expanded the field of historical research to the creation of the working class, its fabric, relations with capital, private lives, organization of free time and connections between the world of the family and associative life through the influence of the work of Maurice Agulhon.¹⁹ The pioneering writings by Stefano Merli comprised an essential contribution to a history concerned

¹⁷ DROZ, J. dir. *Storia del socialismo*. Roma: Riuniti, 1974-1981.

¹⁸ SALVATI, Mariuccia. ed. *Storia Sociale e storia del movimento operaio. Annali della Fondazione Lelio e Lisli Basso-Issoco*. IV, 1979-1980 and *Cultura operaia e disciplina industriale. Annali della Fondazione Lelio e Lisli Basso-Issoco*. VI, 1982; BORTOLOTTI, Pieroni. *Alle origine del movimento femminile in Italia (1849-1882)*. Torino: Einaudi, 1963.

¹⁹ British oral history was collected in THOMPSON, P. “Storia orale e storia della classe operaia”. *Quaderni Storici*. v. 35, 1977. pp. 403-432. For critical use of oral sources, see PASSERINI, Luisa. *Storia orale. Vita quotidiana e cultura materiale delle classi subalterne*. Torino: Rosenberg/Sellier, 1978 and *Torino operaia e il fascismo. Una storia orale*. Roma: Laterza, 1984; LANZARDO, Liliana. *Classe operaia e partito comunista alla Fiat*. Torino: Einaudi, 1971; MERIGGI, M.G. “Note in margine all’attuale dibattito storiografico”. *Classe*. vol. 18, 1980. pp. 15-22. GEMELLI, Giuliana and MALATESTA, Maria. eds. *Forme di sociabilità nella storiografia contemporanea francese*. Milano: Feltrinelli, 1982. His influence led to works such as PIVATO, Stefano. *Pane e gramática. L’istruzione elementare in Romagna alla fine dell’Ottocento*. Milano: Angeli, 1983.

with the development of capitalism and the living and working conditions of the working class. Later, Franco Ramella studied the process of the creation of the working class from the transition of community and rural relationships to those in the world of the factory in Piedmont.²⁰ This renovation also happened in the historiography of the ICP: there were criticisms of the strict identification of class and the workers' movement, a detailed examination of the post-1945 period, comparisons between the two great Western European Communist Parties (FCP and ICP) and the renewing of viewpoints by political scientists and sociologists interested in the mechanics of the creation of leaders and recruitment of militants as well as in the links between the Party and the political, social and cultural arena that it inhabited.²¹

While the French and Italian historiographies of the working class advanced along these lines, Spanish historiography slowly began to take off in the late sixties. In conditions that were difficult due to the controls imposed by the dictatorship, historians with Marxist sympathies wrote a history that was committed to the fight against Franco and centred on the working class movement – a model that was being updated in France and Italy. At this point, criticisms arose of this conventional historiography. Closely linked to the social changes experienced – which saw other social sectors gain greater influence and other types of mobilization – Spanish historians discovered new angles that were successful in western historiographies. History writing would have to become depoliticized, the automatic representation of the worker by class organisations questioned, an overview of the history of workers given priority – working conditions, day-to-day life, mentality and culture – and contact with foreign historiographies increased. To achieve this, it was necessary to accurately define concepts, a process that required the collaboration of the social sciences. Along these lines, historians began to write working-class histories that were less politically militant and more academic. They formed specialized associations and publications that – as in the Italian and French cases – consolidated the scientific nature of working-class history, gaining a home in

²⁰ MERLI, S. “La grande fabbrica in Italia e la formazione del proletariato industriale di massa”. *Classe*, vol. 1, 1969. pp. 1-87 and *Proletariato di fabbrica e capitalismo industriale. Il caso italiano, 1880-1900*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1972. RAMELLA, F. *Terra e telai. Sistemi di parentela e manifattura nel biellese dell'ottocento*. Torino: Einaudi, 1984.

²¹ BALLONE, Adriano. “Storiografia e storia del PCI”. *Passato e presente*. vol. 33, 1994. pp. 129-140. AGOSTI, Aldo. “L'età dell'oro della storiografia sul Partito Comunista Italiano (1960-1989)”. *Revista de Historia Actual*. vol. 6, 2008. pp. 103-113.

the expanding university system and advancing through innovative means that allowed it to converge with its European counterparts.²²

Conclusions

Following the Spanish Civil War, a highly politicized historiography sprang up in Spain consisting of the victors within and the exiled without. Meanwhile, the French and Italian historiographies of the working class evolved with similar results: supremacy of the history of the working-class movement and their own national histories and limited connections with the outside world. Additionally, these were politically militant histories that aimed to eventually achieve a scientific methodology through the publication of research based on the study of sources. Over the course of the 1960s and 1970s, as the imprint of militancy faded, the French and Italian historiographies of the working class began to gain research centres and publications in which to reflect and strengthen ties, renewing their methods and subject areas, and consolidating themselves in the university world. This is the path that Spanish historiography would also take later and, following the transition to democracy, would witness a convergence with wider European historiographies of the working class.

²² ÁLVAREZ JUNCO, José and PÉREZ, Ledesma Manuel. “Historia del movimiento obrero. ¿Una segunda ruptura?”. *Revista de Occidente*. vol. 12, 1982. pp. 19-41. The conferences of the *Asociación de Historia Social* (1989) and the contents of *Historia Social* (1988) bring together some of the main lines of Spanish historiography of the working class. On its development see BARRIO, Ángeles. *A propósito de la historia social, del movimiento obrero y los sindicatos*. In: RUEDA, G. coord. *Doce estudios de historiografía contemporánea*. Santander: UC, 1991. pp. 41-68; GABRIEL, Pere. “A vueltas y revueltas con la historia social obrera en España”. *Historia Social*. vol. 22, 1995. pp. 43-53; PIQUERAS, José Antonio and SANZ, Vicent. “The Social History of Work in Spain: From the Primitive Accumulation of Knowledge to Offshoring”. *International Review of Social History*. vol. 50, 2005. pp. 467-483 and CEAMANOS, R. “De la ruptura a la convergencia. La historiografía social obrera española y francesa (1939-1982)”. *Historia Social*. vol. 61, 2008. pp. 147-168.