

ANALYSE ET COMMENTAIRE DE TEXTES OU DOCUMENTS EN ANGLAIS

Durée : 6 heures

Analysez et commentez, **en anglais**, les cinq documents suivants:

DOCUMENT 1

Altho' you will receive, thro' the official channel of the War Office, every communication necessary to develop to you our views respecting the Indians, and to direct your conduct, yet, supposing it will be satisfactory to you, and to those with whom you are placed, to understand my personal dispositions and opinions in this particular, I shall avail myself of this private letter to state them generally.

I consider the business of hunting as already insufficient to furnish clothing and subsistence to the Indians. The promotion of agriculture, therefore, and household manufacture, are essential in their preservation, and I am disposed to aid and encourage it liberally. This will enable them to live on much smaller portions of land, and indeed will render their vast forests useless but for the range of cattle; for which purpose, also, as they become better farmers, they will be found useless, and even disadvantageous.

While they are learning to do better on less land, our increasing numbers will be calling for more land, and thus a coincidence of interests will be produced between those who have lands to spare, and want other necessities, and those who have such necessities to spare, and want land. This commerce, then, will be for the good of both, and those who are friends to both ought to encourage it.

You are in the station peculiarly charged with this interchange, and who have it peculiarly within your power to promote among the Indians a sense of the superior value of a little land, well cultivated, over a great deal, unimproved, and to encourage them to make this estimate truly. The wisdom of the animal which amputates and abandons to the hunter the parts for which he [*sic*] is pursued should be theirs, with this difference, that the former sacrifices what is useful, the latter what is not.

In truth, the ultimate point of rest and happiness for them is to let our settlements and theirs meet and blend together, to intermix and become one people. Incorporating themselves with us as citizens of the United States, this is what the natural progress of things will of course bring on, and it will be better to promote than to retard it. Surely it will be better for them to be identified with us, and be preserved in the occupation of their lands, than be exposed to the many casualties which may endanger them while a separate people.

President Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Benjamin Hawkins, February 18, 1803
Quoted in Henry Stephens Randall, *The Life of Thomas Jefferson*, Vol.3
New York: Derby & Jackson, 1858, p. 41

DOCUMENT 2

"The World is upside down"

In many cases the family is not wholly dissolved by the employment of the wife, but turned upside down. The wife supports the family, the husband sits at home, tends the children, sweeps the room and cooks. This case happens very frequently; in Manchester alone, many hundreds such men could be cited, condemned to domestic occupations. It is easy to imagine the wrath aroused among the working-men by this reversal of all relations within the family, while the other social conditions remain unchanged. There lies before me a letter from an English working-man, Robert Pounder, in Leeds. [...]

He relates how another working-man, being on tramp, came to St Helens, in Lancashire, and there looked up an old friend. 'He found him in a miserable, damp cellar, scarcely furnished ; and when my poor friend went in, there sat poor Jack near the fire, and what did he, think you? Why he sat and mended his wife's stockings with the bodkin; and as soon as he saw his old friend at the doorpost, he tried to hide them. But Joe, that is my friend's name, had seen it, and said "Jack, what the devil art thou doing? Where is the missus? Why, is that thy work?" And poor Jack was ashamed, and said: "No, I know this is not my work, but my poor missus is i' th' factory ; she has to leave at half-past five and works till eight at night, and then she is so knocked up that she cannot do aught [anything] when she gets home, so I have to do everything for her what I can, for I have no work, nor had any for more nor three years, and I shall never have any more work while I live;" and then he wept a big tear. Jack again said "There is work enough for women folks and children hereabouts, but none for men; thou mayest sooner find a hundred pound on the road than work for men! But I should never have believed that either thou or anyone else would have seen me mending my wife's stockings, for it is bad work. But she can hardly stand on her feet; I am afraid she will be laid up, and then I don't know what is to become of us, for it's a good bit that she has been the man in the house and I the woman; it is bad work, Joe" and he cried bitterly, and said, "It has not always been so. [...] [T]hou knowest when I got married I had work plenty and thou knows I was not lazy." "No, that thou wert not." "And we had a good furnished house, and Mary need not go to work. I could work for the two of us; but now the world is upside down. Mary has to work and I have to stop at home, mind the children, sweep and wash, bake and mend; and when the poor woman comes home at night, she is knocked up." [...]

