frontier” or Militärgrenze instead of confin militaire. Such slips only confuse the nonspecialist reader, especially undergraduates. The German titles listed are misspelled as well. In short, these errors provide good evidence of how crucial it is for a press to secure the services of people who have adequate professional experience themselves with the material at hand. The index, for its part, is little more than perfunctory.

Notwithstanding its unnecessary defects (for which Corvisier obviously bears no responsibility), Armies and Societies in Europe can be highly recommended to all persons interested in social history and military affairs. It represents a first-rate scholarly achievement.

Thomas M. Barker,
State University of New York at Albany.

* * *


There were, suggested Gladstone, three ways of riding the tiger of an industrial society with its millions of “hard hands” — force, fraud or goodwill. Historians have sought further understanding of the sources of social order in the period by borrowing the concept of social control from sociology. This has sometimes distorted rather than explicated the specific permutations of Gladstone’s three elements, and Donajgrodzki’s introduction is in part a defensive exercise which warns against the dangers of reductionism, while rebutting recent charges that the concept is inseparable from the consensual assumptions of the functionalists who developed the term. The idea has, he argues, a considerable flexibility which makes it transideological, and his even-handed exposition does a useful service in demonstrating the proper utility and potential of the concept of social control for the historian. In particular he stresses that its operation must be studied as a process of interaction between controllers and controlled, both of whom, he proposes, were in a sense trained in their roles.

The contributors examine how a variety of social institutions served the interests of social order, proceeding in a roughly chronological order, which serves a further editorial theme, that of the structural changes in the general mechanisms of social control during the century. As the explosive conditions of the early Victorian period gave way to the calmer political and economic climate of later years, the balance of emphasis shifted from force to goodwill, though several essays point to their continuing tactical complementarity. Thus John Stevenson shows that the hard men of the post-1789 counter-revolution tempered terror with paternalism, and Donajgrodzki’s own contribution on the early Victorian bureaucratic elite reveals a pragmatic mix of benevolence and coercion in the social policy of both utilitarians and traditionalists. Judith Fido’s piece on the new model paternalists of the Charity Organisation Society argues that behind their aspirations to class fraternity lay a steely reliance on the negative sanctions of the New Poor Law.
The collection suggests, however, that tactical flexibility was not enough to contain a considerable diversity of approach among the superordinate classes. The educational experts of the 1830s examined here by Richard Johnson looked to the state as a prime agency of social domination, but found their schemes compromised by internal disputes and the tenacity of private agencies in the English political culture. Elsewhere, as Michael Rose indicates in his piece on the Lancashire cotton famine, statism came in by the back-door in an auxiliary role, supplementing accepted methods of relief and control. Social control was deployed through a multiplicity of subsystems and its operation could be dyschronic as well as disparate. Victor Bailey’s piece shows the authorities in small towns preserving their traditional social order against the challenge of the Salvation Army by inciting counter-demonstrations by the “skeleton armies” of the mob, a use of licence as a conservative device that echoes the practices of the previous century rather than reflects those of a new industrial age.

Yet if means varied, and the pace was uneven, the controllers largely achieved their aims, not only of the maintenance of social order but of tightening it and redefining its social content. Hugh Cunningham in his study of London’s fairs (the only piece that offers a conspectus of the whole period) suggests that the new respectability that characterized fairgoing in the 1880s was the product of a convergence of class norms as the police, the showmen and the customers came to agree upon a more restrained style of merrymaking — more restrained, that is, than that of the earlier period discussed by Robert Storch who points up the cultural antagonisms over popular leisure that had generated the reform drive for national recreation. However, Cunningham describes the symptoms rather than the causes of this transformation in the behaviour of working people and indeed there is little in the whole collection that tells us exactly how they were trained in more passive and subordinate roles. We are in fact sold short on the promise of consistent attention to the interaction of the controllers and the controlled. In Jennifer Hart’s contribution on the social content of sermon literature the latter appear not at all (neither is there any attention here to immediate context). Elsewhere the controlled appear as an abstract given. Stevenson in particular seems negligent in ignoring the dramaturgical model of the riot or disturbance offered by Thompson which emphasizes the interface between rich and poor as conscious social actors.

