

Editorial Review of Volume 19

Socially and institutionally an artificial unit, the calendar year provides, in cultural terms, a comfortable time for taking stock. Volume 19 of *CSSH* has published articles that reflect work in most of the social sciences, treat cases from around the globe, and study societies that have simple and complex technologies, are literate and illiterate, urban and rural. The subjects are broad enough to have implications for the serious student of any society, and all can be seen as an extension of questions that enjoy their own respectable scholarly lineage. Omissions may be significant too: there was too little in Volume 19 on preindustrial Europe, on North America, on the arts and literature in general. These matters occupy at least half of the historical profession and were once indispensable grist for social psychologists and sociologists. They deserve—and need—their place in the larger comparative frameworks.

The broad topics covered in this volume reflect contemporary concerns, classic issues of social analysis, and traditional historical interests. Within each, however, there was an impressive reaching out. No question is more alive today than the interrelationship between peasant, peripheral societies and Western capitalism; by treating that question in terms of specific societies, Michael Taussig, Marie Perinbam, and Terry Rambo (19:2) gave fresh reason for recognizing the cultural values and the creative variety expressed in peasant responses. The continuing fascination with revolution led Philip Kuhn and Henry Tobias and Charles Woodhouse back to religion (19:3), and echos of 1968 which may have stimulated interest in the history of higher education did not keep Fritz Ringer and Lawrence Stone from turning their debate (19:2) to one of method.

The relationships between city and countryside and between race and stratification also raise issues crucial to contemporary life; but as subjects of investigation, they benefit from a literature now classic. Perhaps that is why Moses Finley and Joel Migdal (19:3) could insist on the need to distinguish among types of cities, why Mary Wilkie could provide the taxonomy for a theory of ethnic stratification (19:1), and Brian Moore (in the same issue) was attracted to a remarkable case of adaptability in notions of caste. *Race and Status in Two Colonial Mexican Cities* in this issue continues both discussions, grouping two very precise studies (by John Chance and William Taylor and by Patrick Carroll) of the ecological connections that tighten or weaken the limits between race and status, that isolate or integrate city and countryside. The perceptions of anthropologists and demographers are here nicely integrated into empirical historical research. In this issue Ronald Skeldon, too, continues a discussion familiar across the

printed pages of *CSSH*. One phase of that discussion led to the publication of Lloyd Fallers, ed., *Immigrants and Associations* (The Hague-Paris: Mouton, 1967); Jongkind later offered a reappraisal (17:4) that now prompts Skeldon's schema for reconciling some issues in dispute by looking more broadly at the social environment and distinguishing more sharply between stages and types.

At the beginning of this century, the study of politics and of institutions could almost have served as a definition of historical study. Now the time has come to look again at such traditional topics in terms of newer work on economic and social structure. Military history was used (in 19:1) by Gayl Ness and William Stahl, Don Bowen, and Edward Price to expose social organization and the process of change. Karl Figlio and George Sussman (in 19:3) used social analysis to cast new light on the development of medical practice and from that practice in turn gained insight into the larger society. Institutional studies, which lost fashion after becoming autonomous detailed treatments of precedents and personalities, come alive when placed in social context. For politics, Ali Mazrui and Charles Press (19:2) used social stereotypes as a bridge to that context. In this issue the discussion of *Social Structure and Politics in Two Modern Societies* sees Ronald Rogowski and David Sumler systematically apply social science methods to original historical research on questions of long standing: the social origins of Nazis and the political divisions of the Third Republic. Despite the vast literature that precedes them, these authors have something important to say, in part at least because of a methodological sophistication.

If the topics treated in this volume vary from contemporary to traditional, the methods used range as widely. They have in common, however, their appropriateness to the subject at hand. It is an achievement when historians, sociologists, anthropologists, and political scientists write about a variety of topics with a breadth that often makes it difficult to identify their disciplinary home. As Thomas Tentler's review in this issue notes, to work across disciplines requires more than terminology or juxtaposition. One hesitates to proclaim the maturity of social science, if only to avoid joining a parade that for generations has shuffled past with more heralds than infantry. Still, the articles in this volume use new evidence and broad perspectives to point up critical differences, the recognition of which can raise the level of discourse; and there is reason to be hopeful when scholars can count and also see structure, dissect society and recognize culture, write about war, religion, cities, migrants, medicine or politics in ways that allow comparison and invite generalization without amputating social context. The dignity in that, for subject and scholar, merits welcome.