

Published in: Peter N. Stearns and Jan Lewis (eds.), *An Emotional History of the United States*, New York University Press, New York 1998: pp. 283-304.

ETIQUETTE BOOKS AND EMOTION MANAGEMENT IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY: AMERICAN HABITUS IN INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON

Cas Wouters

1. Introduction

Manners books (or etiquette books) are not an American invention. The reception of European manners books in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century America, particularly Lord Chesterfield's *Letters of Advice to His Son* (1775), launched the creation of American codes and ideals of behavior and emotion management. In close connection to the changing power structure, this revolutionary period saw the change from a courtesy genre to an etiquette genre. In the latter genre, inherited status and class deference were no longer emphasized. As 'the manners game was open to all who could compete,' these were books for status-conscious social climbers.¹

The present essay deals with changes in twentieth-century manners, comparing American, Dutch, English and German etiquette books.² This comparison has revealed several significant national differences, with regard not only to a variety of specific topics but also to the genre as a whole. Here, a few of these differences will be discussed, in particular those that illuminate specifically American patterns of emotion management. Among them are different ways of addressing readers, differences in social dividing lines between private and public, formal and informal, introductions, reserve, snubbing, business etiquette, superlatives and popularity. Other topics like 'race,' chaperonage, dating and petting, in which there are significant differences, are part of the same overall emotional style, but will have to be discussed at a later time. International comparison is directed at presenting striking, and therefore illuminating, contrasts, and placing them in the context of a wider framework of changes in both national *habitus* and national class structure. This framework needs to be outlined first.

As in earlier centuries, modern etiquette books generally express the codes of behavior and emotion management of established classes and their Good Society, functioning as a model for other social groups and classes. In 1890, Gabriel Tarde published his *Laws of Imitation*, an extensive study of this model function, capturing the 'trickling' of codes and ideals 'down' the social ladder in the metaphor of a water tower:

Invention can start from the lower ranks of the people, but its extension depends upon the existence of some lofty social elevation, a kind of social water tower, whence a continuous waterfall of imitation may descend.³

In his study of American etiquette books, the historian Arthur M. Schlesinger reported that:

The rules of etiquette were calculated, as an astronomer would say, for the meridian of the city, and even there it was "good society" that paid principal heed.

Nevertheless the little candle threw its beams afar and as *time* toned down the differences between urban social classes and between country and town as well, something like a nationwide consensus of manners came about. (italics added)

And in the 1960 edition of America's most famous etiquette book, first published in 1922, Emily Post also referred to the same process, relating it to growing prosperity: 'What was once considered the tradition of gracious living of the few has in these times of plenty rightly become the heritage of us all.'⁴ The spread of 'gracious living' and the 'toning down of differences' in the development of 'a nationwide consensus of manners' are undisputed developments, but their explanation in terms of a 'social water-tower,' 'time' and 'plenty' will have to be augmented. In the present essay, these developments will be analyzed in the wider framework of expanding and intensifying competition and cooperation, which operated as the main driving forces toward continued social differentiation and integration, a social interweaving in which networks of interdependence between various groups of people expanded, and became denser and more multileveled. In one of Norbert Elias's formulations:

The main line of this movement . . . , the successive rises of larger and larger groups, is the same in all Western countries, and incipiently so in increasingly large areas elsewhere. And similar, too, is the structural regularity underlying it, the increasing division of functions under the pressure of competition, the tendency to more equal dependence of all on all...⁵

It is this process of changing power and dependency relationships that is seen as the motor of changes in behavior, experience, values, emotions, and emotion management. On the whole, twentieth-century changes in power and dependency relationships can be interpreted as a process of social integration in which more and more groups of people came to be represented in the various centers of power. Their members increasingly adopted the same national code of behavior and feeling; thus the more extreme differences

in power, ranking, behavior and emotion management between all social groups diminished. In the same process, as larger and larger groups became interdependent, the people involved increasingly came to experience others as belonging to their own group or nation. This expanding group-feeling or widening identification has somewhat weakened the boundaries of class, religion, ethnic background or race, and provided a basis for a rising societal level of mutual trust and, correspondingly, a declining level of anxiety, mutual suspicion and hatred. Thus, the process of social integration involves rising social constraints toward such self-restraints as reflection and consideration in controlling conflicts. The spectrum of accepted emotional and behavioral alternatives has expanded (with the important exception of feelings of superiority and inferiority), however an acceptable and respectable usage of these alternatives implied a continued increase in the demands made on emotion management.⁶ In this way, the successive ascent of larger and larger groups, their increasing status and power relative to other groups, has been reflected in the dominant codes and ideals of behavior and feeling, in an overall style of emotion management, in *habitus*.

In contrast to *individual* social ascent, the ascent of an entire social group involves a change in the whole shape and volume of the social water tower, to use Tarde's metaphor. It involves some form of mixing of the codes and ideals of the groups that have risen and those of the previously superior groups. My central hypothesis is, that the way this mixing process has proceeded helps us understand, if not explain, particular changes in emotions and emotion management and the formation of a particular national habitus.⁷ The sediments of this mixing process can be seen in longer-term changes in etiquette books: the 'emotionology' or patterns of emotion management of increasingly wider social groups is reflected in the rules of etiquette. In turn, major directional trends in these codes and ideals are indicative of changes in power relationships between all social groups - classes, sexes, and generations - and changes in the level of integration in any particular society. Trends in manners are therefore indicative of trends in power relationships or class structures as well as in national habitus. It is in the light of these connections that this essay will focus on differences and changes in the above mentioned specifically American manners. Discussing manners as an integral part of dominant American patterns of behavior, ideals and emotion management - conceptualized as habitus - will shed light on the development of a specifically American overall emotional style.

2. General Outline of National Developments

Since America was a 'new nation' with an enormously varied population, ranging from black slaves to rich landowning and commercial patricians - but no aristocracy – its integration processes differed in many ways from those in 'old nations'. The lack of any hereditary ruling group is usually held to account for there being hardly any of the characteristics of a courtly civilization in the American national habitus. Yet the easygoing conduct that is so often portrayed as typically American can also be understood as a typical product of a court society and a courtly civilization:

While our rejection of the magnificent and the grandiose and our preference for ease and informality are probably influenced by leveling and democratic ideas, the fact remains that the easy style was an invention of an aristocratic age and was meant to exalt its possessor above his fellows, not to bring him down to their level.⁸

The easy style has remained a means for attaining success. As a 1992 book on success puts it: 'Yes, there are little "tricks of the trade" in meeting and greeting people and learning to become at ease and casual in social situations.' This is a twentieth-century example of a process-continuity; it is in fact similar to the process that occurred in the late eighteenth century, when 'the middling sort repudiated the basis of aristocratic power even as they seized the aristocratic armor of manners and remade it for their own purposes.'⁹ In each country under study although only partially in Germany before 1871, appropriating the manners of superior groups has again and again facilitated the rise of subordinated groups.

