ČLÁNKY A STUDIE 58-80

Industrialisation, Domestic Work and Domestic Industry in the Bohemian Lands at the Turn of the 20th Century*

PETR POPELKA

Popelka, Petr: Industrialisation, Domestic Work and Domestic Industry in the Bohemian Lands at the Turn of the 20th Century

Economic historians have paid due attention to the phenomenon of domestic work, especially in connection with the theory of proto-industrialisation, for decades. However, domestic production has not been a marginal issue even in those economies of European countries that can be considered industrialised. The phenomenon of domestic industry was significant in the Bohemian lands as well as in some other countries of the Habsburg monarchy (e.g. Vorarlberg and Galicia) or East and Southeast Europe until the turn of the 20th century. Both the industrial and protoindustrial forms of production coexisted in the society of Central Europe for a relatively long time. This is what Witold Kula called "the coexistence of anachronisms". This study focuses on the causes of the persistence of protoindustrial forms of production, their field structure, and gender aspects, as well as on the comparison of data from official statistics and from the period press. Specific examples present domestic work not only as a social problem but also as a strategy to earn a living mainly for country people.

Key Words *Industrialisation; Domestic Work; Domestic Industry; Bohemian Lands*

Contact *Ostravská univerzita; petr.popelka@osu.cz*

DOI – 10.15452/Historica.2024.15.0004

Introduction

During the so-called long 19th century, major civilisational changes had taken place around Europe, accompanied by a complex societal transformation, referred to as modernisation. Major changes in economic production and labour relations were also part of this general process. The classical model, based on a chronological sequence of the individual stages of economic development with characteristic labour relations, presents, following the development in West and Central Europe, a gradual transition from pre-industrial labour relations (before 1700), proto-industrial relations (1700–1820) and industrial relations (1820–1980) to post-industrial relations (after 1980). This development pattern enables to create an evaluation of the predominant labour forms that evolved from handcraft to labour forms connected with various types of putting-out and manufactory production, factory work and, lastly, deregulated labour and labour of the present time based on knowledge economy.[1] Handcraft in this model suffered a crisis as industrialisation

* This study was created in connection with the project SGS08/FF/2022 Czechoslovak Society in the First Half of the 20th Century, conducted in 2022 at the Faculty of Arts of the University of Ostrava.

1 KOMLOSY, Andrea: *Globalgeschichte. Methoden und Theorien*. Böhlau Verlag 2011, pp. 102–107.

This work is licenced under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license for non-commercial purposes.

progressed, demonstrating its uncompetitiveness and retreating into the background, only to be replaced by a more advanced form of work in factories. However, not only is this notion barely applicable to non-European environments, but research since the 1970s has essentially shown the unsustainability of the thesis regarding the global decline of small business in 19th-century Central Europe.[2] For this reason, we can see a transition from the classical model described above to a synchronous model assuming an overlap and a combination of different types of work and various ways of production.[3]

The phenomenon of the so-called domestic work and domestic industry, i.e. traditional forms of organised domestic work, has justifiably become an important topic in the historiography of economic and social history, as well as in historical or economic ethnology.[4] In historical research, domestic work has been studied primarily in connection with two topics: 1. The theory of proto-industrialisation and the question of the transition from proto-industrial forms of production to a modern factory industry and 2. The question of the evolution of the social status of craftsmen during the commencement and development of industrial factory production.

To this day, the concept of proto-industrialisation is one of the main topics of economic and social history. While the concept itself has undergone very extensive discussion, research into the pre-industrial handcraft of rural domestic producers has remained the centre of attention. The shift from proto-industrial forms of production to modern factory production, its pace and specifics in different production sectors, represents a classic topic that has been dealt with both by case studies for various European regions or production sectors and by works whose ambition was an international comparison.[5] Nonetheless, the question of the persistence of production organised by traditional forms in societies that had embarked on a path to industrial society remains in the background. It is generally believed that proto-industrial forms of production had lost their original function during industrial production, becoming a complement to factory production.[6]

---

[2] PIERENKEMPER, Toni: *Gewerbe und Industrie im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. München: Oldenburg 1994, pp. 61–73; LUFT, Robert: „Des Handwerks goldener Boden". Handwerker im Übergang zum Kleinunternehmer in Böhmen in späten 19. Jahrhundert. In: HOFFMANN, Robert (ed.): *Bürger zwischen Tradition und Modernität*. Böhlau 1997, pp. 315–334; BLACKBOURN, David: Handwerker in Kaiserreich: Gewinner oder Verlierer? In: WENGENROTH, Ulrich (ed.): *Prekäre Selbstständigkeit. Zur Standortbestimmung von Handwerk, Hausindustrie und Kleingewerbe im Industrialisierungsprozess*. Stuttgart 1989, pp. 7–21.

[3] KOMLOSY, Andrea: Work and Labor Relations. In: KOCKA, Jürgen – LINDEN, Marcel van der (ed.): *Capitalism : The Reemergence of a Historical Concept*. Bloomsbury 2016, pp. 33–69.

[4] For the evolution of the term Hausindustrie, see KRIEDTE, Peter: *Hausindustrie : Bemerkungen zu einem gewerbegeschichtlichen Begriff*. In: LEGNER, Friedrich (ed.): *Handwerk, Hausindustrie und die historische Schule der Nationalökonomie*. Bielefeld 1998, pp. 105–131; LUKÁŠ, Josef: Domácká výroba. *Sociální revue. Věstník ministerstva sociální péče* 11, 1930, pp. 19–36, 125–134, 265–270.

[5] CERMAN, Markus – SHEILAGH, Ogilvie C. (eds.): *European Proto-Industrialization. An Introductory Handbook*. Cambridge 1995; BOLDORF, Marcel: *Europäische Leinenregionen im Wandel. Institutionelle Weichenstellung in Schlesien und Irland (1750–1850)*. Böhlau 2006; DITT, Karl – POLLARD, Sidney (eds.): *Von der Heimarbeit in die Fabrik. Industrialisierung und Arbeiterschaft in Leinen- und Baumwollregionen Westeuropas*. Paderborn 1992; MAGER, Wolfgang – EBELING, Dietrich (eds.): *Protoindustrie in der Region. Europäische Gewerbelandschaften vom 16. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert*. Bielefeld 1997; SCHÄFER, Michael: *Eine andere Industrialisierung. Die Transformation der sächsischen Textilexportgewerbe 1790–1890*. Stuttgart 2016; KRIEDTE, Peter – MEDICK, Hans – SCHLUMBOHM, Jürgen: Sozialgeschichte in der Erweiterung – Proto-Industrialisierung in der Verengung? Demographie, Sozialstruktur, moderne Hausindustrie: eine Zwischenbilanz der Proto-Industrialisirungs-Forschung. *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 18, 1992, pp. 70–87, 231–255.

[6] MYŠKA, Milan: *Region a industrializace. Studie k dějinám industrializace ve Slezsku (1800–1918)*. Ostrava 2014, pp. 77–78; IDEM: *Opožděná industrializace : Protoindustriální výrobní vztahy a formy za průmyslové revoluce*

Unlike discussions related to the theory of proto-industrialisation, the problem of the social status of craftsmen in the period of industrialisation is a topic that already resonated strongly in the 19th century (Gustav Schmoller, Werner Sombart, Karl Bücher, Eugen Schwiedland, Josef Gruber, Emanuel Adler, and others).[7] Historians repeatedly returned to the topic as a research problem during the 20th century, when a relatively large number of social history authors of the 19th century touched on the evolution of craftsmen, whether in connection with research into the development of social structures (J. Kocka, H. U. Wehler, Fredrich Lenger, H. G. Haupt, G. Crossick, etc.) or by analysing the transformation of the position of craftsmen in a chosen town or craft, but more recently also in terms of gender (specifically, the phenomenon of female or child domestic work). In research, craftsmen in towns are generally preferred, while rural crafts are mostly sidelined.[8] I find particularly inspiring those works that highlight the plurality of strategies employed to ensure existence, in which independent status and ownership played a significant role.[9] The research of crafts and domestic work is also carried out in connection with other research specialisations, most notably with labour history, in which domestic work is studied together with research into the so-called informal sector (*informelle Sektor*).[10] This is a very varied range of activities in which an individual enters a variety of social relationships, and which can also represent a certain stage of life.[11]

Besides historians, the phenomenon of domestic work has also been increasingly studied by ethnologists. In addition to reflecting the technological level in the individual production sectors, ethnologists also apply a socio-cultural perspective tied to smaller social groups (families, local communities, regions).[12] Since as early as the second half of the

---

na příkladu lnářského průmyslu ve Slezsku. Ústí nad Orlicí 1987; IDEM: Výrobní vztahy v tzv. domáckém průmyslu na Moravě a ve Slezsku na sklonku 19. století. In: *Z dějin textilu 5*. Trutnov 1988, pp. 59–75.

7 SCHMOLLER, Gustav: *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Kleingewerbe im 19. Jahrhundert. Statistische und nationalökonomische Untersuchungen*. Halle 1870; ADLER, Emanuel: Ueber die Lage des Handwerks in Oesterreich. In: *Wiener Staatswissenschaftliche Studien*, Band 1. Freiburg i. B. – Leipzig – Tübingen 1898, pp. 1–130; SCHWIEDLAND, Eugen: *Die Entstehung der Hausindustrie mit Rücksicht auf Österreich*. Zeitschrift für Volkswirtschaft, Sozialpolitik und Verwaltung 1, 1892, pp. 146–170; SOMBART, Werner: *Der moderne Kapitalismus*. Band II/2. München – Leipzig 1916; SOMBART, Werner: Die Hausindustrie in Deutschland. *Archiv für soziale Gesetzgebung und Statistik* IV, 1891, pp. 103–156; LIEFMANN, Robert: *Wesen und Formen des Verlags (des Hausindustrie)*. Freiburg – Leipzig – Tübingen 1899.