Can one imagine a more insane state of things than that described in this letter? And yet this condition, which unsexes the man and takes from the woman all womanliness without being able to bestow upon the man true womanliness, or the woman true manliness – this condition which degrades, in the most shameful way, both sexes, and through them, Humanity, is the last result of our much-praised civilisation, the final achievement of all the efforts and struggles of hundreds of generations to improve their own situation and that of their prosperity. We must either despair of mankind, and its aims and efforts, when we see all our labour and toil result in such a mockery, or we must admit that human society has hitherto sought salvation in a false direction; we must admit that so total a reversal of the position of sexes can have come to pass only because the sexes have been placed in a false position from the beginning. If the reign of the wife over the husband, as inevitably brought about by the factory system, is inhuman, the pristine rule of the husband over the wife must have been inhuman too.

Frederick Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, 1845, pp. 145-6

DOCUMENT 3

The Middle Classes in England between the wars

In inter-war Britain, unlike our own times, the middle class had a profound sense of social inferiority, occupying a subordinate position in what was generally conceptualised as a three-tier social order. In retail trade, according to a 1939 manual, there were three types of district, "for which any shop may cater" – "high-class, middle-class, and working-class." Virginia Woolf (one of her commentators tells us) showed a "passionate" social curiosity about the "upper," "middle" and "lower" classes, "these distinctions were sharply present in her mind." The trichotomous division of society often recurs in accounts of individual localities, as, for instance, "gentry," "farmers" and "labourers" in a country village.

The measures vary, depending on the scale in use, but in any of these cases the upper class, however its membership is defined, is seen as qualitatively different. At the top of society there was a conspicuously privileged and apparently well-integrated ruling class, made up of public persons and social leaders – what had been known in mid-Victorian times as the 'upper ten thousand' and what was variously referred to in the inter-war years as "the aristocracy," "the upper classes," or "society." In one aspect it was the Establishment. In another, a leisure class of prestige who took part in the

15 London Season¹, and followed the country house round. More rarely it might be extended to take in the leaders of industry and finance, but only when they were taken up in high politics, or caught up in the social round.

20 Society was a descriptive term for titled and influential people who monopolized prestige roles. But it also served, in middle-class eyes, as a symbolic category for the unattainable Other. The upper classes had wine cellars; the middle class, except on ceremonial occasions, abstained. The upper classes had country estates and kept town houses; the middle class lived in the suburbs. The upper classes followed the hunt; the middle class played tennis. The upper class gambled on horses, the middle class played cards. The upper classes were newspaper celebrities, "the most attractive people in the world;" the middle class were shy and retiring.

25 Aristocracy was not only more powerful, it was also, in the middle class imagination of the time, more sexually exciting. "Society" beauties, rather than mannequins or film stars, were used to model clothes and advertise cosmetics. The stage Englishman of the 1920s, faultlessly groomed and presenting himself in a drawing-room stance, was judged "irresistible and enchanting;" so too was his more outdoor successor, the "silver screen" hero of the 1930s, a tall man dressed in a sporting tweeds, "the mirror of good form, the flower of an English public schooling."

30 The charisma attached to aristocracy rubbed off – by a species of transferred deference – on to all kinds of subaltern roles. In a poor district the symbolic role of being a "real" lady or gentleman would sometimes be performed by a small shopkeeper; in a middle class district, by the doctor or the clergyman; in a village, retired people. In working class South Tottenham, Ted Willis's childhood home, the local "squire" (as Willis calls him), was Mr Wise, "a paternalist of the old Victorian school." He ran a Hand and Steam Laundry "powered by an old and wheezy coke boiler" and sat on the Council as an independent until a "young and beautiful lady doctor" (Edith Summerskill) fought him on the Labour ticket and defeated him.

40 Pride at mixing with superiors ran right down the social scale, and the hope of being taken up by them was a very principle of action in the middle-class career, and the middle-class choice of occupations. The greater prestige which the professions enjoyed in comparison to business – an enduring feature of the British system which was only weakened in very recent times – has often been attributed to the greater proximity to landed wealth, and the greater opportunity of winning social recognition by well-born clients. The relative standing of different branches of retail trade was structured on similar lines, and an enormous amount of prestige was attached to serving 'better class' customers.

50 The charisma attached to the notion of "gentleman" was possibly more widely diffused in the 1920s than in any other period of English history. The Public Schools reached a peak in their recruitment (numbers began to fall away in the 1930s); the rapidly expanding grammar schools borrowed their rituals and took over many of their gentlemanly ideals; there was a large extension in girls' private education. The gentrification of the professions, a long drawn-out process which can be traced back to early Victorian years, reached new heights, at the same time as membership of the professions, as measured in the Census, more than doubled in that space of twenty years.