Moreover, comparisons between new and old nations have often been ideologically inspired, to the extent that all old nations are lumped together after the model of England and France. Thus, the fact that countries like Germany and the Netherlands also have strong middle-class characteristics in their national habitus is generally neglected. In the Netherlands, rich merchants became the ruling class at a very early date. In 1581, their separatist movement succeeded in freeing the country from king and aristocracy. It has been reported that both the contents and history of the Dutch freedom charter, 'Het Plakkaat van Verlatinge' (Declaration of Abandonment/Desertion) of 1581, contain striking similarities to the American 'Declaration of Independence' of 1776. Since 1581, merchant patricians have been the dominant class in the Netherlands; although this ruling group had come to function more or less as an aristocracy by the end of the seventeenth century, when

they attempted to regard themselves 'as equals of Crowned Heads', they continued to keep close ties to the world of commerce. Consequently, the Dutch national code of conduct and emotion management is highly permeated by middle-class characteristics. As early as the 1850s, the American historian John L. Motley compared the Dutch struggle for independence with that of the United States, and the Dutch sociologist Johan Goudsblom thinks S.M. Lipset was wrong in calling the United States *The First New Nation*: 'a further comparison of the early development of the two Republics along the lines suggested by Lipset would probably lead to some interesting analogies.'¹⁰

In what was to become Germany, until the German unification in 1871, bourgeois classes and aristocratic circles remained highly segregated; accordingly, different habitus developed in the two groups. From 1871 until the Second World War, the bourgeois habitus amalgamated with certain elements of the aristocratic code into a German national habitus. However, lacking one central court and the development of a pacified courtly code like the ones in England or France, these elements were more directly related to an aristocratic warrior code than to an aristocratic courtly civilization. As Norbert Elias observed,

it is military values which have once again grown deep roots in the German tradition of behaviour and feeling. In regard to his own honour, the honour of his country, his Kaiser, his Führer, the officer cannot make any compromises. ... Complete determination, absolute loyalty to principles, uncompromising adherence to one's own convictions, still sound particularly good in German.

Since World War II, these warrior code elements have faded, and a 'revised' middle-class habitus has turned into a German national habitus. A clear example of this process is found in an often reprinted etiquette book entitled 'Good Manners Are Back Again' (*Mann benimmt sich wieder*). It contains an open attack upon an element of this warrior code: the feeling that to compromise is dishonorable and automatically brings loss of 'face', that is, loss of respect and self-respect:

However, you can't and won't simply give up your claims altogether, because then you would lose face, and that... that is completely ruled out. Therefore anyone who wants to 'save face' has to be a skilful negotiator, ... a 'typischer Kompromißler' [typical compromiser].

This expression 'typischer Kompromißler' is used deliberately because it is taken to be a

reproach in our country, whereas a 'good compromiser' to most other people is a highly respected and very esteemed man, whose person and *'kompromißliche'* abilities are in demand and praised. As against what once used to be, we have to become clearly aware of this sharp contrast between German and foreign views on the importance attached to 'partly giving in'. We view, or used to view, rigid insistence upon a total claim as proud, brave and masculine, while the rest of the world views it as foolish and destructive, because it blocks any negotiation from ever producing results that are satisfying for both parties, while it generally rules out living together harmoniously. ... The last war, and with it our present misery, was ignited by these contrasting views on 'saving face'.¹¹

In England, throughout the nineteenth century, rich middle-class newcomers were allowed into the centers of power, including (high) society, provided they knocked at the appropriate doors in the appropriate ways, way of integrating nouveaux riches helped make Good Society a unified and strong social and political center. Thus, the integration of new classes into Society coincided with rather collective and nonconflicting changes in the English national code of conduct and affect-control:

In the making of this English code, features of aristocratic descent fused with those of middle-class descent - understandably, for in the development of English society one can observe a continuous assimilating process in the course of which upper-class models (especially a code of good manners) were adopted in a modified form by middle-class people, while middle-class features (as for instance elements of a code of morals) were adopted by upper-class people. Hence, when in the course of the nineteenth century most of the aristocratic privileges were abolished, and England with the rise of the industrial working classes became a nation state, the English national code of conduct and affect-control showed very clearly the gradualness of the resolution of conflicts between upper and middle classes in the form, to put it briefly, of a peculiar blend between a code of good manners and a code of morals.¹²

3. Etiquette Books in International Comparison

a. Public and Private: American and German Habitus Compared

Particularly in comparison with Germany, the American national habitus is characterized by an open and confident attitude towards the public (also political) arena, which has been

widely penetrated by informality. In most social settings, 'all were to avoid the extremes of formality and familiarity'. In contrast, the Germans tend to distinguish rather sharply between public and private, formal and informal. In the words of Stephen Kahlberg:

...the public realm is generally characterized by social distance and purely functional exchanges with only formal involvement. Conversely, all 'impersonal' values - ... such as achievement, competition, and goal-attainment - are strictly banned from the private sphere.¹³

In Germany, political power and the associated public sphere remained dominated by an aristocracy for about a century longer than in other Western countries. Representatives of the middle classes remained highly excluded and were obliged to either exhibit subservient behavior or adopt the aristocratic warrior code. As a social inheritance, Germans still behave rather formally in the public arena, as if they distrust it, particularly in the absence of a clear hierarchical setting with clearly designated superordinates and subordinates. In private, however, relationships tend to be experienced as highly personal and as 'immediate, not domesticated by general rules, intent on honesty and profundity,' which implies they may involve almost unlimited rights and obligations.¹⁴ These characteristics can be interpreted as a process-continuity deriving from a distinction made by the bourgeois intelligentsia in eighteenth-century Germany. Blocked from the political centers of power, they emphasized their 'depth of feeling', 'honesty' and 'true virtue' as against the 'superficiality', 'falsity' and 'mere outward politeness' of the nobility.¹⁵ A similar social inheritance of bourgeois habitus is evident in behavior in public, where a kind of formality is demanded that varies with hierarchical differences:

the greater attentiveness and even, in some circumstances extreme sensitivity, to status of middle-class educated Germans erects obstacles to a free mixing from group to group, even if the social skills for doing so are present. This is the case simply because each new social situation requires an assessment of relative status and the assumption of either a posture of deference or leadership, an exercise that is far too stressful to be repeated frequently.¹⁶

Accordingly, in the public sphere, Germans tend to cling more strongly to hierarchically differentiated formal rules, whereas in private and in informal situations, they allow themselves to let go to a greater degree. Throughout this century, up to the present day, German etiquette books have contained questions like *Ehrlich oder höflich?* (honest or

polite? - a chapter title)¹⁷ as well as many warnings against getting too confidential and against *duzen* (using the informal you), for instance at office parties and trips. The next day at the office one will practically always regret this. In a more general formulation,

Faith, *not confidentiality* should be the basis of a friendship in which *Du* is used as an expression of a special bond. Whoever gives away this 'Du' lightheartedly forgets altogether that, together with this 'Du,' an obligation is to be accepted: to be a real friend, who will also prove himself as such in bad times.¹⁸

Notwithstanding the informalization spurt of the 1960s and 1970s, when most social arbiters sincerely invited their readers to do away with uptight formalities, the formality-informality span¹⁹ of the Germans has remained much wider than that of the other countries. It seems to be smallest in the United States as the Americans tend to be relatively informal. From observations like 'Americans invite people once to check them out; it's the second invitation which is a compliment'²⁰ it follows that the American dividing line between private and public is less sharply drawn. The same goes for the boundaries of friendship. With regard to national symbols and ceremonies, however, Americans tend to be more formal. Moreover, many formal aspects of American behavior are not directly recognizable, for instance, the relatively strong pressure for conformity through a variety of social controls on individuals as members of communities and organizations.²¹

b. Manners and Class in England and America

In the nineteenth century the English developed a system of introductions, cards, and calling that functioned quite effectively to screen newcomers into Good Society and to close their ranks against others. In addition to this elaborate system, an important means of exclusion was the development and maintenance of 'reserve'. Until well into the twentieth century, most British manners books give the impression of having been written from a one-class perspective, as if the public of readers all belonged, or at least were on the verge of belonging to Society and as if all would participate in the events of The Season. Even at a time when many 'new people' with 'new money' were entering high Society, as around 1900, this style of writing remained dominant. This process-continuity demonstrates that the system of gatekeeping functioned not only to identify and exclude undesirables, but also to ensure that the newly introduced would accommodate to the prevailing code of behavior and emotion management. As a whole, the existence of a strong, unified, and unifying center in combination with a gatekeeping system of introductions, cards, and

calling and a habit of 'reserve', might explain why discussions of problems connected with the social mingling of different classes are almost absent in British manners books, whereas they are openly and frequently discussed in manners books from other countries. The effective system of gatekeeping even allowed references to contact with lower classes to become scarce, and references to 'lower instincts' (emotions related to bodily functions and body control, particularly sex and violence) to become taboo. In the nineteenth century, the latter came to be experienced as embarrassing and branded as vulgar: they would betray lower-class origin. In contrast to other countries, no such references are found in twentieth-century British etiquette books.