8 LUFT, Robert: „Des Handwerks goldener Boden". Handwerker im Übergang zum Kleinunternehmer in Böhmen in späten 19. Jahrhundert. In: HOFFMANN, Robert (ed.): *Bürger zwischen Tradition und Modernität*. Böhlau 1997, pp. 281–334; EHMER, Josef: *Soziale traditionen in Zeiten des Wandels. Arbeiter und Handwerker im 19. Jahrhundert*. Frankfurt/New York 1994; BLACKENBURG, Christine – DIENEL, Hans-Liudger (eds.): *Alt und Jung im Handwerk*. Stuttgart 2011; WENGENROTH, Ulrich (ed.): *Prekäre Selbstständigkeit* : *Zur Standortbestimmung von Handwerk, Hausindustrie und Kleingewerbe im Industrialisierungsprozess*. Stuttgart 1989; LENGER, Friedrich: *Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Handwerker seit 1800*. Frankfurt am Main 1988; ENGELHADT, Ulrich (ed.): *Handwerker in der Industrialisierung*. Stuttgart 1984.

9 See, for example, HAUPT, Heinz Gerhard: Besitz und Selbstständigkeit ale Teil von Arbeiterstrategien im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 43, 2017, pp. 240–263.

10 For Central Europe, see KOMLOSY, Andrea: *Arbeit* : *Eine globalhistorische Pespektive*. Wien 2014; EAD: *Spinnen – Spulen – Weben. Leben und Arbeiten im Waldviertel und anderen ländlichen Textilregionen*. Krems – Horn 1991; EAD: Textiles Verlagswesen, Hausindustrie und Heimarbeit. Prototyp des informellen Sektors im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert. In: EAD (ed.): *Ungeregelt und unterbezahlt* : *Der informelle Sektor in der Weltwirtschaft*. Wien 1997, pp. 63–85.

11 NEDERVEEN MEERKERK, Elise van: Temporary Service? A Global Perspective on Domestic Work and the Life Cycle from Pre-Industrial Times to the Present. *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 43, 2017, pp. 217–239.

12 DRÁPALA, Daniel: „Domácký průmysl" Moravy na přelomu 19. a 20. století. Dobová reflexe tradiční ru-

19th century, in addition to the typological and technological questions of traditional production, ethnological research has included a microanalytical focus, aimed at capturing the image of the material culture of the world of domestic work of specific settlement sites or production circuits. Besides thoroughly capturing the evolution of today's often extinct technologies, it is of interest primarily due to its broad cultural and historical focus on studying human everydayness. A more in-depth microhistorical analysis has thus made it possible to survey the various forms of individual involvement in production activities – from occasional or seasonal work to a permanent source of income as the main occupation, and the economic, social and cultural dimensions of its pursuit. These works aimed to reconstruct the living conditions of domestic producers, which were interpreted within smaller social groups based on families, a locally anchored community of producers or a regionally profiled production circuit.[13]

This study aims to present the various forms of domestic work in the Bohemian lands during a period when they started to be seen as an important part of the newly formulated social question.[14] Domestic work was still a significant (whether main or additional) source of livelihood for quite large groups of rural and, to a lesser extent, urban populations. Due to legislative circumstances, social changes as well as social practice, in the 19th century traditional domestic work underwent the process of precarisation, and the problem of the so-called domestic industry and domestic workers was born. However, the image of 19th-century domestic work is quite varied, indicating that the world of domestic work was not only a collection of miserable existences, but also of newfound chances.

Domestic Work and Domestic Industry in the Bohemian Lands at the Turn of the 20th Century

During the 17th and 18th centuries, proto-industrial forms of production became firmly established in the Bohemian Lands, and the Central European region had developed into an area with a strong representation of domestic handicraft. Proto-industrial production was significantly applied primarily in domestic and manufactory textile production, but also in the form of centralised manufactories.[15]

The domestic industry, forming in Central European proto-industrial regions, continued to thrive even during the Industrial Revolution and mass industrialisation. However,

---

kodělné výroby a jejího ekonomického potenciálu v lokálním společenství. *Etnografické rozpravy* 22, 2013, pp. 55–75; SCHEUFLER, Vladimír: Domácká výroba v českých zemích. In: *Příspěvky k etnografii národního obrození v Čechách*. Praha 1978, pp. 116–131.

13 DRÁPALA, Daniel: Changes and Differentiations in the Organization of Handmade Production. In: DOUŠEK, Roman – DRÁPALA, Daniel – NOVOTNÁ, Marie (eds.): *Traditional Folk Culture in Moravia* : *Time and space*. Brno 2015, pp. 121–129.

14 Rákosník, Jakub: Otázka sociální. In: ČECHUROVÁ, Jana – RANDÁK, Jan (eds.): *Základní problémy studia moderních a soudobých dějin*. Praha, 2014, pp. 509–528; DROBESCH, Werner: Die „sociale Frage" in der Habsburgermonarchie im zeitgenössischen gesellschaftwissenschaftlichen Diskurz. *Moderní dějiny / Modern History* 20, 2012, No 1, pp. 1–12; FASORA, Lukáš – HANUŠ, Jiří – MALÍŘ, Jiří (ed.): *Sozial-reformatisches Denken in den böhmischen Ländern 1848–1914*. München 2010.

15 MYŠKA, Milan: Proto-Industrialisierung in Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien. In: CERMAN, Markus – SHEILAGH, Ogilvie C. (edd.): *Proto-Industrialisierung in Europa. Industrielle Produktion vor dem Fabrikszeitalter*. Wien 1995, pp. 177–189; FREUDENBERGER, Herman: *Lost momentum. Austrian Economic Development 1750s–1830s*. Wien – Köln – Weimar 2003; JINDRA, Zdeněk – JAKUBEC, Ivan a kol.: *Hospodářský vzestup českých zemí od poloviny 18. století do konce monarchie*. Praha 2016, pp. 228–248.

its economic function was changing. If, in the early modern period, the domestic industry, forming in the rural milieu, represented a substitution for crafts restricted by guild regulations, in the course of the Industrial Revolution it had become a complement to factory production. In many cases, this complement was necessary and rather widespread. However, only some domestic producers followed up on the proto-industrial traditions. A part of the domestic industry was created throughout the 19th century from scratch – whether as a way out of the dangers of poverty or, in the late 19th century, as a result of its cost advantages. We can mention three basic types of domestic industrial-age industry, namely: 1. Domestic industry based on pre-industrial traditions; 2. Domestic industry that is newly emerging as a way out of impending pauperism and 3. Domestic industry that is emerging in major towns, with a focus on the service sector.

The start of the Industrial Revolution and industrialisation did not eradicate domestic work, which continued to evolve in parallel with factory production. According to the 1902 census of industrial plants in the Bohemian lands, 93.3 % of the plants operated with fewer than five employees. These smallest production units employed a total of 41.8 % of all employees in industrial production. The number of employees registered as domestic workers in the statistics was also by no means insignificant. In the Cisleithanian part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, a total of 15 % of all people active in industry were in the position of domestic workers, making up 40 % of all registered industrial plants. Statisticians recorded the strongest representation of domestic work in Galicia, the Bohemian lands, Vorarlberg and Trieste, and the lowest (only 8 % of those active in industry) in Lower Austria.[16] In the early 20th century, the share of workers engaged in domestic production in the Bohemian lands was 17.2 % of all those active in industry (a total of 276,203 people). From a regional perspective, domestic production was spread all over the territory of the Bohemian lands, albeit to an unequal extent. It was strongly represented especially in mountain and foothill areas, with the strongest representation in Bohemia in the political districts of Žamberk/Senftenberg, Nové Město nad Metují/Neustadt an der Mettau, Jilemnice/Starkenbach and Kraslice/Graslitz. During the first third of the 20th century, there was a rapid decline in the importance of the domestic industry. In 1930, when the second national census of industry was conducted, the share of domestic workers in the Bohemian lands was already only 4.5 % (a total of 91,966 people).[17]

The share and character of the domestic industry at the turn of the 20th century were highly variable, not only concerning the individual regions but especially in the field of production. In the early 20th century, the highest share of domestic workers in Cisleithania worked in the textile industry, which employed 46 % of all people working at home, but strong representation could also be found in the clothing industry (33 %) and in the woodworking, glassware and stone industries (14 %). In the Bohemian lands, the structure was similar. Domestic work here was particularly widespread in the textile industry (40 % of all domestic producers, i.e. around 168,000 people), clothing and footwear production (20.9 % of domestic producers; 57,636 people), wood processing (7.5 % of domestic producers; 20,790 people), small-scale iron production (2.9 % of domestic producers; 7,963 people), and fashion jewellery and glassmaking (5.7 % of domestic producers; 15,633 people).[18]

[16] KOMLOSY, A.: Textiles Verlagswesen, p. 79; BEDNÁŘ, Karel: Domácká práce v průmyslu českých zemí koncem 19. století. *Historická geografie* 4, 1970, pp. 146–163.

[17] BEDNÁŘ, Karel: *Rozmístění průmyslu v českých zemích na počátku 20. století (1902)*. Praha 1970, pp. 46–48.

[18] Ibidem, pp. 46–48.

However, a comparison of the state statistics data with those in the period press and private surveys suggests that the actual number of residents who were fully or partially engaged in domestic production was much higher.[19] The reason is both the lack of a generally accepted definition of domestic work and the fact that family members (children, the elderly or disabled) also helped out with domestic production, either in part or in full. Qualified estimates suggest that, at the turn of the 20th century, up to 1.6 million people (20 % of the total population) in the Bohemian lands were fully or partly dependent on domestic work.[20] It can therefore be stated that, in the late Austrian Empire, the existence of domestic work and domestic industry was not a marginal phenomenon, but still a very significant one.[21] It was quite common in the business practice of the Bohemian lands to combine factory and domestic production, especially among entrepreneurs active in the textile industry.[22]

Throughout the second half of the 19th century, domestic handcraft had become increasingly discussed not only as a major economic phenomenon but, above all, as an extremely vexing social and political problem.[23] In the context of the social question, the problem of the position of craftsmen and the domestic industry was becoming an ever more frequent public topic, mainly in connection with the business policy of the Austrian state. This included both the protection of sole traders against the factory industry and actual support of trades (*Gewerbeförderung*).[24] This fact is reflected in an increase in interest in domestic producers and their social status, both in this period's journalism (mainly from the 1880s to the First World War) and at the level of provincial authorities (the Land Diet and provincial government meetings), economic institutions (mainly chambers of commerce and trade), and political administration (surveys by the Ministry of Trade, proposals to adjust conditions in the domestic industry as well as efforts by the political authorities in the individual lands to monitor domestic work and deal with the most acute problems), as well as at the level of the Monarchy's supreme representative body – the Imperial Council.[25] In period discussions, interest in domestic producers resonated both for economic (com-

[19] This is shown, for example, by a research carried out into the north-west Moravian region. One example for all: In the small foothill village of Drozdov, in the political district of Zábřeh, the 1902 census of industry recorded only one domestic producer, who made a living sewing woollen men's clothes at home. Local teacher František Kahánek, who carried out field research and put together a list of domestic work, stated at around the same time that two factories were working in this municipality, providing job for about 500 people in the municipality and its immediate surroundings through the domestic production of threaded buttons. Furthermore, two families allegedly made a living by the domestic production of brushes, two families by the production of brooms and five families by the domestic production of shingles and ladders. KAHÁNEK, František: *Domácký průmysl na horách hejtmanství Zábřežského*. Zábřeh 1909; Zemský archiv Opava (Olomouc), collection Obchodní a živnostenská komora Olomouc, cart. No 867.

