

# Editorial Foreword

MANAGEMENT IN THE INDUSTRIAL WORKPLACE. Most of the people who write about industrial workers would not want to be one, which may be why scholarly discussions of the working class often seem abstract. Here instead two articles treat relations between workers and their bosses in terms of the tasks performed in the workplace. Supervisors, particularly foremen, as well as tradition and technology were crucial in determining what work was like. Donald Reid takes paternalism seriously, recognizing not only that it offered something to the worker but that it expressed a seriously held view of social order. And his comparison of firms in coal mining and metallurgy can then show how paternalism was ultimately self-defeating and why it lasted so long. (Reid's analysis is also closely related to themes in essays by Sewell, Truant, and Reddy on French labor, *CSSH*, 21:2, and by Smith on Japanese workers, 26:4). Issac Cohen looks at cotton spinning in Massachusetts and demonstrates that strikes were related to the presence of British spinners, which leads to a revealing comparison of the organization of work in British and American cotton spinning, where the technology used proved to be one of management's strategic choices in labor relations (and note Haydu in 27:1 on factory politics in the United States and Britain). On a much broader scale, these same issues are the central concern of David F. Crew's review essay, which sees the division of labor itself as the result of political choices.

SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF CULTURE. There is a special vocabulary for the study of social structure and another for the study of culture. Each has its own tools, techniques, and traditions and these are so distinct that merely to apply the methods of one to the subject matter of the other can be stimulating. There is then a sense of freshness in studies that treat both culture and social structure, as many articles in *CSSH* have done. Recent ones by Thompson, Moch and Tilly, and Haydu (27:1) explored ways in which social structures shaped behavior initially seen as cultural; others by Du Boff, Smith, and Mann (26:4) showed some solid structures formed from cultural patterns. In this issue three authors, working on very different historical scales, focus directly on the intersection of structure and culture, broad fields without sharp boundaries. Hence there are few coordinates to predict where they will interact. That is better understood not so much through study of social class or kinship as by analyzing smaller groups which, if they express concerns related to those concepts, also transform them. Seen closer to hand, structures tend to appear less rigid and culture more vital than abstract theories predicted. Barry D. Adam argues that a unique set of structural characteristics permitted the formation of modern homosexual sub-

cultures. From a sweeping view of industrializing change, he turns to the question of where homosexuals could meet and develop their own way of life—moving from what social structures permit to how intimate personal choices are expressed. From this perspective, the era of industrialization appears, somewhat ironically, to have been a period of liberating individualism, much as nineteenth-century liberals said it was. The argument has implications for all groups which—for reasons of religion, or occupation, or personal need—have sought to escape demands of a dominant culture through some kind of community. That was not what occurred, Mary Ann Clawson finds, in American fraternal orders (see Kuyk in 25:4). Using the literature on class formation and voluntary organization, she seeks to explain how those fraternal organizations could have comfortably included a large proportion of members from the working class (a fact she establishes). She finds an answer in the vision of American society articulated through a ritual culture that justified social hierarchy as an expression of social mobility. Lawrence J. Taylor looks at a single moment in Ireland, the eviction of a priest from his farm (compare Tentler and Finkler on the Church and protest in the United States and Mexico, 25:2, and Adas on protest in Southeast Asia, 23:2). Because he can study this event both as an oral myth and as an issue of legal contract, he can show us in compelling, concrete terms how landholding, foreign occupation, and the Church intersected with the Gaelic tongue, popular religion, and storytelling; how a changing social structure and a living culture intertwined so intricately (and vitally) that one can only wonder at a tradition of scholarship that could ever have sought to separate them. It is no surprise, then, to find market structures and bourgeois culture integrally related in Richard Holt's review essay of recent studies of French society in the nineteenth century; the surprise lies rather in how similar that society was to our own.

**EXPLANATIONS IN ECONOMIC HISTORY.** Historians seem destined to be forever discovering how sensible peasants really were. Economic historians assume the more difficult task of establishing that with numbers. By means of remarkably constructed empirical tests, Frederic L. Pryor isolates and then weighs the factors of diet and crop, demography, and environment that determined where the plow has been employed. The patterns thus exposed imply of course that adoption of the plow, and in a sense its very invention, was a kind of choice, one related to the way in which a people used the land (see Skinner on technological determinism, 18:1; Otto and Anderson on the adaptability of old forms of agriculture, 24:1). Similar issues of economic explanation—of demography, technology, culturally determined choices, and quantitative data—arise as well in the latest approaches to the understanding of industrialization, approaches here critically assessed by Jonathan Prude and M. Sonenscher.