The degree of integration of English society and the effective gatekeeping of its Good Society may also explain why, as Curtin observed, 'the requirement that a gentleman treat those he met in company on the basis of equality was one of the commonest and most frequently reiterated principles of etiquette.'²² An elaborate, highly formal and hierarchically differentiated system of manners or rules operated to restrict 'those he met in company.' For example,

If you are walking down the street in company with another person, and stop to say something to one of your friends ... do not commit the too common, but most flagrant error, of presenting such persons to one another. ... If you should be so presented, remember that the acquaintance afterwards goes for nothing; you have not the slightest right to expect that the other will ever speak to you. But observe, that in all such cases you should converse with a stranger as if you knew him perfectly well; you are to consider him an acquaintance for the nonce.²³

In other words, these rules helped identify situations in which the rules prescribed the practice of 'reserve', that is, the avoidance of exactly the kind of emotion management required when one was 'in company'. Thus, the effective gatekeeping system of the English also helps explain why and how they developed a tendency to behave either with 'reserve', which 'implies that everyone is to be treated alike as a stranger...'²⁴ or 'on the basis of equality', which implies that everyone 'in company' is to be treated alike as an equal.

An unobtrusive insight into the significance of the elaborate and rather rigid system of manners can be derived from the following warning against the 'visiting card trick', published in a 1906 British magazine:

To bring this trick to a successful issue the beggar must be a man of respectable

appearance and some address, for it is essential that he should gain access to your drawing room. ... If he is fortunate enough to be admitted to the drawing room, he asks, before going, if you will oblige him with a glass of water. Should you leave him... he takes the opportunity to pocket any visiting cards he may see lying about. Presently one of the cards comes back to you. It is presented by another caller, and on the back you read: "Bearer is a thoroughly deserving man. He is on his way to (some distant town) to obtain work. I have given him ten shillings. Can you help?" ... Some of the other stolen cards will be similarly presented to other friends of the people whose names they bear. Thus, the vicar's card will be presented to one of his churchwardens, the town councillor's to one of his colleagues on the council, and so on. Visiting cards are a recognised article of commerce in some of the common lodging houses, where they are sold at prices ranging up to five shillings according to the supposed value of the card as a bait.²⁵

This confidence trick demonstrates the importance of visiting cards and, at the same time, the high degree of seclusion and integration, and the strength of the sense of belonging and protectedness that high society provided; without these, a con game like this could not have been successful. Only within such a protective environment could tact and consideration be developed more fully. The certainty of being more or less equals 'in company' may also explain why many English, to this day, tend to behave in a rather easy and informal way in formal situations, whereas on the other hand, in informal situations where this certainty is lacking, they tend to cling to the boundaries of the relatively greater formality. In other words, when 'in company' with each other, the English adhere to a code of conduct and emotion management characterized by a relatively small formality-informality span, but in informal situations outside this protected circle, traditional constraints of 'reserve' toward 'strangers' may operate.

The relatively high level of integration and seclusion of British high society may also explain, at least partly, why the British have developed a taste for understatements and self-mockery; this demonstrative 'cool' is connected with a relatively strong inhibition of anger. 'In company,' some are more equal, of course, but by developing the custom of not accentuating these differences, the British prevent and contain tensions, conflicts and loss of decorum. To a considerable extent, individual idiosyncrasies are allowed, but only if expressed within a rather strict social definition of modesty. Even with regard to dressing,

'etiquette writers worried more about over-dressing than they did about under-dressing.'²⁶
 For example,

In the morning, before eleven o'clock, even if you go out, you should not be dressed. You would be stamped a *parvenue* if you were seen in anything better than a respectable old frock coat.²⁷

The development of relatively strict and effective rules for inclusion and exclusion, implying a relatively high degree of external social constraints on emotion management, corresponds to the development of a relatively high sensitivity to boundaries, fences, border lines, and gatecrashing. Taken together, these developments present an insight into the paradox that on the one hand the British have preserved a rather hierarchical class society, while on the other hand their national habitus - modeled after their best society - is characterized by a relatively high degree of tact, consideration, and tolerance. The latter implies an emotion management characterized by a relatively high level of mutually expected self-restraints and mutual identification.

In contrast, at the beginning of the twentieth century, American high society was far less integrated and secluded. American upper classes were more spread out and more strongly divided among themselves, the country being much larger and characterized by much greater differences between North, South, East, and West, without a unifying and dominant center like London. In such a setting, 'those who felt they were eligible for entry on the basis of wealth and achievement but who were excluded on grounds of religion, ethnic background or race, formed their own Society.'²⁸ To elaborate on Tarde's metaphor: there were many competing 'social water towers' in the United States. In New York, for instance, there has been a more or less constant competition between 'two Societies, "Old New York" and "New Society." In every era, "Old New York" has taken a horrified look at "New Society" and expressed the devout conviction that a genuine aristocracy, good blood, good bone - themselves - was being defiled by a horde of rank climbers.'²⁹ This high level of competition runs in tandem with a high degree of openness of high society (except for those excluded 'on grounds of religion, ethnic background or race'). Often, America's openness is emphasized for ideological reasons, while the other side of the coin, its strong competitiveness is downplayed. For instance, in the 1960s the author of an historical study of American manners claimed that 'no other civilization can show so many orders, associations, fraternal lodges, ... where it was possible to "meet people," "make contacts"

and find a place'.³⁰ Of course, an open 'frontier' and the absence of a landed aristocracy contributed to the relative openness of competition and, accordingly, to a less marked sensitivity for boundaries and fences, as these were likely to be more porous and changing. In the 1950s, Harold Nicolson, a British member of high society, portrayed Americans as having a

curious indifference to, or disregard of, what to us is one of the most precious of human possessions, namely personal privacy. To them, ... privacy denotes something exclusive, patronising, 'un-folksey', and therefore meriting suspicion. Thus they leave their curtains undrawn at dusk, have no hedges separating their front gardens, and will converse amicably with strangers about private things.³¹

In America, the open competition between many Best Societies explains to a large extent why Good Society as a whole has had a weaker political significance than in England. Davidoff has pointed out that this 'lack of access to real power through Society meant that its reward and entertainment function was stressed'.³² This is expressed in many ways, for instance in the subtitle of Crowninshield's 1908 book 'An Entrance Key to the Fantastic Life of the 400' and in American words like 'the smart', 'fashionable set', 'jet set' and 'socialites', words that are closely associated with 'conspicuous consumption' and 'showing off'. In other words, whereas the British tend to tone down social differences, Americans tend to accentuate them. The weaker integration and seclusion of America's Best Society have also prevented a comparably advanced development of the British habit of keeping one's distance or 'reserve.' It made the dominant code of behavior and emotion management in America more universal than the British type, but at the same time, it prevented the American code from becoming as unified and yet subtly differentiated as the corresponding British code. The range of accepted behavior in the American code allowed for extremes that the British, according to their code, would experience as disgusting. A nineteenth-century example is spitting about the room; in 1859, an English author called this an American 'national habit', and in 1884 an American author, addressing himself in a special preface to English readers, wrote that

Spitting upon the carpet naturally comes in for severe condemnation; and the authority of Dr. Wendell Holmes seems necessary to prove that a handkerchief should be used in blowing one's nose.³³

By the end of the nineteenth century, extremes like these had faded, but the tenor of

differences in national codes and their perception of each other had remained, as this British example shows:

I should be glad to exhibit to the host of American *parvenues* their own broad, glittering cards - bearing upon them names reeking with plebeianism, sewgawed with some paltry title, the synonyme and passport of insignificance - in contrast with the plain and modest cards of some of the highest peers of the British realm.