[20] SCHEUFLER, Vladimír: *Domácká výroba v českých zemích*. *Etnografický atlas 2*. Praha 1991, p. 14.

[21] MYŠKA, M.: *Region a industrializace*, p. 78.

[22] DUBSKÁ, Pavla: *Vývoj lnářského a hedvábnického průmyslu na Šumpersku od poloviny 19. století do roku 1918*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. Olomouc 2021.

[23] EBERT Kurt: *Die Anfänge der modernen Sozialpolitik in Österreich* : *Die Taafische Sozialgesetzgebung für die Arbeiter im Rahmen der Gewerbeordnungensreform (1879–1885)*. Wien 1975, p. 58.

[24] GRUBER, Josef: Průmyslová politika. In: TOBOLKA, Zdeněk Václav (red.): *Česká politika*. Díl 4: *Moderní stát a jeho úkoly*. Praha 1911, pp. 137–432.

[25] *Bericht der k. k. Gewerbe-Inspektoren über die Heimarbeit in Österreich*. Band I–III. Wien 1900–1901.

petition of domestic work in relation to registered trade production) and social reasons (domestic work as an important source of income for the lower social strata), as well as for moral and educational ones.[26]

The Specifics of Domestic Work at the Turn of the 20th Century

The domestic form of work had several specifics compared to factory work. Above all, compared to factory workers, there were quite a few socio-cultural differences, resulting from the character of domestic work, its organisation and differences in social status. Especially in parts of the 19th century national economic literature, these distinctions were evaluated in favour of domestic work, which then seemed more natural: *Domestic work is work in the family. Parents and children, as well as married couples, are not separated, the mother can take care of the household, the father can oversee of the children's upbringing, the children are supervised by their parents. The working time is free, allowing alternation with other jobs, does not require constant attention as with machines in a factory, and is not subject to supervisory control. The way of work is simple* [...]*, the work tasks are generally not as monotonous and mechanical as in the factory as a result of the advanced division of labour, but by their diversity and often artificiality they make greater demands on the mental activity and ingenuity of the worker. The worker usually completes the whole product, not merely certain tasks like factory workers in a large unit of workers gathered for the work, and their work provides them with greater satisfaction and joy.*[27] However, this liberal 19th century national economic narrative did not reflect the obvious crisis phenomena, most notably the deepening social inequalities emerging as a product of industrial modernity.

Domestic work showed a number of traditional characteristics in the monitored period.[28] The basic production unit of domestic production was the domestic worker's household. The producers worked at home (i.e. in their dwelling), usually in living spaces where there was a close connection between the world of work and the household or family life. One exception was a production which required separation of the workspace for practical hygienic reasons (dustiness of the production, odour, etc.). Examples of domestic work taking place separately from the living space included glass grinding or metalworking domestic production. The connection between the work and private sphere encouraged the involvement of a wider family circle in domestic production, which was quite common in many production sectors (e.g. domestic textile production, fashion jewellery production, etc.). Involving children in domestic production, often from a very young age, brought several of problems reflected at the time, most notably the neglect of school attendance, strenuous work affecting the children's bodies and

[26] ŠOUŠA, Jiří – ŠTAIF, Jiří: Diskurzivní reprezentace sociální otázky. Čechy na přelomu 19. a 20. století. In: HLAVAČKA, Milan – CIBULKA, Pavel (eds.): *Chudinství a chudoba jako sociálně historický fenomén*. Praha: Historický ústav 2013, pp. 100–134; ŠTAIF, Jiří: *Modernizace na pokračování. Společnost v českých zemích (1770–1918)*. Praha 2020, p. 237; KLADIWA, Pavel: Sociální reportáže Maxe Wintera jako prostředek boje s chudobou a jako historický pramen. In: HLAVAČKA, Milan – CIBULKA, Pavel (eds.): *Chudinství a chudoba jako sociálně historický fenomén*. Praha 2013, pp. 135–147.

[27] RYCHLÍK, Karel: Domácký průmysl. *Obzor národohospodářský* IV, 1899, p. 213.

[28] DÜLMEN, Richard van: „Arbeit" in der frühneuzeitlichen Gesellschaft. In: KOCKA, Jürgen – OFFE, Klaus (eds.): *Geschichte und Zukunft der Arbeit*. Frankfurt am Main – New York 1999, pp. 80–87.

their social isolation.[29] These phenomena, which had emerged despite the existing legal protection of children in factories, triggered an extensive questionnaire event through which the Ministry of Trade surveyed the true state of child labour.[30]

The working habits of domestic workers were rather different from those of factory workers. If factory workers were going through the process of discipline, in most cases domestic workers did not go through this specific experience.[31] The clash of factory discipline with the life of rural domestic small-scale producers was aptly reflected by, for example, the operators of model workshops (*Musterwerkstatt*). These were not only production units but also places of practical training through which entrepreneurs could practically train domestic workers. For example, in the late 1860s, the operators of lace model workshops from the Ore Mountains (Krušné Hory) mentioned the fact that the female attendants (usually children and girls up to 18 years of age) had completely irregular attendance, while entrepreneurs referred to the workshops as chaotic (*Taubenschlage*). Domestic workers were not subject to the "dictate of the watch" and began their work "simply when it was daytime", which significantly disrupted the running of the workshops. Besides the pre-modern understanding of time and the associated fluctuations in the working hours, the considerable walking distance, as well as the lack of suitable footwear, were further complications for the model workshop attendants. As a result, in winter the parents brought their children to the workshops in a back basket. Many of the girls were still attending school simultaneously with their work and, eventually, had responsibilities in the domestic agricultural holding. Nevertheless, over several years, hundreds of girls were successfully trained in handmade lace production.[32] This points to difficulties in managing world of work and, at the same time, family and household.

A number of the domestic producers lived in their own homes and often owned or rented agricultural land, which in both cases significantly reduced the cost of living. However, other domestic producers had to live in rental housing – whether as tenants of wealthier villagers or in towns in tenement houses. Rents were generally higher in towns, while in the countryside it was possible to live in rental housing more cheaply.[33] In some cases, the rent was quite a large part of the cost of living and directly affected the

---

[29] For example, according to a report by a trade inspector from the Hradec Králové inspection district, the children of the local weavers often neglected their school attendance, and in the case of their mother or father falling ill, they did not show up at school for weeks. In some areas, e.g. in Orlické Mountains or in northwest Moravia, the children of weavers made extra money after school by making threaded buttons, thus earning money for clothes and school supplies. The lack of exercise, prolonged sitting and hunching over work had a negative effect on the children's physical development. *Bericht der k. k. Gewerbe-Inspektoren über die Heimarbeit in Österreich*. Band I. Wien 1900, pp. 267, 323; Ibidem, Band 2, p. 111.
The neglect of school attendance was not unique in the rural society of the Bohemian lands of the second half of the 19th century, which was often complained about by the school inspectors. CIBULKA, Pavel – KLADIWA, Pavel – POKLUDOVÁ, Andrea – POPELKA, Petr – ŘEPA, Milan: *Čas změny. Moravský a slezský venkov od zrušení poddanství po Velkou válku*. Praha 2021, pp. 143–175.

[30] *Erhebung über die Kinderarbeit in Österreich im Jahre 1908*. Wien 1911–1913.

[31] NEBŘENSKÝ, Zdeněk: *Katedrály industriálního věku* : *Textilní továrny a sociální otázka v českých zemích 1884–1914*. Praha 2019, p. 78.

[32] DOTZAUER, Richard – SCHEBEK, Edmund: *Die Musterwerkstätten für Spitzenfabrikation in böhmischen Erzgebirge*. Prag 1871, pp. 8–9.

[33] MESCH, Michael: *Arbeiterexistenz in der Spätgründerzeit. Gewerkschaften und Lohnenentwicklung in Österreich 1890–1914*. Wien 1984, p. 192.

standard of living of the household. However, living on one's property was not automatically an advantage, as rental housing in towns typically brought with it a higher housing culture than in the countryside, contrasting with the dilapidated houses of the rural domestic weavers that had become the period symbols of poverty.[34]

The particularity of domestic production was also the fact that those involved in it were, due to the lack of legislation, outside the protective legal framework. In fact, producers in the domestic industry were not workers in the sense of the Trade Act (both the Trade Act of 1859 and its 1883 amendment), from whose scope domestic work was excluded and thus was effectively in no way regulated by the state.[35] While, from as early as the 1890s, it was possible to observe a systematic effort from the side of the Ministry of Trade to create legislative regulations for domestic work, long discussions and numerous bills did not result in the desired outcome.[36] Most of the legal regulations applicable to both factory workers and craftsmen (maximum working hours, prohibition of child labour, night work by women and adolescents, etc.), nor most legal insurances, did not apply to domestic workers. Domestic producers did not have employment record books or an obligation of association. The complexity of the problem is also illustrated by the fact that, at the level of legal practice, even in the highest Cisleithanian judicature there was no consensus on defining the commonly used terms of domestic work and domestic industry.[37]

The particularity of domestic work, resulting from the above, was the weak level of cohesion of domestic workers and their organisation.[38] The isolation of domestic workers complicated the possibility of formulating and advocating their common interests, which was in stark contrast to the situation in, for example, the factory textile industry.[39] Self-help activities also developed belatedly in the domestic industry milieu. Even at the turn of the 20th century, when, for example, the cooperative movement positively influenced even the hitherto peripheral rural areas of the Bohemian lands, in the domestic industry milieu cooperatives developed only very gradually.