55 The reverence which the middleclass of the inter-war years offered to aristocracy was in some sort a counterpart of their own low social esteem, their sense of being outdistanced by upstarts, and their fear of the growing power of the working class. The object of desire was a chimera, owing more to romantic literature and stage-plays, or the excitements of the newspaper gossip columnists, than to life. The mystique of gentility offered the middle class an idealised version of others rather than of themselves. But it served them not only as a consolatory myth, but as a prescription for everyday conduct, determining the occupations they chose, the education they paid for in their children, the "dainty" teas and doilies they put on the table, the "good" suits they laboriously saved up for, the "superior" boarding houses they patronised on holidays, the "refined" voices in which they spoke, the way they hitched their trousers and the way they crossed their legs.

Raphael Samuel, *New Socialist*, March / April 1983, pp. 28-31

¹ For hundreds of years, the London Season was the heartbeat of the upper class British social life, serving to aid the introduction and courtship of marriageable age children of the nobility and gentry.

DOCUMENT 4

At the Top of the Bottom in the Segregated South

I think that I came to an appreciation of the concept of social class in my earliest years. The segregated South where I was born 20-odd years before *Brown v. Board of Education* was a place of stark contrasts in black and white. "Negro" families of relative position and privilege, as mine was, inculcated the values of education, citizenship and, as one said back then, breeding with a pertinacity that was as anxious as it was authentic. The rough, undiscerning democracy among pre-pubescent males was leavened by a narcissism of small differences of speech, color, dress, ambitions, etc., none too subtly imparted by watchful mothers whose silent prayer was, "There but for the grace of God...."

Both parents were educators, my father the principal of our city's first public high school for Negroes. We were people of consequence in the eyes of both "races," a family who lived, therefore, under the discipline of a double mandate: to be pillars, straightlaced and self-conscious, of social uplift in the community of color; and to serve, at best, as ameliorating agents of relations between the races and, at worst, as hired professionals of the Jim Crow order.

We lived well, our days were mostly sunny, and I know that my parents were stoically undeceived by the objectively equivocal, contingent nature of the advantaged life they gave me and my siblings. We knew we would go to college (with a detour for my older brothers in the segregated armed forces during World War II) and then become lawyers, doctors, teachers and preachers. Within our cocoon of modest material possessions my playmates of the "right sort" and I envisaged a grown-up future of unexceptional assimilatedness. But the life of a class at the top of the bottom can be, and more often than not is, subject to irony, paradox and the crisis of compromise. It was because of an all-of-the-above class lesson that I was spared a coming-of-age experience in the ex-Confederacy that I've never had great cause to regret. Because of my father's position, he had to take a position. He characteristically decided to stand on principle in a major civil rights case. He testified as an authority for the N.A.A.C.P. [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People] and against the discriminatory policies of the city public school system. The N.A.A.C.P. prevailed.

In less than a year, as I remember it, our family went from the top of the social heap to pariah status in the dominant community and to an awkward presence as unemployables among its own racial group. From this profoundly instructive trauma, I learned to assume the permanent possibility that, however solid the middle-class reinforcements, race could trump class in my life experience. But there is progress, I think. A broad national consensus now exists that, whenever it is socially and politically advantageous to do so, class considerations should trump racial identity. Race remains integral to Americans' perception of class, nevertheless. To deny its powerful, subsisting reality would be to endorse a simplistic and ultimately unhelpful evasion.

Daniel Levering Lewis, *The New York Times*, June 12, 2005

David Levering Lewis is a history professor at New York University and the author of a two-volume biography of W. E. B. DuBois, each volume of which won a Pulitzer Prize.

DOCUMENT 5

Some studies of working-class social reproduction suggest that middle-class social reproduction is largely attributable to a structurally advantageous social position. Middle-class social

reproduction is not always recognized as an active process of negotiation and construction—much less contestation. Both Willis (1977:1) and MacLeod (1995:214) allude to the structurally determined nature of middle-class reproduction by suggesting that middle-class students reproduce because of the actions of others toward them and not because of their own actions. This argument implies that middle-class social reproduction is a process that does not require much human agency. This perspective is notably different from the constructionist explanations of working-class reproduction, in which individuals actively (re)produce their social positions, and some even resist, contest, and reject structural impositions. Although middle-class students engaged in social reproduction may not exhibit such overt strategies of resistance and rejection, they must still engage in the negotiation and construction of their social reality. As Lareau notes, middle-class individuals must actively utilize their structural resources if they hope to reproduce their social-class standing: “Possession of high status cultural resources does not therefore *automatically* lead to a social investment. Rather, these cultural resources must be effectively activated by individuals, in and through their own actions and decisions” (Lareau, 2000:178). [...]