This example also shows that differences were experienced as class differences. However, hardly ever would a British author even address *parvenues* in his own country, let alone with strong words like these. Half a century earlier, Tocqueville had observed that 'the English make game of the manners of the Americans.'³⁴

c. Differences in Introductions, in Snubbing, and in Ways of Addressing Readers

In contrast, many American authors of the early twentieth century explicitly presented the British code as an example: 'If we could learn to treat the English people as they treat us in the matter of *introductions*, it would be a great advance. The English regard a letter of introduction as a sacred institution and an obligation which cannot be disregarded.' Even when the British code was not explicitly mentioned, implicitly it was often there:

If not friend from childhood, acquaintance between young men and young women begins with an introduction, and this matter of introduction is one rather too lightly considered on our free American soil.³⁵

In this example, the authors start out to prescribe introductions in an almost commanding tone, only to withdraw in the same sentence by appealing to the American dream. This quotation demonstrates a typical American ambivalence, to be found in most American etiquette books from around 1900. It is an ambivalence with regard to social usages like introductions and chaperonage, functioning to keep strangers and 'intruders' at a distance. These were considered important by some authors and disputed by others, but many were just ambivalent. Taking the matter of introductions 'rather too lightly' implied that the ranks of American Best Society did not close as efficiently as those of English Society. This also implied that protection against strangers or intruders was less efficient. This relatively weak protection from strangers, another aspect of America's rather open competition between many Best Societies, has kept these ranks more dependent on external social controls and has prevented the level of mutual trust from rising: 'There are unfortunately many persons abroad in the land without proper social credentials, who seek new fields of adventure by

the easy American manner of beginning a conversation.' The ambivalence in etiquette books regarding introductions reflects yet another ambivalence: between trust and suspicion, or between the inclination to 'converse amicably with strangers about private things' and the need to be evasive and keep a protective distance. This ambivalence might explain another difference:

...in fashionable London society a hostess takes it for granted that her guests understood that she would invite none but well-bred persons to her house, and that, therefore, they are safe in addressing strangers whom they encounter in her drawingroom. Americans, however, have not generally accepted this custom; and consider it better form for a hostess to introduce her guests.

Here, it is implied that Americans were not safe in addressing strangers whom they encountered in a drawing-room and that they therefore had not accepted this custom. Instead, they preferred to leave the prime responsibility for new acquaintanceships to the hostess. This subtle difference was significant at that time, because around 1900, American 'fashionable circles' still more or less tried to live up to the ideal that

one individual introducing another becomes responsible for his good behavior, as if he should say, "Permit me to introduce my friend; if he cheats you, charge it to me." Such must be the real value of an introduction among all people who expect to take a place in good society. In the course of business, and under various circumstances, we form casual acquaintances, of whom we really know nothing, and who may really be anything but suitable persons for us to know. It would be wrong, therefore, to bring such characters to the favorable notice of those whom we esteem our friends.³⁶

This ideal never died out completely, but it did fade considerably. In the revised 1937 edition of her etiquette book, Emily Post abandoned former, more formal claims by writing 'Under all informal circumstances the roof of a friend serves as an introduction.' Her explanation reads: 'Yesterday believed in putting the responsibility on the protector ... The idea of protection, as it existed then, is out of tune with the world of today.'³⁷ The vanishing of protective rules of etiquette implies that these external social controls had to be taken over by self-controls: people increasingly expected each other to be able to protect themselves.

As social dividing lines in America were less sharply drawn, people wanting to

cross these lines were accordingly presented with a much more direct kind of advice than anything to be found in the British sources. American advice such as 'If a person is more prominent than ourselves, or more distinguished in any way, we should not be violently anxious to take the first step' or 'Too much haste in making new acquaintances, however - "pushing," as it is called - cannot be too much deprecated',³⁸ would have sounded much too crude in the ears of British social arbiters of the same period. They took the avoidance of such intruding manners more or less for granted. Consequently, British authors felt no need to point to the sanctions imposed on such conduct, as American advisors did:

there is the tyranny in large cities of what is known as the "fashionable set," formed of people willing to spend money... If those who desire an introduction to this set strive for it too much, they will be sure to be snubbed; for this circle lives by snubbing.

This quotation demonstrates another characteristic difference: American authors of etiquette books regularly wrote from the perspective of outsiders - people wanting entrance into 'smart circles', *Who's Who*, or the *Social Register*. In contrast, most British authors took their perspective rather exclusively from within Best Society:

Years of mingling in good society are necessary to its full development, and though a delicate sense of what is due to others is of the very essence of tact, it is never quite perfect without a knowledge of the gentle art of snubbing. This is an accomplishment which some women never acquire. They cannot firmly repress the unduly officious or the over-eager without adopting harsh measures or losing their temper. Where they should simply ignore, they administer the cut direct.³⁹

This British author's perspective reveals a confidence and a degree of identification with the established that is virtually absent in American manners books. A quotation like the last one can be read as another variation of 'it takes three generations to make a gentleman,' a maxim against which an American expert on how to behave had already protested in 1837: 'This is too slow a process in these days of accelerated movement.'⁴⁰ In this vein, many authors were quite explicit about the class and status gaps their readers were hoping to bridge. In 1905, for example, the introduction to an etiquette book addressed as its readers

Men and women - women, in particular - to whom changed circumstances or removal from secluded homes to fashionable neighborhoods involved the necessity of altered habits of social intercourse; girls, whose parents are content to live and

move in the deep ruts in which they and their forebears were born; people of humble lineage and rude bringing up, who yet have longings and tastes for gentlehood and for the harmony and beauty that go with really good breeding - these make up the body of our *clientèle*. Every page of our manual was written with a thought of them in our minds.⁴¹

Thus, the identification of social arbiters with any particular 'fashionable set' could only be halfhearted, balancing between an identification with rising outsiders and an identification with the established. A peculiar position was taken by Emily Post. Edmund Wilson contrasts her book to Lilian Eichler's successful etiquette book, published a year earlier (1921); Eichler, he wrote, 'makes social life sound easy and jolly. But Mrs. Post is another affair.' She 'always assumes that the reader wants to belong to Society' and 'to believe in the existence of a social Olympus'; moreover,

What you get in Emily Post, for all her concessions to the age's vulgarization, is a crude version of the social ideal to which the mass of Americans aspired after the Civil War: an ideal that was costly and glossy, smart, self-conscious and a little disgusting in a period when even Mrs. Oldname reflected the lavish Gildings in stimulating her visitors to realize that the clothes she wore were "priceless" and her tableware and furniture museum pieces.⁴²