Domestic Work as a Symbol of Pauperism: Reflecting the Decline of Domestic Weaving Production

The discourse of domestic work at the turn of the 20th century is usually based on the picture of the decline experienced during the Industrial Revolution and subsequent industria-

[34] HERZ, Hugo: *Die Heimarbeit und der Nothstand der Heimarbeiter in der mährischen Textilindustrie*. Brünn 1904, p. 61.

[35] EBERT, Kurt: *Die Anfänge der modernen Sozialpolitik in Österreich* : *Die Taafische Sozialgesetzgebung für die Arbeiter im Rahmen der Gewerbeordnungensreform (1879–1885)*. Wien 1975, p. 145.

[36] *Bericht der k.k. Gewerbe-Inspektoren über die Heimarbeit in Österreich*. Band I. Wien 1900, pp. V–VI; *Verhandlungen des ständigen Arbeitsbeirates über den Entwurf eines Gesetzes, betreffend die Regelung der Arbeitsverhältnisse in der Heimarbeit*. Wien 1913.

[37] *Ottův slovník obchodní*, Díl 1. Praha 1912, p. 638.

[38] For example, a poll by the *Oděvník* magazine from 1900 indicated that only 7 % of tailors were members of support associations and 5 % of educational associations (calculated from less than 3,000 questionnaires from the entire Bohemian lands). POPPER, Max: *Bída dnešního dělnictva krejčovského*. Praha 1900, pp. 46–52.

[39] Characteristically, weavers in factories represented a driving force in promoting the interests of the textile workers and the basis of their common identity and self-confidence. However, they also maintained a clear distance from their colleagues involved in domestic work, who were accustomed not only to low pay but also to overall harsher treatment. FASORA, Lukáš: *Dělník a měšťan* : *Vývoj jejich vzájemných vztahů na příkladu šesti moravských měst 1870–1914*. Brno 2010, pp. 48–49.

lisation. Domestic work was seen as a developmentally older, uncompetitive form of work that was a significant source of poverty. In the course of the 19th century, it had acquired a new face in Europe – mass poverty, or pauperism.[40] Poverty became a major topic in the 19th century and, permeated not only then period journalism but also became one of the key fields in art.[41] Domestic weavers had become one of the main faces of newspapers as well as of artistic interpretations of pauperism. In the European context, the greatest period of publicity was undoubtedly earned by the situation of the Silesian weavers in the Eulengebirge region/Góry Sowie, which resulted in a massive social revolt in 1844 that was severely suppressed by the state authorities.[42] However, this was a manifestation of a deep crisis that other Central European linen industry regions, including the Silesian-Moravian linen industry area, were also undergoing.[43] Even in later decades, the picture of the problematic social situation of domestic weavers did not change much, except perhaps in the 1860s, when linen production was able to profit from the temporary crisis of cotton production. However, handcrafting in the cotton and linen industries continued to decrease in competitiveness, resulting in a latent crisis starting no later than the 1870s, which long affected all Central European regions concentrating on domestic weaving production.[44] In the case of weaving, the social elites expected a gradual decline of the craft that was slowly being mechanised, but it was important to make the transition socially bearable and to eliminate undesirable excesses, including political radicalisation.

It was none other than weaving production which most domestic workers in the Bohemian lands were still associated at the turn of the 20th century. According to the 1902 census, weavers made up 36.2 % of all domestic workers in the Bohemian lands (99,877 people). In essence, linen weaving was still fully dependent on domestic workers (83 % of all linen weavers worked at home; a total of 26,847 people), and cotton weaving in no small part (52.5 % of cotton weavers worked at home; a total of 61,946 people). As weavers formed the largest part of domestic workers, their social status attracted the most attention. Period observers drew particular attention to the very low earnings of domestic weavers, which failed to ensure the dignified existence of weaving households, as well as the poor working conditions and an overall low material and spiritual culture.[45]

The situation of domestic weavers was depicted in very sad colours at the time. In the journal *Obzor národohospodářský*, the following shocking words were written about the weavers' plight in the late 19th century: *A year ago (i.e. in 1898), there was such terrible poverty in the district of Žamberk that people were closing down, hammering shut and lea-*

---

40 LEPENIES, Phillip: *Armut. Ursachen, Formen, Auswege*. München 2017, pp. 50–62.

41 FLUM, Carmen: *Armeleutemalerei. Darstellungen der Armut im deutschsprachigen Raum 1830–1914*. Merzhausen 2003.

42 HODENBERG, Christina von: *Aufstand der Weber* : *Die Revolte von 1844 und ihr Aufstieg zum Mythos*. Bonn 1997.

43 KUTNAR, František: Sociální otázka tkalcovská v polovině 19. století. *Sborník historický* 2, 1954, pp. 186–232.

44 MYŠKA, Milan: Hospodářsko-politické předpoklady rozvoje lnářského průmyslu v českých zemích 1830–1914. In: ZÁŘICKÝ, Aleš (ed.): *Milan Myška* : *Z díla hospodářského historika*. Ostrava 2010, pp. 265–278.

45 See, for example, WINTER, Max: Skizzen aus dem Mährisch-Schlesischen Weberland. *Arbeiter-Zeitung* 9, No. 50 from 19. 2. 1899, No 57 form 26. 2. 1899; No 64 from 5. 3. 1899; No 71 from 12. 3. 1899; No 78 from 19. 3. 1899; No 85 from 26. 3. 1899. On line: http://www.max-winter.org/htm/1899_02.htm.
From later artistic reflections, see, for example, ŠÍR, Josef: *Tkalci* : *Sociální román*. Vrchlabí 1933; MARTÍNEK, Vojtěch: *Stavy rachotí* : *Kronika ze starých časů*. Praha 1939.

ving their debt-ridden homes. Typhoid caused by hunger broke out, and corpses were lying for days in homes with the dying and the living, who, in mute resignation, also awaited unaided the merciless death of starvation. In the district of Žamberk, like in the weaving districts in North Moravia, the authorities were forced to appeal for public assistance by organising fund-raising campaigns, providing other suitable work, etc. The same poverty afflicted people outside the gates of Vienna itself, and Minister Dipauli was clearly moved by the terrible images of social misery found in the individual weaving shacks during his visit to Waldviertel in February of this year, as the official newspaper reports themselves informed.[46] Similarly dramatic images filled the pages of professional periodicals as well as dailies with clear culmination around the turn of the 20th century. They were connected with efforts to enforce effective support mechanisms and state regulation of hitherto unregulated domestic work. As part of these efforts, a number of surveys were conducted to describe and suggest possible solutions to the problems of textile and clothing domestic producers.[47]

According to partial period statistics, the wages of domestic weavers were essentially steadily decreasing. At the turn of the 20th century, they were reaching, in several cases, half or only a third of the wages of factory textile workers, not to mention the wages in heavy industry or engineering, which were even higher in comparison.[48] Even in the discourse, the main cause of the persistence of domestic weaving work was seen in its cheapness, or, in the words of entrepreneurs, "low operating costs".[49] Moreover, the critical wage situation was intensified by several waves of price increases that took place in Cisleithania mainly between 1906 and 1914.[50] The period statistics stated unequivocally that if the families of domestic workers were reliant only on income from domestic production, they were worse off than the families of factory workers. The households of domestic workers, especially whenever there was a lack of work or adverse circumstances, had to economise significantly compared to the households of factory workers, and the consumer basket of domestic and factory workers could thus be, and generally also was, considerably different.

In the early 20th century, Hugo Herz, an associate professor of German technical education in Brno, compared the living standards of domestic and factory workers, showing, on specific examples, differences in the families' life possibilities. A six-member family of a domestic weaver from the Rýmařov region/Römerstadt had an annual income of just 450–500 crowns, with a total of three family members contributing to the earnings. The family was just managing to scrape by with its income, and any fluctuation would

46 RYCHLÍK, K.: Domácký průmysl, p. 165.

47 For example, *Untersuchungen über die Lage des Handwerks in Österreich mit besonderer Rücksicht auf seine Konkurrenzfähigkeit gegenüber der Grossindustrie*. (Schriften des Vereins für Sozialpolitik, Band 71). Leipzig 1896; FLÖGL, Alphons: *Bericht in Angelegenheit des Webernothstandes in Mähren* : *Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Weberverhältnisse in Mähren*. Brünn 1899; POPPER, Max: *Bída dnešního dělnictva krejčovského*. Praha 1900; *Die Wohnungs- und Gesundheitsverhältnisse der Heimarbeiter in der Kleider- und Wäscheconfection*. Wien 1901.

48 If a weaver in North Moravia could make up to 5 guldens a week around 1890 (which was the standard wage at the time in, for example, the textile factories in Brno), around 1895 it was only three guldens, and around 1901 only 2–2.5 guldens. FISCHER, Richard: Severní Morava : Hospodářský přehled. *Obzor národohospodářský 6*, 1901, pp. 257–258.

49 DUBSKÁ, P.: Vývoj, p. 83.

50 MACHAČOVÁ, Jana: Mzdy dělnictva v brněnské průmyslové oblasti do roku 1918. *Slezský sborník* 77, 1979, pp. 188–198.

mean a plunge into utter poverty. The family spent the most money on food (slightly less than 280 crowns), clothing (104 crowns), housing, including heating and lighting (slightly less than 95 crowns), and various minor expenses (slightly less than 21 crowns). A nine-member family of a domestic weaver in Libina/Deutsch Liebau, in which four people worked, had an annual income of 720 crowns, of which 550 crowns was spent on food, 80 crowns on housing, 60 crowns on heating and 10 crowns on lighting. In this case, the weaver's family was even living on debt. The incomes of textile factory workers looked much different. For example, a family of four from Březová nad Svitavou/Brüsau, operating mechanical looms in the factory of the company Aron und Jacob Löw-Beer, had an annual income of 1,272 crowns. This family was even able to afford a maid (which was far from typical in the working-class milieu) and spent 627 guldens on food alone – i.e. more than most families of domestic weavers earned in a year.[51]

The difference in incomes had a direct impact on the consumption basket of the weaving families. While a weaver's family of four employed in a factory in North Moravia could spend almost 11 crowns a week on food and cover all their basic life needs, the same family of a domestic weaver had less than 4 crowns at their disposal, which significantly affected the consumption of domestic weavers' families. In the case of domestic weavers, the largest item in the food budget was bread (1 crown), potatoes (60 halers), coffee (46 halers) and tobacco (60 halers). There was little money left for milk, fat, meat or vegetables. The main diet of domestic weavers at the turn of the 20th century was therefore potatoes, various thin soups, sauerkraut, mash and bread. In contrast, a factory weaver spent most of their weekly budget on milk (nearly 3 crowns), bread (2 crowns and 44 halers), meat (2 crowns), fat and vegetables.[52]

Domestic workers sought to increase their low incomes extensively, i.e. by extending the working hours, as stated by most observers at the time. If, at the turn of the 20th century, a factory worker in the textile industry typically worked ten to eleven hours a day, a domestic weaver extended the working hours to twelve or even sixteen hours a day. However, it should be noted here that, compared to other industries, in the textile industry we can find the highest share of employees working more than 10 to 11 hours a day.[53] The long working hours, low-quality diet and minimal work safety measures left their marks on the health of many domestic weavers. Publications of the time pointed out the high morbidity – e.g. in the case of tailors and textile workers it was mainly respiratory diseases (typically bronchitis and pulmonary tuberculosis), rheumatism and anaemia.[54] However, malnutrition and inadequate housing conditions also caused other problems. For example, in the North Moravian town of Štíty/Schildberg, half of the mothers from weaving families were reportedly unable to breastfeed their young children, who had to be given artificial nutrition.[55] In the North Moravian weaving village of Německá

[51] HERZ, H.: Die Heimarbeit, pp. 52–62.