What we have here then are several suggestive accounts of the mentalities of the controllers and the generation of a new social orthodoxy, but little of how its norms were received and internalized, and we shall not be able to understand this until we learn more of the actualities of social encounter between the classes. How else can we understand the psychic success of liberal capitalism in combining its deployment of force and goodwill with the seductive but essentially fraudulent rhetoric of liberty and progress that preached economic independence but refused full social and moral autonomy to working people? The editor’s suggestion that the indigenous institutions of working-class life might be examined as social control systems indicates one potentially fruitful entrée to the mentality of the controlled. As a more general point, we need to know more about social control in the workplace, and the relationship between social control and socialization. Historians should be encouraged to co-opt from the other social sciences besides sociology — surely there is something of relevance to be learned from social psychology? In sociology, Coser’s work on the integrating functions of social conflict could be as helpful for the earlier period as Durkheim’s emphasis on solidarity ties is for the latter, and there are ideas in the writings of historians such as W. L. Burn and Trygve Tholfsen that go unmentioned here but which could still be usefully exploited. In conclusion, however, it must be said that this is a helpful collection that
ventilates an important interpretative theme in modern scholarship, and that its individual contributions are never less than interesting.

Peter Bailey,
University of Manitoba.

* * *


Voilà un titre qui promet d’emblée que seront réalisées les retrouvailles de l’école primaire et de ses clientèles sur un demi-siècle. Et un ouvrage qui déçoit rapidement le lecteur qui s’attend à y trouver le processus de scolarisation ancré dans les réalités sociales de l’Angleterre victorienne et édouardienne. Un livre aussi qui manque tristement de l’épine dorsale que constituerait la définition d’une problématique d’ensemble.

Il apparaît incontestable que l’auteur songe avant tout à donner la parole aux consommateurs populaires du produit scolaire, dans l’intention fort louable de pratiquer « l’histoire par le bas ». Or, ce sont, pour l’essentiel, des sources officielles — rapports des comités parlementaires et des commissions d’enquête consacrés à la situation de l’enseignement, au travail et à la santé des enfants — et des témoignages intéressés — contenus dans des périodiques spécialisés ou exprimés face à des situations déterminées — traduisant en priorité les perspectives d’observateurs étrangers aux milieux populaires, que J. S. Hurt a constamment privilégiés. À telle enseigne que chacun des sept chapitres doit partiellement sa justification à l’exploitation d’un matériel documentaire en particulier, laquelle n’est pas toujours satisfaisante à plus d’un titre.

En premier lieu, l’auteur ne précise nullement les critères qui ont, sans doute, inspiré la sélection des passages qu’il a bien voulu retenir pour statuer sur la valeur, voire la représentativité des exemples proposés : quiconque a brasse des papiers parlementaires est conscient des embûches parsemant la voie des généralisations, sur le plan géographique aussi bien que dans la dimension sociale. À ne point s’interroger sur la portée des échantillons, on se retrouve bientôt dans le voisinage de l’arbitraire.

Par ailleurs, cet ouvrage qui, au demeurant, ne contient pas de bibliographie, se signale par un superbe dédain de maintes études antérieures — générales autant que monographiques — qu’il serait fastidieux de relever ici. Dédain, de préférence à ignorance dans certains cas où l’auteur décrète sans façon que d’aucuns n’ont vraisemblablement mérité que de sombrer dans l’anonymat (pp. 21, 23, 38, 44, entre autres). Ainsi, bien des points soulevés, non sans perspicacité, par l’auteur sonnent parfois le déjà entendu quelque part, dont nous nous passerions volontiers.

Encore J. S. Hurt reconnaît-il (pp. 16, 39, 59, 155) qu’il n’a point eu recours aux sources quantitatives... les plus aptes à vivement éclairer les zones d’ombres qui lui échappent : les recensements nominatifs pour les structures familiales et les répartitions socio-professionnelles, les registres d’inscription pour les aires de ramassage des différents établissements, les journaux de bord tenus par les insti-