This perspective may partly explain why Emily Post as late as 1922 still continued the attempt to gain greater acceptance for an elaborate system of introductions: a social Olympus cannot be climbed without pull. Although she admits that 'about twenty years ago the era of informality set in and has been gaining ground ever since', she remains rather strict in presenting specific shades and boundaries of introductions, for instance:

A lady who goes to see another to get a reference for a servant, or to ask her aid in an organization for charity, would never consider such a meeting as an introduction, even though they talked for an hour. Nor would she offer to shake hands in leaving.⁴³

And, according to Post, when people were introduced, this did not necessarily bring recognition: 'if Mrs. ... and Mrs. ... merely spoke to each other for a few moments, in the drawing-room, it is not necessary that they recognize each other afterwards' (10). At the most, such a conversation could establish a 'bowing acquaintanceship', but only if the lady of higher rank took that initiative. This was crucial to what the British called the 'right of

recognition'.⁴⁴

In her revised 1931 edition, this kind of advice was omitted. By that time, in all countries under study, such conduct was branded as too formal and artificial. This branding was typical of the 1920s, when the rise of whole social groups and an acceleration of processes of emancipation and integration were reflected in the shape and volume of the social water tower. The expansion of business and industry, together with an expansion of means of transportation and communication, gave rise to a multitude of new and more casual relationships. These made the old system of introductions too troublesome. It was an era in which many newly wealthy families were jostling for a place within the ranks of good Society, bringing about a formidable spurt of informalization. It is then that the often observed American characteristic sometimes called social promiscuity was much more sharply profiled than elsewhere, not only in the eyes of foreign observers, but even by Emily Post. In her 1931 edition she writes,

Fashionable people in very large cities take introductions lightly; they are veritable ships that pass in the night. They show their red or green signals - which are merely polite sentences and pleasant manners - and they pass on again. (15)

And in her revised edition of 1937, Post writes explicitly 'introductions in very large cities are unimportant' (16), while her new preface contains the observation that 'In the general picture of this modern day the smart and the near-smart, the distinguished and the merely conspicuous, the real and the sham, and the unknown general public are all mixed up together. The walls that used to enclose the world that was fashionable are all down' (x-xi). The relatively modest importance and then further decline of formal rules for 'getting acquainted' occurred in all countries under study. The trend implied the increased importance of individual social navigational abilities, the greater capacity to negotiate with ease and lack of friction the possibilities and limitations of relationships. This shift also implied that formal and external rules and constraints had to be taken more into individual custody. Social interweaving also exerted pressure toward an increased avoidance of conflicts, and in conflicts, to increased attempts at de-escalation through 'role taking' and by using diplomacy and compromise, not anger, shouting, and ridicule. In the United States this trend was reinforced by studies like the 'Hawthorne experiments' of Elton Mayo. An indication is the spread of industrial relations departments in American business; during the 1930s, 31 percent of all companies maintained such services.⁴⁵ This had spread much more

widely in the United States than elsewhere. As to why this was, economic profitability is not likely to be the only explanation. An additional answer is related to the absence of a social class structure like the British in which a relatively high degree of tact, consideration, and tolerance was developed in its Society and had descended the social water tower. America's class system of open competition prevented a further rise in the societal level of mutual trust or mutually expected self-restraints, which made Americans more dependent upon external social constraints. In this relational context, Americans developed 'social engineering' into a kind of security system in order to control conflicts and the dangerous emotions involved. Industrial relations departments are such a form of external social control; they lubricate, supervise, and pacify, and it is this function of a social constraint toward self-restraint, lowering the level of insecurity, mutual fear, suspicion and hatred, that helps explain why industrial relations departments spread so early and widely in the United States.

d. Superlatives and Popularity

The process-continuity of a variety of competing Best Societies and other groups also helps explain why Americans tend to use superlatives - overstatements, not only according to the British standard - and a relatively open display of feelings of superiority. More open competition and a stronger reliance on supervision and other forms of external social controls have formed a barrier to the development of lower-pitched or subtler forms of expression and negotiation; they continued to stimulate more pronounced and accentuated forms of impression management. 'Bragging and boasting,' 'exaggeration,' 'national self-consciousness and conceit' appeared as generally recognized American characteristics in a 1941 review.⁴⁶ Irving Berlin ironized this tradition in his lyric 'Anything you can do, I can do better. I can do anything better than you.' And in the late 1970s and again in the mid-1990s, Judith Martin did the same by calling her books *Miss Manners' Guide to Excruciatingly Correct Behavior* and *Miss Manners Rescues Civilization*. In some circles, media circles in particular, the use of superlatives in negotiations has reached levels at which the uncertainty about their meaning is pushed up so high that many are left with the question, 'What's the bullshit degree?' This use of superlatives is symptomatic of uncertainty of rank, of porous and changing social dividing lines. In circles where social positions are more stable and established, the use of superlatives tends to diminish, as the example of British Society demonstrates. Another example is the Republic of the

Netherlands in the eighteenth century. In the first part of that century, it had become a civilized custom in Dutch Society to outbid each other in mutual compliments. According to the Dutch historian Pieter Spierenburg, customs like these 'reflect the fact that within the patriciate there was often no certainty about rank.' In the second half of the eighteenth century, when this uncertainty had diminished, 'the higher strata in the Republic dropped these forms of ceremonial altogether ... [and] the dropped habits came to be regarded as characteristic of the middle class.'⁴⁷

Open competition and its related status-striving may also explain why Americans are more directly and more openly concerned with social success in terms of popularity. In American etiquette books, manners and popularity are closely linked. The manners books from the other countries under study use the term success in the sense of gaining respect and appreciation, but the term popularity is completely absent. The close link in American books seems to be another symptom of relatively high status insecurity and status consciousness. In the antebellum period, Americans developed a high sensitivity to confidence men and a fear of hypocrisy that were countered by developing a system of 'sincerity', as Karen Halttunen has vividly described. In her view, it 'expressed the deep concern of status-conscious social climbers that they themselves and those around them were "passing" for something they were not.' After 1870, as she points out, 'a new success literature was emerging that effectively instructed its readers to cultivate the arts of the confidence man in order to succeed in the corporate business world.'⁴⁸ As the expansion of this world stimulated both status insecurity and the circuits in which confidence men could operate successfully, Americans more or less started to beat confidence men at their own game, a peculiar example of 'if you can't beat them, join them.' This change implies that the link between manners and popularity was established when Americans openly embraced social manipulation (or social engineering) as an art.⁴⁹ It was a transformation that can be interpreted as a conciliating mix of middle-class and aristocratic patterns of emotion management: middle-class 'sincerity', 'honesty' or 'true virtue' was mixed with aristocratic 'grace', 'charm' or 'outward politeness'. This mix implied a higher level of awareness or reflection than the former, more or less automatic reliance on being principled and sincere. Book titles like *The Secret of Popularity: How to Achieve Social Success* are in themselves clear demonstrations of this embrace. The opening sentence of this book, published in 1904, states that it 'has been written to the especial benefit of those men and women who

wished to be liked and admired and are not,' while its suggested bottom line reads: 'popularity, like charity, begins really at home,'⁵⁰ a clear attempt to give success striving a basis of sincerity. In 1922, Emily Post also combined old-time sincerity with modern social manipulation. Focusing on young girls, she writes, 'Instead of depending on beauty, upon sex-appeal, the young girl who is "the success of to-day" depends chiefly upon her actual character and disposition. ... secret of popularity? It is unconscious of self, altruistic interest, and inward kindness, outwardly expressed in good manners' (287). Here, Post echoes the nineteenth-century demand to demonstrate 'perfect sincerity or 'transparency of character.' At the same time, the twentieth-century competitive 'rating' aspect of popularity is quite outspoken: 'In olden days and until a comparatively short while ago, a young girl's social success was invariably measured by her popularity in a ballroom. It was the girl who had the most partners, who least frequently sat 'against the wall' (284). In 1937, Emily Post had written a whole new chapter on popularity with sections like 'Popularity Analyzed', 'Lasting or Transient Popularity' and 'To Make Ourselves Liked'. In the context of the 'rating and dating complex', many discussions centered on petting: 'The reason many teenage girls pet is because "everyone else does" and they're afraid of being unpopular, of missing out on good times! But petting is a high price to pay for popularity.' In the 1960s, similar advice read: 'Promiscuity isn't a short cut to authentic popularity. ... You may say, "Nobody needs to know." But it never, never remains a secret that a girl is generally available...'⁵¹