[52] Ibidem, pp. 59–60; ŠTAIF, J.: Modernizace, pp. 243–247.

[53] *Die Arbeitszeit in den Fabriksbetrieben Österreichs*. Wien 1907, pp. 202–203; MESCH, Michael: *Arbeiterexistenz in der Spätgründerzeit. Gewerkschaften und Lohnenentwicklung in Österreich 1890–1914*. Wien 1984, pp. 53–58.

[54] GROTJAHN, Alfred: *Die Berufskrankenheiten der Schneider und Textilarbeiter*. Berlin 1913, pp. 3–16; *Die Wohnungs- und Gesundheitsverhältnisse der Heimarbeiter in der Kleider- und Wäscheconfection*. Wien 1901, pp. 90–95.

[55] FLÖGL, Alphons: *Bericht in Angelegenheit des Webernothstandes in Mähren* : *Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Weberverhältnisse in Mähren*. Brünn 1899, p. 27.

Huzová/Deutsch Hause, not a single young man was recruited to the army in the decade 1891–1901 due to the men's dire medical condition.[56]

The reasons for the dismal state of domestic weavers were common knowledge – the pressure of mechanised factory production, the problem of the sales of domestic workers' products, and, above all, the problematic organisation of labour, where a trader-factor generally stood between the producer and the final customer, influencing the falling weavers' wages. However, even the weavers themselves shared some of the blame for this situation. For many of them, it was scarcely conceivable to leave the traditional craft and pursue a different profession, or lead their children to a different profession. For example, when the Frenštát factory owner Šídlo had dozens of girls and boys from weaving families trained in the knitting of stockings and gloves, which promised better prospects and intended to set up a knitting cooperative, thus reduce the terrible unemployment in the mountain region, he was successful with only a quarter of the trainees.[57] In certain cases, there was also a gender dimension to the problem. The entrepreneur Alois Menčík recalled that in 1875, when his father founded a weaving mill in Černý Důl/Schwarzental, he had great problems with the workers, as he assumed that the local numerous domestic weavers would be happy to do the work. However, they could not get used to the fast running of the mechanical weaving machines and hated their noise, therefore leaving the factory work in droves and returning to their handlooms. To resolve the problems, Menčík recruited young girls into the factory, whose initial training went well.[58] A case from the related clothing production is telling as well. Even from the period preceding the First World War, we have a report from trade inspectors that dressmakers, making gloves utilizing of domestic work, did not want to leave their houses for factories, even when they knew that they would have significantly higher wages there.[59] Due to the dismal living conditions, a part of the domestic weavers opted to leave their native cottages and migrate for work, but for some weavers, leaving their native villages and fearing uncertainty in their new jobs and homes was hard to overcome.[60]

The solution to the social question of domestic weavers was discussed in period discourse mainly in two directions: 1. The provision of vocational training that would contribute to the rationalisation and innovation of weaving production; 2. The creation of common interest organisations, especially weaving cooperatives.

The issue of the elevation of crafts was discussed in Cisleithania in the second half of the 19th century concerning, among other things, the issue of improving education.[61]

---

[56] FISCHER, R.: Severní Morava, p. 257.

[57] MYŠKA, Milan: „Osvětou a sebeobranou ku pravé svobodě a zámožnosti" aneb stručné dějiny Tkalcovského výrobního družstva ve Vyšních Lhotách. *Slezský sborník* 114, 2016, pp. 81–96.

[58] NEBŘENSKÝ, Z.: Katedrály, p. 93.

[59] *Bericht der K. K. Gewerbe- Inspektoren über ihre Amtstätigkeit im Jahre 1913*. Wien 1914, p. 306.

[60] For instance, Flögl states that from the small town of Rýžoviště/Braunseifen and the surrounding area, two hundred weavers, including family members, left only between 1896 and 1898 to work mostly in Germany. Several weaving villages in North Moravia (Červená Voda, Štíty, Německá Huzová, etc.) went through a similar process, spawning a wave of migration to German cities (Hamburg, Bremen) and to US. FLÖGL, A.: Bericht, p. 33.

[61] HAAS, Wilhelm: *Die Gewerbeförderung und gewerbliche Bildungswesen in Österreich*. Wien – Leipzig 1918; KLIMBURG, Rudolf: *Die Entwicklung des gewerblichen Unterrichtswesens in Oesterreich*. In: Wiener staatswissenschaftliche Studien, Zweiter Band. Tübingen – Leipzig 1900, pp. 1–240; KADLEC, Petr: *Vzdělání – společnost – hospodářství. Utváření profesně vzdělávací infrastruktury v Předlitavsku od poloviny 19. století do roku 1914 na příkladu rakouského Slezska*. Ostrava 2020.

The complex transformation of the individual phases in textile production underwent fundamental changes during the Industrial Revolution, which also directly affected the requirements for the workers' qualifications. If spinning had undergone rapid mechanisation and even before the mid-19th century hand spinning was quickly losing significance, handcraft prevailed for a long time in weaving. The purpose of weaving schools, established in the Habsburg monarchy from the 1850s, was systematic practical and theoretical teaching of the craft. The problem, however, was that weaving schools, like other industry-profiled vocational schools, were created naturally way, without a coherent vision, depending purely on the local initiative and possibilities. After a strong wave of establishments in the 1870s, there were three dozen textile schools in Cisleithania, 23 of which were in the Bohemian lands in areas with the strongest concentration of the textile industry. The vast majority of schools in the Bohemian lands were focused on weaving (21 institutes). By the First World War, the number of weaving schools in the Bohemian lands had grown to 29 (there were 34 weaving schools in all of Cisleithania).[62]

Weaving schools were primarily meant to encourage the transition to modern mechanical factory mass production, which was reflected in efforts to acquire costly mechanical looms for schools. To a lesser extent, they were also intended to help domestic weavers innovate handcraft, especially in the form of weaving courses. In addition to full-time classes from Monday to Saturday (usually one or two years long), these educational institutions often offered a variety of courses (evening, Sunday). These evening or Sunday courses, intended for weavers practising the craft, were relatively well attended, and their students made up the majority of those educated at weaving schools.[63] In contrast, only a limited number of students, usually a few dozen in a given year, generally attended regular full-time classes, intended to educate new qualified labour forces. Then again, weaving schools were attended exclusively by boys, which corresponded to the fact that, in the 19th century, weaving was almost exclusively a male domain. On the other hand, it cannot be said that only the children of weavers studied here – according to statistics from the early 20th century, only 39 % of students had at least one parent employed in textile production.[64] As a result, the role of weaving schools in the process of tackling the social question of domestic weavers cannot be overrated. The limited number of schools and students, a small degree of specialisation, the low age of students and their employment on in lower positions in companies caused the Ministry of Cult and Education to, with effect from 1910, reorganise the textile schools to rationalise and specialise vocational education.

The second way to ensure the improvement of the position of domestic weavers was to promote self-help activities, especially the establishment of associations and cooperatives.[65] The first weaving cooperatives began to form in the Austrian Empire as late as the

---

62 KADLEC, Petr: Changes in education for textile production in the industrialisation process. *Vlákna a textil / Fibres and Textiles* 26, 2019, No 4, pp. 32–46.

63 IDEM: Vzdělání, pp. 405–422.

64 IDEM: Changes, pp. 38–39.

65 For more details on the cooperative movement in the Bohemian lands, see LORENZ, Torsten: Družstevnictví střední a východní Evropy v procesu utváření národních společností 1850–1940 : Pokus o periodizaci. *Moderní dějiny / Modern History* 21, 2013, No 1, pp. 1–18; NĚMCOVÁ, Lidmila – PRŮCHA, Václav: The Co-operative System in its Historical Perspective. In: *The Cooperative Movement in Historical Perspective*. [Twelfth International Economic History Congress. Sevilla 1998]. [Part 2.] Praha 1998, pp. 7–24; BAŽANTOVÁ, Ilona: *Družstevní a svépomocné koncepce v českém ekonomickém myšlení* : *Vývoj názorů a pokusů o praktickou realizaci do roku 1948*.

end of the 19th century (Waidhofen an der Thaya, Horní Kostelec/Ober Kosteletz, Vyšní Lhoty/Ober Ellgoth, Jilemnice/Starkenbach). A more significant wave of establishments came to the Bohemian lands only after 1918 and was associated with the post-war hunger for textile products. However, most newly established or renewed weaving cooperatives after 1918 were short-lived, their activity lasting, on average, only four years.[66] Especially provincial institutions considered the establishment of cooperatives as an effective tool for activating weavers and a platform for formulating and advocating common interests. Weaving cooperatives had the potential to better win state and provincial commissions, were able to negotiate more favourable prices for materials for their members, spread innovations more efficiently among weavers, and acquire more expensive production facilities by using common means. Limiting the influence of business intermediaries in the form of factors and linen traders may also have had a major impact on improving the situation of domestic weavers.