Middle-class students, like many of their peers, are not averse to rejecting the path their parents have mapped out for them. A good example of this process comes from AJ, whose parents were very clear about what he should do: they expected him to become a doctor. Initially, AJ did attend a college that accepted him into a special, 7-year BA/MD program. But after a year he burned out, “blew up” at his parents, and rejected the medical career they had planned for him. His parents, who were both surprised and distraught, refused to talk to AJ for a month. The reaction of AJ’s parents, while extreme, reflects the extent to which “the task of recreating the middle-class is a total preoccupation” for some parents, who stake “much of their own sense of success on the lives of their children” (Newman, 1993:92). When the lines of communication were finally re-opened between AJ and his parents, they kept up the pressure:

So they were asking me what’s the option? Obviously if I was making such a grand, earth-shattering change I should have a plan. Obviously I didn’t, because I didn’t know anything else; I hadn’t had time to think of anything else. So I told them, “I don’t know,” and unfortunately [that was] not what they were waiting to hear, so they were like, “Well don’t expect us to pay \$30,000 a year for you to go to ---- University and figure out what you are going to do. God knows, you could come out and become a theater major.” So they told me to choose a state school.

Upon enrolling at a public university, AJ took a broad spectrum of liberal arts courses and finally settled on majoring in history—a choice his parents would rather not have heard:

I quote from my father, “AJ, do you know what kind of people major in history?” And I was fully expecting a derogatory answer, “People who can’t cut it in any other major.” It was an answer that I expected, but after a while they’ve gotten used to it, and I’m doing very well. Then I decided to go to law school, and this is something that I really want to do, and thank God it’s something that they approve of.

A similar process of rejection is illustrated by the case of Amy, who expects to create a much different middle-class lifestyle than the one her parents expect of her. Amy’s parents are both well-educated and working in professional managerial occupations. Her father is an environmental conservationist for the government, and her mother is a nurse supervisor. Although they are solidly middle-class, Amy’s parents do not live the type of well-polished, professional lifestyle that Amy desires:

My mother says, “I hope you are kidding when you say that,” because I’m always saying, “It’s all about the outfit, mom.” Whatever’s going to give me the outfit, that’s what I’m going to do. She is very concerned about me doing something socially conscious. I am concerned about the overall perception of my lifestyle, which is something that I probably wasn’t raised to do. I’ve been to Washington, D.C., and I could just so see myself there. All those people I suits, and I don’t like martinis, but, you know, the whole martini bar kind of thing. I could see myself doing that for a while. And the wine and cheese parties, and driving the Lexus, that’s what I could see myself doing.

Amy, like AJ, is negotiating a different path of social reproduction than what her parents had hoped. But unlike AJ, who is constructing an identity more consistent with his parents' desires, Amy is engaged in constructing an identity that, while it will ensure her social reproduction (and maybe even produce upward mobility), will also result in a considerable change in lifestyle. Amy's orientation is an example of what Emirbayer and Mische (1998) refer to as the "protective element" of agency, whereby she is creatively reconfiguring the structural resources that her middle-class upbringing have [sic] granted her.

In addition to illustrating the variations of middle-class lifestyles and the need for individuals to actively choose the path they will take, the examples of AJ and Amy also reflect some of the ways in which class intersects with race and gender. In both examples, desired social class outcomes are refracted through the lens of race and gender. AJ was partially aware of these effects when he noted how difficult it was to contest his parents' expectations, given his racial-ethnic background: "It's somewhat stereotypical and somewhat it's not. You know, it's Asian-American parents, only male child, both of my parents were extreme overachievers just in everything they've done." In this sense, AJ's occupational choice allows him to reproduce his parents' social class and achieve the stereotypical gender script for an Asian American male (Hirschman and Wong, 1986). Similarly, Amy alludes to the intersection of gender, race, and class by emphasizing her dress as the driving force behind the form she hopes her social reproduction will take (Davis, 1992). She even references Sigourney Weaver's character in the movie *Working Girl* as the type of high-powered female executive she hopes to emulate. Amy is not striving to reproduce (or transcend) her parents' middle-class status, she is more generally striving for a white, upper-middle-class female ideal.

Peter Kaufman

"Middle-Class Social Reproduction: The Activation and Negotiation of Structural Advantages"
Sociological Forum, Vol. 20, No. 2 (June 2005), pp. 246 and 252-254