Dale Carnegie directly connected popularity and friendship to success in business, and he brought this out straightforwardly in his book's title, *How to Win Friends and Influence People* (1940). This open emphasis on social manipulation as an art, presenting its author as some sort of 'charm school' director, seems typically American; in other countries such a title probably would have been banned as too embarrassing to be commercially sound. For instance, in the Netherlands, a translation of Carnegie's book was entitled 'How to make friends and establish good relations.' Earlier as well as later American book titles, for instance *How to Make Friends and Deal Effectively in the Global Marketplace*,⁵² indicate a tradition of connecting friendship, popularity, and business success. In the countries under study, particularly in Germany, and also in France,⁵³ this is often experienced as a tradition of insincerity and hypocrisy. And indeed, in some cases this American tradition of wanting to be liked and to seek validation from everyone seems

to go over the top. Take, for example, these introductory words:

Too often many of us feel like Willy Loman did in Arthur Miller's classic play, *Death of a Salesman*. Willy said: "Oh, I'm liked, I'm just not *well* liked." We want to be well liked, we want to be able to meet new people without a trace of nervousness or a queasy stomach, we want to know how to be casual and friendly, know how to turn strangers into friends. In short how to unlock the "real you" and have people like you. That's what this book is going to do for you.⁵⁴

Ironically, these lines are an example of exactly that American death-denying mentality - 'Winning's not the most important thing, it's the only thing' - against which Miller's play is directed.

e. 'Service' as Profitable and Pacifying

In the 1930s, the rise of 'social promiscuity' in the United States, or, in other words, the declining importance of introductions and other such hierarchically differentiated ways of establishing relationships, coincided with an increasing concern for manners in the business world, that is, business etiquette. The Depression may have exerted pressure in this direction, but in the other countries under study, only a few translations from American books on this subject appeared. There, this concern only reached comparable intensity in the 1980s and 1990s, whereas in the United States a large number of sections and articles on the subject had already appeared in the 1930s. According to Deborah Robertson Hodges, author of an annotated bibliography of twentieth-century etiquette books, one of the authors of business etiquette, Joan Wing, 'created a niche for herself by proving that improved manners among employees would mean improved efficiency in business.'⁵⁵ Thus, what Emily Post had formulated rather casually about social navigation in fashionable society - 'they show their red or green signals - which are merely polite sentences and pleasant manners' - was taken more seriously, adopted, and further developed in offices and other places of work. In the words of Schlesinger, 'And so, by a strange juxtaposition of circumstances, stereotyped politeness, having been ejected from the drawing-room and the dance floor, found an unforeseen asylum in the marts of trade.'⁵⁶ According to Hodges, 'Even the railroads jumped on the courtesy bandwagon, as the the British [1937] article 'Smile School: Teaching Courtesy and Service to Railroaders, U.P. Trouble-Shooter's Job' would indicate. The trouble-shooter's job is 'instructing railroad employees on the best ways to avoid getting angry

at finicky passengers.⁵⁷ A little later, via Dale Carnegie's famous book, the smile-school message was spread widely; it has been further developed in literature and campaigns ever since: 'no "attacking or defending" behaviors, please.'⁵⁸ This literature describes the behavior Arlie Hochschild analyzed in *The Managed Heart* (1983); she has interpreted this kind of smiling and trouble shooting as a 'commercialization of human feeling'. A rival interpretation would see it as the commercialization, or rather as the 'trickling down' of the pleasant manners of Best Society via the expansion of commercial classes. It was this 'waterfall of imitation descending from the social water-tower' which has resulted in the type of civility for which Harold Nicolson expressed his deep admiration: 'They call it "service", but we should describe it as a universal gift for being unfailingly helpful, hospitable and polite. It is not a virtue confined to any class; it comes as naturally to a porter at a railway station as it does to the president of a freshwater university.'⁵⁹ This 'public virtue' did not come naturally, of course, but resulted from the particular development of American society, in which good manners had a particularly important function. Until the present day, manners also have been more strongly emphasized than in the other countries; Americans take etiquette books and doing 'the right thing' more seriously, in business and in politics. The latter is expressed in these typically American sentiments, published in 1946: 'When manners break down, anarchy begins; and anarchy always ends eventually in force and tyranny of some kind... Fascism and Nazism are modern examples.'⁶⁰ A similarly serious appreciation of manners was demonstrated by President Bush when he used a term from the discourse of manners in formulating one of the arguments for ending the Gulf War; he said that it would have been 'unchivalrous' to continue, for it would have only led to 'unnecessary killing'. In no other country is the pacifying function of manners - to avoid 'unnecessary killing' and, of course, other humiliation - so heavily emphasized. The comparatively large overall importance attached to manners can be understood from their specific function in the integration process of a country with a quite open competition between Best Societies, businesses, and religious and ethnic groups.⁶¹ A casual anecdote on snobs in *How To Be Happy Though Civil*, published in 1909, illuminates this function:

The greatest snob is polite when he knows that it is safer or more to his interest to be so. 'The idea of calling this the Wild West!' exclaimed a lady, travelling in Montana, to one of the old hands. 'Why, I never saw such politeness anywhere. The

men here all treat each other like gentlemen in the drawing-room!' 'Yes, Marm, it's safer,' laconically replied the native, with a glance at his six-shooter.

Taken more broadly, this anecdote suggests that the waterfall of imitation was enforced by 'American Tough'.⁶² In the absence of specific rules of procedure for avoiding 'strangers' and situations that might be dangerous (avoiding anger), both 'American Tough' and 'have-a-nice-day' manners can be interpreted as functional successions to the protection provided by introductions, cards, and calling. The same goes for the multitude of American expressions like 'take it easy,' 'no sweat' or 'keep your shirt on.' This 'take-it-easy' custom has been interpreted (in 1943) as evidence of the desire of Americans 'to avoid mental and physical irritation and the strain that follows it.' In contrast to the tough-guy tradition, the 'take-it-easy' and 'have-a-nice-day' customs function not only to lubricate social intercourse but also to pacify it. They are another form of external social control, a kind of security system, preventing and containing conflicts and the dangerous emotions involved. They form a social constraint toward self-restraint through which the level of insecurity, mutual fear, suspicion and hatred is lowered. In a country where so many 'tough guys' of so many diverse groups are fiercely involved in open competition, where the state has rather incompletely monopolized the use of violence - where there are so many weapons around (that are used to kill and wound people) - the need 'to avoid getting angry', not just at 'finicky customers' but in all situations, has been quite pressing. This necessity illuminates Peabody's observations that 'for Americans, a tradition of violence exists side by side with a desire to be liked by everyone' and that Americans in particular try to avoid public hostility and get 'along with others without friction by smiling affably.'⁶³