However, in the long run, not even the implementation of the idea of cooperatives brought much success to the development of the domestic industry. A unique analysis of the operation of a weaving cooperative, established in 1900 in Vyšní Lhoty in the Beskydy Mountains, shows the modest results of the cooperative efforts of domestic weavers. While they were able to jointly secure several modern machines, procure material together and, above all, had the chance to win at least smaller commissions for both provincial and state institutions, despite its best efforts the cooperative was not competitive in the long run, and after the First World War it was already only languishing.[67] This, however, was already the time of the inevitable decline of domestic weaving, which was completely replaced by mechanical looms in the interwar period.[68]

Domestic Work as a Chance: Lace Production in the Bohemian Lands at the Turn of the 20th Century

Lace-making, like weaving, can be considered a handcraft that had a long tradition in the Bohemian lands. The first mentions of lace-making from the mid-16th century come from the Erzgebirge/Krušnohoří, which developed into the most important lace-making region of the Habsburg monarchy as early as the 18th century.[69] Lace-making employing domestic production was organised by Saxon traders in the form of the putting-out system. In the last decade of the 18th century, the lace production here reportedly sustained between 14,000 and 18,000 domestic producers.[70] The positive development in lace-making also continued in the first half of the 19th century, when the protectionist policy of the state, which, in 1818, imposed heavy tariffs on imports of lace into the Habsburg monar-

Praha 2002.

66 KRISTEN, Vladimír: Ústřední jednota hospodářských družstev a domácká výroba. *Český lid* 79, 1992, No 4, pp. 343–354.

67 MYŠKA, M.: Osvětou a sebeobranou, pp. 81–96.

68 For the Liberec region, this process is documented in detail by HAWELKA, Walter: *Geschichte des Kleingewerbes und Verlages in der Reichenbereger Tucherzeugung*. Reichenberg 1932, pp. 147–160.

69 DORMITZER, Maxmilian – SCHEBEK, Edmund: *Die Erwerbsverhältnisse im Böhmischen Erzgebirge*. Prag 1862.

70 CRONBACH, Else: Die österreichische Spitzenhausindustrie : Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Hausindustriepolitik. In: *Wiener Staatswissenschaftliche Studien*, Band 7. Wien – Leipzig 1907, p. 26.

chy, contributed to the development of the sector. In the 1840s, this positive trend was disrupted by a domestic production crisis, which also affected domestic lace production and called for many support measures. The association Zentralkomitee zur Förderung der Erwerbstätigkeit der Böhmischen Erz- und Riesengebirge, founded in 1843, played an important role in the Ore Mountains region. The association initially had a charitable character. At the turn of the 1850s and 1860s, the admission of entrepreneurs Richard Dotzauer and Maximilian Dormitzer converted it into an institution dedicated to systematically supporting the economic activities of the Erzgebirge population.[71] Support for lace-making consisted primarily of acquiring foreign know-how through the organisation of lace-making courses and schools with the participation of foreign experts.[72] From the turn of the 1860s and 1870s, the Central Committee supported the establishment of the so-called model workshops (*Musterwerkstätte*), whose operation was secured by the famous Berlin lace merchant Johann Jacob Wechselmann, who was well acquainted with lace production in both France and Belgium. Besides model workshops, the association also arranged the creation and distribution of lace patterns.[73] It was only later that vocational schools (*k. k. Fachschulen*) were established as well, focused on lace production. Besides the Erzgebirge, during the 17th and 18th centuries lace-making also spread significantly to the area of the Český Les/Böhmerwald, East Bohemia (Vamberk/Wamberg and its surroundings) and eventually also to Krain (around the town of Idrija).

The quality of handmade lace was already quite high in the 1860s, as evidenced by the great success of Czech lace at the World's Fair in Paris in 1867. Already at that time, according to estimates by the Chamber of Commerce and Trade in Cheb/Eger, tens of thousands of people were reportedly involved in lace production in Erzgebirge, whether year-round or seasonally.[74] Since the 1870s, lace production in both the Bohemian lands and Saxony had been aided by a new boom, related to the decline of French lace-making after the 1870/1871 Franco-Prussian War. Especially after the World's Fair in Vienna in 1873 it became an attractive luxury commodity, its production newly spreading, besides the Bohemian lands, to Krain and Küstenland. At the turn of the 20th century, lace products were of great interest mainly abroad, and Czech lace had become primarily an export commodity (including exports to the USA), whose export volume had a rising tendency.[75]

As a result of the 1902 census of industrial plants, Else Cronbach put the number of people involved in bobbin lace-making in Austria at 11,579 domestic producers, to which we can add another 574 people employed in this production in plants. From the geographical point of view, the vast majority of lace-makers worked in Bohemia (10,726 domestic workers and 551 workers in plants; the majority of these were registered in the district of the Chamber of Commerce and Trade in Cheb – 7,454 domestic workers and 269 workers in industrial plants), and a smaller part in Krain (710 domestic workers).

---

71 SCHEBEK, Edmund: *Richard Ritter von Dotzauer*. Prag 1895, pp. 244–245.

72 STOCKLÖW, Josef: Die Spitzenfabrikation im böhm. Erzgebirge. In: *Mittheilungen des Vereins zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen*, Band X, XI. Prag 1872, 1873.

73 DOTZAUER, R. – SCHEBEK, E.: Die Musterwerkstätten.

74 Ibidem, p. 163.

75 As of 1906, 211 quintals of linen lace and hems worth more than 932,000 crowns were exported from Austria, and 43 quintals of silk lace worth 257,000 crowns. The Central Lace Course (Zentralspitzenkurz in Wien) even estimated the total lace production in the Ore Mountains region at 2.5 million crowns in the same year. CRONBACH, E.: Die österreichische Spitzenhausindustrie, p. 19.

However, the author of the research observes that lace production was generally done as a side job and that the official statistical numbers do not correspond to reality. An investigation by the Viennese Directorate of Lace Courses reported up to 40,000 people in Cisleithania, while Cronbach's estimates based on the statistics of chambers of commerce and trade and the estimates of traders stated between 30,000 and 35,000 people, of which around 15,000 lace-makers were based in the Erzgebirge, 12,000 in Krain and Küstenland, around 3,000 in the area of Český Les/Böhmerwald, and at least 2,000 lace-makers in the Vamberk region. The estimated value of Austria's lace-making annual production was 4 million crowns.[76]

Lace-making in the 19th century was the domain of women, adolescent girls, and even children. According to period reports, children as young as six were involved in the production of simple lace patterns. However, in the case of a shortage of work, bobbin lace-making was also, to a limited extent, done by men, especially during the winter months. However, in the discourse of the discussed period, lace-making was considered to be typically female domestic work, requiring care and skill.

In terms of the livelihood of the rural population, lace production was a chance to secure a decent standard of living, especially in areas suffering from a lack of well-paid work. The putting-out system generally organised the work in domestic lace production. The working tools used to make lace were simple, and not expensive to acquire, so the domestic producers could get them without any problems. The most expensive item was the sample book, which was generally provided to domestic workers by the merchant, with the use of suitable patterns being crucial for good lace sales. Indeed, the patterns were subject to rapid changes related to changes in fashion trends. Also, the material, i.e. thread, was generally provided to domestic producers by the merchant. Procuring thread on one's own made little sense for domestic producers, as in such a case they bore the immediate consequences of the rapidly increasing material prices.[77]

According to the investigations of the discussed period, revenues from lace production were highly differentiated and fluctuated significantly depending on the quality of the work done as well as the skill. Although even in period literature we see lamentations about the declining revenues from domestic lace production, the situation here was infinitely better than that of domestic weaving.[78] Else Cronbach has extensively documented the enormous disparities in the remuneration of lacework in individual regions and the cases studied. In the early 20th century, the average hourly wage in lace production for an adult woman was 6–12 halers per hour, and the daily wage 0.8–1.6 crowns. This means that at its lowest level, it was only slightly below the average of the daily nominal wage common in textile factories. At its upper limit, it was comparable to the daily incomes in the chemical or construction industries, i.e. industries with above-average earnings.[79] The work of children and the elderly, which was common in lace-making, was generally valued less, at an average of 3–6 halers per hour of work. The differences in remuneration were due to both

[76] Ibidem, pp. 17–20; SCHLOSAREK, Franz: *Die Heimarbeit in der Spitzenindustrie des deutsch-böhmischen Erzgebirge*. Jena 1922, pp. 7–10.

[77] SCHLOSAREK, F.: Die Heimarbeit, p. 15.

[78] DOTZAUER, R. – SCHEBEK, E.: Die Musterwerkstätten, p. 164.

[79] FASORA, L.: Dělník a měšťan, p. 65.

the pace of work and the various difficulties of the lace patterns. The choice of lace pattern depended on both the skill and choice of the lace maker. In general, however, the wages in domestic lace production were significantly higher than in the case of the aforementioned weaving.[80]

There was a strong chance of decent financial security for families where the man had a relatively well-paid job and his wife and children contributed by seasonal lace-making. The specific example of a family from Vysoká Pec near Nejdek/Hochofen shows the possibility of relatively high savings for such families. The family of five (the man working in a rolling mill, his wife, two adolescents and the man's old mother) had only a small cottage, a field and one cow, but thanks to seasonal lace-making, self-sufficiency from farming and their housing they saved more than half of their income each year – a total of 960 crowns, allowing not only a decent standard of living, but also the chance to save. Nevertheless, bobbin lace-making was able to secure livelihoods even for incomplete families. An indigent woman with two daughters living in rental housing in Mutěnín/Muttersdorf managed to earn 876 crowns a year together with her daughters, which satisfied the life necessities of all family members quite sufficiently. She spent only 48 crowns (i.e. only 5.5 % of the family's annual earnings) on rent and could save the rest to provide for other life necessities, which was a truly excellent result in the context of this period, one that many working-class families in towns could only dream of.[81]

According to these investigations, families used the incomes from lace production very prudently, tending to save for a rainy day. In the foothill and mountain areas, these families were used to a modest diet, consisting mainly of potatoes, milk or buttermilk, and soups, while butter and meat appeared on the table only very rarely. The level of clothing and housing conditions proved to be more favourable than the diet, especially when compared to town workers. Most lace-makers lived in their own homes, where the standard of living was generally quite decent, which was characterised by sufficient light and air. Lace production thus presented the possibility of a dignified existence and significant improvement of income, especially for families living in mountain and foothill areas (Erzgebirge, Böhmerwald), but also in the rural milieu with developed agricultural production (South Bohemia).

