

## EDITORS' REMARKS

### New Directions for *ILWCH*

*ILWCH* has a new publisher. Henceforth the journal will be produced and distributed by the University of Illinois Press. Renewals and correspondence regarding subscriptions should be directed to the Press (54 E. Gregory Dr., Champaign, IL 61820). Helmut Gruber, David Montgomery, and Julia Greene will continue to edit the journal from Yale, with the increasingly active assistance of the new editorial board. The prominence and prestige of the University of Illinois Press in the field of social and working-class history, and the new opportunity provided by this arrangement for the editors, assistant editor, and board to spend their time and energy editing, make this development most welcome.

It is entirely fitting that this same issue present *ILWCH*'s first substantive (or original research) article, Ellen Ross's " 'Not the Sort that Would Sit on the Doorstep': Respectability in Pre-World War I London Neighborhoods." Given the limited number of pages available to us and our primary commitment to review essays, reviews, and controversies, there will probably never be more than one article of this type, or perhaps two short ones, in any issue. Our aim in introducing what is surely the "bread and butter" of most other journals is not to compete with them. We intend rather to offer space to articles with special appeal for our diverse readership, articles that are either explicitly comparative or that suggest ways of conceptualizing history that are potentially useful beyond the boundaries of a single country, are based on a blend of methods or sources, or are devoted to important aspects of labor history that have previously received little attention. Ross's article meets several of these criteria. Starting from the role of women in English working-class households and neighborhoods, it sheds new light on familiar controversies concerning the links between "respectability" and an "aristocracy of labor," gender roles and power within families, and *embourgeoisement* in ways that provide serious food for thought for historians of other industrial countries.

Letters about Ross's article would be welcomed, as would comments about our venturing in this direction. Written communications that are concise and to the point can be published, and they will be. They can help establish the kind of relationship among readers and between readers and editors that contributes to *ILWCH*'s basic objectives. Steven Sapolsky's response to Sean Wilentz's controversy piece on "American exceptionalism" illustrates just the sort of exchange that we invite. Because the last issue was mailed quite late, there may be other readers who still wish to respond to this controversy. Space

will be reserved in the next *ILWCH* (no. 28) for additional letters on the exceptionalism controversy and for Wilentz's reply to the correspondents.

This issue's Scholarly Controversy concerns the value of "formal methods of analysis" for labor history. Charles Tilly offers an imaginative model of our subject area (one that helps to explain why *ILWCH*'s title is so cumbersome) and indicates just where within that model quantitative methods and concepts from the social sciences are likely or unlikely to prove useful. His argument provokes three remarkably different responses. Alan Dawley champions the use of theory, but he warns against attempts to squeeze history into sociological models simply because they suggest questions that are capable of quantification. John Bodnar feels that the success of labor history's "core questions" in repelling new methods is but one indication among others that those core questions themselves are seriously deficient. William Reddy warns against the illusion of precision that quantitative methods encourages, but finds in the evidence they can provide valuable boundaries to frame historical inquiries.

The review essays carry us into new areas of investigation, new concepts, and new sources. Maurine Weiner Greenwald examines three new studies of domestic workers, which move the emphasis away from the employers' "servant problem" to the workers themselves, and she suggests that the most important area for future research involves the role of domestic servants in their communities, rather than in the workplace. Adrian Schubert argues that recent monographs on collectivization in Spain during the summer and fall of 1936 show that it is possible to cut through partisan myths and discover what actually happened and where. Jean Quataert contends that if we examine the process of industrialization from the vantage point of rural workers' households, rather than from that of the factory gate, we find that both the English model and the notion of "protoindustrialization" mislead the historians of continental Europe. Finally, Richard Parker informs us that large archival collections for the study of Venezuelan labor movements have lately been assembled, and that much of their material is being published. The decisive role of Venezuelan workers in the conflicts among international bodies trying to shape South American movements makes this scholarly undertaking of unusual importance to historians of the Americas generally.

Both Parker's and Tilly's bibliography employ a form of citation, borrowed from social science journals, that is especially useful for bibliographic purposes. We do *not* intend that the form should be a model for future essays in *ILWCH*, and we hope that authors of future submissions will not use it as an example, except in those rare instances where bibliography per se is a major component of the essay. In all other cases, please adhere to the form of end-note citation we have customarily used.

A final note: As a result of the transfer of subscriptions and other business matters to the University of Illinois Press, this issue has no section presenting Works in Progress. That vital information will reappear in future issues. Please use the enclosure you'll find in your renewal notice to send us news of what you are currently doing to advance our knowledge of working-class history so that we may include the information in future listings of Works in Progress. Be sure to include also the historical fields in which you would like to review books for *ILWCH*. Our new publishing arrangements provide the editorial staff more time to enlarge our circle of reviewers.

H. G. and D. M.