4. Concluding Remark

In this chapter, I have attempted to describe developments in emotion management via changes in a few topics in manners books that stand out as specifically American. I have illuminated them mainly by placing them in a wider international comparative context, focusing on connections between differences and changes in national class structures and differences and changes in specific patterns of emotion management. The specific processes of social integration in each country, particularly the ways the ranks of the falling strata have been opened up by and to the rising strata, appear to have been decisive for the form and manner in which their distinctive patterns of emotion management influenced each other, and for the type of mixture that finally resulted as a national habitus. In other

words, each national habitus emerged from the specific process of change in the relative power-chances of the rising and falling strata, from their specific forms and levels of competition and cooperation. National variations in these processes are reflected in the particular ways the courtesy genre of manners books developed into the etiquette genre. By comparative analysis of changes in ways of addressing readers, in the usage of social introductions and in social dividing lines between public and private, formal and informal, I have tried to illuminate the specifically American integration process, characterized by relatively open competition, a high level of (status) anxiety, and a comparatively strong reliance on external social controls. The development of a specifically American cultural structure - particularly the different importance of high Society, its weaker protection against intruders, a rather high level of anxiety with regard to status, anger, and violence, and, correspondingly, a lower level of mutual trust – helps explain several aspects of the American habitus, such as a smaller formality-informality span, 'American tough', 'take-it-easy' and 'have-a-nice-day' manners, the use of superlatives, a preoccupation with popularity and social manipulation or engineering. In the description of these connections, the contours of the development of a specifically American overall emotional style have been outlined.

My thanks to Johan Goudsblom, Richard Kilminster, Michael Schröter, Pieter Spierenburg, and Peter Stearns for valuable comments, as well as to Stephen Mennell, who revised my English.

ENDNOTES

1. The American transformation from the courtesy genre to the etiquette genre is solidly presented by C. Dallett Hemphill, 'Middle Class Rising in Revolutionary America: the evidence from manners', Journal of Social History, Winter 1996: 317-344; this quotation, page 333.
2. This chapter results from a larger comparative study; for earlier reports, see Cas Wouters, 'Etiquette Books and Emotion Management in the 20th Century; Part One - The Integration of Social Classes'; Journal of Social History Vol. 29 (1995a): 107-124, and Part Two - 'The Integration of the Sexes'; Journal of Social History Vol. 29 (1995b): 325-340.
3. Gabriel Tarde, Laws of Imitation, (1903)(original 1890): 221; see also Pitirim A. Sorokin, Social and Cultural Mobility, (New York: Free Press 1964), 549-640. The term 'trickle effect' is from Lloyd A. Fallers, 'A Note on the Trickle Effect', Public Opinion Quarterly 18 (1954): 314-21. There are many earlier formulations of this model function. De Tocqueville, for instance, distinguished between the copying of manners in aristocracies and copying in a democracy (America). In a democracy, he wrote, 'manners are constantly characterized by a

number of lesser diversities, but not by any great differences. They are never perfectly alike because they do not copy from the same pattern; they are never very unlike because their social condition is the same' Democracy in America New York: Vintage 1945, 2: 229. An earlier such formulation can be read in the introduction to the Dutch translation of Freiherr von Knigge's famous courtesy book (1788): 'The courts, as they are the center to which everything flows, they are also the center or general source from which the mentality and way of life of nations is steadily springing and receiving its alterations. This goes in particular for the more civilized circuits; not only in the monarchical countries, although it is from there that everything spreads to nation after nation, at least in Europe ... even those far away in the barren North, have tuned in' (J.H. Swildens, 'Over den tegenwoordigen toestand der samenleving in onze republiek.' in: Knigge (van), Over de verkeer met menschen, Amsterdam 1789: LXXXIX; quoted in Pieter Spierenburg, Elites and Etiquette: Mentality and Social Structure in the Early Modern Northern Netherlands, Centrum voor Maatschappijgeschiedenis, volume 9, Erasmus University Rotterdam 1981: 28.

4. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Learning How to Behave: A Historical Study of American Etiquette Books (New York: Macmillan 1946): 65/6; Emily Post, Etiquette in Society, in Business, in Politics and at Home (New York: Funk and Wagnalls 1922, revised editions 1927/31/34/37/42/50/60): xxvii.

5. Norbert Elias, The Civilizing Process (Cambridge MA, Blackwells 1994): 511.

6. See my articles (1995a and 1995b) mentioned in note 2, and also 'On Status Competition and Emotion Management', Journal of Social History, 24(4) 1991: 699-717. See also Abram de Swaan, 'Widening Circles of Social Identification: Emotional Concerns in Sociogenetic Perspective' (Theory, Culture & Society 12, 1995: 25-39).

7. see also Norbert Elias, The Germans. Power Struggles and the Development of Habitus in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries (Cambridge, Polity Press 1996): 459/60.

8. Michael Curtin, Propriety and Position: A Study in Victorian Manners (New York and London, Garland 1987): 110.

9. Chet Cunningham, How to Meet People and Make Friends (Leucadia CA, United Research Publishers 1992): xi; Hemphill 1996, 321.

10. J.P.A. Coopmans, 'Het Plakkaat van Verlatinge (1581) en de Declaration of Independence (1776)', in: Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden 98 (1983): 540-567. The 'process of aristocratization' (see Spierenburg 1981) was not unique to the Netherlands. In the USA too, after the decline of a 'Southern aristocracy' before and in the Civil War, ruling classes again attempted with some success to function as an aristocracy, see also E. Digby Baltzell, The Protestant Establishment: Aristocracy and Caste in America (New Haven, Yale University Press 1987, orig. 1964); Seymour Martin Lipset, The First New Nation. The United States in Historical and Comparative Perspective (Garden City, Anchor Books 1967, orig. 1963); Johan Goudsblom, Dutch Society (New York, Random House 1967): 154).

11. Norbert Elias, The Germans 1996: 296 (on compromising also: 113,133,163,199); Hans-

Otto Meissner, Man benimmt sich wieder (Giessen, Brühlscher 1951): 242-3.

12. Elias The Civilizing Process 1994: 505/6.

13. Hemphill, 325; Stephen Kahlberg, 'West German and American Interaction Forms: One Level of Structured Misunderstanding' Theory, Culture & Society 4(1987): 603-618, here 608; see also Kurt Lewin, Resolving Social Conflict (New York, Harper & Row 1948).

14. R. Dahrendorf, Society and Democracy in Germany (Garden City NY, Doubleday 1969): 300; Dean Peabody, National Characteristics (New York, Cambridge University Press 1985): 113.

15. Elias, The Civilizing Process 1994: 13-21; De Tocqueville already observed a similar difference: 'In aristocracies the rules of propriety impose the same demeanor on everyone; they make all the members of the same class appear alike in spite of their private inclinations; they adorn and conceal the natural man. Among a democratic people manners are neither so tutored nor so uniform, but they are frequently more sincere. They form, as it were, a light and loosely woven veil through which the real feelings and private opinions of each individual are easily discernable. The form and substance of human actions, therefore, often stand there in closer relation...' (de Tocqueville 1945, II: 230).

16. Kahlberg 1987: 616.

17. Dr. Gertrud Oheim, Einmaleins des guten Tons (Gütersloh, Bertelsmann 1955): 29.

18. For recent warnings against duzen at office parties, see for example Sybil Gräfin Schönfeldt, 1 x 1 des guten Tons (München, Mosaik Verlag 1987, and Hamburg 1991): 273, and Irmgard Wolter, Der Gute Ton in Gesellschaft und Beruf (Falken Bücherei 1990): 75/6; the quotation is from Oheim 1955: 133.