Conclusion

Despite the implementation of production in centralised factories during industrialisation, at the turn of the 20th century domestic work remained a significant segment of the economy. Despite all negative prognoses, both handcraft and domestic work proved to be irreplaceable in many ways. It was a dynamically evolving segment, in which some domestic producers experienced crisis and decline (domestic weaving), while some traditional producers managed to adapt successfully (handmade lace production). Furthermore, throughout the 19th century, a whole range of new industries emerged within domestic work (such as ready-to-wear clothes production, jewellery production, and basketry).

At the turn of the 20th century, the prevailing social discourse in all of Central Europe was built on the thesis of crisis and decline in handcraft, which was becoming non-com-

[80] CRONBACH, E.: Die österreichische Spitzenhausindustrie, pp. 87–113.

[81] Ibidem, pp. 113–126.

petitive in the factory industry. Unquestionably, there were several reasons for this. The objective situation of a significant part of domestic producers was worsening over time. In Central Europe, this was undoubtedly true for domestic spinning, which had disappeared over several decades with the invention of the self-actor, and also for the most widespread form of domestic production, domestic weaving. Unlike spinning, domestic weaving persisted for a long time, mainly due to the interest of textile entrepreneurs, who combined both domestic and factory production in their practice. At the turn of the 20th century, domestic weavers therefore became the prototypes and most visible representatives of the declining domestic production, thanks to scientific analyses, period statistics, and the interest of public intellectuals, including writers and journalists. Although the social dimension of the crisis of domestic weaving generated proposals to improve the social status of these producers, they had little significant effect. Neither the support of weaving education nor the spreading of ideas of self-help activities solved the position of domestic weavers in the long run. Consequently, during the first third of the 20th century, the situation led to a noticeable marginalisation of this form of domestic production.

On the other hand, a part of the traditional domestic textile production managed to adapt well, as evidenced by the situation in lace-making. This traditional production, thanks to the long-standing popularity of lace, used in fashion throughout the entire 19th century, managed to successfully resist machine production. In addition, this sector embraced innovation in patterns that allowed for flexible adjustments in production according to the current demand. Moreover, lace-making production and its innovation were supported by centralised educational organisations (1879 k. k. Zentral–Spitzen Kurs; 1912 k. k. Anstalt für Frauen- Hausindustrie), which contributed to the development of lace-making education in the individual regions. As a result, women, who formed the overwhelming majority of lace producers, were able to secure a decent livelihood in the period context.

During the 19th century, additional groups of people entered the world of domestic work, engaging in new types of production activities both in the countryside and in towns. Domestic work demonstrated not only the ability to persist but also, to a considerable extent, to adapt and creatively respond to the period's economic challenges. As a result, domestic work at the turn of the 20th century took on a dual nature: on the one hand, it was considered precarious, often portrayed bleakly in newspapers as work generating deep social issues, but on the other hand, it was also seen as a life strategy, a means for individuals to rise from the bottom of society and live a dignified life.

Bibliography

Archival sources

Zemský archiv Opava (Olomouc), fund Obchodní a živnostenská komora Olomouc

Printed sources

ADLER, Emanuel: Ueber die Lage des Handwerks in Oesterreich. In: *Wiener Staatswissenschaftliche Studien*, Band 1. Freiburg i. B. – Leipzig – Tübingen 1898, pp. 1–130.

Die Arbeitszeit in den Fabriksbetrieben Österreichs. Wien 1907.

Bericht der k. k. Gewerbe-Inspektoren über die Heimarbeit in Österreich. Band I–III. Wien 1900–1901.

CRONBACH, Else: Die österreichische Spitzenhausindustrie. Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Hausindustriepolitik. In: *Wiener Staatswissenschaftliche Studien*, Band 7. Wien – Leipzig 1907, pp. 1–212.

DORMITZER, Maxmilian – SCHEBEK, Edmund: *Die Erwerbsverhältnisse im Böhmischen Erzgebirge*. Prag 1862.
DOTZAUER, Richard – SCHEBEK, Edmund: *Die Musterwerkstätten für Spitzenfabrikation in böhmischen Erzgebirge*. Prag 1871.
FISCHER, Richard: Severní Morava : Hospodářský přehled. *Obzor národohospodářský* 6, 1901, pp. 76–80, 116–122, 157–163, 224–226.
FLÖGL, Alphons: *Bericht in Angelegenheit des Webernothstandes in Mähren. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Weberverhältnisse in Mähren*. Brünn 1899.
GROTJAHN, Alfred: *Die Berufskrankenheiten der Schneider und Textilarbeiter*. Berlin 1913.
HERZ, Hugo: *Die Heimarbeit und der Nothstand der Heimarbeiter in der mährischen Textilindustrie*. Brünn 1904.
KAHÁNEK, František: *Domácký průmysl na horách hejtmanství Zábřežského*. Zábřeh 1909.
LIEFMANN, Robert: *Wesen und Formen des Verlags (des Hausindustrie)*. Freiburg – Leipzig – Tübingen 1899.
POPPER, Max: *Bída dnešního dělnictva krejčovského*. Praha 1900.
RYCHLÍK, Karel: Domácký průmysl. *Obzor národohospodářský* IV, 1899, pp. 165–172, 213–221, 272–282.
SCHEBEK, Edmund: *Richard Ritter von Dotzauer*. Prag 1895.
SCHMOLLER, Gustav: *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Kleingewerbe im 19. Jahrhundert. Statistische und nationalökonomische Untersuchungen*. Halle 1870.
SCHWIEDLAND, Eugen: Die Entstehung der Hausindustrie mit Rücksicht auf Österreich. *Zeitschrift für Volkswirtschaft, Sozialpolitik und Verwaltung* 1, 1892, pp. 146–170.
SOMBART, Werner: Die Hausindustrie in Deutschland. *Archiv für soziale Gesetzgebung und Statistik* IV, 1891, pp. 103–156.
WINTER, Max: Skizzen aus dem Mährisch-Schlesischen Weberland. *Arbeiter-Zeitung* 9, No. 50 from 19. 2. 1899, No 57 form 26. 2. 1899; No 64 from 5. 3. 1899; No 71 from 12. 3. 1899; No 78 from 19. 3. 1899; No 85 from 26. 3. 1899.
Die Wohnungs- und Gesundheitsverhältnisse der Heimarbeiter in der Kleider- und Wäscheconfection. Wien 1901.

Literature

BAŽANTOVÁ, Ilona: *Družstevní a svépomocné koncepce v českém ekonomickém myšlení* : *Vývoj názorů a pokusů o praktickou realizaci do roku 1948*. Praha 2002.
BEDNÁŘ, Karel: Domácká práce v průmyslu českých zemí koncem 19. století. *Historická geografie* 4, 1970, pp. 146–163.
BEDNÁŘ, Karel: *Rozmístění průmyslu v českých zemích na počátku 20. století (1902)*. Praha 1970.
BLACKBOURN, David: Handwerker in Kaiserreich: Gewinner oder Verlierer? In: WENGENROTH, Ulrich (ed.): *Prekäre Selbstständigkeit* : *Zur Standortbestimmung von Handwerk, Hausindustrie und Kleingewerbe im Industrialisierungsprozess*. Stuttgart 1989, pp. 7–21.
BLACKENBURG, Christine – DIENEL, Hans-Liudger (eds.): *Alt und Jung im Handwerk*. Stuttgart 2011.
BOLDORF, Marcel: *Europäische Leinenregionen im Wandel. Institutionelle Weichenstellung in Schlesien und Irland (1750–1850)*. Böhlau 2006.
CERMAN, Markus – SHEILAGH, Ogilvie C. (eds.): *European Proto-Industrialization* : *An Introductory Handbook*. Cambridge 1995.
CIBULKA, Pavel – KLADIWA, Pavel – POKLUDOVÁ, Andrea – POPELKA, Petr – ŘEPA, Milan: *Čas změny* : *Moravský a slezský venkov od zrušení poddanství po Velkou válku*. Praha 2021.
DITT, Karl – POLLARD, Sidney (eds.): *Von der Heimarbeit in die Fabrik* : *Industrialisierung und Arbeiterschaft in Leinen- und Baumwollregionen Westeuropas*. Paderborn 1992.
DRÁPALA, Daniel: „Domácký průmysl" Moravy na přelomu 19. a 20. století : Dobová reflexe tradiční rukodělné výroby a jejího ekonomického potenciálu v lokálním společenství. *Etnografické rozpravy* 22, 2013, pp. 55–75.
DRÁPALA, Daniel: Changes and Differentiations in the Organization of Handmade Production. In: DOUŠEK, Roman – DRÁPALA, Daniel – NOVOTNÁ, Marie: *Traditional Folk Culture in Moravia* : *Time and space*. Brno 2015, pp. 121–129.
DUBSKÁ, Pavla: *Vývoj lnářského a hedvábnického průmyslu na Šumpersku od poloviny 19. století do roku 1918*. Unpublished Ph.D. theses. Olomouc 2021.
DÜLMEN, Richard van: „Arbeit" in der frühneuzeitlichen Gesellschaft. In: KOCKA, Jürgen – OFFE, Klaus (Hg.): *Geschichte und Zukunft der Arbeit*. Frankfurt am Main – New York 1999.
EBERT Kurt: *Die Anfänge der modernen Sozialpolitik in Österreich* : *Die Taafische Sozialgesetzgebung für die Arbeiter im Rahmen der Gewerbeordnungensreform (1879–1885)*. Wien 1975.
EHMER, Josef: *Soziale traditionen in Zeiten des Wandels* : *Arbeiter und Handwerker im 19. Jahrhundert*. Frank-