19. Elias The Germans 1996: 28; examples of German informalization: Wouters 1995a.

20. Moyra Bremner, Enquire within upon Modern Etiquette and Successful Behaviour for Today (London etc., Century 1989): 20; see also Lewin, Resolving Social Conflict, his illustrative drawings in particular.

21. David Riesman, (with N. Glazer and R. Denney) The Lonely Crowd (New Haven and London, Yale University Press 1969, orig. 1950), and Ralf Dahrendorf, Die angewandte Aufklärung (Frankfurt a/M, Fischer 1968). S.M. Lipset presents a connection between competition, status uncertainty, and conformity; he views the latter as resulting from status-striving: 127-9.

22. Curtin, Propriety and Position: 121. An interesting comparison of English and Austrian habitus is: Helmut Kuzmics, 'Österreichischer und englischer Volkscharakter' in H. Nowotny and K. Taschwer (eds.), Macht und Ohnmacht im neuen Europa (Wien: WUV 1993).

23. James Millar, How to be a perfect Gentleman (Rosters 1897): 43/4.

24. Peabody, National Characteristics 1985: 99.

25. Quoted in Cecil Porter, Not Without A Chaperone. Modes and Manners from 1897 to 1914 (London: New English Library 1972): 24/5.
26. Curtin, Propriety and Position 1987: 107.
27. Millar How to be a Perfect Gentleman 1897: 32; see also the change in the meaning of 'snob' in Wouters 1995a.
28. Davidoff The Best Circles 1973: 102.
29. Tom Wolfe, Radical Chic & Mau-Mauing the Flak Catchers (New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux 1970): 35.
30. Carson The Polite Americans 1966: 240. Carson views the "country club" as 'an American improvisation, now about eighty years old, [which] provides a rough equivalent of the English weekend, adapted to American conditions' (p. 244); see also Baltzell The Protestant Establishment 1964: 123.
31. Harold Nicolson, Good Behaviour. Studies of Certain Types of Civility (London, Constable 1955): 18.
32. Davidoff, The Best Circles 1973: 102.
33. Habits of Good Society: A Handbook of Etiquette (London: James Hogg & Sons 1859); Censor, Don't: A Manual of Mistakes & Improprities more or less prevalent in Conduct and Speech (London: Field & Tuer 1884): 5/6.
34. Millar How to be a Perfect Gentleman 1897: 53. It is telling that rare exceptions in the British sources - sentences like 'I have lunched in the house of a nouveau riche where they seemed to line the dining room with footmen and other servants, till it was positively oppressive' or 'One occasionally meets vulgar people who seek to impress those around them with their own (supposed) superiority... - were deleted from a next edition (Flora Klickmann, The Etiquette of To-day London 1902: 33/48, and 1915); Tocqueville Democracy in America 1945,II: 229.
35. Mary E.W. Sherwood, Manners and Social Usages (New York: Harper 1907): 359; Marion Harland and Virginia van de Water, Everyday Etiquette. A Practical Manual of Social Usages (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill 1905): 123.
36. Margaret Wade, Social Usage in America (New York: Thomas Crowell 1924): 28; Emily Holt, The Secret of Popularity: How to Achieve Social Success (1901/4/20): 9; John Wesley Hanson Jr., Etiquette of To-Day: The Customs and Usages Required by Polite Society (Chicago 1896): 45.
37. Post 1937: 10/353.
38. Hanson 1896: 38; Sherwood 1907: 2.
39. Hanson 1896: 38/9; Humphry 1897: 72; The "cut direct" is 'to look directly at another and

not acknowledge the other's bow (...) a direct stare of blank refusal', Post 1940: 30.

40. Quoted in Schlesinger 1946: 20.

41. Harland and de Water 1905.

42. Edmund Wilson, 'Books of Etiquette and Emily Post', in: Classics and Commercials. A Literary Chronicle of The Forties (New York: Vintage 1962): 375/381.

43. Post 1922: 81 and 15. Mrs. Post was not that exceptional; Margaret Wade, in her Social Usage in America (1924) presented similarly strict rules for introductions.

44. Hanson 1896: 38/9; Mrs. C.E. Humphry, Etiquette for Every Day (London: Richards 1897/1902): 72; The 'right of recognition' has found an optimal expression in the joke about the lady who refuses to 'recognize' a man by saying 'sexual intercourse is no social introduction.'

45. Peter N. Stearns, American Cool: Constructing a Twentieth-Century Emotional Style, New York and London: New York University Press 1994): 125.

46. L. Coleman, 'What is American? A Study of Alleged American Traits', Social Forces 19 (1941): 492-499. A befriended businessman told me an amusing example of open display of feelings of superiority. Once, he was told 'You're a real pro; you can charm a monkey's balls! But there's a difference between you and me: I can do it all the time.'

47. Spierenburg 1981: 30.

48. Karen Halttunen, Confidence Men and Painted Women (New Heaven: Yale UP 1982): xv and 198.

49. Another indication follows from a book on dating; in the 1958 edition a section headed 'How To Be Popular' was changed into 'Learning Social Skills' in the 1968 edition. Evelyn Millis Duvall with Joy Duvall Johnson, The Art of Dating (New York: Association Press 1958 and 1968): 17. It may also indicate that the traditional emphasis on popularity increasingly came to be experienced as embarrassingly direct and crude.

50. Holt 1904: 241.

51. Willard Waller, 'The Rating and Dating Complex', in American Sociological Review 2 (1937): 727-734; Lilian Eichler Watson, The Standard Book of Etiquette (New York: Garden City 1948): 479; Elisabeth L. Post, Emily Post's Etiquette (New York: HarperCollins 1992, 15th edition, orig. 1965): 152.

52. For example, Mary A. Hopkins, Profits from Courtesy (Garden City 1937); Cunningham 1992; Lennie Copeland & Lewis Griggs Going International. How to Make Friends and Deal Effectively in the Global Marketplace (New York: Plume 1986).

53. Raymonde Carroll, Cultural Misunderstandings: The French-American Experience (translated by Carol Volk, Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1989).

54. Cunningham 1992: xi.

55. Deborah Robertson Hodges, Etiquette. An Annotated Bibliography of Literature Published in English in the United States, 1900 through 1987 (Jefferson NC and London: McFarland 1989): 8.

56. Schlesinger 1946: 61.

57. Hodges 1989: 8/9.

58. Stearns American Cool 1994: 310.

59. Arlie Russel Hochschild, The Managed Heart. Commercialization of Human Feeling (Berkeley: University of California Press 1983) Nicolson, Good Behaviour 1955: 16.

60. Struthers Burt, 'Manners Maykth Man', Ladies' Home Journal, Vol. 63 (May 1946): 6, quoted in Hodges 1989: 9.

61. Before the 1950s, ethnic minority groups had been largely excluded from the 'open' competition. From then on, Negroes - later called blacks and African-Americans - had become sufficiently powerful to force white people to take their feelings and interests more into account. America's relatively high level of segregation 'on grounds of religion, ethnic background or race' had to be increasingly faced and its history of 'open' competitiveness reconsidered. The tensions and conflicts involved in this process came to function as a barrier to further increases in the level of mutual trust and provided additional motives for avoiding public hostility and anger.

62. E.J. Hardy How To Be Happy Though Civil (New York: Scribners 1909): 279; Rupert Wilkinson, American Tough: The Tough-Guy Tradition and American Character (Westport Conn. 1984).

63. John Whyte, American Words and Ways especially for German Americans (New York: Viking Press 1943): 131; Peabody 1985: 174/211.