furt – New York 1994.
ENGELHADT, Ulrich (ed.): *Handwerker in der Industrialisierung*. Stuttgart 1984.
FASORA, Lukáš: *Dělník a měšťan : Vývoj jejich vzájemných vztahů na příkladu šesti moravských měst 1870–1914*. Brno 2010.
FREUDENBERGER, Herman: *Lost momentum. Austrian Economic Development 1750s–1830s*. Wien – Köln – Weimar 2003.
GRUBER, Josef: Průmyslová politika. In: TOBOLKA, Zdeněk Václav (red.): *Česká politika*. Díl 4: *Moderní stát a jeho úkoly*. Praha 1911, pp. 137–432.
HAUPT, Heinz Gerhard: Besitz und Selbstständigkeit ale Teil von Arbeiterstrategien im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 43, 2017, pp. 240–263.
HAWELKA, Walter: *Geschichte des Kleingewerbes und Verlages in der Reichenbereger Tucherzeugung*. Reichenberg 1932, pp. 147–160.
KADLEC, Petr: *Changes in education for textile production in the industrialisation process*. *Vlákna a textil / Fibres and Textiles* 26, 2019, No 4, pp. 32–46.
KADLEC, Petr: *Vzdělání – společnost – hospodářství : Utváření profesně vzdělávací infrastruktury v Předlitavsku od poloviny 19. století do roku 1914 na příkladu rakouského Slezska*. Ostrava 2020.
KLADIWA, Pavel: Sociální reportáže Maxe Wintera jako prostředek boje s chudobou a jako historický pramen. In: HLAVAČKA, Milan – CIBULKA, Pavel (eds.): *Chudinství a chudoba jako sociálně historický fenomén*. Praha 2013, pp. 135–147.
KOMLOSY, Andrea: *Arbeit : Eine globalhistorische Pespektive*. Wien 2014.
KOMLOSY, Andrea: *Globalgeschichte. Methoden und Theorien*. Böhlau Verlag 2011.
KOMLOSY, Andrea: Textiles Verlagswesen, Hausindustrie und Heimarbeit. Prototyp des informellen Sektor sim 18. und 19. Jahrhundert. In: KOMLOSY, Andrea (ed.): *Ungeregelt und unterbezahlt : Der informelle Sektor in der Weltwirtschaft*. Wien 1997, pp. 63–85.
KOMLOSY, Andrea: Work and Labor Relations. In: KOCKA, Jürgen – van der LINDEN, Marcel (edd.): *Capitalism : The Reemergence of a Historical Concept*. Bloomsbury 2016, pp. 33–69.
KOMLOSY, Andrea: *Spinnen – Spulen – Weben : Leben und Arbeiten im Waldviertel und anderen ländlichen Textilregionen*. Krems – Horn 1991.
KRIEDTE, Peter: Hausindustrie : Bemerkungen zu einem gewerbegeschichtlichen Begriff. In: LEGNER, Friedrich (ed.): *Handwerk, Hausindustrie und die historische Schule der Nationalökonomie*. Bielefeld 1998, pp. 105–131.
KRIEDTE, Peter – MEDICK, Hans – SCHLUMBOHM, Jürgen: Sozialgeschichte in der Erweiterung – Proto-Industrialisierung in der Verengung? : Demographie, Sozialstruktur, moderne Hausindustrie: eine Zwischenbilanz der Proto-Industrialisirungs-Forschung. *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 18, 1992, pp. 70–87, 231–255.
KRISTEN, Vladimír: Ústřední jednota hospodářských družstev a domácká výroba. *Český lid* 79, 1992, No 4, pp. 343–354.
KUTNAR, František: Sociální otázka tkalcovská v polovině 19. století. *Sborník historický* 2, 1954, pp. 186–232.
LENGER, Friedrich: *Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Handwerker seit 1800*. Frankfurt am Main 1988.
LEPENIES, Phillip: *Armut : Ursachen, Formen, Auswege*. München 2017.
LORENZ, Torsten: Družstevnictví střední a východní Evropy v procesu utváření národních společností 1850–1940 : Pokus o periodizaci. *Moderní dějiny / Modern History* 21, 2013, No 1, pp. 1–18.
LUFT, Robert: „Des Handwerks goldener Boden" : Handwerker im Übergang zum Kleinunternehmer in Böhmen in späten 19. Jahrhundert. In: HOFFMANN, Robert (ed.): *Bürger zwischen Tradition und Modernität*. Böhlau 1997, pp. 315–334.
LUKÁŠ, Josef: Domácká výroba. *Sociální revue. Věstník ministerstva sociální péče* 11, 1930, pp. 19–36, 125–134, 265–270.
MAGER, Wolfgang – EBELING, Dietrich (eds.): *Protoindustrie in der Region : Europäische Gewerbelandschaften vom 16. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert*. Bielefeld 1997.
MACHAČOVÁ, Jana: Mzdy dělnictva v brněnské průmyslové oblasti do roku 1918. *Slezský sborník* 77, 1979, pp. 188–198.
MESCH, Michael: *Arbeiterexistenz in der Spätgründerzeit : Gewerkschaften und Lohnenentwicklung in Österreich 1890–1914*. Wien 1984.
MYŠKA, Milan: Hospodářsko-politické předpoklady rozvoje lnářského průmyslu v českých zemích 1830–1914. In. ZÁŘICKÝ, Aleš (ed.): *Milan Myška : Z díla hospodářského historika*. Ostrava 2010, pp. 265–278.
MYŠKA, Milan: *Opožděná industrializace : Protoindustriální výrobní vztahy a formy za průmyslové revoluce na příkladu lnářského průmyslu ve Slezsku*. Ústí nad Orlicí 1987.
MYŠKA, Milan: „Osvětou a sebeobranou ku pravé svobodě a zámožnosti" aneb stručné dějiny Tkalcovského

výrobního družstva ve Vyšních Lhotách. *Slezský sborník* 114, 2016, pp. 81–96.
MYŠKA, Milan: Proto-Industrialisierung in Böhmen, Mähren und Schlesien. In: CERMAN, Markus – SHEILAGH, Ogilvie C. (ed.): *Proto-Industrialisierung in Europa. Industrielle Produktion vor dem Fabrikszeitalter.* Wien 1995, pp. 177–189.
MYŠKA, Milan: *Region a industrializace* : *Studie k dějinám industrializace ve Slezsku (1800–1918)*. Ostrava 2014.
MYŠKA, Milan: Výrobní vztahy v tzv. domáckém průmyslu na Moravě a ve Slezsku na sklonku 19. století. In: *Z dějin textilu 5*. Trutnov 1988, pp. 59–75.
NEBŘENSKÝ, Zdeněk: *Katedrály industriálního věku* : *Textilní továrny a sociální otázka v českých zemích 1884–1914*. Praha 2019.
NEDERVEEN MEERKERK, Elise van: Temporary Service? : A Global Perspective on Domestic Work and the Life Cycle from Pre-Industrial Times to the Present. *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 43, 2017, pp. 217–239.
NĚMCOVÁ, Lidmila – PRŮCHA, Václav: The Co-operative System in its Historical Perspective. In: *The Cooperative Movement in Historical Perspective*. [Twelfth International Economic History Congress. Sevilla 1998]. [Part 2.] Praha 1998, pp. 7–24.
PIERENKEMPER, Toni: *Gewerbe und Industrie im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. München: Oldenburg 1994.
SCHÄFER, Michael: *Eine andere Industrialisierung* : *Die Transformation der sächsischen Textilexportgewerbe 1790–1890*. Stuttgart 2016.
SCHEUFLER, Vladimír: Domácká výroba v českých zemích. In: *Příspěvky k etnografii národního obrození v Čechách*. Praha 1978, pp. 116–131.
SCHEUFLER, Vladimír: *Domácká výroba v českých zemích*. *Etnografický atlas 2*. Praha 1991.
SCHLOSAREK, Franz: *Die Heimarbeit in der Spitzenindustrie des deutsch-böhmischen Erzgebirge*. Jena 1922.
STOCKLÖW, Josef: Die Spitzenfabrikation im böhm. Erzgebirge. In: *Mittheilungen des Vereins zur Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen*, Band X, XI. Prag 1872, 1873
ŠTAIF, Jiří: *Modernizace na pokračování. Společnost v českých zemích (1770–1918)*. Praha 2020.
WENGENROTH, Ulrich (ed.): *Prekäre Selbstständigkeit* : *Zur Standortbestimmung von Handwerk, Hausindustrie und Kleingewerbe im Industrialisierungsprozess*. Stuttgart 1989.

Summary

Industrialisation, Domestic Work and Domestic Industry in the Bohemian Lands at the Turn of the 20th Century

Despite the implementation of production in centralised factories during industrialisation, at the turn of the 20th century domestic work remained a significant segment of the economy. Despite all negative prognoses, both handcraft and domestic work proved to be irreplaceable in many ways. It was a dynamically evolving segment, in which some domestic producers experienced crisis and decline (domestic weaving), while some traditional producers managed to adapt successfully (handmade lace production). Furthermore, throughout the 19th century, a whole range of new industries emerged within domestic work (such as ready-to-wear clothes production, jewellery production, or basketry).

The prevailing social discourse at the turn of the 20th century in all of Central Europe was built on the thesis of crisis and decline in handcraft, which was becoming non-competitive in regards to the factory industry. Unquestionably, there were several reasons for this. The objective situation of a significant part of domestic producers was worsening over time. In Central Europe, this was undoubtedly true for domestic spinning, which had disappeared over several decades with the invention of the self-actor, and also for the most widespread form of domestic production, domestic weaving. Unlike spinning, domestic weaving persisted for a long time, mainly due to the interest of textile entrepreneurs, who combined both domestic and factory production in their practice. At the turn of the 20th century, domestic weavers therefore became the prototypes and most visible representatives of the declining domestic production, thanks to scientific analyses, period statistics, and the interest of public intellectuals, including writers and journalists. Although the social dimension of the crisis of domestic weaving generated proposals to improve the social status of these producers, they had little significant effect. Neither the support of weaving education nor the spreading of ideas of self-help

activities solved the position of domestic weavers in the long run. Consequently, during the first third of the 20th century, the situation led to a noticeable marginalisation of this form of domestic production. On the other hand, a part of the traditional domestic textile production managed to adapt well, as evidenced by the situation in lace-making. This traditional production, thanks to the long-standing popularity of lace, used in fashion throughout the entire 19th century, managed to successfully resist machine production. In addition, this sector embraced innovation in patterns that allowed for flexible adjustments in production according to the current demand. Moreover, lace-making production and its innovation were supported by centralised educational organisations, which contributed to the development of lace-making education in the individual regions. As a result, women, who formed the overwhelming majority of lace producers, were able to secure a decent livelihood in this period.

Domestic work demonstrated not only the ability to persist but also, to a considerable extent, to adapt and creatively respond to the period's economic challenges. As a result, domestic work at the turn of the 20th century took on a dual nature: on the one hand, it was considered precarious, often portrayed bleakly in period journalism as work generating deep social issues, but on the other hand, it was also seen as a life strategy, a means for individuals to rise from the bottom of society and live a dignified life.